



Canada's Drug Agency  
L'Agence des médicaments du Canada

Reimbursement Recommendation

# Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Omaveloxolone (Skyclarys)

Indication: For the treatment of Friedreich's ataxia in patients 16 years of age and older

Sponsor: Biogen Canada Inc.

Recommendation: Reimburse with Conditions

Version: 1.0  
Publication Date: March 2025  
Report Length: 24 Pages



**Canada's Drug Agency** (CDA-AMC) is a pan-Canadian health organization. Created and funded by Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, we're responsible for driving better coordination, alignment, and public value within Canada's drug and health technology landscape. We provide Canada's health system leaders with independent evidence and advice so they can make informed drug, health technology, and health system decisions, and we collaborate with national and international partners to enhance our collective impact.

**Disclaimer:** CDA-AMC has taken care to ensure that the information in this document was accurate, complete, and up to date when it was published, but does not make any guarantee to that effect. Your use of this information is subject to this disclaimer and the Terms of Use at [cda-amc.ca](https://cda-amc.ca).

The information in this document is made available for informational and educational purposes only and should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice, the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient, or other professional judgments in any decision-making process. You assume full responsibility for the use of the information and rely on it at your own risk.

CDA-AMC does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily reflect those of CDA-AMC. The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (operating as CDA-AMC) and its licensors.

Questions or requests for information about this report can be directed to [Requests@CDA-AMC.ca](mailto:Requests@CDA-AMC.ca).



## Recommendation

The CDA-AMC Canadian Drug Expert Committee (CDEC) recommends that omaveloxolone be reimbursed for the treatment of Friedreich's ataxia (FA) in patients 16 years of age and older only if the conditions listed in Table 1 are met.

## Rationale for the Recommendation

Friedreich's ataxia is a rare, inherited, degenerative disease that causes damage to the nervous system, resulting in difficulties with coordination, balance and movement, fatigue, and difficulty speaking. CDEC emphasized that there is a need for effective therapies for patients with FA.

Evidence from one phase II randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled trial (MOXIe Part 2, N=103) demonstrated that at week 48, treatment with omaveloxolone likely results in a slower progression of neurological decline in patients with FA compared with placebo. In the full analysis set, patients receiving omaveloxolone experienced a mean improvement (a decrease) in mFARS score of 1.45 points versus a worsening (increase) of 0.90 points in the placebo group—yielding an estimated mean difference of  $-2.40$  points (95% CI:  $-4.31$  to  $-0.50$ ;  $P = 0.0141$ ). In addition, improvements in activities of daily living (ADL) were observed (mean difference  $-1.30$  points). Although secondary endpoints (upper limb function, mobility, and fall frequency) did not show significant differences. Importantly, there is a high unmet need for a disease-modifying treatment in FA; which is a rare, debilitating condition with no approved alternatives.

Input from patient groups and clinical experts underscores the severe burden of FA, the profound impact on quality of life, and the absence of effective disease modifying therapies. Patients report that even slowing of disease progression could help preserve function and independence. CDEC acknowledges that while omaveloxolone appears to meet some patient needs (e.g. stabilization of mFARS and ADL), uncertainty remains due to the lack of an estimated meaningful improvement difference (MID) estimates.

Using the sponsor-submitted price for omaveloxolone and publicly listed prices for all other drug costs, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for omaveloxolone plus standard of care (SOC) was \$1,534,503 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained compared with SOC alone (health care payer perspective). At this ICER, omaveloxolone plus SOC is not cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY willingness to pay threshold for patients aged 16 years and older with FA. A price reduction is required for omaveloxolone plus SoC to be considered cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold.

**Table 1: Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons**

Reimbursement condition	Reason	Implementation guidance
<b>Initiation</b>		
1. Adults and adolescents aged 16 years and older as per the following criteria: 1.1. genetically confirmed FA 1.2. mFARS score $\geq 20$ and $\leq 80$ 1.3. must not have severe pes cavus 1.4. must be ambulatory	MOXIe Part 2 trial provided evidence of safety and efficacy for the use of omeveloxolone in patients with genetically confirmed FA who are 16 years of age and older with a baseline mFARS score $\geq 20$ and $\leq 80$ . Analysis of omeveloxolone in MOXIe Part 2 suggests that patients without severe pes cavus will benefit the most from the treatment while there was insufficient evidence to suggest that non-ambulatory patients would perceive benefits from the treatment.	The clinical experts noted to CDEC that diagnosis of FA should be based on confirmed presence of of biallelic mutations of the FXN gene.  Ambulation can be defined as the ability to ambulate more than 7 meters without stopping, the use of assistive device in the clinical assessment is allowed.  Pes cavus is a foot deformity often seen as a complication of Friedreich's ataxia. The clinical experts noted to CDEC that there is no standardised method to classify the severity of pes cavus
2. The maximum duration of initial authorization is 12 months.	The MOXIe Part 2 trial assessed the primary endpoint at week 48	—
<b>Renewal</b>		
3. For renewal after initial authorization and each subsequent annual renewal, the physician must provide proof of beneficial clinical effect when requesting continuation of reimbursement, defined as stabilization (i.e., no deterioration from baseline) following treatment initiation, as measured by the mFARS score.	MOXIe Part 2 trial demonstrate that patients who benefited from omeveloxolone exhibited a stabilization of the disease at 48 weeks of the study. Considering the nature of the disease and the large unmet need, clinical experts and patient groups suggested that disease stabilization can be considered meaningful.	—
<b>Discontinuation</b>		
4. Treatment with omeveloxolone should be discontinued if the patients develops loss of ambulation	There is lack of evidence that omeveloxolone would benefit patients with the outlined clinical presentations.	—
<b>Prescribing</b>		
5. The patients must be under the care of a clinician experienced in treating ataxias.	Accurate diagnosis and management of patients with FA are important to ensure that omeveloxolone treatment is prescribed to appropriate patients.	—
<b>Pricing</b>		
6. A reduction in price	The ICER for omeveloxolone plus SOC is \$1,534,503 when compared with SOC alone (health care payer perspective).  A price reduction of 97% would be required for omeveloxolone plus SOC to	—

Reimbursement condition	Reason	Implementation guidance
	achieve an ICER of \$50,000 per QALY compared to SOC alone.	
<b>Feasibility of adoption</b>		
7. The economic feasibility of adoption of omaveloxolone plus SOC must be addressed	At the submitted price, the incremental budget impact of omaveloxolone plus SOC is expected to be greater than \$40 million in year 1, year 2, and year 3.	—

FA = Friedreich's Ataxia; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; mFARS = modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale; QALY= quality-adjusted life-year; SOC = standard of care.

