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Should Rare Oncology Treatments be Considered True Orphans?

- Rare disease: prevalence of <5 in 10,000
- Ultra-rare disease: prevalence of <1 in 50,000
- Rare cancer: incidence of <6 in 100,000 persons per year

Life-threatening or chronically debilitating disease
- Unlikely sufficient returns from marketing to justify investment
- Must be of significant benefit to those affected by the condition

Poll: When drugmakers 'salami-slice' they undermine precision medicine efforts

Poll: Unmet need in rare cancers remains high
Questions Posed to the Panel

1. Should rare cancers and other rare diseases be considered distinct?
2. Are companies justified in receiving orphan benefits for cancer drugs with several indications?
3. Should a separate rare cancer reimbursement process be introduced – if so, how?

- Each panellist will speak for ~10 minutes
- There will then be a brief opportunity for the other panellists to respond
- After all panellists have presented there will be a ~15 minute discussion session
- Questions and comments from the audience will be taken during the discussion session
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Should rare cancers and other rare diseases be considered distinct?
Are companies justified in receiving orphan benefits for cancer drugs with several indications?

Scientific advances brought our understanding of molecular causes of cancer to the next level

Treatment of cancer is becoming increasingly personalized by targeting genetic mutations that give rise to the disease.
Should a separate rare cancer reimbursement process be introduced – if so how?

WE OFFER 3 KINDS OF SERVICES

GOOD – CHEAP – FAST

BUT YOU CAN ONLY PICK TWO

GOOD & CHEAP WON’T BE FAST

FAST & GOOD WON’T BE CHEAP

CHEAP & FAST WON’T BE GOOD
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Introducing the Anticancer Fund

- Founded in 2009 by Belgian entrepreneur Luc Verelst as Reliable Cancer Therapies, later the Anticancer Fund
- A not-for-profit, private foundation
- Supports the development of promising therapies with little or no commercial value (e.g. drug repurposing)
- Focus on areas of high unmet needs

**Rare cancers**
- **FluvaBrex**
  - Fluvastatin & celecoxib for children with optic nerve gliomas

**Pediatric Cancers**
- **Metzolinos**
  - Metformin, zoledronic acid and sirolimus for recurrent osteosarcoma

**Metastatic or Recurrent Disease**
- **ModuLung**
  - Metronomic chemotherapy, pioglitazone & clarithromycin in resistant NSCLC

ODD – A Blunt Instrument?

- **Prevalence**
  - Ultra-rare
  - Very-rare
  - Relatively-rare

- **Number of prescriptions**
  - Acute/Spontaneous
  - Relapsing/Remitting
  - Chronic

- **Very different financial incentives**
The hemangioma story...

Incidental observation in a child treated with propranolol shows rapid and sustained effects on infantile hemangioma – results repeated in 10 other children.

Results confirmed in numerous patients and trials


Drug reformulated for infants

Hemangeol – FDA Approved March 2014

Hemangiol – EMA Approved Feb 2014

Successfully repurposed

Rare cancer – Angiosarcoma

- Angiosarcoma is a rare vascular soft-tissue sarcoma with an incidence of 1 – 2 per million per year (SEER or NCIN data).
- They make up 2%-3% of all soft tissue sarcomas.
- Standard first line treatments are taxane or anthracycline-based chemotherapy, with surgery and radiotherapy options.

Wide range of evidence sources for anticancer effects of propranolol – lab work, animal models, retrospective human data, case reports, some trials...


Angiosarcoma/propranolol – multiple published case reports, on-going clinical trial. Anticancer Fund granted ODD

Propranolol – financial incentives?

