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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>adverse event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AML</td>
<td>acute myeloid leukemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>area under the curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZA</td>
<td>azacitidine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>budget impact analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMB</td>
<td>bone marrow blasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>best supportive care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>clinical guidance panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOG</td>
<td>Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>hazard ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICER</td>
<td>incremental cost-effectiveness ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>indirect treatment comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDAC</td>
<td>low-dose cytarabine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCI</td>
<td>Ontario Case Costing Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>overall survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS-like</td>
<td>progression-free survival like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>post-progression survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALY</td>
<td>quality-adjusted life year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QoL</td>
<td>quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD</td>
<td>time-to-treatment discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>willingness-to-pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The executive summary is comprised of two tables (Table 1: Background and Table 2: Economic) and a conclusion.

**Table 1: Submitted for Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Product</strong></td>
<td>Glasdegib (Daurismo), 25 mg and 100 mg tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submitted Price</strong></td>
<td>Glasdegib, $286.41 per 25 mg tablet; $572.82 per 100 mg tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indication</strong></td>
<td>In combination with low-dose cytarabine, for the treatment of newly diagnosed and previously untreated acute myeloid leukemia (AML) in adult patients who are aged ≥75 years or who are not eligible to receive intensive induction chemotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Canada Approval Status</strong></td>
<td>NOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Canada review pathway</strong></td>
<td>Standard review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOC Date</strong></td>
<td>April 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reimbursement Request</strong></td>
<td>As per indication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Pfizer Canada Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission History</strong></td>
<td>Previously Reviewed: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AML = acute myeloid leukemia; NOC = notice of compliance.
### Table 2: Summary of Economic Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Type of Economic Evaluation** | Cost-utility analysis  
Partitioned survival model |
| **Target Population** | Adult patients with newly diagnosed and previously untreated acute myeloid leukemia who are ineligible for intensive induction chemotherapy |
| **Treatment** | Glasdegib in combination with low-dose cytarabine (glasdegib + LDAC) |
| **Comparators** | Main population: Low-dose cytarabine (LDAC) alone  
20 to 30 BMB* and >30% BMB subgroups: LDAC alone and azacitidine (AZA) alone |
| **Perspective** | Canadian publicly-funded health care payer |
| **Outcomes** | QALYs, LYs |
| **Time Horizon** | 5 years |
| **Key Data Source** | BRIGHT AML 1003 trial and sponsor-submitted simulated and indirect treatment comparisons (STC/ITC) reporting overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival like (PFS-like) |

#### Submitted Results for Base Case

**Main Population**
- ICER = $177,065 per QALY (0.41 inc. QALYs; $72,695 inc. costs) vs. LDAC

**Population 1 - 20% to 30% BMB**
- ICER for glasdegib + LDAC = $249,865 per QALY (0.60 inc. QALYs; $149,919 inc. costs) vs. LDAC

**Population 2 - >30% BMB**
- ICER for glasdegib + LDAC = $155,645 per QALY (0.32 inc. QALYs; $50,408 inc. costs) vs. LDAC

#### Key Limitations

- Given the limitations associated with the sponsor’s ITC, CADTH was unable to determine the comparative efficacy or cost-effectiveness of glasdegib + LDAC compared with AZA.
- There was uncertainty associated with the use of a PFS-like health state given that this endpoint was not included as part of the BRIGHT AML 1003 trial and it is unknown to what extent the inclusion of partial responders in the non-remission health states biases cost-effectiveness results.
- The sponsor applied a general chemotherapy cost code for the administration of AZA; however, it was unclear which modes of administration for treatment were included and if this accurately reflects the administration costs for AZA. Treatment administration costs were likely overestimated and biased results in favour of glasdegib + LDAC when compared with AZA.
- Given the lack of quality of life data captured in the BRIGHT AML 1003 trial, the sponsor applied health state utility estimates from the published literature. CADTH considered these estimates to be associated with uncertainty given that the patient population (i.e., myelodysplastic syndrome) was not reflective of the patient population in the BRIGHT AML 1003 trial (i.e., acute myeloid leukemia). Further, the sponsor selected utilities were based on the time spent in transfusion dependence as opposed to remission status, the latter of which was only explored in the sponsor economic model using data from the BRIGHT AML 1003 trial. Given the uncertainty associated with health state utilities, conservative estimates were included in the CADTH base case.
- The sponsor adjusted glasdegib + LDAC drug costs according to dose intensity (i.e., dose adjustments or drug interruption) which underestimated treatment costs. Further, the sponsor likely overestimated drug dose intensity for AZA, biasing results in favour of glasdegib + LDAC.
- Due to the non-continuous nature of Kaplan-Meier curves, calculating point survival estimates was associated with challenges, specifically long plateaus or sudden drops in survival which potentially biased results in favour of glasdegib + LDAC.
- The CGP highlighted that subsequent treatments were not reflective of clinical practice as a subset of patients would receive gilteritinib and the proportion of patients receiving AZA was likely overestimated.
Component | Description
---|---
**CADTH Reanalysis Results** | • CADTH reanalyses included: utilizing a parametric survival extrapolation for OS and PFS-like; utilizing a more conservative health state utility value for remission; revising subsequent treatment distributions; readjusting treatment administration costs for AZA to better reflect clinical practice; and, revising drug dose intensities for glasdegib + LDAC and AZA. The latter two limitations primarily affecting subsequent treatment in the CADTH base case and AZA as a comparator in exploratory analyses.