## Discussion Points

- Criteria for significant unmet need are met:** CDEC noted that there was uncertainty with the clinical evidence; therefore, the committee deliberated on omaveloxolone considering the criteria for significant unmet need described in the [Procedures for CDA-AMC Reimbursement Reviews](#). Considering the rarity and severity of the condition, and the absence of clinically effective alternatives, the committee concluded that the available evidence reasonably suggests that omaveloxolone has the potential to slow disease progression, although the available evidence is associated with uncertainty.
- GRADE assessment:** CDEC discussed the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) assessment of selected outcomes from the MOXIe Part 2 trial concluded with moderate certainty that treatment with omaveloxolone would likely result in a slower progression of the mFARS score and decrease in the ADL score in patients with FA compared to placebo, while omaveloxolone may result in little to no difference in the change in 9-HTP, 25-foot timed walk test, and change in frequency of falls compared to placebo in patients with FA.
- Clinical meaningfulness of the results:** The clinical experts indicated to CDEC that a change of 2 points in mFARS score is considered clinically meaningful, but also that stabilization of disease over a long period would be considered beneficial given the progressive nature of Friedreich ataxia. The MOXIe Part 2 trial demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in mFARS scores after 48 weeks of treatment compared to placebo (difference of -2.40 points, p=0.014). CDEC noted however that there is no defined MID for mFARS, and hence there is uncertainty regarding how important the difference between omaveloxolone and placebo that was observed in the MOXIe Part 2 trial is meaningful to the patients. CDEC also deliberated on the appropriate method to assess treatment response. While acknowledging the limitations of mFARS, they noted that it is a validated tool for assessing neurological function across four domains: bulbar, upper limb coordination, lower limb coordination, and upright stability. Therefore, CDEC recommended its use for evaluating the response to treatment with omaveloxolone.
- mFARS scale:** The clinical experts noted to CDEC that while the modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale (mFARS) is a valid research tool, it is time-consuming and not routinely employed in standard clinic visits and that requiring its use could limit equitable access, favoring patients who live closer to large centers with more resources. CDEC noted that the sponsor be required to cover the cost of the training and/or the resources required for the use of mFARS scale.
- Severe liver disease and severe heart failure:** CDEC discussed that the MOXIe Part 2 trial excluded patients with history of clinically significant left-sided heart disease and/or clinically significant cardiac disease. The trial also excluded patients with clinically significant liver disease, and hence CDEC noted that clinicians should use their clinical judgment when prescribing omaveloxolone for patients with these comorbidities. CDEC also noted that the Health Canada product monograph indicate that management of fluid overload and heart failure may require discontinuation of omaveloxolone.

- **Adverse events:** The clinical experts noted to CDEC that some adverse events due to omaveloxolone can be managed and reversed. In which cases temporarily discontinuation and subsequent reintroduction of omaveloxolone can be an option.
- **Long term efficacy:** CDEC discussed that the OLE study (a comparison of treatment-naïve patients and patients maintaining treatment) supports the clinical trial findings, but illustrates that the treatment effects may wain or decrease since the newly treated patients had better mFARS scores after 48 weeks. The real-world evidence comparison, in which there was an observed improvement in mFARS scores maintained through a period up to 3 years compared to an external cohort, illustrated that treated and nontreated patients both progressed at similar rates after the first year. While this provides supportive evidence of effectiveness in clinical practice, there are important limitations including potential selection bias in the FACOMS cohort and missing data at later timepoints that warrant cautious interpretation.
- **Impact on HRQoL:** Key outcomes identified as important by patient groups included maintaining independence in activities of daily living, slowing disease progression, improving quality of life, managing fatigue and energy levels, and maintaining ability to work/attend school. While the mFARS score captures aspects of physical function and disease progression as encapsulated in the mFARS end point, direct measures of quality of life, fatigue, and activities of daily living were either not assessed in the clinical trial or did not show significant treatment effect. This also includes the key secondary outcomes of PGIC and CGIC. Beyond the primary outcomes, all outcomes tested in the MOXle trial either included the null or fell outside of the statistical testing hierarchy, suggesting that the only evidence of efficacy for omaveloxolone was seen in the mFARS end point. This represents a gap in the evidence for outcomes most meaningful to patients. The clinical experts noted that improvements in mFARS would be expected to translate to functional benefits, but this relationship has not been formally established.
- **Evidence Gap:** CDEC discussed that there is no evidence on the effectiveness of omaveloxolone in patients with more advanced disease, impact on non-neurological manifestations, effects on disease progression in very early disease, and comparative long-term efficacy beyond 3 years.
- **Moral distress:** CDEC discussed the potential ethical challenges faced by providers due to the indication for omaveloxolone being limited to patients aged 16 or older. While they discussed the importance of setting clear parameters around reimbursement that relied on available clinical evidence, they also acknowledged that providers may face moral distress in restrictions on access to younger patients with FA, as well as pressure from patients and their caregivers to prescribe earlier (i.e., off-label). Given the life-limiting nature of FA, and vulnerability of pediatric patients broadly, the committee understood that providers are confronted with an ethical dilemma of balancing unknown efficacy and safety of omaveloxolone in patients younger than 16 years old against the risk of waiting to treat in the context of early-onset, progressive disease.
- **Equity of Access:** CDEC discussed ethical and equity considerations posed by the need for omaveloxolone to be prescribed, provided, and monitored by multidisciplinary care teams in specialised treatment centers. While they noted the geographic challenges to access arising from this need are neither unique to the implementation of omaveloxolone for FA, nor rare conditions more broadly, they stressed the importance of considering actions that may help to alleviate some of the potential inequities in geographic access (e.g., telemedicine for long-term monitoring).
- **Economic uncertainty:** CDEC discussed the uncertainty in the sponsor's economic analyses. In the absence of robust comparative evidence, the incremental gains in QALYs with omaveloxolone plus SoC predicted by the sponsor's model for both the health care payer and societal perspective analyses may overestimate the incremental benefits relative to SoC. Further price reductions may therefore be required.
- **Societal perspective:** CDEC discussed the sponsor's societal perspective analysis, which included indirect costs and outcomes such as transportation, education support, respite care, caregiver support, and productivity loss, as well as potential negative impacts on caregiver HRQoL. CDEC noted that indirect costs and outcomes were not assessed in the MOXle trial and that no evidence was submitted by the sponsor to support an impact of omaveloxolone on these costs or outcomes. Thus, the incremental costs and QALYs predicted in the sponsor's societal analysis are highly uncertain due to

a lack evidence of the impact of omaveloxolone and uncertainty associated with the chosen model inputs, and the committee deemed that the results of this analysis were too uncertain to inform decision making.

- **Budget impact:** CDEC discussed the uncertainty in the number of patients eligible for omaveloxolone. CDA-AMC's estimated budget impact of reimbursing omaveloxolone is based on registry data from Muscular Dystrophy Canada (MDC). Although not all people with FA may choose to register with MDC, clinical expert input received by CDA-AMC indicated that these registry data represent the most reliable estimates for Canada. If the number of people with FA in Canada is higher than estimated, the budget impact of reimbursing omaveloxolone will be greater.

## Background

Friedreich's Ataxia (FA) is a rare autosomal recessive ataxia caused by loss-of-function mutations from trinucleotide repeat expansions in the frataxin (FXN) gene located on chromosome 9q13. FA accounts for up to one half of all hereditary ataxia cases and affects approximately 1 in 30,000 to 1 in 50,000 white individuals. In Canada, estimates suggest between 300 and 1,000 patients are affected. FA typically presents in childhood or adolescence with a complex neurological phenotype characterized by progressive gait ataxia. Additional cerebellar signs including dysarthria and dysphagia; peripheral motor and sensory neuropathy combined with pyramidal signs; and, in advanced disease, visual and hearing impairment. Most affected individuals develop hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, which in some cases may precede the onset of ataxia. Diabetes mellitus and skeletal abnormalities such as pes cavus and scoliosis are also common. The disease considerably shortens life expectancy because of cardiac complications, with a mean age of death of 37 years. Currently, there are no approved disease-modifying therapies available in Canada for FA. Management focuses on supportive care, rehabilitation, and symptomatic treatment of complications.

FA is associated with inhibition of nuclear factor erythroid 2-related factor 2 (Nrf2), involved in cellular response and oxidative stress. The suppression of Nrf2 in FA results in oxidative damage leading to cell death and tissue degradation. Activation of Nrf2 by omaveloxolone has been shown to restore Nrf2 levels, increase Nrf2 activity, rescue mitochondrial dysfunction, and restore redox balance. The precise mechanism by which omaveloxolone exerts therapeutic effects in patients with Friedreich's ataxia is unknown.

The recommended dose of omaveloxolone is 150mg (3 capsules of 50mg each) taken orally once daily. The Health Canada indication is for the treatment of FA in patients 16 years of age and older.

