

Reimbursement of Kymriah and Yescarta in the UK and the Big4-EU markets

Panos Kefalas

Reimbursed price for licensed innovative therapies is subject to valuebased assessments

PRINCIPLES OF VALUE-BASED ASSESSMENTS



Therapy Value (V)

- Value defined in terms of a reference value (Standard of Care), and the positive and negative differentiation value of the novel therapy vs the SOC
 - o Comparative data against the SOC is required
 - For a given target disease, "V" varies depending on therapeutic positioning (e.g. 1st line vs 2nd line)
 - In countries where indication specific price is not possible, lowest value indication will impose downwards pressure on price
 - Potential impact of CAR-T label expansion from refractory/relapsed to 1st line

© Copyright Reserved Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult

Positive or negative differentiation value is driven by therapy's impact on healthcare costs, health gains and in some cases societal gains

Value of novel therapy= healthcare costs displaced + monetised health gains (+societal gains?)

- Therapy value is determined by comparing it to current therapeutic approaches and accounting for its impact on:
 - **1. healthcare costs:** e.g. savings from reducing need for current therapeutic approaches and improving outcomes
 - **2. health gains:** e.g. the gain in Quality-Adjusted Life-years (QALYs) over the existing therapeutic approaches
 - **3. societal gains** (less common): e.g. increase in work productivity
- Various approaches are used to translate value to reimbursed price (depending on geography) e.g.
 - Cost-effectiveness analysis
 - Budget impact analysis



In the UK the cost-utility analysis (CUA) is used to determine costeffective price; it accounts for healthcare costs and health gains





- For end-of-life/high disease severity up to £50K
- For very rare conditions: ICER up to £300K (depending on magnitude of QALY gain)

- It rewards for gains in life years and quality of life (QoL)

- It covers a longer horizon (e.g. lifetime for chronic disease); <u>however discount rate</u> <u>used disadvantages one-off therapies with long-term benefits</u>

- Can accommodate modelled data e.g. extrapolations to support long term claims

© Copyright Reserved Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult

The CUA accounts for the comparative impact (novel therapy vs SOC) **CATAPULT** in terms of lifetime QALY gains and costs from treatment



Decision Tree for Acute Myeloid Leukaemia / SOC: LDAC (low dose cytarabine) SOC: Standard of Care BSC: Best Supportive Care

Budget impact (BI) assessments are also used to assess whether a cost-effective price presents affordability issues



			BUDGET IMPACT					
Vor drivers	Total Population of England	50,542,505						
Key drivers:	Target population p.a.	1,000						
 Change in costs per 	SOC price per patient	£5,000		Illustrative exemplar of a budget neutral therapy				
patient from	New Therapy price per patient	£6,000						
displacing	Probability of rehospitalisation with SOC	2.00%						
existing therepies	Probability of rehospitalisation with New Therapy	1.00%						
therapies	Cost per rehospitalisation	£20,000						
(usually healthcare			Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
budget only)	Market share of New Therapy		0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
• Number of	SOC Costs		£5,000,000	£4,000,000	£3,000,000	£2,000,000	£1,000,000	£0
patients	New Therapy Costs		£0	£1,200,000	£2,400,000	£3,600,000	£4,800,000	£6,000,000
treated	Total Drug Costs		£5,000,000	£5,200,000	£5,400,000	£5,600,000	£5,800,000	£6,000,000
	Rehospitalizations Avoided		0	10	20	30	40	50
• Time horizon	Reduction in Rehospitalization Costs		0	£200,000	£400,000	£600,000	£800,000	£1,000,000
(≤5 years)	Change in Costs							
	Change in Drug Costs		£0	£200,000	£400,000	£600,000	£800,000	£1,000,000
	Change in Rehospitalization Costs		£0	-£200.000	-£400,000	-£600,000	-£800,000	-£1,000,000
	Total Change in Costs		£0	£0	50	≥ £0	£0	£0

*£20M annual (years 1-3) net BI trigger-point for commercial negotiations with NHS England

© Copyright Reserved Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult

Clinical, regulatory and commercial considerations often necessitate a clinical development programme for ATMPs that payers find challenging

Common data challenges for ATMPs:

- Potential for a cure but lack of long-term data at launch
- Weak comparative effectiveness data vs. the standard of care (SOC) due to one or more of the following:
 - Head-to head (H2H) comparative data against the standard of care is not available
 - Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) not feasible, which limits prospect for indirect comparisons
 - Meaningful comparative data from single arm trials can not be generated due to e.g. limitations with the historical control data, the natural history of disease is not well known, or the patient population is heterogeneous
 - Small trials limit statistical significance of outcomes measured
 - Measuring only surrogate outcomes rather than hard clinical outcomes (risk for overestimation of benefit as per: *NICE Regenerative Medicine Study*, 2016)
 - No comparable treatment or outcome measures are available







