

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

Bendamustine Hydrochloride (Treanda) for First Line Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia

February 19, 2013

## 3 Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation

Name of the drug indication(s):

		lymphocytic leuk			
rsed by:		Provincial Advisory Group Vice-Chair			
	provided by eigh ticipating in pCOD	•	nces (Ministries of Health and/or provincial cancer		
Comme	ents on the Initial I	Recommendation			
	Please indicate if the PAG (either as individual PAG members and/or as a group) agrees or disagrees with the initial recommendation:				
X	agrees	agre	ees in part disagree		
bendar lympho accept eligible deliber conside	mustine (Treanda ocytic leukemia (Gable level. Membe e patient populat rations section of ered that the recally fit to tolerate	) in the first line se CLL) conditional on pers indicated the w ion appears to be be the document. Mer ommendation was of fludarabine-based	with the initial pERC recommendation to fund etting for the treatment of patients with chronic the cost-effectiveness being improved to an wording of the recommendation related to the broader than that which is considered in the mbers suggest potential wording such as "pERC only applicable to patients who may not be I regimens and who would be treated with other		
	s such as chloram				
b) No	etwithstanding the buld support this in	nitial recommendation	in part a) above, please indicate if the PAG on proceeding to final pERC recommendation within 2(two) business days of the end of the		
b) No	otwithstanding the buld support this in early conversion") nsultation period.	nitial recommendation, which would occur on to final	on proceeding to final pERC recommendation		

Bendamustine Hydrochloride (Treanda) for first line chronic

clearly worded? Is the intent clear? Are the reasons clear?

c) Please provide feedback on the initial recommendation. Is the initial recommendation or are the components of the recommendation (e.g., clinical and economic evidence)

Page		Paragraph,	Comments and Suggested Changes to
Number	Section Title	Line Number	Improve Clarity
3	Overall clinical	3. line 4	PAG members noted that clarity in the
	benefit		patient population, ie. for whom
			fludarabine is not appropriate, may
			reduce concerns around the potential
			request for FCR (fludarabine,
			cyclophosphamide and rituximab) once
			patients fail bendamustine.
1	pERC	Does not exist	PAG members noted that the
	recommendation		recommended dose of bendamustine in
			CLL is not included in the
			recommendation. Members suggested the
			insertion of either the recommended dose
			of bendamustine for first line CLL or a
			sentence indicating that bendamustine
			has different recommended doses
			depending on the indication. Members
			noted that this may potentially aid in
			avoiding confusion in the clinical setting.

## 3.2 Comments related to PAG input

Please provide feedback on any issues not adequately addressed in the initial recommendation based on the PAG input provided at the outset of the review on potential impacts and feasibility issues of adopting the drug within the health system.

Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Comments related to initial PAG input
NA	NA	NA	NA

## 3.3 Additional comments about the initial recommendation document

Please provide any additional comments:

Page	Section	Paragraph,	Additional Comments
Number	Title	Line Number	
			PAG noted that although issues around wastage have already been noted in the pCODR recommendation report, it will likely continue to be an issue that must be addressed at the negotiation and implementation level.