## Sources of Information Used by the Committee

To make its recommendation, the committee considered the following information:

- a review of one pivotal phase 2 randomized controlled trial in patients aged 16 to 40 years, who have an mFARS score between 20 to 80 and genetically confirmed FA; one ongoing open-label extension (OLE); and one propensity score matched analysis included in the Studies Addressing Gaps in Systematic Review Evidence section
- patients' perspectives gathered by four patient groups, Muscular Dystrophy Canada (MDC), National Ataxia Foundation (NAF), Ataxia Canada – Claude-St-Jean Foundation, and Friedreich's Ataxia Research Alliance (FARA)
- input from public drug plans that participate in the reimbursement review process
- Four clinical specialists with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with FA
- input from one clinician group, Neuromuscular Disease Network for Canada (NMD4C)
- a review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor
- a review of relevant ethical issues related to omaveloxolone

## Perspectives of Patients, Clinicians, and Drug Programs

### Patient Input

Four patient groups, Muscular Dystrophy Canada (MDC), National Ataxia Foundation (NAF), Ataxia Canada – Claude-St-Jean Foundation, and Friedreich’s Ataxia Research Alliance (FARA) provided their input. The MDC identified and contacted adults living with FA and parents of children over the age of 16 years to participate in a healthcare experience survey and semi-structured virtual interview. They gathered insights from 85 individuals (between the ages of 16 and 70) with confirmed FA diagnosis on diagnostics delays, gaps in treatment, emotional and social effects, and access to care and support systems. The NAF conducted a survey of their community members with FA living in different provinces across Canada and received 14 responses (9 people with FA and 5 caregivers). Ataxia Canada gathered experiences of Canadian patients and caregivers through a combination of interviews and a survey and received 85 responses. Feedback from FARA regarding the disease experience was drawn from two sources. First, a white paper which included views from parents of children with FA living in the US highlighting the importance of pediatric inclusion in clinical trials. Second, a Patient Focused Drug Development Meeting that included 145 patients and caregivers, where participants were polled about current disease state, experience with different symptoms, and perspectives on future treatments.

Ataxia Canada and the MDC highlighted that patients with FA experience significant impact on the following: coordination and/or maintaining balance, mobility and scoliosis, productivity at home and work, on independence and social participation, and mental health. Additionally, FARA noted that patients and caregivers indicated neurological symptoms (balancing, walking, regular falls, coordination of hands and/or arms) and fatigue having the most impact on daily quality of life. The NAF, Ataxia Canada and FARA indicated that people with FA and their caregivers spend hours with symptom-based therapies (such as occupational therapy, speech therapy and physiotherapy), visiting medical specialists, and obtaining mobility devices which can be challenging, expensive and time consuming.

The patient groups agreed that there is a significant need for a treatment that is a cure or a treatment to reverse the effects of FA. Patients are also seeking for a treatment that slows and/or stops disease progression, promotes better symptom management, helps regain and/or preserve mobility, increases energy levels, improves health related quality of life and independence while reducing the physical and emotional burden on families and caregivers, and prevents complications such as scoliosis or diabetes. Currently, individuals require genetic testing to confirm the presence of biallelic mutations of the FXN gene. The MDC and NAF highlighted the process to be easy, especially for people with family members who had been diagnosed with FA. However, the process was often emotionally challenging but provided clarity about the diagnosis.

Four respondents (one each from MDC and NAF, and two from Ataxia Canada) shared their experience of accessing omaveloxolone via clinical trials. All respondents highlighted that being on the drug slowed disease progression, of which two were already wheelchair users. Viewpoints of individuals with FA and parents of individuals who participated in the MOXIe trial gathered by FARA included slowing progression, longer retention of motor function (improved endurance, speech, ability to walk, stay upright and eat), better coping with fatigue and minimal side effects (transient elevation of liver enzymes, cholesterol, headache, nausea, diarrhea).

### Clinician Input

#### *Input From Clinical Experts Consulted for This Review*

The information in this section is based on input received from a panel of 4 clinical specialists consulted by CDA-AMC for the purpose of this review.

The clinical experts consulted for this review emphasized that there are currently no approved disease-modifying treatments for FA in Canada, representing a critical unmet need. Current management relies on supportive care and symptom management, which do not alter the underlying progressive disease course.

The experts indicated that omaveloxolone would represent the first disease-modifying therapy for FA and would be positioned as a first-line option for eligible patients aged 16 years and older with genetically confirmed disease. They noted it would be used alongside existing supportive care measures rather than replacing them.



Regarding patient selection, the experts suggested that while all patients with confirmed FA could theoretically benefit, those at earlier disease stages may show more discernible stabilization before irreversible neurologic damage occurs. However, they emphasized that non-ambulatory patients should not be excluded, as preserving upper limb or bulbar function could still provide meaningful benefit.

For assessing treatment response, the experts acknowledged challenges in translating the clinical trial measures to routine practice. While the modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale (mFARS) was used in trials and in natural history studies, it is not commonly employed in clinical settings. Furthermore, they suggested monitoring for 2 years to establish efficacy but noted that even partial slowing of disease progression may be valuable. According to the experts, treatment discontinuation should be based primarily on safety/tolerability rather than lack of improvement alone, given the progressive nature of FA, the variability of the disease and its rate of progression, and absence of alternative disease-modifying options.

The experts emphasized that diagnosis and treatment should be guided by specialists experienced in FA management, such as neuromuscular or movement disorder neurologists. They noted that while regular monitoring is important, requiring intensive specialized outcome measures (such as standardized scales designed for clinical trials and that require trained users for reliable administration) could limit equitable access to treatment.

### *Clinician Group Input*

A single clinician group input was received from Neuromuscular Disease Network for Canada (NMD4C). Input from four clinicians familiar with the clinical trials on treatments with FA, and specifically for omaveloxolone, was gathered from 1:1 submissions and group discussions. The group noted that primary therapeutic goals are to slow disease progression, preserve or enhance function, extend survival, and improve patient well-being.

The clinician group indicated that omaveloxolone is poised to be incorporated into the current treatment paradigm. However, they also highlighted that there is not enough evidence to establish those patients who are most likely to respond to omaveloxolone. Regarding the outcomes used to determine a patients' response, the clinician group indicated the use of standardized tests used in neurological exams (mFARS) and functional assessments (FARS ADL). Measurements every six months in the first year and then annually were noted as reasonable and practical. In terms of a clinically meaningful response to treatment, the group noted that there should be an improvement in patient function and well-being (for example, this could be reflected by just a 1-point improvement in upright stability score compared to its expected progression, indicating preserved balance in the short term and predicting delayed loss of ambulation).

The clinician group noted that omaveloxolone may be discontinued due to lack of efficacy (to be determined after a year based on clinician's and patient's global impression of change), or due to side effects (evidence of organ dysfunction). Additionally, it was recommended that a statin be prescribed to manage cardiovascular risk factors due to increased LDL (a common side effect of omaveloxolone) rather than discontinuing omaveloxolone. Lastly, the clinician group highlighted that people with FA must be treated at specialized centers that offer comprehensive interdisciplinary care, regardless of omaveloxolone treatment. For patients without easy access to such centers, care should be managed by a neurologist knowledgeable about the disease and its management.

### **Drug Program Input**

Input was obtained from the drug programs that participate in the reimbursement review process. The following were identified as key factors that could potentially impact the implementation of a recommendation for omaveloxolone:

- Relevant comparators
- considerations for initiation of therapy
- considerations for continuation or renewal of therapy
- considerations for discontinuation of therapy
- considerations for prescribing of therapy
- generalizability of trial populations to the broader populations in the jurisdictions

- system and economic issues

The clinical experts consulted for the review provided advice on the potential implementation issues raised by the drug programs.

