

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

Carfilzomib (Kyprolis) for Multiple Myeloma

June 21, 2016

# 3 Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation

Name	of the drug indication(s):	Carfilzomib (Kyprolis) for Multiple Myeloma				
Endor	rsed by:	Provincial Advisory Group Chair				
	back was provided by all n cipating in pCODR.	ine provinces (Minist	ries of Health ar	nd/or provincial car	ncer agencies)	
3.1	Comments on the Initial Re	ecommendation				
	a) Please indicate if the or disagrees with the			s and/or as a group)	) agrees	
	agrees	x agre	es in part	disagree		
	Some PAG members prov members agrees in part.	iding feedback agreed	d with the pERC i	nitial recommendati	ion and some	
	b) Notwithstanding the f would support this ini ("early conversion"), consultation period.	tial recommendation	proceeding to fin	al pERC recommend	lation	
	x Support conver			support conversion t nendation.	to final	
	Recommendati reconsideration	on does not require n by pERC.		mendation should be dered by pERC.	9	
	PAG members support conv	rersion to final recomme	endation pending o	clarification of patient	population.	
	c) Please provide feedba					

Page		Paragraph,	Comments and Suggested Changes to Improve
Number	Section Title	Line Number	Clarity
1	pERC		The ASPIRE trial included patients who failed
	D		and to these union lines of the second. The

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

Page		Paragraph,	Comments and Suggested Changes to Improve
Number	Section Title	Line Number	Clarity
			patients who received one prior line of therapy would be eligible to receive the combination. Clarity around the meaning of 'failure' is requested as this recommendations does not align with the ASPIRE trial patient inclusion as patients who failed (i.e. progressed while on lenalidomide or bortezomib) were not included in the trial.  PAG suggests changing wording from 'following
			failure of one prior therapy' to 'who received at least one prior treatment and did not progress on bortezomib and/or lenalidomide based therapy'.
page 4 and page 9		last paragraphs	Maintenance lenalidomide is not given with dexamethasone. PAG suggests re-wording to clarify that there is no evidence for the benefit of using Carfilzomib+Len/Dex as a sequential treatment for patients currently receiving and now progressing on maintenance therapy post-transplant of either bortezomib or lenalidomide.

#### 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

#### 3.3 Additional comments about the initial recommendation document

Please provide any additional comments:

	Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Additional Comments
Ī				

### **About Completing This Template**

pCODR invites the Provincial Advisory Group (PAG) to provide feedback and comments on the initial recommendation made by the pCODR Expert Review Committee. (See <a href="www.pcodr.ca">www.pcodr.ca</a> for information regarding review status and feedback deadlines.)

As part of the pCODR re view process, the pCODR Expert Review Committee makes an initial recommendation based on its review of the clinical, economic and patient evidence for a drug. (See <a href="https://www.pcodr.ca">www.pcodr.ca</a> for a description of the pCODR process.) The pERC initial recommendation is then posted for feedback and comments from various stakeholders. The pCODR Expert Review Committee welcomes comments and feedback that will help the members understand why the PAG, either as individual PAG members and/or as a group, agrees or disagrees with the pERC initial recommendation. In addition, the members of pERC would like to know if there is any lack of clarity in the document and if so, what could be done to improve the clarity of the information in the pERC initial recommendation. Other comments are welcome as well.

All stakeholders have 10 (ten) business days within which to provide their feedback on the initial recommendation and rationale. If all invited stakeholders agree with the recommended clinical population described in the initial recommendation, it will proceed to a pERC final recommendation by 2 (two) business days after the end of the consultation (feedback) period. This is called an "early conversion" of an initial recommendation to a final recommendation.

If any one of the invited stakeholders does not support the initial recommendation proceeding to a pERC final recommendation, pERC will review all feedback and comments received at the next possible pERC meeting. Based on the feedback received, pERC will consider revising the recommendation document as appropriate. It should be noted that the initial recommendation and rationale for it may or may not change following consultation with stakeholders.

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

## Instructions for Providing Feedback

- a) Only members of the PAG can provide feedback on the pERC initial recommendation; delegates must work through the PAG representative to whom they report.
  - a. Please note that only one submission is permitted for the PAG. Thus, the feedback should include both individual PAG members and/or group feedback.
- b) Feedback or comments must be based on the evidence that was considered by pERC in making the pERC 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 *Provincial Advisory Group (PAG) Feedback on a pERC Initial Recommendation* can be downloaded from the pCODR website. (See <a href="www.pcodr.ca">www.pcodr.ca</a> for a description of the pCODR process and supporting materials and templates.)
- d) At this time, the template must be completed in English. PAG 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. Similarly, PAG should not feel restricted by the space allotted on the form and can expand the tables in the template as required.

- 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 forwarded to the pERC.
- 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.
- g) 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 Secretariat.
- h) The comments must be submitted via a Microsoft Word (not PDF) document to the pCODR Secretariat by the posted deadline date.
- i) If you have any questions about the feedback process, please e-mail submissions@pcodr.ca.

Note: Submitted feedback may be used in documents available to the public. The confidentiality of any submitted information cannot be protected.