- Millions of prescriptions for long-term use of propranolol in primary indications (e.g. hypertension)
- For angiosarcoma? A few hundred prescriptions per year for short-term use. Not even a rounding error...
- No clinically justifiable reason to reformulate
- Clinicians will use the generic version if a high-priced formulation becomes available
- *Orphan drug designation does not work in such cases*
- Other mechanisms required – non-commercial label-extension?
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NICE and ‘rare’ diseases

Highly Specialised Technologies

- Target patient group is so small that treatment will usually be concentrated in very few centres in the NHS
- Target patient group is distinct for clinical reasons
- Condition is chronic and severely disabling
- Potential for life long use
- Expected to be used exclusively in the context of a highly specialised service
- Likely to have a very high acquisition cost
- Need for national commissioning of the technology is significant.

What is ‘rare’?

HST evaluations to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HST</th>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Patients in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atypical haemolytic uraemic syndrome</td>
<td>0.4/1,000,000</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mucopolysaccharidosis Type IV a</td>
<td>1/220,000</td>
<td>74-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duchenne’s muscular dystrophy with nonsense mutation</td>
<td>1/220,000</td>
<td>8-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fabry’s disease</td>
<td>1/220,000</td>
<td>74-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type 1 Gaucher’s disease</td>
<td>1/50-100,000</td>
<td>50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Paediatric-onset hypophosphatasia</td>
<td>1/300,000</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMA – orphan designation – prevalence <5/10,000

In England = < 26,505 patients
Perspective: HST

Given the very small numbers of patients a simple utilitarian approach, in which the greatest gain for the greatest number is valued highly, is unlikely to produce guidance which would recognise the particular circumstances

- vulnerability of very small patient groups
- limited treatment options
- nature and extent of the evidence
- challenge for manufacturers in making a reasonable return on their research and development investment

So to answer the questions...

- Should rare cancers and other rare diseases be considered distinct?
  - No, NICE does not differentiate.....
  - ....though HST conditions are more likely to be rare disease that are not cancers
  - Gap between HST and non-orphan conditions requires alternate policy options
- Are companies justified in receiving orphan benefits for cancer drugs with several indications?
  - No, HST does not deal with subgroups of populations
  - Avoid ‘leakage’ to populations that were not within evaluation remit
  - ‘Return on investment’ depends on size of all eligible populations
## What’s different about rare diseases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential for a cure</th>
<th>• High upfront cost and uncertain long-term effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Frequently developed by SMEs/academics | • Lack of funding  
| | • Multi-stakeholder expertise  
| | • Expensive manufacturing  
| | • Complicated logistics |
| Limited evidence | • RCTs – impossible?  
| | • Limited generalisability and external validity  
| | • Small sample sizes  
| | • Surrogate rather than final outcomes  
| | • Short trials – maintenance of effect?  
| | • Unknown future adverse effects |

### HST– different cost-effectiveness decision thresholds

- Decision Threshold £100k/QALY (20-30k/QALY for pharmaceuticals)
- Above £100k/QALY, judgements take account of the **magnitude of benefit** and the additional **QALY weight** that would be needed to support recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incremental QALYs</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
<th>Effective Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£100,000/QALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-29</td>
<td>1-3 (sliding scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£300,000/QALY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managed Access Agreements

- Risk-sharing agreements comprising of:
  - Commercial Arrangement with NHS England - financial risk management
  - Commitment to collect additional data to address significant uncertainty
  - Time limited and agreement for what happens next
  - Agreed with stakeholders (company, NHS England, patient groups and NICE)

Cancer Drug Fund

- Plausible potential for the drug to satisfy the criteria for routine commissioning, but there is significant remaining clinical uncertainty which needs more investigation, through data collection in the NHS or clinical studies
- Managed Access Agreement consists of two key components:
  - Data Collection Arrangement – this sets out the outcomes that need to be collected in order to resolve the key areas of clinical uncertainty.
  - CDF Commercial Agreement – this determines the cost of the drug during the managed access period.
And to answer the last question.....

• Should a separate rare cancer reimbursement process be introduced - if so how?
  • No, the policy options already exist
  • Issues for evaluation of rare diseases less relevant for ‘true’ orphan conditions
  • Higher thresholds for rare diseases
  • Managing uncertainty through price agreements and further data collection

Thank you
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