**Table 2: Responses to Questions from the Drug Programs**

Implementation issues	Response
<b>Relevant comparators</b>	
<p>Are there other medications that are in the pipeline that show slowing of the progression of FA?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that there are no currently approved disease-modifying therapies for FA, and no other medications are well-established to slow FA progression. Experts noted that there are some therapeutics are currently in the development pipeline, (e.g., vatiquinone) and could present future opportunities, but are unaware of any imminent pipeline drugs with clear evidence of disease modification. While research is ongoing globally, omaveloxolone would be the first of its kind in this space if approved.</p>
<b>Considerations for initiation of therapy</b>	
<p>In the lifespan of a person with FA, when is genetic testing usually done, and who pays for this test?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that genetic testing is typically done at the time of suspected diagnosis, usually in childhood or adolescence. It is covered by provincial health care plans in Canada, although this may vary by jurisdiction.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that diagnosis of FA be confirmed by genetic testing.</p>
<p>Overall, should the initiation criteria for omaveloxolone reflect the inclusion criteria for MOXle phase II trial?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that strict adherence to MOXle trial criteria may not be fully necessary. While genetic confirmation and age thresholds, as per Health Canada’s indication, should be respected, excluding certain subgroups (e.g., those with more severe disease) may not be desirable in clinical practice. The clinical experts noted the lack of clinical evidence of efficacy and safety for patients under the age of 16 or over the age of 40. However, they also noted that, theoretically, patients outside this age group could also benefit from omaveloxolone although evidence of such theoretical benefit is lacking. The study only included patients with a baseline mFARS score between 20 to 80 points. The experts noted that the lower bound (20 points) only ensures that patients are symptomatic and may not be a useful criterion for initiation. However, measuring progress in patients with a baseline mFARS over 80 points could be challenging.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that mFARS score be used for initiation of treatment and assessment of response</p>
<p>In practice, what is the proportion of patients who are &gt;40 years? What proportion of these patients are diagnosed with FA &gt; 40 years?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that late diagnosis after age 40 is rare. Most patients are identified well before this age. The proportion of</p>

Implementation issues	Response
	patients over 40 living with FA exists but is relatively small, as diagnosis typically occurs in childhood or early adolescence.
In practice, what is the proportion of patients who are <16 years with a diagnosis of FA?	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that the majority of FA patients are diagnosed before age 16, often around 10-15 years of age. Pediatric populations are an important portion of patients under clinical care.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that treatment with omeveloxolone be initiated in patients who at least 16 years of age</p>
Should the initiation criteria of omeveloxolone reflect the age thresholds in the MOXle phase II trial?	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that while the trial included patients ≥16 years, experts acknowledge pressure to consider use in younger patients. Given limited data, it may be prudent to initially follow the age threshold from the trial (≥16 years), but clinical trial evidence over time may support earlier use.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that treatment with omeveloxolone be initiated in patients who at least 16 years of age</p>
If a patient with FA discontinues treatment, e.g., due to side effects, are they eligible for re-treatment?	The clinical experts noted to CDEC that there is no known contraindication to re-challenging after side effect resolution. If the reason for stopping (e.g., transaminase elevations) resolves and the patient and/or family wishes to try again, re-initiation at the physician's discretion may be reasonable.
<b>Considerations for continuation or renewal of therapy</b>	
In patients with FA, is there a definition of full versus partial responder? How would you monitor continuous response?	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that no standardized definition of “full” or “partial” responder exists. Response may be interpreted as stabilization or slower disease progression. Monitoring would be through clinical judgment, patient function (gait, upper limb coordination, bulbar function), and possibly adapted objective measures every 6-12 months rather than strictly using trial scales.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that mFARS score be used for initiation of treatment and assessment of response</p>
<b>Considerations for discontinuation of therapy</b>	
The recommendation by the sponsor is to assess patients for progression annually after starting treatment. What parameters would inform discontinuation of omeveloxolone?	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that persistent severe adverse events (e.g., significant liver enzyme elevations), severe allergic reactions, or patient preference might warrant discontinuation. Disease progression alone may not be a reason to stop, as even partial stabilization is considered beneficial.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that mFARS score be used for assessment of response to treatment</p>

Implementation issues	Response
<p>If a patient is achieving therapeutic response on omaveloxolone at 150 mg/day, is a “drug holiday” a consideration?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that there is no established rationale for a drug holiday if the patient is stable and tolerating therapy. Experts suggested that discontinuation could risk losing whatever benefit was gained, and reintroducing therapy without data on off/on effects is uncertain.</p> <p>The clinical experts however noted to CDEC that some adverse events can be managed and reversed. In which cases temporarily discontinuation and subsequent reintroduction of the treatment can be an option.</p>
<b>Considerations for prescribing of therapy</b>	
<p>Omaveloxolone is dosed 150 mg/day. Apart from hepatic impairment where there are lower dosing recommendations according to the Product Monograph, are there any other instances/circumstances where a lower dose of omaveloxolone may be appropriate?</p>	<p>The clinical experts did not identify other clear scenarios. The 150 mg/day dose resulted from the initial, dose-seeking part of the MOXIe trial when lower and higher doses were tested. Though numbers were low, results clearly pointed to that as optimal dose. Standard dosing is 150 mg/day unless hepatic impairment necessitates adjustments. Pediatric dosing or off-label modifications are not supported by current evidence.</p>
<p>Given that patients with FA require a multidisciplinary approach, can you comment on where the patients will be receiving their care across Canada?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that patients are typically followed in specialty neuromuscular or movement disorder clinics often affiliated with tertiary care centers. Care is multidisciplinary, involving neurologists, cardiologists, physiotherapists, OTs, and genetic counselors. This care model ensures comprehensive management and appropriate monitoring if omaveloxolone is introduced. Ideally, establishing additional sites in Canada of the Friedreich Ataxia Global Clinical Consortium (FA-GCC) would facilitate proper care and participation in clinical research of FA patients.</p>
<b>Generalizability</b>	
<p>With the extensive exclusion criteria of the MOXIe phase II trial, what subgroups of FA patients will this medication not be indicated? E.g., patients with active substance use, concomitant medications that cause significant drug-drug interactions?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that while no subgroup is explicitly excluded in practice, those with severe cardiac disease or other major comorbidities were underrepresented in the trial. Clinicians would exercise caution, but no absolute exclusion is anticipated. Substance use or complex drug interactions would need individual assessment.</p>
<p>If a patient is deemed “ambulatory” or “non-ambulatory” as per the definitions within the trial, should it affect access to omaveloxolone?</p>	<p>Experts do not support restricting based on ambulatory status. Non-ambulatory patients may still benefit (e.g., preserved upper limb or bulbar function).</p> <p>CDEC recommended that due to lack of evidence, only patients who are ambulatory should receive treatment with omaveloxolone</p>
<b>System and economic issues</b>	

Implementation issues	Response
As it is a rare drug, access will be variable given jurisdictions may have a specific department managing requests for rare drugs	This is a comment from the drug programs to inform CDEC deliberations.

CDEC = Canadian Drug Expert Committee; FA = Friedreich's Ataxia; OT = Occupational therapists

## Clinical Evidence

### Systematic Review

#### *Description of Studies*

One pivotal phase 2 randomized controlled trial (MOXIe Part 2, N=103) was included in the review to evaluate whether omaveloxolone 150 mg once daily improved modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale (mFARS) scores compared to placebo after 48 weeks of treatment in patients aged 16-40 years, who have an mFARS score between 20 to 80 and genetically confirmed FA. The trial included secondary end points assessing changes in activities of daily living, upper limb function (9-hole peg test), mobility (25-foot timed walk test), and frequency of falls.