**Main Population** | • ICER for glasdegib + LDAC = $229,622 per QALY (0.36 inc. QALYs; $83,126 inc. costs) vs. LDAC

• At a WTP threshold of $50,000 per QALY, a price reduction of 95% would be required

AZA = azacitidine; BMB = bone marrow blasts; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; inc. = incremental; ITC = indirect treatment comparison; LDAC = low dose cytarabine; LY = life year; OS = overall survival; QALY = quality-adjusted life-year; PFS-like = progression-free survival like; STC = single treatment comparison; vs. = versus; WTP = willingness-to-pay.

**Conclusions**

Given the clinical review of evidence, there were multiple limitations associated with the sponsor’s submitted indirect treatment comparison (ITC) meaning that CADTH was unable to determine the comparative efficacy between glasdegib + LDAC and AZA according to BMB subgroups. Therefore CADTH was unable to determine the cost-effectiveness between these treatments and focused base case results on the main population.

CADTH undertook reanalyses to address limitations that included: adjusting treatment administration costs for AZA to better reflect clinical practice; utilizing a more conservative health state utility for remission; revising drug dose intensities for glasdegib + LDAC and AZA; revising subsequent treatment distributions; and, utilizing a parametric survival function for overall survival and progression-free survival (PFS-like). There was uncertainty associated with the use of a PFS-like health state that could not be addressed by CADTH, specifically the classification of partial responding patients (with or without incomplete blood count) being considered as non-remission. The CGP indicated partial responder patients would likely be associated with an improved quality of life and lower healthcare resource utilization compared to non-responders, therefore it is uncertain what impact partial responding patients would have on cost-effectiveness results.

In the CADTH base case in the main population, glasdegib + LDAC was associated with an ICER of $229,622 per QALY gained compared with LDAC, with 0% of simulations resulting in glasdegib + LDAC being considered cost-effective at a WTP threshold of $50,000 per QALY gained. CADTH determined that a price reduction of 95% would be required for glasdegib + LDAC to be considered cost-effective at a willingness-to-pay (WTP) threshold of $50,000 per QALY.

In various scenario analyses, glasdegib + LDAC was sensitive to the target population explored due to variance in patient OS/PFS-like response. In the cytogenetic subgroups, glasdegib + LDAC was more cost-effective in patients with good/intermediate cytogenetic risk (ICER: $293,320 per QALY) compared to poor cytogenetic risk patients (ICER: $367,933 per QALY). As part of exploratory analyses where AZA was included in BMB reanalyses, CADTH investigated the impact of assuming equal efficacy between glasdegib + LDAC and AZA, which resulted in glasdegib + LDAC being dominated (i.e., more costly and less effective) by AZA for both BMB subgroups.

Based on the sponsor’s submitted budget impact analysis, the total incremental cost is estimated to be $33,446,886 over the first three years for the main population. CADTH reanalyses suggest that the budget impact of introducing glasdegib to the market (based on revised market shares informed by the CGP which included a lower uptake of glasdegib + LDAC over the time horizon) was estimated to be $21,463,743 in the main population over the first three years. In scenario analyses, the use of the sponsor market share in CADTH reanalyses resulted in an estimated three-year budget impact of $63,084,041 in the main population.
Stakeholder Input Relevant to the Economic Review
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