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Value based - HTA model

How do jurisdictions estimate the VALUE of new cancer drugs?

• Notion of VALUE for the payer?
• How to estimate the VALUE of a drug?
• Concept of VALUE for guiding reimbursement and/or pricing decisions?

Potential models for HTA:
- Cost per QALY approach
- THERAPEUTIC value approach
NICE approach

- CENTRALISED model with EXPLICIT analytical framework:
  - A single generic measure of VALUE: QALYs to MAXIMISE health
  - Cost-effectiveness (ICER): additional cost per QALY gained
  - NICE threshold is used to judge if the estimated cost per QALY represents good value for money for the NHS

- Technology Appraisals recommendations are based on a review of clinical and economic evidence (RCTs / models)

- Independent academic assessment group reviews the evidence submission presented by the manufacturer. An Independent Appraisal Committee reaches a consensus.

- NHS obligation to fund NICE positive recommendations.
HTA system in Spain

**Central**
- THERAPEUTIC HTA approach
- Efficacy, Safety
- Usage criteria

**Decentralised model**
- Regional
  - THERAPEUTIC & NAÏVE CE approach
  - Efficacy, Safety, Effectiveness, and Efficiency
- Local

**Bodies**: Spanish Drug Agency, DF MoH, CCAA (*overlap of activities*)
**Coordination** group (2012) to conduct Therapeutic Positioning Reports (IPTs).
**Pricing and reimbursement** advise.
**Methods**: Lack of transparency or standardised methods.
**Mandatory** for Regional level

**Bodies**: Spanish Society Hospital Pharmacy (*GENESIS, 2004*) gather regional and hospital pharmacy units (agreements to avoid duplication !?)
**Methods**: Transparent (MADRE model) SR clinical and economic evidence **Basic CEA & budget impact**. Conducted by Regions (And and Cata) and local hospitals.
**Not mandatory**: hospitals do follow recommendations.
• We compared NICE technology appraisals from January 2008 to July 2015 with Spanish assessments both at a central (IPT reports) and at a regional level (GENESIS reports).

• Data collected: availability of an HTA report, indication(s), comparator(s), and reimbursement recommendation: recommended, restricted, not recommended.

• Regions of Andalucia (GFTDA) and Cataluña (CAMDHA) use the same HTA methodology, hence selected for the comparison.
Results 1

**NICE appraisals**
67 drug/pairing indications
- Recommended: 13%
- Restricted: 45%
- Not recommended: 42%

**Central IPT reports**
17 drug/pairing indications
- Recommended: 41%
- Restricted: 53%
- Not recommended: 6%

**GENESIS reports**
79 drug/pairing indications
- Recommended: 13%
- Restricted: 65%
- Not recommended: 16%
- Exceptional use: 6%

**Common assessments in both settings**
53 drug/pairing indications
# Common HTA assessments (January 2008 - July 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Recommended</th>
<th>% Restricted</th>
<th>% NR</th>
<th>% Excepcional Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESP Central</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP Regional Andalucia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP Local</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP Regional Cataluna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HTA Spanish framework

#### HTA approach - Effect on ACCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>UK NICE</th>
<th>ESP Central</th>
<th>ESP REGIONAL</th>
<th>ESP LOCAL</th>
<th>Used in practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aflibercept</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Non available report</td>
<td>Restricted CAMHDA NR (C2) GENESIS</td>
<td>Recommended Hosp Henares</td>
<td>Restricted Catalonia Andalucia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Duplicated reports** by Catalonia (CAMDA) and Andalusia (GTFDA); (n=13). Different recommendations for 46% (n=6)

NICE is used as a reference for the Regional HTA system in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug/Condition</th>
<th>NICE</th>
<th>GFTHA</th>
<th>CAMDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everolimus Breast cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlotinib NSC Lung cancer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enzalutamide Prostate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasatinib CM Leukaemia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevacizumab Paclitaxel Ovarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevacizumab Colorectal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended (1); Restricted (2); NR (3)
**Naïve Cost-effectiveness**

**GENESIS report (MADRE methodology) for Cost-effectiveness**

E,G. Trastuzumab emtansine (TDM1) for HER2-positive breast cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coste Eficacia Incremental (CEI)</th>
<th>Variables continuas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referencia</td>
<td>Tipo de resultado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Vem a, MD et. Al.</td>
<td>Primaria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- T-DM1 = 9.6 m x 0.78 + 21.3m x 0.5 = 18.2 meses ajustados por QoL
- Lapa + Cape = 6.4 m x 0.74 + 18.7m x 0.5 = 14.1 meses ajustados por QoL

**Coste Eficacia Incremental (CEI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Vem a, MD et. Al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Survival converted into QALYS using utilities from NICE report (TAG350)**

**ICER: 180,000 eur/QALY**

NICE report (TAG350)
GENESIS report (MADRE methodology) for Cost-effectiveness

E.g. Trastuzumab emtansine (TDM1) for HER2-positive breast cancer

Cost per QALY estimation = EUR 165,000 per QALY

• The use of CEA is not mandatory in Spain hence there is no explicit threshold, although a first reference by PINTO et al was set at 30,000eur/QALY in 2002.

• The most common threshold accepted for cancer drugs ranges between 30,000-50,000 eur/QALY. According to published evidence 32% of Spanish oncologists think that 100,000 eur/QALY might be considered as an acceptable threshold for cancer drugs assessed in the Spanish setting.

• NICE appraisal was used to justify that TDM1 fulfils EoL criteria (despite published evidence supporting higher preferences for QoL in this setting).

• The price is the key factor for cost-effectiveness. The authors state that a 45% reduction in price would be required in order for TDM1 to be cost-effective (at 50,000 eur/QALY). (e.g. Risk Sharing agreements / PAS). Hence recommendation restricted according to clinical criteria.
• The complex organisation of HTA system at the national and regional level in Spain made the assessments difficult to compare.

• Most of the Spanish (ESP) assessments were accepted either as recommended or on a restricted basis – in Catalonia none were not recommended. In contrast, for NICE 45% were not recommended.

• In Spain, regions cannot (very difficult) deny a drug that has been approved by the Spanish Drug Agency (or IPT). Therefore a filtering system is used to restrict according to clinical criteria or exceptional use.

• Despite the efforts to coordinate HTA assessments for new drugs, there is still overlapping of functions between the central and regional levels in Spain, which produce a delay in access. In the UK the NHS has the obligation to fund positive recommendations within 3 months following NICE guidance.
• A transparent and explicit analytic framework is in place only at a regional level in Spain, where cost-effectiveness plays a more important role. Furthermore, NICE appraisals are used as a reference for the HTA regions in Spain. This influence is greater in Andalucia.

• Regions only provide isolated data (cost-effectiveness) for national IPT reports, however it is not clear to what extent this data is integrated or taken into account for central decisions.
Further steps

- The UK HTA approach is more consistent and organised, and prescribing might be limited by the guidance given by NICE. The Spanish decentralised HTA approach is complex but it might be more efficient to take into account local practice.

Next step for this study is to explore drug usage in both settings in order to analyse what type of recommendations - locally (Spain) or central (NICE) – (i) are more likely to be followed, (ii) helps to reduce inequalities, (iii) offer the greater value for money given the budget constraints.


Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad. Propuesta de colaboracion para la elaboracion de los Informes de posicionaiento terapeutico de los medicamentos. 2013