Despite randomization, there were imbalances in baseline characteristics between treatment groups. The omaveloxolone group had a higher proportion of males (60% vs 33%), more patients with cardiomyopathy (48% vs 29%), higher baseline mFARS scores (40.94 vs 38.77), and more patients with GAA1 repeat lengths  $\geq 675$  (53% vs 43%) compared to the placebo group. The mean age was similar between groups (approximately 24 years), and the majority of patients in both groups were ambulatory (93%), though about half required assistive devices. Other disease characteristics were generally balanced, including mean age of FA onset (15 years), disease duration (4.8 years), and prevalence of conditions like scoliosis (74%) and sensory neuropathy (49%).

#### *Efficacy Results*

##### **Change in mFARS Score at week 48**

The modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale (mFARS) measures neurological function across 4 domains: bulbar, upper limb coordination, lower limb coordination, and upright stability. Scores range from 0-93 with higher scores indicating greater impairment. Assessments were conducted at baseline and week 48.

In the prespecified primary analysis population (Full Analysis Set), patients receiving omaveloxolone had a mean baseline mFARS score of 40.94 (SD 10.39) points and showed a mean improvement (decrease) from baseline of [REDACTED] at week 48. The placebo group had a mean baseline score of 38.77 (SD 11.03) points and showed a mean worsening (increase) from baseline of [REDACTED]. The MMRM estimate of mean difference in change from baseline between omaveloxolone and placebo was -2.40 points (95% confidence interval [CI]= -4.31 to -0.50; P=0.0141).

In the All Randomized Population, which included patients with severe pes cavus, omaveloxolone treatment improved mFARS scores by an estimated mean difference of -1.93 points relative to placebo (95% confidence interval [CI], -3.70 to -0.15; P=0.0342). The mean baseline scores were [REDACTED] for omaveloxolone and [REDACTED] for placebo, with mean changes from baseline of [REDACTED] and 0 [REDACTED], respectively.

##### **Change in performance on 9-HPT**

The 9-Hole Peg Test (9-HPT) measures upper extremity function based on the time taken to place and remove 9 pegs in a pegboard. The test was performed at baseline and week 48, with faster times indicating better function. Results are reported as the reciprocal of average time (1/seconds) for the dominant hand.

In the Full Analysis Set (FAS) population, patients receiving omaveloxolone had a mean reciprocal of average time (1/sec) baseline value of [REDACTED] and showed little to no change from baseline (mean change [REDACTED]) at week 48. The placebo group had a



mean reciprocal of average time (1/sec) baseline value of [REDACTED] and showed little to no change (mean change [REDACTED]). The MMRM estimated mean difference between groups was [REDACTED].

### **Change in performance on a 25-foot timed walk test**

The 25-foot timed walk test measures mobility based on the time taken to walk 25 feet. Assessments were conducted at baseline and week 48, with results reported as the reciprocal of average walk time (1/seconds). Higher values indicate better function.

In the FAS population, patients receiving omaveloxolone had a mean baseline score of 0.1330 (SD 0.06559) and showed a decline from baseline of -0.0175 (SD 0.02716) at week 48. The placebo group had a mean baseline score of 0.1342 (SD 0.06192) and showed a decline of -0.0221 (SD 0.03294). The MMRM estimated mean difference between groups was 0.0058 (95% CI [REDACTED]; P = 0.4635).

### **Frequency of Falls at Week 48**

Falls were recorded daily by patients in a study diary throughout the 48-week treatment period. A fall was defined as "the patient unintentionally coming to rest on the ground or at a lower level."

In the FAS population, patients receiving omaveloxolone reported a mean of [REDACTED] during treatment compared to [REDACTED] in the placebo group. The Poisson estimated difference in incidence rate of falls between omaveloxolone and placebo was [REDACTED].

### **Activities of Daily Living at Week 48**

The Activities of Daily Living (ADL) assessment included 9 questions evaluating speech, swallowing, cutting food/handling utensils, dressing, personal hygiene, falling, walking, quality of sitting position, and bladder function. Total scores range from 0-36 with higher scores indicating greater impairment. Assessments were conducted at baseline and week 48.

In the FAS population, patients receiving omaveloxolone had a mean baseline ADL score of 10.738 (SD 4.7663) and showed an improvement (decrease) from baseline [REDACTED] at week 48. The placebo group had a mean baseline score of 9.869 (SD 4.8339) and showed a worsening (increase) of [REDACTED]. The MMRM estimated mean difference between groups was -1.30 points (95% CI, [REDACTED]; P = 0.0420).

### **Harms Results**

All patients in both treatment groups experienced at least one adverse event during the 48-week trial. Common adverse events occurring more frequently with omaveloxolone included nausea (33.3% vs 13.5%), abdominal pain (21.6% vs 5.8%), diarrhea (19.6% vs 9.6%), fatigue (21.6% vs 13.5%), and increased liver enzymes (ALT: 37.3% vs 1.9%; AST: 21.6% vs 1.9%). Serious adverse events occurred in 9.8% of omaveloxolone patients versus 5.8% of placebo patients. Treatment discontinuations due to adverse events were more frequent with omaveloxolone (7.8% vs 3.8%). Notable harms of special interest included liver enzyme elevations, which occurred more often in the omaveloxolone group. No deaths were reported during the study period.

### **Critical Appraisal**

Overall, the MOXle trial demonstrated acceptable internal validity, benefiting from its randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled design, proper allocation concealment, validated primary outcome measure, and appropriate statistical methods. Key limitations affecting internal validity included baseline imbalances between treatment groups despite randomization, with the omaveloxolone group having characteristics suggesting more advanced disease (higher mFARS scores, longer GAA1 repeat lengths, and greater proportion with cardiomyopathy). Furthermore, the imbalance in the male to female ratio between omaveloxolone and placebo may also bias the results against omaveloxolone, as observed in subgroup analyses showing better response in males. The impact of some of these imbalances was explored in post-hoc analyses which suggested a potential underestimation of treatment effect in the primary endpoint. Additionally, a higher discontinuation rate in the omaveloxolone group (13.7% vs 3.8%) primarily due to adverse events raises concerns about potential bias from missing data. The absence of an established minimal clinically important difference for mFARS also creates uncertainty in interpreting the clinical significance of the observed treatment effect. All outcomes beside the primary outcome either include the null or are outside the statistical testing hierarchy.

Overall, external validity of MOXle part 2 was limited by the restriction of eligibility and the exclusion of patients with significant cardiac issues and capping those with severe pes cavus. The sponsor justified the decision to cap patients with severe pes cavus on evidence from MOXle part 1 that suggested patients with severe pes cavus may represent a different subtype of FA and likely interferes with the ability to perform assessments that require standing or pedaling. Clinical experts involved in this review suggested that all FA patients have a certain level of pes cavus and has not been suggested as clinically prognostic of FA prognosis. The trial excluded patients younger than 16 years despite most patients being diagnosed around age 11, creating uncertainty about treatment effects in pediatric populations. However, the current Health Canada indication restricts the population to patients 16 years of age or older. As such, this limitation to external validity is of limited impact if the drug is prescribed according to the indication. The restriction to patients with mFARS scores between 20-80 and exclusion of those with significant cardiac issues limits generalizability to patients with more severe disease. Furthermore, the outcomes used in the trial, particularly mFARS, are not routinely implemented in clinical practice, creating challenges for translating trial results to real-world assessment of treatment response. While the absence of Canadian sites was noted, clinical experts did not consider this a major limitation given the similarity of the patient population and treatment approaches across countries.

