

CADTH Reimbursement Review

CADTH Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Brexucabtagene autoleucel (Tecartus)

For the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory mantle cell lymphoma after two or more lines of systemic therapy including a Bruton's tyrosine kinase inhibitor

Recommendation: Reimburse with Conditions

Version: 1.0
Publication Date: July 2021
Report Length: 12 Pages

Brexucabtagene Autoleucl (TECARTUS — Gilead Sciences Canada Inc.)

Therapeutic Area: Relapsed/Refractory (R/R) Mantle Cell Lymphoma (MCL)

Recommendation

The CADTH pCODR Expert Review Committee (pERC) recommends that brexucabtagene autoleucl should be reimbursed for the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory mantle cell lymphoma (R/R MCL) after two or more lines of systemic therapy including a Bruton's tyrosine kinase (BTK) inhibitor, only if the conditions listed in Table 1 are met.

Rationale for the Recommendation

One phase II, single arm, open label study (ZUMA-2, n = 68) demonstrated that treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl was associated with fast and durable remission through a clinically meaningful objective response rate (ORR) of 93% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 83.8, 98.2) and proportion of patients achieving a complete response (CR) to treatment (67% [95% CI: 53.3, 78.3]). Further, neither median progression-free survival (PFS) or median overall survival (OS) were reached (95% CIs: 9.6, NE; and NE, NE, respectively) with 16.8 months follow up. These survival rates are not typically observed in patients with R/R MCL. Brexucabtagene autoleucl was also associated with a significant but manageable toxicity profile, as expected with Chimeric Antigen Receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy. However, pERC acknowledged that there was uncertainty in the magnitude of clinical benefit given the phase II single-arm, open-label, non-randomized, non-comparative design of the ZUMA-2 study. Although patients value new treatments for R/R MCL to improve health-related quality of life (HRQoL), given the amount of missing data, pERC was uncertain about the HRQoL benefit for brexucabtagene autoleucl. Brexucabtagene autoleucl could potentially meet the patient identified values of faster remission, longer life, control of disease and symptoms and providing another treatment option.

The sponsor submitted a matching-adjusted indirect comparison (MAIC) that compared the efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl to standard of care in terms of OS, PFS, and tumor response outcomes. pERC noted that the uncertainty in the results of the sponsor-submitted unanchored MAIC were compounded by the inclusion of lower quality comparator trials and clinical heterogeneity across studies. Due to the limitations of the indirect treatment comparisons, pERC was unable to draw any conclusions on the comparative efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl.

The cost-effectiveness of brexucabtagene autoleucl compared with SOC is highly uncertain given the lack of robust comparative evidence, and limitations with the modelling approach. As such, a base case cost-effectiveness estimate was unable to be determined in patients with R/R MCL whose disease progressed after treatment with an anthracycline or bendamustine therapy, an anti-CD20 antibody, and a BTK inhibitor. The committee considered exploratory analyses conducted by CADTH and determined that the ICER was likely closer to the upper range of these results (\$422,000), and that brexucabtagene autoleucl is not cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY willingness to pay (WTP) threshold. At a \$388,000 per QALY ICER, a 99% price reduction would be required to achieve cost effectiveness at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold.

Table 1. Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons

| Reimbursement Condition | Reason |
|--|---|
| Initiation | |
| 1. Brexucabtagene autoleucl should be reimbursed for adult patients (aged 18 years or older) who have all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. ECOG PS of 0 or 1 1.2. Pathologically confirmed MCL, with documentation of either overexpression of cyclin D1 or presence of t(11;14) 1.3. Relapsed or refractory disease, defined by one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3.1. Disease progression after last regimen 1.3.2. Refractory disease is defined as failure to achieve a PR or CR to the last regimen | This condition reflects the eligibility criteria and place in therapy from the ZUMA-2 trial, as well as guidance from clinical experts. |
| 2. Patients may have received up to 5 prior regimens for MCL. Prior therapy must have included all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Anthracycline or bendamustine-containing chemotherapy 2.2. Anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody therapy 2.3. BTK inhibitors | This condition reflects the prior therapies required in the ZUMA-2 trial. |
| 3. Treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl should not be initiated in patients with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. ECOG PS \geq2 3.2. Multiple co-morbidities which are uncontrolled | This condition reflects the exclusion criteria for the ZUMA-2 trial. |
| Renewal | |
| 1. Treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl is a one-time therapy | There is currently no evidence available for repeating treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl. |
| Prescribing | |
| 1. Brexucabtagene autoleucl must be administered by experienced specialists in centres delivering cellular therapies with a multidisciplinary team of qualified medical personnel and appropriate capacity to provide urgent ICU care. | Patients undergoing cellular therapy require tertiary care management to ensure that the treatment is administered most effectively and that patients receive optimal care. |
| 2. Brexucabtagene autoleucl should not be used in combination with other treatments for MCL. | There is no evidence to support combining brexucabtagene autoleucl therapy with any other treatment for MCL. |
| Pricing | |
| 1. Price reduction | <p>The cost-effectiveness of brexucabtagene autoleucl is highly uncertain.</p> <p>CADTH undertook a price reduction analysis based on an exploratory analysis which used data from the MAIC for brexucabtagene autoleucl and removed the cure component. This analysis indicated that a 99% reduction in price is required to achieve an ICER of \$50,000 per QALY.</p> |

