CADTH

CADTH Implementation Advice

FREESTYLE LIBRE FLASH GLUCOSE MONITORING SYSTEM (Abbott Diabetes Care Ltd.)

Indication: Measurement of interstitial fluid glucose levels in adults aged 18 years and older

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A1C	glycated hemoglobin
CGM	continuous glucose monitoring
CSEMI	Comité scientifique de l'évaluation des médicaments aux fins d'inscription / Standing Scientific Committee on Entry on the List of Medications
FGMS	Flash glucose monitoring system
HQO	Health Quality Ontario
HTA	health technology assessment
IIT	intensive insulin therapy
INESSS	Institut national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux
OHTAC	Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee
RCT	randomized clinical trial
RAMQ	Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec
SMBG	self-monitoring of blood glucose
T1D	type 1 diabetes
T2D	type 2 diabetes

Table 1: Product Description

Product	Freestyle Libre Flash Glucose Monitoring System
Indication	Measurement of interstitial fluid glucose levels in adults aged 18 years and older
Manufacturer	Abbott Diabetes Care Ltd.

1 BACKGROUND

Background and Policy Issue

Given the increasing demand from patients and healthcare professionals to have publicly funded access to Freestyle Libre Flash Glucose Monitoring System (FGMS), public drug plans in Canada are seeking guidance for their policy decisions. CADTH therefore initiated a project to inform jurisdictional decision-making on funding of this technology. The initial phase of this project was to synthesize results from two publicly available recent Canadian health technology assessments (HTAs) on Freestyle Libre FGMS (Abbott Diabetes Care Ltd.), i.e., Health Quality Ontario (HQO)[1] and the Institut national d'excellence en santé et services sociaux (INESSS)[2]. Findings from these two HTAs, along with the associated funding recommendations from HQO (under the guidance of the Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee [OHTAC])[3] as well as from INESSS and the Comité scientifique de l'évaluation des médicaments aux fins d'inscription/Standing Scientific Committee on Entry on the List of Medications (CSEMI)[4,5], were summarized in a CADTH Technology Review Report. A draft version of the latter was posted on the CADTH website to solicit stakeholder feedback between May 21 and June 4, 2020. The second phase of this project consisted of CADTH convening an implementation advice panel (IAP). This panel was tasked to further contextualize information contained in the Technology Review report and identify additional considerations such as specific groups of patients who may particularly benefit from using FGMS and determine the key benefits of using this technology. This consultation aimed to develop an advice for Canadian public drug plans regarding the potential implementation of the two currently available provincial funding recommendations for Freestyle Libre FGMS.

Policy Questions

Two policy questions were identified for this project:

1. Is there a group of patients with diabetes that may particularly benefit from using Freestyle Libre FGMS, versus using a more traditional glycemia monitoring method such as test strips?
2. If so, what criteria should be used to identify the patients for whom Freestyle Libre FGMS could be reimbursed by the public drug programs?

2 CONSULTATION PROCESS AND OBJECTIVES

The objective of this project was to develop implementation advice to inform public funding of Freestyle Libre FGMS in Canada; an IAP was convened by CADTH for that purpose. This panel was composed of four experts, i.e., three endocrinologists and one nurse manager working in a regional health authority in Canada; some IAP members also had experience with the HTA process. Therefore, the IAP members had collective experience in the clinical management of diabetes, management of health care resources, and development of health policies. They shared their expertise to help developing the advice on the implementation of the Freestyle Libre FGMS funding recommendations recently released by HQO/OHTAC and INESSS/CSEMI.

The advice developed by the IAP does not constitute an evidence-based recommendation; rather, it is an evidence-informed implementation advice, based on two recent Canadian HTAs and provincial funding recommendations on

FGMS. This advice is being provided to publicly funded drug plans to assist with decision-making regarding the reimbursement of Freestyle Libre FGMS in Canada.

The panelists provided initial input using a questionnaire that was developed by CADTH and representatives of the public drug programs (Appendix). This questionnaire included three questions designed to gain insight into the following considerations:

- What population(s) are likely to benefit the most from using Freestyle Libre FGMS;
- What testing methods are these patients currently using to monitor their glycemia;
- What are the anticipated improved outcomes of using Freestyle Libre FGMS for the population(s) expected to benefit the most from using this technology?

