

Bridging the gap between Regulatory approval & Reimbursement for Precision Medicines: a case study from the Netherlands

Dr. Janneke Boersma, Chapter Lead Patient Access, Roche Netherlands June 28, 2021

Disclosures



Janneke Boersma is an employee of Roche Nederland B.V.

The views expressed in this presentation and panel discussion are her personal opinions



Care has become more personalised in various disease areas in the Netherlands, since 1990

Relationship between level of precision medicine and burden of disease in the Netherlands [level of precision medicine in PM score, burden of disease in DALY/patient, 1990 - 2017]



Roche

Imagine the potential of PHC in the Netherlands... if all existing cutting edge technology and advancements are implemented

2 to 4 extra weeks in good health each year



3 to 7 extra years in good health over a lifetime

An enormous potential. Imagine there was **no more disease south of the Rhine**



N=1, PHC Catalyst Alliance, Gupta



Realisation of the promise of PHC takes an integrated approach and many paradigm shifts



EHR, electronic health record

Roche

Cancer a disease of the genome: from tumour type to tumour biology



Thomas et al. Aiming for higher ambition: the Roche approach to cracking the code of cancer, Nature Research



ALK+ 5% NSCLC





If a breast cancer patient with metastatic disease, had progressed on standard therapy, and then you found that she had an ALK mutation...



NL/COMM/1910/0103 ALK = Anaplastic lymphoma kinase



Roche



Are tumour specific RCTs feasible in indications with a low prevalence?

< 60 months	\geq 60 months	Minimum sample	Time to study	Feasible?
GO NO	GO	size	results (years)	
 Sample size - related parameters The assumed primary outcome of interest was progression-free survival (PFS). The required sample size was estimated for each tumour based on the assumption of SoC PFS as reported for relevant SoC therapies (Table 1), and a clinically-meaningful difference of 30% reduction in PFS hazard associated with targeted therapy (1:1 allocation; alpha = 0.05; beta = 0.2).² Estimates of PFS at the tumour level were obtained from the literature from clinical trials of therapies prescribed in Canada for the management of patients with similar treatment experience in the STARTRK trial (NTRK+ patients).¹ Enrollment rate - related parameters Enrollment rate in each tumour-specific trial was dependent on the enrollment rate in the clinical trial program of NTRK mutations (STARTRK-2 2018 average; 4.25 patients per month over 150 sites). 	Colorectal cancer MASC Papillary thyroid Anaplastic thyroid Squamous NSCLC Non-squamous NSCLC Pancreatic cancer	215 207 255 206 206 206 206 206 206 209	55 31 87 104 104 27 70 17	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
 Patient enrollment across tumour-specific trials was assumed to follow the same distribution as observed in the STARTRK trial program (Table 1). The time required to enroll patients into each tumour-specific RCT was estimated based on the tumour-specific enrollment rate and the estimated sample size. 	Neuroendocrine	222	76	8
	Secretory breast cancer	207	53	8
	Non-secretory breast cancer	207	105	8

MASC: Mammary analogue secretory carcinoma; NSCLC: non-small cell lung cancer.

Lozano-Ortega, ISPOR poster 2019

The majority of alterations have a low prevalence, although often a high response rate to targeted medicines



Illustrative purposes only.

PHC: personalised healthcare; RWD: real-world data.

The number of regulatory approved tumour agnostic treatments is expected to grow exponentially

1. Data on File. FMI data base query; 2. Gatalica, Z., et al. (2019) Mod Pathol 32:147-53;









Reimbursement

¥

Patient Access (identification of patients)



HTA challenges and ways forward



- Level of knowledge & acceptance of precision oncology trial design
 - Outcome measures
 - Comparators
 - Small (often new) populations



Ways forward



HTA challenges



Lack of knowledge and acceptance of precision oncology trial design

- Other outcome measures
- Relative effectiveness difficult
- Small (often new) populations
- Evidence pack does not fit in the HTA assessment framework
 - Clinical benefit assessment on population level
 - How to deal with uncertainty?
 - Outcomes based pricing?
 - Pay for proof?