BTK = Bruton's tyrosine kinase; CNS = central nervous system; ECOG PS= Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status; MAIC = matching adjusted indirect comparison; MCL = mantle cell lymphoma

Implementation Guidance

1. Place of brexucabtagene autoleucl in therapy

- Clinical experts noted that brexucabtagene autoleucl therapy best fits into treatment of relapsed or refractory MCL following failure of a BTK inhibitor. In the ZUMA-2 trial, most patients received brexucabtagene autoleucl treatment following ibrutinib. The clinical experts indicated for patients who are intolerant to ibrutinib, brexucabtagene autoleucl may be administered following treatment with acalabrutinib. pERC noted that intolerance to both (or all) BTK inhibitors is rare; however, in such cases, the use of brexucabtagene autoleucl should be discussed on a case-by-case basis.
- The clinical experts consulted by CADTH stated that there is currently no evidence available to suggest any benefit of retreatment or sequencing of treatment for brexucabtagene autoleucl; therefore, pERC agreed that switching to brexucabtagene autoleucl is not warranted unless there is disease progression on patients' current therapy.
- pERC discussed the time-limited need to cover brexucabtagene autoleucl in patients who are on other therapies for R/R MCL, including immunochemotherapies and salvage chemotherapy. Patients currently receiving third- or fourth-line therapy with ibrutinib or acalabrutinib following progressive MCL could be considered for brexucabtagene autoleucl even if currently responding, given the short duration of expected benefit with the former therapies. pERC noted that switching to brexucabtagene autoleucl should be considered in these patients if they show any signs of relapsing disease following treatment with a BTK inhibitor. Patients should be monitored with frequent imaging in order to estimate the best time to switch to brexucabtagene autoleucl.
- pERC noted that for the transplant-eligible younger patients, autologous stem cell transplant (SCT) would be the preferred first-line approach; however, implementation of brexucabtagene autoleucl will likely result in this therapy being given prior to consideration of allogeneic SCT. Brexucabtagene autoleucl can potentially replace allogeneic SCT.
- In the ZUMA-2 trial, lymphodepleting chemotherapy (LDC) consisting of fludarabine and cyclophosphamide was administered for 3 days prior to brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion. Bridging therapy was administered, based on the clinical discretion of the investigator for disease control, after leukapheresis and was completed at least 5 days prior to the initiation of LDC. pERC noted that patients who are unable to tolerate fludarabine in the LDC regimen can be considered for brexucabtagene autoleucl. The committee agreed with the clinical experts who consulted with CADTH that bendamustine can be used for LDC in these patients.

2. Priority setting for scarce resources

- Brexucabtagene autoleucl must be administered at specialized treatment centres. However, a limited number of centres in Canada have the expertise and resources to deliver this treatment and it is unlikely that qualified centres will be available in all jurisdictions. Therefore, out-of-province care may be needed for administration of brexucabtagene autoleucl. pERC considered that some patients may be unable to travel outside the province or country to receive therapy. Therefore, the committee suggested that the jurisdictions may need to consider developing interprovincial and international (with the US states) agreements to ensure equitable access for eligible patients and their caregivers, including consideration of financial and logistic support for required travel and short-term relocation.
- pERC noted that, upon implementation of brexucabtagene autoleucl reimbursement, considerations of distributive and procedural justice may arise where the demand for CAR T-cell therapies (including brexucabtagene autoleucl) exceeds manufacturing and administration capacities, which may be constrained by access to highly-trained personnel and facilities capable of assessing patients' eligibility for therapy, collecting, shipping, and handling cells, as well as administering the therapy. pERC recognized that jurisdictions would need to establish equitable and fair priority setting criteria for patient access to CAR T-cell therapies with key stakeholders, including patients, that are clear, transparent, and based on rationales that are publicly defensible, and with an appeals mechanism.