The questionnaire was distributed to the experts prior to the panel meeting, along with a draft version of the CADTH Technology Review report on FGMS. Panelists were asked to consider the evidence and the recommendations included in the draft CADTH Technology Review report when responding to the questionnaire. A summary of the expert input was prepared by CADTH to identify the most frequently cited or important elements of the responses that were provided by the panelists. This summary was shared with IAP members in preparation for the panel meeting which took the form of a conference call hosted by CADTH. Using the summary of the feedback they had provided, the panelists attempted to reach consensus on the most important patient characteristics, most relevant comparators, as well as the anticipated improved outcomes of using Freestyle Libre FGMS. CADTH drafted the Implementation Advice Report based on the panel discussion.

A draft version of this Implementation Advice Report will be posted on the CADTH website in July 2020 to solicit feedback from stakeholders, including patients and their representatives, caregivers, clinicians, and other stakeholders such as advocacy groups and pharmaceutical manufacturers.

3 IMPLEMENTATION ADVICE

3.1 Provincial Funding Recommendations for FGMS

The two Freestyle Libre FGMS provincial funding recommendations that are of interest to this report were respectively developed by HQO/OHTAC and INESSS/CSEMI.

HQO/OHTAC

Based on the guidance of OHTAC, HQO recommended publicly funding FGMS for the following two groups of patients:

- People with type 1 diabetes (T1D) who experience recurrent hypoglycemia despite frequent self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) and efforts to optimize insulin management
- People with type 2 diabetes (T2D) requiring intensive insulin therapy (IIT), i.e., multiple daily injections of insulin or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, who experience recurrent hypoglycemia despite frequent SMBG and efforts to optimize insulin management.[3]

INESSS/CSEMI

In October 2018, INESSS evaluated Freestyle Libre FGMS.[4] At that time, CSEMI recommended that this FGMS be reimbursed to adults aged 18 years and older who have at least two years of experience in self-managing their diabetes and who meet the following three criteria:

- Requiring IIT
- Having frequent or severe hypoglycemia events
- Requiring blood glucose self-monitoring at least eight times daily.[4,6]

The above recommendation was based on the condition that the economic burden of Freestyle Libre FGMS be lessened, otherwise CSEMI recommended that this technology only be considered as an exceptional drug product in the Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec (RAMQ) drug formulary.[4] Of note, Freestyle Libre FGMS is reimbursed in

Quebec since July 2019 to persons fulfilling the above-cited criteria. The RAMQ authorization form must be completed by the attending physician.[7] INESSS also added an implementation-related consideration to its recommendation, i.e. training so that patients can master sensor application and learn how to interpret and use the information provided by the device. More specifically, the initial request is authorized for three months to evaluate patient capacity to use Freestyle Libre FGMS and wear the sensor. Request to pursue treatment is authorized for maximum of twelve months if patients show a capacity to make an optimal use of Freestyle Libre FGMS, i.e. at least 70% of the time.[4]

The recommendation from CSEMI was updated in April 2020 based on a change to the Health Canada labelling dating August 2019 and which no longer requires that patients have at least two years of experience in diabetes self-management.[5] The most recent funding recommendations therefore applies to persons with diabetes of minimum 18 years of age who meet the following three criteria:

- Requiring ITT (i.e., use of insulin pump therapy or ≥ greater than three insulin injections per day);
- Having frequent or severe hypoglycemic events;
- Requiring blood glucose self-monitoring at least eight times daily.[5]

Initial request would now be authorized for six months (instead of three) to evaluate patient capacity to use Freestyle Libre FGMS and wear the sensor. Requests to pursue treatment would be authorized for twelve months if patients show a capacity to make an optimal use of Freestyle Libre FGMS, i.e., at least 70% of the time.[5] Of note, the updated listing criteria have not yet been implemented in the RAMQ drug formulary.[8]

3.2 Implementation Issues

The implementation advice from the panel is summarized in Table 2. For each issue, a summary of the relevant panel meeting discussion is provided below for additional context.