Ways forward



M-NL-00000937

HTA challenges



Lack of knowledge and acceptance of precision oncology trial design

- Other outcome measures
- **Relative effectiveness difficult**
- Small (often new) populations
- Evidence pack does not fit in the HTA assessment framework
 - Clinical benefit assessment on population level
 - How to deal with uncertainty?
 - Outcomes based pricing?
 - Pay for proof?
- No structural real world data collection for testing and outcomes
 - Identification of patients (for trials and registered therapies)
 - Unknown prognostic value of alterations _
 - No learning system (now one off yes/no)

Creating system solutions takes time,

therefore the a temporary solution is being created



Ways

M-NL-00000937







DRUP (Drug Rediscovery Protocol) a Dutch platform for medical oncologists to prescribe and monitor off-label treatments based on molecular alterations

DRUP

- Collect RWD and provide access
- Personalized reimbursement model
- Patients that exhausted SoC
- Additional treatment (MGTO)
- Off-label indications





Stages in the Drug Rediscovery Protocol- study design per cohort





DRUP (Drug Rediscovery Protocol) and DAP (Drug Access Protocol) are two similar protocols with a different purpose

Key distinguishers

DRUP

- Collect RWD and provide access
- Personalized reimbursement model
- Patients that exhausted SoC
- Additional treatment options
- Off-label indications

LF FR

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1600-x

The Drug Rediscovery protocol facilitates the expanded use of existing anticancer drugs

D. L. van der Velden^{1,2,21}, L. R. Hoes^{1,2,3,21}, H. van der Wijngaart^{2,3,4,21}, J. M. van Berge Henegouwen^{2,3,5,21}, E. van Werkhoven⁶, P. Roepman⁷, R. L. Schilsky⁸, W. W. J. de Leng⁹, A. D. R. Huitema^{10,11}, B. Nuijen¹¹, P. M. Nederlof¹², C. M. L. van Herpen¹³, D. J. A. de Groot¹⁴, L. A. Devriese¹⁵, A. Hoeben¹⁶, M. J. A. de Jonge¹⁷, M. Chalabi^{1,18}, E. F. Smit^{2,19}, A. J. de Langen¹⁹, N. Mehra¹³, M. Labots⁴, E. Kapiteijn⁵, S. Sleijfer^{2,17}, E. Cuppen^{3,7,20}, H. M. W. Verheul^{4,13}, H. Gelderblom⁵ & E. E. Voest^{1,2,3}

The large-scale genetic profiling of tumours can identify potentially actionable molecular variants for which approved anticancer drugs are available¹⁻³. However, when patients with such variants

is taken into consideration. However, with regards to drug sensitivity, the importance of a given genetic or molecular variant is usually tested in the subtype of cancer that most frequently contains this variant. are treated with drugs outside of their approved label, successes The importance of the same variant in other cancers often remains and failures of targeted therapy are not systematically collected unknown. Third, as drug development is challenging for rare subtypes Van der Velden, 2019, Nature

DAP

- Collect RWD and provide access
- Personalized reimbursement model
- Type of evidence does not fit assessment frame
- On-label indications pre- and post registration



Roche

Important steps... still miles to go

- Important steps are being set to bridge the gap between regulatory approval and reimbursement in the Netherlands.
- Stakeholders take responsibility to realize a future proof HTA and reimbursement system
- We're not there yet, still work in progress

High quality, diagnostics for every cancer patient National genomics/-omics data (knowledge) centre National tumour board & shared decision making Access to personalised treatment



Based on tumour profile, medical measures and the wishes of the patient Automated collection of outcomes data to allow continuous learning Payment for treatments based on outcomes/value



Doing now what patients need next

Thank you for your attention