Discussion Points

- pERC discussed the evidence from one phase II, single arm, open label trial (ZUMA-2, n = 68) that showed treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl was associated with fast and durable remission through a clinically meaningful ORR and high proportion of patients who achieved a CR. The median PFS and OS was not reached after a median of 16.8 months follow-up in patients treated with brexucabtagene autoleucl. pERC acknowledged that these survival outcomes are higher than expected in patients with advanced MCL. Brexucabtagene autoleucl was associated with a manageable toxicity profile. However, pERC noted that the observed benefits of brexucabtagene autoleucl need to be weighed against the associated harms including serious cytokine release syndromes (CRS) and neurologic adverse events (AEs).

- Inputs received from patient and clinician groups highlighted that R/R MCL is a rare cancer with a poor prognosis and lack of effective treatment options. pERC concluded that brexucabtagene autoleucl could potentially address patients' unmet needs for a durable treatment that alleviates symptoms, has manageable side effects, and prolongs survival, although the impact on quality of life and delays in disease progression is uncertain.
- Although results of MAIC suggest that brexucabtagene autoleucl may be associated with meaningful improvements in ORR, PFS, and OS, no conclusions on the comparative efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl can be drawn due to limitations that are inherent to unanchored indirect comparisons, inclusion of lower quality comparator trials and clinical heterogeneity across studies.
- Clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that the ZUMA-2 trial may represent a population of patients who are generally healthier than in clinical practice settings. It was noted that the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of patients included in the ZUMA-2 trial may be lower than what is seen in clinical practice. Additionally, the proportion of patients who received bridging therapy in the trial was considered by the clinical experts to be lower than the proportion of patients who would require bridging therapy in their clinical practice. pERC agreed that these factors may affect the generalizability of the trial results to the Canadian setting.
- pERC discussed ethical concerns driven by the high cost of brexucabtagene autoleucl, limited number of centres that are authorized to administer the therapy, and geographic constraints on access. It was noted that patients from remote areas would need to have a prolonged stay at or near specialized centres; and that relocation and interprovincial travel will be required for some patients to access this therapy. Travel costs for patients and their caregivers and the requirement for time spent away from work may disproportionately affect certain populations. Furthermore, pERC agreed with clinical experts that some provinces do not have capacity to assess patients' eligibility for treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl, which would result in substantive out-of-pocket costs for patients travelling out of province to meet the eligibility requirements. For implementation purposes, pERC agreed that there is a need to advocate for equitable patient access not based on ability to pay, and requiring patient support programs or reimbursement for lodging, travel and other expenses so that all patients in need have timely access to therapy.

Background

Brexucabtagene autoleucl is approved by Health Canada for the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory mantle cell lymphoma (MCL) after two or more lines of systemic therapy including a Bruton's tyrosine kinase (BTK) inhibitor. Brexucabtagene autoleucl is an autologous T-cell product manufactured from leukapheresis and administered after LDC, and bridging therapy, as necessary. It is available as a single infusion bag containing a suspension of anti-CD19 CAR T-cells in approximately 68 mL. The target dose is 2×10^6 CAR T-cells per kilogram (kg) of body weight (range: $1 \times 10^6 - 2 \times 10^6$ CAR T-cells/kg), with a maximum of 2×10^8 CAR T-cells for patients 100 kg and above.

Sources of Information Used by the Committee

To make their recommendation, the Committee considered the following information:

- A review of one phase II clinical trial of brexucabtagene autoleucl in patients with R/R MCL
- Patients' perspectives gathered by a patient group, Lymphoma Canada
- Input from public drug plans and cancer agencies that participate in the CADTH review process
- Three clinical specialists with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with R/R MCL
- Input from two clinician groups, including Ontario Health (Cancer Care Ontario) Hematology Disease Site Drug Advisory Committee and seven clinicians whose input was coordinated by Lymphoma Canada
- A review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor
- A review of relevant ethical issues related to brexucabtagene autoleucl from published literature

Patient Input

One patient group, Lymphoma Canada, provided input for the review of brexucabtagene autoleucl, based on information gathered through an anonymous on-line survey of patients with MCL that was circulated between October 2020 and January 2021. In total, 33 patients provided input on their experience with MCL.