### *GRADE Summary of Findings and Certainty of the Evidence*

The selection of outcomes for GRADE assessment was based on the sponsor's Summary of Clinical Evidence, consultation with clinical experts, and input received from patient and clinician groups and public drug plans. The following list of outcomes was finalized in consultation with expert committee members:

- Change in mFARS Score
- Change in 9-HTP performance
- Change in 25-foot timed walk test
- Change in frequency of falls
- Changed in Activities of Daily Living



**Table 3: Summary of Findings for Omaveloxolone Versus Placebo for Patients With Friedreich's Ataxia**

Outcome and follow-up	Patients (studies), N	Relative effect (95% CI)	Absolute effects (95% CI)			Certainty	What happens
			Placebo	Omaveloxolone	Difference		
<b>Change in mFARS at Week 48</b>							
Change in mFARS Score (less is better) Follow-up: 48 weeks	82 (1 RCT)	NA	██████	██████	██████	Moderate <sup>a</sup>	Omaveloxolone likely results in a slower progression of the mFARS score in patients with FA compared to placebo.
<b>Change in performance on 9-HPT at Week 48</b>							
Change in 9-HPT performance ( Reciprocal of Average Walk Time [/sec] – more is better) Follow-up: 48 weeks	82 (1 RCT)	NA	██████	██████	██████	Low <sup>b</sup>	Omaveloxolone may result in little to no difference in the change in 9-HPT compared to placebo in patients with FA.
<b>Change in performance on a 25-foot timed walk test at Week 48</b>							
Change in 25-foot timed walk test (Reciprocal of Average Walk Time [/sec] – more is better) Follow-up: 48 weeks	82 (1 RCT)	NA	-0.0221 1/second	-0.0175 1/second	0.0058 more 1/seconds (██████)	Low <sup>b</sup>	Omaveloxolone may result in little to no difference in the in 25-foot timed walk test compared to placebo in patients with FA.
<b>Change in frequency of falls at Week 48</b>							
Change in frequency of falls (less is better) Follow-up: 48 weeks	82 (1 RCT)	NA	██████	██████	██████	Low <sup>b</sup>	Omaveloxolone may result in little to no difference in the change in frequency of falls compared to placebo in patients with FA.
<b>Change in Activities of Daily Living at Week 48</b>							
Changed in Activities of Daily Living (less is better) Follow-up: 48 weeks	82 (1 RCT)	NA	██████	██████	██████	Moderate <sup>c</sup>	Omaveloxolone likely results in a decrease in the ADL score in patients with FA.

ADL = Activities of Daily Living; CI = Confidence Interval; FA = Friedreich's Ataxia; mFARS = Modified Friedreich Ataxia Rating Scale; NA = Not Applicable; RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; 9-HPT = 9-Hole Peg Test.

Note: Study limitations (which refer to internal validity or risk of bias), inconsistency across studies, indirectness, imprecision of effects, and publication bias were considered when assessing the certainty of the evidence. All serious concerns in these domains that led to the rating down of the level of certainty are documented in the table footnotes.

<sup>a</sup> No published between-group MID was identified. Clinical experts consulted by CDA-AMC identified 2 points as potential clinically meaningful threshold. Rated down 1 level down for imprecision as the upper bound of the CI suggests no clinically meaningful difference and the lower bound of the 95% CI suggests benefit

<sup>b</sup> No published between-group MID was identified, and the clinical experts consulted by CDA-AMC were unable to estimate a threshold for clinically important effects, therefore the null was used. Rated down 2 level down for very serious imprecision as the lower CI suggests harm while the upper CI suggest benefit of little-to-no difference.

<sup>c</sup> No published between-group MID was identified, and the clinical experts consulted by CDA-AMC identified 1 point as potential clinically relevance threshold. Rated down 1 level for imprecision as the upper bound of the CI





suggests no clinically meaningful difference and in the lower bound of the CI suggests clinically meaningful difference Did not rate down for imprecision; a between-group difference of less than the null and a confidence interval that excludes the null.

Source: Details included in the table are from the sponsor's Summary of Clinical Evidence.

## Long-Term Extension Studies

### *Description of Studies*

One ongoing open-label extension (OLE) study was included to assess the long-term safety and tolerability of omaveloxolone in patients with FA following the completion of Part 1 or Part 2 of the MOXle trial. The study enrolled 149 patients from MOXle Parts 1 and 2, including 106 patients who were omaveloxolone-naïve (placebo-omav group) and 43 who previously received omaveloxolone (omav-omav group). All patients received omaveloxolone 150 mg daily, with interim analysis data available up to 144 weeks. Baseline characteristics were generally balanced between groups, though the placebo-omav group had a higher proportion of males (██████%) and patients with pes cavus (██████%).

### *Efficacy Results*

At 144 weeks, the mean change from baseline in mFARS score was ████████ in the placebo-omav group and ████████) in the omav-omav group. Activities of daily living scores showed mean increases (indicating worsening) of ███ points in the placebo-omav group and ███ points in the omav-omav group at week 144. Additional functional measures including the 9-hole peg test and 25-foot timed walk test showed similar patterns.

### *Harms Results*

The safety profile in the OLE was consistent with the controlled trial. Common adverse events included coronavirus infection (18.8%), increased ALT (18.8%), headache (18.1%), upper respiratory tract infection (16.8%), nausea (16.1%), and fatigue (13.4%). Serious adverse events occurred in 8.7% of patients (7.5% placebo-omav, 11.6% omav-omav), and 6.7% discontinued due to adverse events (7.5% placebo-omav, 4.7% omav-omav). Liver enzyme elevations remained a notable adverse event of special interest but appeared manageable with monitoring. No deaths were reported.

### *Critical Appraisal*

The main limitations of the long-term extension include the lack of a control group, an open-label design with subjective outcomes, and the potential selection bias from enrolling only patients who completed the original trials. There is a risk of attrition bias as the number of patients contributing to the analyses declined steadily over time and final measures of the outcome are based on less than half of enrolled patients. The COVID-19 pandemic also impacted study visits and treatment continuity, with 14.8% of patients experiencing treatment interruptions. The use of historical controls for contextualizing progression rates, while informative, has inherent limitations due to potential differences in patient populations and assessment methods.

The clinical experts consulted on this review suggested that, with exception of the exclusion of pediatric patients, the eligibility criteria of the OLE were comparable to the Canadian population. The trial's strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, however, including constraints around cardiac involvement, may have led to a cohort healthier than what is typically encountered in routine clinical practice in Canada. Furthermore, the study did not include any sites in Canada, reducing the generalizability and applicability of the results to the Canadian practice.

## Indirect Comparisons

No indirect treatment comparisons were submitted for this review.

## Studies Addressing Gaps in the Evidence From the Systematic Review

### *Description of Studies*

A propensity score matched analysis compared long-term outcomes between MOXle extension patients (N=136) and matched controls from the Friedreich Ataxia Clinical Outcome Measures Study (FACOMS) natural history database (N=136). Patients were matched on key characteristics including age, sex, baseline mFARS score, age at FA onset, and baseline gait score, with a mean follow-up of approximately 2.5 years in both cohorts.

### *Efficacy Results*

The estimated 3-year change from baseline in mFARS score was 6.61 points (SE=0.65) in matched FACOMS patients compared to 3.00 points (SE=0.66) in MOXle extension patients, representing a statistically significant difference of -3.61 points (95% CI, -1.79 to -5.43) favoring omaveloxolone. This suggests that patients from the MOXle OLE experienced a slower increase in mFARS score than patients included from the matched FACOMS group (indicative of slowed disease progression).

### *Harms Results*

Safety outcomes were not assessed in this analysis.