Table 2: Summary of Advice for Addressing Implementation Issues

Issue	Advice
Implementation issue 1: Population expected to benefit most from using Freestyle Libre FGMS	Among patients with insulin-treated diabetes, certain subgroups may be expected to benefit from using FGMS. These would include: ○ Adults and children with T1D or with T2D on IIT as part of a strategy to achieve tight control of glycemic targets. ○ Patients with certain conditions or special needs including, but not limited to, the following: ▪ Adults and children: • on IIT with highly labile glycemia despite optimal diabetes care, or • with T1D requiring IIT having hypoglycemia unawareness and/or frequent hypoglycemic episodes who do not have access to CGM, or • using insulin therapy who cannot perform finger pricking as part of SMBG because of dexterity, mobility, dermatological problems, occupational limitations, or other similar reasons. ○ Women with T1D who are pregnant or planning a pregnancy and who do not have access to CGM.
Implementation issue 2: Current alternative glycemic testing methods	○ The alternative glycemic testing methods is SMBG which involves use of test strips and lancets to prick fingertips.
Implementation issue 3: Anticipated improved outcomes of using Freestyle Libre FGMS for the population(s)	○ While the HTAs found limited evidence of reduced frequency and duration of hypoglycemia in adults with T1D and in adults with T2D using IIT, as well as improved time spent in target glycemic range in adults with T1D, IAP members clarified that the main outcome improvement of using FGMS is to improve hypoglycemia events.

expected to benefit the most from using this technology.	○ Other clinically relevant benefits of using FGMS, compared with using SMBG, are enhanced patient comfort, convenience, and independence as well as improved patient compliance in testing and better disease management due to availability of multiple, frequent data points for analysis of glycemic trends.

CGM = continuous glycemic monitoring; FGMS = Flash glucose monitoring system; HTA = health technology assessment, IAP = implementation advice panel; IIT = intensive insulin therapy; SMBG = self-monitoring of blood glucose; T1D = type 1 diabetes; T2D = type 2 diabetes.

Implementation Issue 1 (population expected to benefit most from using FGMS):

Among patients with insulin-treated diabetes, certain subgroups may be expected to benefit from using Freestyle Libre FGMS. These would include:

- Adults and children with T1D or with T2D on IIT as part of a strategy to achieve tight control of glycemic targets.
- Patients with certain conditions or special needs including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Adults and children:
    - on IIT with highly labile glycemia despite optimal diabetes care, or
    - with T1D requiring IIT with hypoglycemia unawareness and/or frequent hypoglycemic episodes who do not have access to real time continuous glycemic monitoring (CGM), or
    - using insulin therapy who cannot perform finger pricking as part of SMBG because of dexterity, mobility, dermatological problems, occupational limitations, or other similar reasons.
- Women with T1D who are pregnant or planning a pregnancy and who do not have access to real time CGM.
- In addition, during the consultation, IAP members:
  - Indicated that patients with T1D requiring IIT may potentially derive a greater benefit, i.e. reduction in hypoglycemia, from using FGMS; patients with T2D requiring similar therapy would nonetheless also be expected to have improved hypoglycemia with this technology.
  - Indicated that patients requiring IIT due to other causes (e.g., pancreatogenic diabetes [including diabetes resulting from pancreatitis] - this condition is sometime referred to type 3c diabetes) - may also benefit from using FGMS.
  - Acknowledged that there could be potential for significant budgetary impact to public drug plans of funding FGMS. Consequently, when developing reimbursement criteria for FGMS, consideration may be given to combining key clinical characteristics that patients should present in order to access this technology. For example, it was noted that patients who are unable to perform multiple daily glycemic tests and record associated results (for a variety of reasons, including access, professional occupation or lifestyle), may particularly benefit from using FGMS. Accordingly, a potential subgroup of patients presenting with several clinical features that may be considered for reimbursement of FGMS would be composed of individuals with either T1D, or T2D requiring IIT, and who are unable to do multiple daily glycemic tests.

The panel further indicated that not all patients with diabetes are expected to benefit from using FGMS. There is no evidence to indicate that patients not using insulin benefit from using this technology. However, among patients with insulin-treated diabetes, certain subgroups may be expected to benefit from using Freestyle Libre FGMS; these were described in the above paragraph. Also, IAP members clarified that evidence was not available in the HTAs reviewed for all subgroups identified in the aforementioned paragraph; as such some of these statements are based on their expert opinion.