Patients reported that the symptoms of MCL, such as enlarged lymph nodes, fatigue, and gastrointestinal symptoms, aches and pains, and high or low white blood count, had the greatest impact on their quality of life and affected their ability to travel, exercise, concentrate, perform daily activities like household chores, and perform regular duties like work or volunteering. Patients' mental and emotional well-being was negatively impacted, and many patients experienced stress, anxiety or worry, and difficulty sleeping.

All patients surveyed rated faster remission and longer life as the most important outcomes for a new therapy. Other important outcomes included control of disease and symptoms, improved quality of life and improved blood counts. Having choice in their treatment selection was rated as very important with a large majority of patients agreeing that there is a need for more effective therapy options.

Most patients would accept a treatment with known, and potentially serious adverse effects, if it was recommended by their doctor. The majority of patients were willing to tolerate adverse effects of a new treatment if they were short-term.

Drug Plan Input

Input was obtained from drug programs (Ministries of Health and/or cancer agencies) participating as part of the CADTH pan-Canadian Oncology Drug Review Provincial Advisory Group (PAG). PAG identified the following key implementation factors:

- Place of brexucabtagene autoleucl in treatment of R/R MCL and sequencing with other relevant treatments
- Priority setting for scarce resources

Clinical Evidence

Clinical Trials

The CADTH systematic review included one phase II trial, ZUMA-2 (N=74), which was a single-arm, open-label, multicenter study assessing the efficacy and safety of brexucabtagene autoleucl in patients with R/R MCL whose disease had progressed on anthracycline- or bendamustine-containing chemotherapy, an anti-CD20 antibody, and a BTK inhibitor (ibrutinib and/or acalabrutinib).

Key eligibility criteria included pathologically confirmed MCL, with documentation of either cyclin D1 overexpression, or presence of t(11;14) that is relapsed or refractory (R/R) defined by disease progression after the last regimen, or failure to achieve a PR or CR to the last treatment regimen. Patients were required to have prior treatment with up to five regimens that included all of the following: anthracycline or bendamustine-containing chemotherapy, anti-CD20 antibody, and ibrutinib or acalabrutinib. Therapy with a BTK inhibitor was not required to be the last line of therapy before trial entry, and patients were not required to have disease that was refractory to BTK inhibitor therapy. Patients were also required to have an ECOG performance status of 0 or 1, an absolute neutrophil count $\geq 1000/\mu\text{L}$, platelet count $\geq 75,000/\mu\text{L}$, and an absolute lymphocyte count $\geq 100/\mu\text{L}$. Patients were excluded if they had a history of ASCT, or autologous stem cell transplant within 6-weeks of study drug infusion or had a history of CNS or cardiac disorders.

The key limitations of the ZUMA-2 trial included the lack of a comparator arm which can lead to bias in the estimation of treatment effects of brexucabtagene autoleucl, and an open-label design which can increase the risk of bias in reporting of outcomes that are subjective in measurement and in interpretation such as response, HRQoL, and adverse events. The risk of bias due to the open-label design may be unavoidable given the rarity of the indication and unmet need in a population where placebo-controlled randomized trials are not methodologically or ethically feasible.

Outcomes

Outcomes of interest to this review assessed in the ZUMA-2 trial included:

- **Objective Response Rate (ORR)** was the primary efficacy endpoint of ZUMA-2, defined as the incidence of CR or PR using central assessment of positron emission tomography–computed tomography (PET/CT) scans per the Lugano lymphoma staging classification. Scans were conducted 4 weeks post-treatment and repeated every three months, and as needed for patients that displayed symptoms suggestive of disease progression. Evaluations of bone marrow were also needed to confirm CR.
- **Duration of Response (DOR)** was evaluated only for patients who had an objective response (CR or PR) and was defined as the time from the first objective response to disease progression or death, using disease assessments (central and investigator assessment).
- **Progression-Free Survival (PFS)** was defined as the time from the brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion date to the date of disease progression or death from any cause using both central assessment and investigator assessment. In the full analysis set, PFS was defined as the time from the enrollment date to the date of disease progression or death from any cause.
- **Overall Survival (OS)** was defined as the time from the brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion to the date of death from any cause. In the full analysis set, OS was defined as the time from enrollment to the date of death from any cause.
- **Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQoL)** was assessed using the EQ-5D questionnaire at screening (for baseline scores), Week 4 (\pm 3 days), Month 3 (\pm 1 week), and Month 6 (during the long-term follow-up period).