### *Critical Appraisal*

The choice of study design was considered appropriate given the constraints of the rare disease. The RWE used comparative evidence to describe treatment efficacy in a treatment-naïve population, but the choice of baseline in the FACOMS group could introduce indication bias due to unmeasured confounding factors. While the timing of treatment initiation was not an issue, the primary analysis cohort included patients who completed 48 weeks of follow-up, potentially differing systematically from those in FACOMS. Limited bias due to exposure or outcome misclassification was noted, though measurement error at Year 3 could slightly favor omaveloxolone. Propensity score matching variables were sufficient, and diagnostic results showed comparability between FACOMS and MOXle cohorts. However, the estimation of progression at three years relied on a MAR assumption, with missing outcome analyses not provided, raising concerns about dropout due to adverse events.

## **Ethical Considerations**

Patient group, clinician group, and drug plan input, as well as consultation with clinical experts were reviewed to identify ethical considerations specific to the use of omaveloxolone for the treatment of Friedreich's Ataxia in adults and adolescents aged 16 years or older.

### **Diagnosis, treatment, and experiences of people living with Friedreich's Ataxia**

- FA substantially reduces life expectancy, with most patients living an average of 37 years worldwide. Cardiac complications account for the majority of deaths, alongside risks such as pneumonia, stroke, and diabetic coma. Beyond its life limiting nature, FA imposes significant physical and psychosocial burdens on patients and caregivers. The progressive loss of coordination, balance, and muscle strength typically leads to reliance on mobility aids within 8-10 years of symptom onset, with many patients requiring a wheelchair 11-15 years after diagnosis. Comorbidities like cardiomyopathy, diabetes, and scoliosis further contribute to fatigue, pain, and reduced mobility. Patient group input noted that as the condition progresses, people slowly lose their ability to function independently and often become unable to participate in social activities or the workplace due to impacts on mobility, coordination, and speech. This not only may result in social isolation and a lost sense of autonomy, but it can also impact people's mental health with patient group input reporting experiences of anxiety and depression among FA patients. Caregivers similarly face challenges as they strive to balance the demands of care with their own mental health, work responsibilities, and financial stability.
- Patient and clinician group input indicated that while FA is typically diagnosed in childhood or adolescence, disparities in diagnosis and referral pathways can delay access to essential care. Though the requisite genetic testing for confirmation of FA is broadly available across Canada, clinician group input noted that non-neurological presentations may still delay recognition, and testing only occurs when clinical suspicion arises.
- There are currently no therapies indicated to slow or halt the progression of FA. Instead, patients and clinicians rely on treatment options oriented toward managing complications associated with FA and rehabilitation (e.g., physiotherapy and occupational therapy). Patient group input and clinical experts suggested that existing care is inadequate, with supportive therapies providing inconsistent benefits and access often limited by factors such as out-of-pocket costs, lack of insurance coverage, and variable geographic availability of specialized services. In advanced stages, logistical and financial barriers to accessing specialized care centers compound these challenges. Taken together, this underscores the high unmet need for

an accessible treatment option that can address the progression of FA and improve quality of life for patients and their families.

- Patient group input and clinical experts indicated that people with FA want an intervention that can slow or stop the progression of FA. Interventions that could improve symptom control (which may come with slowed progression), preserve mobility, improve energy levels, preserve existing quality of life, and prevent long-term complications (e.g., scoliosis, diabetes, heart problems) would also be highly valued.

### Clinical evidence used in the evaluation of omaveloxolone

- The safety and efficacy of omaveloxolone in patients aged 16-40 with genetically confirmed FA were evaluated in the pivotal phase II, randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled MOXIe trial (N=103). The trial's primary objective was to assess whether a daily oral 150mg dose of omaveloxolone improved modified Friedreich's Ataxia rating scale (mFARS) scores at week 48 when compared to placebo. mFARS is a composite measure that evaluates neurological function in FA patients, including assessments of speech, upper and lower limb coordination, and standing and walking ability. Results demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in mFARS scores for patients receiving omaveloxolone versus placebo. However, the clinical review report notes that the clinical significance of this improvement remains uncertain due to the absence of an established minimal clinically important difference for mFARS scores. Additionally, other functional measures included as secondary outcomes (e.g., changes in performance on a 9-hole peg test and a 25-foot timed walk test) did not demonstrate meaningful improvements with treatment. No endpoints examined changes in health-related quality of life or experiences with symptoms such as fatigue, which are important outcomes to patients. Further details on the MOXIe trial are provided in the Clinical Review Report.
- Sponsor submitted real world evidence suggests that the benefits observed in mFARS scores during the initial 48 weeks of treatment may be maintained over three additional years of treatment, with treated patients showing slower disease progression compared to natural history. However, long-term data beyond three years is limited, making ongoing data collection and monitoring essential for understanding whether omaveloxolone offers sustained clinical value.
- Clinical experts considered the MOXIe results broadly generalizable to the FA population, and the predominately white trial population (98%) was seen as appropriate given the condition primarily occurs in people who are white. However, the exclusion of patients with clinically significant cardiac disease – a common FA comorbidity – represents a notable gap in the evidence. While this absence would not deter clinical experts from prescribing omaveloxolone to patients with comorbid cardiac disease, they emphasized the importance of careful monitoring and the collection of real-world data to inform future clinical decision-making in this population. Similarly, individuals younger than 16 were excluded from the MOXIe trial, leaving a significant data gap in understanding the safety and efficacy of omaveloxolone for this population.

### Clinical use of omaveloxolone

- Omaveloxolone represents the first potential disease-modifying treatment for FA, addressing a critical unmet need in this population. Clinical experts indicated they would prescribe it as a first-line treatment for patients aged 16 years and older, given the lack of alternatives. They expressed confidence in its safety profile and considered the observed slowing of disease progression, as measured by changes in mFARS scores over the first 48 weeks of treatment, to be promising. Real world evidence suggests the initial benefit in delayed progression may be sustained for up to three years. Both clinical experts and patient group input underscored the significance of this potential benefit, with patients emphasizing their hope for treatments that could slow disease progression.
- While omaveloxolone appears well-tolerated overall, clinical experts highlighted uncertainties in managing specific adverse events and pre-existing comorbidities. Elevated liver enzymes were noted as a particular challenge, with the lack of clear guidance from the sponsor making decisions about discontinuing treatment difficult in cases of prolonged elevation. Similarly, the exclusion of individuals with significant cardiac disease limits understanding of the safety of omaveloxolone in this group, leaving providers to navigate potential risks without robust evidence. These gaps underscore the importance of thorough informed consent processes and close monitoring to address patient-specific complexities.

- If recommended for public reimbursement, clinical experts anticipate caregivers will be interested in prescribing omaveloxolone off-label to patients younger than 16 years old, despite the current absence of data in this population. This scenario poses an ethical dilemma for providers, who may experience moral distress when trying to balance an uncertain risk-benefit profile in this population against the potential harm of waiting to treat in the context of this early-onset, progressive disease. Clinical experts noted that this could lead to disparate prescribing practices, with some providers offering off-label treatment and others adhering strictly to the indicated population, potentially creating inequities in access and care. This variability in prescribing practices could also risk eroding trust in healthcare providers, as families navigating these decisions may encounter conflicting recommendations. If providers choose to prescribe to this population, clinical experts noted they will need to engage in transparent conversations with families, clearly addressing the known risks, lack of evidence, and uncertainties surrounding potential outcomes.
- Clinical experts noted that patients with FA are typically managed by multidisciplinary care teams with specialization in FA and in specialized settings. With the introduction of omaveloxolone, clinical experts indicated that continued reliance on these specialized clinics will be essential to ensure appropriate monitoring and treatment. However, this requirement could create barriers for patients in rural or underserved regions who may already face challenges accessing care. Additionally, implementing intensive or standardized outcome measures, such as mFARS, could strain clinical capacity and limit accessibility. Ensuring equitable access to omaveloxolone will require careful consideration of how monitoring protocols can be adapted to balance feasibility and fairness across diverse care settings.

