

### **CADTH REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW**

# Stakeholder Feedback on Draft Recommendation

**NIVOLUMAB** (Opdivo)

(Bristol-Myers Squibb Canada)

**Indication:** Gastric, gastroesophageal junction or esophageal adenocarcinoma.

February 17, 2022

**Disclaimer:** The views expressed in this submission are those of the submitting organization or individual. As such, they are independent of CADTH and do not necessarily represent or reflect the view of CADTH. No endorsement by CADTH is intended or should be inferred.

By filing with CADTH, the submitting organization or individual agrees to the full disclosure of the information. CADTH does not edit the content of the submissions.

CADTH does use reasonable care to prevent disclosure of personal information in posted material; however, it is ultimately the submitter's responsibility to ensure no identifying personal information or personal health information is included in the submission. The name of the submitting stakeholder group and all conflicts of interest information from individuals who contributed to the content are included in the posted submission.

### **CADTH Reimbursement Review**

### **Feedback on Draft Recommendation**

Stakeholder information	
CADTH project number	PC0259
Name of the drug and	Nivolumab for gastroesophageal junction or esophageal
Indication(s)	adenocarcinoma
Organization Providing	PAG
Feedback	

1. Recommendat Please indicate if the recommendation.	ion revisions ne stakeholder requires the expert review committee to reconsider or clari	fy its
Request for Reconsideration	<b>Major revisions:</b> A change in recommendation <b>category</b> or patient <b>population</b> is requested	
	Minor revisions: A change in reimbursement conditions is requested	
No Request for Reconsideration	<b>Editorial revisions:</b> Clarifications in recommendation <b>text</b> are requested	Х
	No requested revisions	

# 2. Change in recommendation category or conditions Complete this section if major or minor revisions are requested None.

### 3. Clarity of the recommendation Complete this section if editorial revisions are requested for the following elements

#### a) Recommendation rationale

None.

#### b) Reimbursement conditions and related reasons

In the Cost and Cost-Effectiveness summary table, in the "Treatment Cost" row, PAG is requesting the removal of the word cycle.

#### c) Implementation guidance

In Table 2 Implementation Guidance, under condition 4, PAG is seeking clarity whether treatment with nivolumab can be resumed at time of progression (i.e., if patients stopped treatment while on nivolumab and did not experience progression, can they resume).



# **CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation**

Stakeholder information			
CADTH project number	PC0259-000		
Brand name (generic)	Opdivo (nivolumab)		
Indication(s)	In combination with fluoropyrimidine- and platinum-containing		
	chemotherapy, for the treatment of adult patients with advance	ed or	
	metastatic gastric, gastroesophageal junction or esophageal		
	adenocarcinoma.		
Organization	Ontario Health (CCO) Gastrointestinal Cancer Drug Advisory	Comm	ittee
Contact information <sup>a</sup>	Name:		
	Title:		
	Email:		
Stakeholder agreement wi	th the draft recommendation	1	
1. Does the stakeholder ac	ree with the committee's recommendation.	Yes	$\boxtimes$
2000 iiio dianondia. ug		No	
	ration of the stakeholder input		
	on demonstrate that the committee has considered the	Yes	$\boxtimes$
stakeholder input that y	our organization provided to CADTH?	No	
Clarity of the duett necessary	andation		
Clarity of the draft recomm	nendation		
3. Are the reasons for the	recommendation clearly stated?	Yes	
	·	No	
4. Have the implementation	n issues been clearly articulated and adequately	Yes	$\square$
addressed in the recom	n issues been clearly articulated and adequately mendation?	No	
	deration for a recommendation on nivolumab with alternate che	_	
	umab+FOLFIRI) in patients who were treated and progressed		
	ed treatment (e.g., patients who received curative-intent adjuva		
	et of patients. While the benefit of this combination is uncertain		not
	Mate 649, clinicians may not want to retreat these patients with and use an alternate chemotherapy backbone (e.g., FOLFIRI)		1
[In reference to Prescribing		iiisi <del>c</del> ai	۱.
	mbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale	Yes	$\boxtimes$
for the conditions provided in the recommendation?		No	

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm a}$  CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.

#### **Appendix 2. Conflict of Interest Declarations for Clinician Groups**

- To maintain the objectivity and credibility of the CADTH drug review programs, all participants in the drug review processes must disclose any real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest.
- This conflict of interest declaration is required for participation. Declarations made do not negate or preclude the use of the feedback from patient groups and clinician groups.
- CADTH may contact your group with further questions, as needed.
- Please see the Procedures for CADTH Drug Reimbursement Reviews for further details.
- For conflict of interest declarations:
  - Please list any companies or organizations that have provided your group with financial payment over the past two years AND who may have direct or indirect interest in the drug under review.
  - Please note that declarations are required for each clinician that contributed to the input.
  - If your clinician group provided input at the outset of the review, only conflict of interest declarations
    that are new or require updating need to be reported in this form. For all others, please list the
    clinicians who provided input are unchanged
  - Please add more tables as needed (copy and paste).
  - All new and updated declarations must be included in a single document.

A. Assistance with Providing the Feedback		
1. Did you receive help from outside your clinician group to complete this submission?		
	Yes	$\boxtimes$
OH-CCO provided secretariat support to the DAC in completing this input.		
Did you receive help from outside your clincian group to collect or analyze any	No	$\boxtimes$
information used in this submission?	Yes	
B. Previously Disclosed Conflict of Interest		
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was		
submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.		
If yes, please list the clinicians who contributed input and whose declarations have not changed:  • Dr. Erin Kennedy  • Dr. Christine Brezden-Masley  • Dr. Tim Asmis  • Dr. Jim Biagi		



# **CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation**

Stakeholder information			
CADTH project number	PC0259		
Brand name (generic)	OPDIVO (nivolumab)		
Indication(s)	OPDIVO in combination with fluoropyrimidine- and platinum-c	ontain	ing
	chemotherapy, for the treatment of adult patients with advanc	ed or	
	metastatic gastric, gastroesophageal junction or esophageal		
	adenocarcinoma.		
Organization	Bristol-Myers Squibb Canada		
Contact information <sup>a</sup>	Name:		
Stakeholder agreement wi	th the draft recommendation		
1 Doos the stakeholder as	groo with the committee's recommendation?	Yes	$\boxtimes$
1. Does the stakeholder agree with the committee's recommendation?		No	
combination with fluoropyring patients with advanced adenocarcinoma. The pEF improvement in overall survacknowledged that nivolume working with the provinces junction or esophageal ader Expert committee considerations.	da (BMS) agrees with the pERC draft recommendation for ni midine- and platinum-containing chemotherapy, for the treatmet or metastatic gastric, gastroesophageal junction or extra acknowledged the statistically significant and clinically ival (OS) in all randomized patients regardless of PD-L1 CPS. The was associated with a manageable toxicity profile. BMS is contact to facilitate access to Canadian patients with gastric, gastroenocarcinoma.  The stakeholder input on demonstrate that the committee has considered the	ent of a esopha meaning pERC ommitte	adult ageal ngful also ed to
	our organization provided to CADTH?	No	
Clarity of the draft recomm	nendation		
3 Are the reasons for the	recommendation clearly stated?	Yes	$\boxtimes$
3. Are the reasons for the	recommendation clearly stated:	No	
	n issues been clearly articulated and adequately	Yes	$\boxtimes$
addressed in the recommendation?		No	
			5-3
	mbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale	Yes	
for the conditions provide	ded in the recommendation?	No	
1			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.