Efficacy

The primary efficacy outcome of the ZUMA-2 trial was ORR using central assessment. Two data cutoff dates were included; the 24-July-2019 data cutoff representing a 12.3-month median follow up, and 31-December-2019 which was focused on results at a longer-term median follow up of 16.8 months.

As of the 24-July-2019 data cutoff date, the primary endpoint of ZUMA-2 was met. The ORR was 93% (95% CI: 83.8%, 98.2%) with 67% (95% CI: 53.3%, 78.3%) of patients achieving a CR. As of the 31-December-2019 data cutoff date, the ORR was 92% (95% CI: 81.6%, 97.2%), with 67% (95% CI: 53.3%, 78.3%) of patients achieving a CR. The median time to response (CR or PR) was 1.0 month (range: 0.8 to 3.1 months) and the median time to achieve a CR was 3.0 months (range: 0.9 to 9.3 months). At both data cutoffs, ORR was significantly greater than the pre-specified historical control of 25% ($p < 0.0001$), as the lower limit of the 95% CI for ORR exceeded higher historical control margins. At both data cuts, pre-specified subgroup analyses for ORR were consistent with the primary analyses.

Key secondary outcomes included DOR, PFS, and OS. As of the 24-July-2019 data cutoff, and a median follow-up time for DOR of 8.6 months, the median DOR was not reached. In patients who achieved a PR, the median DOR was 2.2 months (95% CI: 1.4 months, not evaluable). With a median follow-up time for DOR of 14.1 months at the 31-December-2019 data cutoff, the median DOR was still not reached (95% CI: 13.6 months, not estimable).

As of the 24-July-2019 data cutoff, the median PFS and median OS were not reached (PFS 95% CI: 9.2, not evaluable; OS 95% CI: 24.0, not evaluable). The 6-, 12-, and 24-month PFS rate estimates were 77.0%, 60.9%, and 56.9%, respectively; and the corresponding OS rates were 86.7%, 83.2%, and 66%, respectively. As of the 31-December-2019 data cutoff, the median PFS and OS remained unreached (PFS 95% CI: 9.6, not evaluable; OS 95% CI: not evaluable, not evaluable). Kaplan-Meier estimates of PFS rate at 6 months and 12 months were similar to the primary data cut at 76.8% and 62.2%, respectively. The 24- and 33-month PFS rate estimates were 55.5% and 50.5%, respectively. Kaplan-Meier estimates of OS were comparable to the primary data cutoff with rates of 86.7%, and 83.3% at 6- and 12 months, and were 68.8% in the 24- and 36-month estimates.

HRQoL was measured by the EQ-5D in the ZUMA-2 trial. A total of 62 patients (91%) completed the questionnaire at study screening, however only 42 (62%) completed the questionnaire at 6 months. The proportion of patients experiencing moderate to severe health problems increased in the first month following infusion with brexucabtagene autoleucl for all EQ-5D subscales, however, longitudinal changes in HRQoL cannot be interpreted due to the decreasing numbers of patients reporting for HRQoL.

assessments over time. Overall, the median visual analogue scale (VAS) score improved by 5 points from 85.0 to 90.0 from screening to month 6 and by 12 points from 78.0 at week 4 to 6 months. An improvement of 7 to 12 points on the VAS in patients with advanced cancer is considered a clinically meaningful difference; however, given the missing data at later timepoints, interpretations in change over time are cannot be made.

Harms

At least one treatment emergent adverse event (AE) was reported in all patients, of which 99% had AEs that were Grade 3 or higher (16% Grade 3, 76% Grade 4, and 6% Grade 5). The most common Grade 3 or higher AEs at the primary data cutoff were anemia (50%), decreased neutrophil count (50%), and decreased white blood cell (WBC) count (40%). In the updated analysis, the most common Grade 3 or higher treatment emergent AEs were also decreased neutrophil count (53%), anemia (51%), and decreased WBC count (41%). Grade 3, 4, and 5 serious adverse events (SAEs) were recorded in 29%, 19%, and 6% of patients, respectively. The most common Grade 3 or higher SAEs were encephalopathy (18%), hypotension (12%), and hypoxia (12%). Two patients had Grade 5 SAEs of B-cell lymphoma, who died due to disease progression. At the 31-December-2019 data cutoff, Grade 3, Grade 4, and Grade 5 SAEs were similar to the primary analysis and were observed in 31% and 19%, and 6% of patients, respectively. The most common Grade 3 or higher SAEs were encephalopathy (16%), pneumonia (which increased to 13% from 7%), and hypotension (12%).