### Health systems impact

- Introducing omaveloxolone raises ethical considerations about resource allocation and health system sustainability, given the therapy’s high cost and limited long-term safety and efficacy evidence. Patient group input suggested potential downstream savings, such as reduced emergency visits and prolonged workforce participation, but there is currently no evidence to support this. Clinical experts emphasized the importance of collecting real-world data through registries to better understand omaveloxolone’s impact on function, symptoms, quality of life, mortality, and healthcare costs. However, they cautioned that data-collection efforts could place great financial and administrative burdens on clinicians and health systems, particularly in under-resourced settings.
- The potential use of mFARS as a standardized tool to guide treatment initiation, monitoring, and renewal raises significant practical and resource challenges, as it risks overburdening the health system with unknown benefit. While mFARS was the primary endpoint in the MOXIe trial, it is not routinely used in clinical practice and would require specialized training, extended appointment times, and greater administrative coordination to implement effectively. These requirements could strain under-resourced clinics, particularly those in underserved areas, and bias prescribing toward larger, well-equipped centers. Further, as a measure reliant on clinician interpretation and subject to variability, the use of mFARS in clinical practice may create inconsistencies in treatment decisions. As such, clinical experts questioned whether such intensive monitoring efforts justify the significant resources required, particularly given the subjective nature of the measures and their perception that providers would be reluctant to discontinue therapy in the absence of serious harms. Instead, clinical experts suggested that long-term monitoring should rely on clinical judgment, assessing patient function (e.g., gait, upper limb coordination, bulbar function), and possibly using adapted objective measures every 6-12 months, instead of solely depending on trial scales.

## Economic Evidence

### Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

Component	Description
Type of economic evaluation	Cost-utility analysis Regression-based model
Target population	Adults and adolescents aged 16 years and older with Friedreich’s ataxia (FA)

Component	Description
<b>Treatment</b>	Omaveloxolone plus standard of care (SOC, assumed by the sponsor to comprise treatments for symptom and comorbidity management)
<b>Dose regimen</b>	Omaveloxolone: 150 mg once daily
<b>Submitted price</b>	Omaveloxolone: \$364.30 per capsule
<b>Submitted treatment cost</b>	Omaveloxolone: \$346,933 per year <sup>a</sup>
<b>Comparator</b>	SOC
<b>Perspective</b>	Canadian publicly funded health care payer Societal perspective <sup>b</sup>
<b>Outcomes</b>	QALYs, LYs
<b>Time horizon</b>	Lifetime (84 years)
<b>Key data sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efficacy of omaveloxolone was informed by observations from the MOXle trials (omaveloxolone vs placebo); efficacy of SOC was based on data from the Friedreich's Ataxia Clinical Outcome Measures (FACOMS) natural history study.</li> <li>The sponsor submitted a propensity-matched analysis comparing disease progression (via mFARS score) in patients in the FACOMS natural history study to those in the MOXle trial. Rate ratios from this analysis were applied to the mFARS trajectory for SOC patients to derive the mFARS trajectory for patients who received omaveloxolone,</li> </ul>
<b>Key limitations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence from the MOXle trial suggests that omaveloxolone likely results in slower neurological decline (based on modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale [mFARS] score) compared to placebo over 48 weeks. However, the clinical importance of this finding is uncertain due to the lack of an established minimum clinically important difference. Other functional outcomes (e.g., upper limb function, mobility, frequency of falls) did not show significant improvements with use of omaveloxolone.</li> <li>The long-term relative effectiveness of omaveloxolone compared to SOC alone is highly uncertain owing to a lack of direct comparative data beyond 48-weeks (MOXle trial duration). To inform the comparative effectiveness of omaveloxolone in the economic model, the sponsor undertook a propensity matched analysis using data from the FACOMS natural history study for SOC and the ongoing MOXle long-term extension study for omaveloxolone (up to 3 years of observation); however, the interpretation of finding from this analysis are limited by the open-label design and potential selection bias (refer to CADTH clinical review). In the economic model, the sponsor assumed that the estimated effectiveness of omaveloxolone plus SOC from the propensity matched analysis would be maintained indefinitely, without consideration of effectiveness waning. Approximately 96% of the incremental QALYs predicted to be gained with omaveloxolone were accrued after the 48-week MOXle trial period.</li> <li>The impact of omaveloxolone on health-related quality of life (HRQoL). In the MOXle trial, the mean change in SF-36 scores from baseline to week 48 were small and similar between omaveloxolone and placebo. The health state utility values used in the sponsor's model are highly uncertain owing to the use of mapping in their derivation. The results of a sponsor-submitted scenario analysis using alternative utility values indicate that the estimated cost-effectiveness of omaveloxolone is highly sensitive to the chosen utility values, with ICERs from both perspectives increasing approximately two-fold.</li> <li>The sponsor submitted an analysis from a societal perspective, which included indirect costs and the impact of treatment on costs and HRQoL of caregivers. This analysis required assumptions about the impact of FA on caregivers' HRQoL, hours worked by patients and caregivers, the proportion of patients and caregivers employed, and costs paid by patients and caregivers versus the health care system. Indirect costs and caregiver HRQoL were not outcomes of the MOXle trial, and the impact of omaveloxolone on these costs and outcomes is highly uncertain.</li> </ul>
<b>CADTH reanalysis results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reanalyses were performed owing to uncertainty in the clinical evidence that could not be resolved through reanalysis.</li> </ul>

Component	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the sponsor's submission, omaveloxolone plus SOC is not cost-effective at a willingness-to-pay threshold (WTP) of \$50,000 per QALY gained when either the public health care payer or a societal perspective is adopted. Price reductions of 95% to 97% would be required for omaveloxolone plus SOC to be cost-effective compared to SOC from the societal and public payer perspectives, respectively, at this threshold.</li> </ul>

FA = Friedreich's Ataxia; FACOMS = Friedreich's Ataxia Clinical Outcome Measures; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; LY = life-year; mFARS = modified Friedreich's Ataxia Rating Scale; QALY= quality-adjusted life-year; SOC = standard of care; WTP = willingness-to-pay.

<sup>a</sup> Assuming 87% relative dose intensity. Annual cost without adjustment: \$399,180.

<sup>b</sup> Omaveloxolone is being reviewed by CDA-AMC through the complex review pathway; as such, CDA-AMC has appraised 2 cost-effectiveness analyses submitted by the sponsor, one adopting a publicly funded health care payer perspective and one adopting a societal perspective.

### Budget Impact

CADTH identified the following key limitations with the sponsor's analysis: the number of people aged 16 years and older with FA is likely underestimated; and the uptake of omaveloxolone is uncertain and may be higher than anticipated by the sponsor. In the CADTH reanalysis, the number of patients eligible for omaveloxolone was derived using registry data from Muscular Dystrophy Canada. In the CADTH base case, the 3-year budget impact of reimbursing omaveloxolone for the treatment of FA in people aged 16 years and older is expected to be \$224,535,025 (Year 1 = \$53,122,535; Year 2 = \$78,574,132; Year 3 = \$92,838,358). The estimated budget impact is highly sensitive to the number of patients eligible for omaveloxolone and assumptions about its uptake among eligible patients.



## CDEC Information

### Members of the Committee:

Dr. Peter Jamieson (Chair), Dr. Sally Bean, Daryl Bell, Dan Dunskey, Dr. Trudy Huyghebaert, Morris Joseph, Dr. Dennis Ko, Dr. Christine Leong, Dr. Kerry Mansell, Dr. Alicia McCallum, Dr. Srinivas Murthy, Dr. Nicholas Myers, Dr. Krishnan Ramanathan, Dr. Marco Solmi, Dr. Edward Xie, and Dr. Peter Zed.

Meeting date: February 26, 2025

### Regrets:

One expert committee member did not attend.

### Conflicts of interest:

None