Implementation Issue 2 (current alternative glycemic testing methods):

- In the populations identified above, patients are currently managed with SMBG which involves use of test strips and lancets to prick fingertips. Accordingly, IAP members deemed this traditional approach of monitoring glycemia to be the current alternative to Freestyle Libre FGMS. Compared to SMBG, IAP members specified that Freestyle Libre FGMS provides the ability to analyze glycemic trends to support better disease management.
- IAP members stated that CGM is not currently considered a comparator to Freestyle Libre FGMS as public coverage of this technology in Canada is currently very limited; IAP members indicated that some private insurers may reimburse this technology for certain clinical situations;
  - Compared to FGMS, the panel indicated that CGM offers the ability for patients to be informed by alarms of changes in glycemic level (e.g. hypo- and hyperglycemia) and take necessary action. Both technologies provide ability for glycemic trend analysis with multiple data points.

Implementation Issue 3 (anticipated improved outcomes):

- Panelists noted that the HTAs found limited evidence of glycemic benefits and these were only shown for the following two clinical endpoints:
  - Reduced frequency and duration of hypoglycemia in adults with T1D as well as in adults with T2D using IIT.
  - Improved time spent in target glycemic range in adults with T1D.
- Acknowledging findings from the two HTAs, IAP members clarified that the main anticipated change in outcome of using Freestyle Libre FGMS is to improve hypoglycemia events, more specifically reduce the frequency and duration of these events.
- Some IAP members however indicated that recent evidence, mainly from observational studies, has suggested that the use of FGMS may also improve A1C and quality of life measures.
- Other clinically relevant benefits of using FGMS, compared with using SMBG, are enhanced patient comfort, convenience, and independence as well as improved patient compliance in testing and better disease management due to availability of multiple, frequent data points for analysis of glycemic trends. The latter statement is based on the observation that, for individuals on IIT, the quality of diabetes management is directly related to the frequency of glycemic testing and the use of related glycemic results to inform insulin dosing.
- In addition, during the consultation, IAP members:
  - Stressed that, in all clinical situations, patients should be willing and able to learn how to use Freestyle Libre FGMS to improve diabetes management. It is therefore appropriate that access to this device be conditional on patients successfully completing a training session on the use of this technology and on self-management of insulin regimens. Such training would ideally be provided by a certified diabetes educator. If such services are not available close to the residence of patients, alternative approaches could include teaching offered at local pharmacies, use of on-line training programs, or teaching provided by other qualified providers, including industry sponsored training programs.
  - Indicated that it would be reasonable for drug plans to implement a process to ensure optimal use of FGMS; i.e. periodic review of patients to verify that the desired glycemic targets and frequency of scanning are achieved after using Freestyle Libre FGMS for a certain time period. Failure of patients to achieve the targeted scanning frequency and desired glycemic level could result in coverage discontinuation.

3.3 Other Discussion Points

With respect to the HTAs included in the draft Technology Review report, the panel noted that evidence reviewed on FGMS is still limited; provincial HTAs generally evaluated the quality of this evidence to be very low to moderate (using

the GRADE methodology). Acknowledging the limitation of the evidence, the panel indicated that the main advantage of FGMS, compared to SMBG (which involves use of test strips and blood from finger pricks to assess glycemic control), is the ability to analyze trends in glycemic control over time, which may have the potential to improve disease management for patients on insulin therapy, specifically by reducing the frequency and duration of hypoglycemia events.

The panel identified several key clinical characteristics of diabetes patients who could potentially derive greater benefit from FGMS, compared with SMBG. These characteristics include:

- the need for IIT;
- a requirement for frequent glycemic testing; and
- the presence of practical disease management challenges, such as difficulty performing multiple glycemic tests daily.

In addition, the panel indicated that patients with T1D may potentially derive a greater benefit from FGMS with respect to hypoglycemia but also emphasised that patients with T2D with the aforementioned characteristics would also be expected to derive benefit from FGMS.

IAP members noted that the reimbursement of FGMS for patients with diabetes could potentially have a high budget impact for public drug plans, with additional annual treatment costs estimated to range from $627 to $1,241 per patient with T1D and T2D, respectively. IAP members suggested that individual jurisdictions could mitigate the potentially high expenditure for FGMS by reimbursing this technology only for those patients who are most likely to benefit because they are unable to effectively manage their disease using SMBG.