• Confidential discounts

- Uncertainty around ATMP cost-effectiveness could require discounting beyond commercial viability
- Historically oncology <u>only</u>: Temporary coverage while further evidence is collected for reevaluation (Cancer Drug Fund [CDF], <u>now expanding beyond cancer [IMF]</u>)
 - Kymriah and Yescarta adoption within NHS England
- Outcomes-based reimbursement
 - Outcomes tracked at cohort or individual patient basis (clinical, economic, humanistic) to inform payment mechanism
 - i. "Exploring the assessment and appraisal of regenerative medicines and cell therapy products", NICE, March 2016
 - ii. Using the cost-utility framework to identify the managed entry agreement (MEA) that minimises uncertainty as per: "Framework for analysing risk in HTA and its application to Managed Entry Agreements" NICE DSU, January 2016



Metrics recommended by NICE for assessing payer uncertainty- based on the Cost Utility Framework used for Health Technology Assessments

11)	Istrutte Scenario (per patient)	ICER	Incremental NHE (QALY*)	Probability Cost Effective	Consequences of decision uncertainty (QALY *)	Adoption potential
	Paying in full upfront	£50,000	-55	50%	300	Very low
	10% discount	£45,000	200	65%	250	Low
	Pay-for- performance of patients with remission by day 30	£40,000	250	70%	100	Possible
	Performance based annuities: payment over time for surviving patients	£35,000	1000	99.5%	2	High
			Max	/ imise	ا Minimise	

types of innovative payment mechanisms help reduce uncertainty

Certain

"Exploring the assessment and appraisal of regenerative medicines and cell therapy products", NICE, March 2016

© Copyright Reserved Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult

Key considerations in selecting an innovative pricing scheme





Payment mechanisms for Kymriah and Yescarta at launch in major European APULT markets (2019); "list-price" corridor tight unlike non-ATMP medicines

	Access scheme	List price at launch (confidential discounts apply)
England	 Conditional reimbursement (through the Cancer Drugs Fund) on the condition of further evidence collection Reassessment after five years Key outcomes considered: survival, post-treatment requirement for stem cell transplantation and/or use of immunoglobulins 	Kymriah: £282,000 Yescarta: £280,451
France	 Reimbursement on the condition of real-world data collection Annual reassessments on the basis of real-world data Key outcomes considered: survival, remission status, disease progression, adverse events 	Kymriah: €320,000 Yescarta: €327,000
Italy	 Outcomes-based staged payments for individual patients (3 instalments) For Kymriah: 1st at the time of infusion, 2nd after six months, 3rd after 12 months For Yescarta: First payment for Yescarta® is scheduled at 180 days after infusion, the second payment at 270 days, 3rd at 365 days 	Kymriah: €300,000 Yescarta: €327,000
Spain	Outcomes-based staged payments for individual patients (2 instalments)	Kymriah: €320,000 Yescarta: €327,000
Germany	Rebates linked to individual patient outcomes (details not disclosed)	Kymriah: €320,000 Yescarta: €327,000



		Data collection infrastructure used
Cohort based	England	 Reassessment (5 yrs) on the basis of the combination of long-term follow-up of pivotal trials data collected from routine clinical practice the Systemic Anti-Cancer Therapy (SACT) dataset Blueteq (the system for High Cost Drugs Management Process in NHS England's Commissioning)
	France	• Annual reassessment through data captured from routine clinical practice in France through the Lymphoma Academic Research Organisation (LYSARC) data platform
IPD* based		• Performance assessment based on IPD captured in AIFA's registry
in D bused	Spain	• Performance assessment based on Valtermed, a new system established by the Spanish Ministry of Health, was piloted using Kymriah and Yescarta

* IPD: Individual Patient Data



- The use of innovative payment mechanisms for gene therapies in Europe and the USA, Regen. Med. 2021, **16(4):** 405–422
- Outcomes-based reimbursement for gene therapies in practice: the experience of recently launched CAR-T cell therapies in major European countries, Journal of Market Access & Health Policy 2020, 8.1: 1715536



- In the UK CAR-T service delivery is funded by a single payment per patient to hospitals from NHS England Specialised Services
 - £92,000 + market forces factor covers the patient pathway from decision to treat until 100 days post treatment
 - Additional payments are made for supportive drug costs (e.g. immunoglobulins), critical care and outpatient appointments
 - This tariff was developed following a costing study by early implementers and needs updating over time
- Development of infrastructure such as additional beds, staff or training not included
 - $\circ~$ Need to join up infrastructure planning with service delivery planning

CATAPULT Cell and Gene Therapy

Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult is committed to ensuring high standards of research integrity and research best practice in the activities we carry out. We subscribe to the principles described in the UK concordat to support research integrity.

Cell and Gene Therapy Catapult is a trading name of Cell Therapy Catapult Limited, registered in England and Wales under company number 07964711, with registered office at 12th Floor Tower Wing, Guy's Hospital, Great Maze Pond, London, SE1 9RT. VAT number 154 4214 33.

12th Floor Tower Wing Guy's Hospital Great Maze Pond London SE1 9RT

info@ct.catapult.org.uk ct.catapult.org.uk Twitter: @CGTCatapult



Innovate UK