Notable harms evaluated in the ZUMA-2 trial included cytokine release syndromes, and neurologic events. CRS occurred in 91% of patients with the most common Grade 3 or higher CRS symptoms including hypotension (25%), hypoxia (19%), and pyrexia (11%). The median time to onset of CRS was 2 days after the brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion, with a median duration of 11 days (range = 1 to 50 days). As of the 24-July-2019 data cutoff, CRS had resolved in all 62 patients. Neurologic adverse events occurred in 63% of patients, with 22% and 9% of patients reporting Grade 3 and 9% of patients reporting Grade 4 neurologic events, respectively; no patients reported a Grade 5 neurologic event. The most common Grade 3 or higher neurologic events were encephalopathy (19%), confusion (12%), and aphasia (4%). Median onset of a neurologic event following brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion was 7 days, and in patients whose neurologic events had resolved, the median duration of neurologic events was 12 days (range = 1 to 567 days). Three patients had neurologic events beyond 200 days that were attributed to lymphodepleting chemotherapy and brexucabtagene autoleucl.

Overall, there were 18 deaths in the ZUMA-2 trial (26%), 16 (24%) of which were attributed to progressive disease, while two (3%) were reported to be due to AEs including organizing pneumonia and staphylococcal bacteremia, both deemed related to lymphodepleting chemotherapy, and one patient (1%) with an unknown cause of death. The majority of deaths occurred more than 3 months after the brexucabtagene autoleucl infusion (14 of 18 deaths).

Indirect Evidence

In the absence of head-to-head studies, the sponsor submitted indirect treatment comparisons (ITC) that compared the efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl to standard of care (SOC) treatments. The evidence base for the ITC was identified through a systematic literature review to identify studies reporting on treatment outcomes for the post-BTK inhibitor R/R MCL population. The systematic literature review identified nine uncontrolled, mainly retrospective, open-label studies that provided outcome data in patients with relapsed or refractory MCL who received the study treatment(s) following BTK inhibitor therapy. The SOC trials used lenalidomide-based treatments, venetoclax, R-BAC (rituximab, bendamustine, cytarabine), RiBVD (rituximab, bendamustine, bortezomib, dexamethasone), or mixed treatments (various chemo-immunotherapies or systemic therapies).

Absolute treatment effects of SOC treatments, in terms of OS, PFS, and tumor response (ORR, CR, and PR), were estimated using a meta-analysis of studies identified from the systematic literature review. The efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl, relative to SOC, was estimated using a MAIC. For the MAIC analysis, a logistic propensity score model was used to match individual patient-level data for brexucabtagene autoleucl from the ZUMA-2 trial with the aggregate study-level data from the SOC studies identified in the literature review, so that the weighted mean baseline characteristics of the ZUMA-2 patients matched the pooled mean characteristics of the SOC studies. The following baseline patient characteristics were included in the MAIC as covariates: number of prior therapies, prior autologous stem cell transplantation, duration on prior BTK inhibitor therapy, response to prior BTK inhibitors, Ki67 proliferation index, and blastoid morphologic variant. The primary MAIC analyses reported an HR of 0.18 (95% CI: 0.09 to

0.38; 4 studies; effective sample size: 36.2) for OS, HR of 0.50 (95% CI: 0.31 to 0.76, 2 studies, effective sample size 16.3) for PFS, and an odds ratio of 7.91 (95% CI: 2.35 to 26.62, 8 studies, effective sample size 29.5) for ORR. The sponsor-submitted MAIC did not assess safety outcomes for brexucabtagene autoleucl.

The key limitation of the MAIC is the assumption that absolute outcomes can be predicted from the covariates included in the model. This assumption is largely considered impossible to meet and failure of this assumption leads to an unknown amount of bias in the unanchored estimate. For the sponsor-submitted ITC, some prognostic factors were excluded from the model or may have been incompletely specified due to missing data from the clinical trials. Effective sample size was small for all outcomes (16 to 36) which suggests poor population overlap and unstable estimates. The results for the tumor response outcome lacked precision and showed wide 95% CIs. Uncertainty in the results of the unanchored MAIC are compounded by the inclusion of lower quality comparator trials and clinical heterogeneity across studies. Due to the limitations of the ITC, no conclusions on the comparative efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl can be drawn from the MAIC.