IAP members stressed it is important that patients use the FGMS technology correctly in order to optimize the potential benefits. This could be achieved by providing support to patients to facilitate the development of technical knowledge of how to use Freestyle Libre FGMS, and by ensuring that patients use this device to improve the management of their condition. The panel suggested that public drug plans ensure that (1) patients successfully complete a training program and (2) develop a system to verify that patients achieve glycemic and testing frequency targets.

A limitation of this work is that clinical evidence on the effect of FGMS on patient relevant outcomes is still relatively scarce, though growing. In addition, the HTAs used as the main source of information were completed in October 2018 (INESSS) and December 2019 (HQO), respectively. As such, new studies published within the last six to 20 months would not have been captured. On the other hand, as these two HTAs were conducted by Canadian jurisdictional organizations, IAP members could rely of their quality and relevance to inform policy decision in the Canadian context. Further, the HTAs by INESSS and HQO both considered the clinical and economic perspectives.

4 REFERENCES

1. Ontario Health (Quality). Flash glucose monitoring system for people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes: a health technology assessment. *Ontario Health Technology Assessment Series.* 2019;19(8). https://www.hqontario.ca/Portals/0/Documents/evidence/reports/hta-flash-glucose-monitoring-system.pdf. Accessed 2019 Dec 12.
2. Institut national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux. Système flash de surveillance du glucose (Freestyle LibreMC, Abbott). Montreal (QC): INESSS; 2018: https://www.inesss.qc.ca/nc/en/publications/publications/publication/systeme-flash-de-surveillance-du-glucose-freestyle-libremc-abbott.html. Accessed 2020 Jan 10.
3. Flash glucose monitoring system for people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes: recommendation. Toronto (ON): Ontario Health (Quality); 2019: https://www.hqontario.ca/Portals/0/Documents/evidence/reports/recommendation-flash-glucose-monitoring-system-en.pdf. Accessed 2020 Jan 10.
4. Institut national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux. Avis - Système flash de surveillance du glucose (Freestyle Libre, Abbott). Montreal (QC): INESSS; 2018:

https://www.inesss.qc.ca/fileadmin/doc/INESSS/Rapports/Technologies/INESSS_Avis_FreeStyle.pdf. Accessed 2020 Jan 9.
5. Institut national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux. FreeStyle LibreMC – Diabète: Avis transmis à la ministre en mars 2020. Montreal (QC): INESSS; 2020: https://www.inesss.qc.ca/fileadmin/doc/INESSS/Rapports/Technologies/FreeStyle_Libre_2020_03.pdf. Accessed 2020 Apr 8.
6. List of medications. Québec (QC): Régie de l'assurance maladie Québec; 2019: http://www.ramq.gouv.qc.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/liste_med/2019/liste_med_2019_07_10_en.pdf. Accessed 2020 Jan 10.
7. The flash glucose monitoring system is now covered. *Diabetes Québec* 2019; https://www.diabete.qc.ca/en/newscast/news/reimbursement-of-freestyle-libre/. Accessed 2020 Jan 9.
8. Liste des médicaments Québec (QC): Régie de l'assurance maladie Québec; 2020: https://www.ramq.gouv.qc.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/liste_med/2020/liste_med_2020_03_04_fr.pdf. Accessed 2020 Apr 27.

5 APPENDIX

Questionnaire Submitted to the Implementation Advice Panel

1.1. Please describe the population that would be expected to benefit most from using a FGMS to monitor their glycemia.
Focus on the Canadian context. *Please include a detailed description of key characteristics of these patients.* ***Response:*** Click here to enter response.

1.2 Based on your response to question 1.1, please describe the existing method in clinical practice these patients are currently using to monitor their glycemia.
Focus on the Canadian context, accounting for not only clinical benefits but also ease of access for patients through public, private and out-of-pocket payment. ***Response:*** Click here to enter response.

1.3. Compared to the most clinically relevant alternative identified in Question 1.2, please describe the main benefits of using a FGMS for the population identified in Question 1.1.
Please describe the place in therapy of the FGMS in the Canadian clinical practice setting. Also, please indicate whether there are any treatment gaps associated with the use of the most clinically relevant alternative method to monitor glycemia identified in Question 1.2. that this new technology may fill for this population. ***Response:*** Click here to enter response.