Economic Evidence

Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

The submitted price of brexucabtagene autoleucl is \$533,523 per infusion (target dose of 2×10^6 CAR T-cells per kg, with a maximum of 2×10^8 cells). This does not include costs associated with leukapheresis, bridging therapy, and conditioning chemotherapy (i.e., LDC) which are typically required for patients receiving treatment with brexucabtagene autoleucl. This is assumed to be a one-time infusion and one-time cost.

The sponsor submitted a cost-utility analysis comparing brexucabtagene autoleucl with best supportive care (BSC), defined as a blended comparator which included rituximab, bendamustine, and bortezomib, in patients with relapsed/refractory MCL whose disease progressed after treatment with anthracycline or bendamustine therapy, an anti-CD20 antibody, and a BTK inhibitor (ibrutinib and/or acalabrutinib). The submitted model was a partitioned survival mixture-cure model (PSMCM) with three states, pre-progression, post-progression, and death. All patients entered the model in the pre-progression health state. The proportion of patients in each health state at any point in time was based on direct modelling of OS and PFS curves, which the sponsor extrapolated over the time horizon of the analysis using parametric methods. The sponsor incorporated a cure component; patients whose disease did not progress within the first 5 years were considered 'functionally cured' (e.g., experiencing long-term remission and survival). The key efficacy data for brexucabtagene autoleucl were derived from the single-arm ZUMA-2 trial of the treatment in patients with MCL, while the key data used to inform BSC were obtained from a sponsor-commissioned meta-analysis of published retrospective studies and qualitative interviews with clinical experts; no direct or indirect comparative information was used to inform the sponsor's base case. Health state utility values were derived from the published literature. The analysis was undertaken from the perspective of the Canadian public healthcare system and adopted a lifetime time horizon (i.e., 50 years).

CADTH identified several key limitations with the submitted analysis:

- The clinical efficacy of brexucabtagene autoleucl is uncertain. ZUMA-2 is an open-label, single-arm Phase II study limited by a small sample size and short duration of follow-up. The study design resulted in an inability to control for confounding and unblinded assessment of subjective outcomes which may inhibit the interpretation of the results.
- Although follow-up time in ZUMA-2 was considered appropriate to assess response to treatment, it was not considered mature for assessing survival outcomes. Thus, the extrapolated benefits are associated with high uncertainty and the choice of a PSMCM with a 5-year "functional cure" point may not have been appropriate.
- Although the sponsor commissioned a MAIC comparing data from ZUMA-2 with the trials identified in sponsor-commissioned meta-analysis, the MAIC results submitted by the sponsor lacked face validity due to heterogeneity in the patient populations of ZUMA-2 and the studies cited to inform BSC. The sponsor's model was based on a naïve comparison, which is associated with its own potentially erroneous assumptions such as conditional constancy. No conclusions can be drawn regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness of brexucabtagene autoleucl and BSC.

- Relevant costs associated with brexucabtagene autoleucl were underestimated or excluded from the analysis. Bridging therapy and leukapheresis were underestimated, while costs associated with tests to determine patient eligibility were not incorporated nor were costs associated with the use of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG).

The limitations with the clinical trial data, such as the inability to control for confounding and the unblinded assessment of subjective outcomes which may inhibit the interpretation of the results, and the lack of robust comparative data meant that no conclusions could be drawn regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness of brexucabtagene autoleucl with currently available treatments. As such, a CADTH base case could not be derived. Corrections were made to the sponsor's analysis involving an updated cost of leukapheresis and more accurate assumptions around use of bridging therapy; and CADTH undertook a series of exploratory analyses involving alternate efficacy assumptions, alternate parametric modelling approaches for OS and PFS, and alternate cost assumptions. These reanalyses indicate that the ICER of brexucabtagene autoleucl compared to BSC was likely to be higher than the base case ICER estimated by the sponsor (\$89,557 per QALY). The ICERs were most sensitive to clinical efficacy and modelling assumptions, and changes to the time horizon, with results ranging from \$104,570 to \$422,416 per QALY. In an analysis in which the cure component of the model was removed and weighted data from ZUMA-2 was used to inform the comparative effectiveness, the ICER for brexucabtagene autoleucl compared to BSC was \$308,034. Based on this analysis, a price reduction of more than 99% would be required to achieve an ICER of \$50,000 per QALY based on this combination analysis.

Budget Impact

The sponsor estimated the incremental budget impact of reimbursing brexucabtagene autoleucl to be \$39,386,468 and \$45,524,260 over three years from a drug plan and healthcare system perspective, respectively. CADTH identified limitations with the submitted budget impact analysis and undertook reanalyses which estimated the incremental budget impact of reimbursing brexucabtagene autoleucl to be \$39,386,468 (unchanged from sponsor's when considering a drug plan perspective) and increasing to \$46,439,484 (health care system perspective) over three-years. CADTH noted the budget impact is sensitive to market share assumptions and consideration of assessment costs for eligibility for brexucabtagene autoleucl which will underestimate the budget impact if not included.

Ethical Considerations

Empirical and normative literature related to the use of brexucabtagene autoleucl and other CAR T-cell therapies as well as experiences of refractory mantle cell lymphoma were reviewed for ethical content, using methods of qualitative description to highlight ethical considerations and themes. Nine publications met the inclusion criteria and were included in the report; none directly reported on the use of brexucabtagene autoleucl for refractory mantle cell lymphoma, but instead explored mantle cell lymphoma incidence and outcomes, cost and value, risks and benefits of CAR T-cell therapies in vulnerable populations, and decision-making capacity.

Findings indicate several domains of disparity in mantle cell lymphoma incidence and outcomes based on age, gender, race, socioeconomic status, as well as differential access to effective upfront therapies and treatment options. These findings necessitate implementation strategies to enhance equitable patient access to therapy and consideration of differential treatment strategies for different groups.

Patients eligible for CAR T-cell therapies often have few therapeutic options and thus are willing to pursue high risk treatments, highlighting a need to consider and identify the appropriate balance of risks and benefits for patients receiving these therapies.

pERC Members

Dr. Maureen Trudeau (Chair), Dr. Catherine Moltzan (Vice-Chair), Mr. Daryl Bell, Dr. Jennifer Bell, Dr. Kelvin Chan, Dr. Matthew Cheung; Dr. Winson Cheung, Dr. Michael Crump, Dr. Avram Denburg, Dr. Leela John, Dr. Christine Kennedy, Dr. Christian Kollmannsberger, Mr. Cameron Lane, Dr. Christopher Longo, Ms. Valerie McDonald, Dr. Marianne Taylor, and Dr. W. Dominika Wranik.

May 13, 2021 Meeting

Regrets

None

Conflicts of Interest

None.

Disclaimer: The information in this document is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. While patients and others may access this document, the document is made available for informational purposes only and no representations or warranties are made with respect to its fitness for any particular purpose. The information in this document should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice or as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services.

While care has been taken to ensure that the information prepared by CADTH in this document is accurate, complete, and up-to-date as at the applicable date the material was first published by CADTH, CADTH does not make any guarantees to that effect. CADTH does not guarantee and is not responsible for the quality, currency, propriety, accuracy, or reasonableness of any statements, information, or conclusions contained in any third-party materials used in preparing this document. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of CADTH.

CADTH is not responsible for any errors, omissions, injury, loss, or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the contents of this document or any of the source materials.

This document may contain links to third-party websites. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third-party sites is governed by the third-party website owners' own terms and conditions set out for such sites. CADTH does not make any guarantee with respect to any information contained on such third-party sites and CADTH is not responsible for any injury, loss, or damage suffered as a result of using such third-party sites. CADTH has no responsibility for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information by third-party sites.

Subject to the aforementioned limitations, the views expressed herein are those of CADTH and do not necessarily represent the views of Canada's federal, provincial, or territorial governments or any third party supplier of information.

This document is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. The use of this document outside of Canada is done so at the user's own risk.

This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this document will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by CADTH and its licensors. These rights are protected by the Canadian *Copyright Act* and other national and international laws and agreements. Users are permitted to make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes only, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH and its licensors.

Redactions: Confidential information in this document has been redacted at the request of the sponsor in accordance with the *CADTH Drug Reimbursement Review Confidentiality Guidelines*.

About CADTH: CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs, medical devices, diagnostics, and procedures in our health care system.

Funding: CADTH receives funding from Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec.