

CADTH Reimbursement Review

CADTH Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Romosozumab (Evenity)

Indication: the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women at high risk for fracture, defined as a history of osteoporotic fracture, or multiple risk factors for fracture

Recommendation: Reimburse with Conditions

Version: 1.0
Publication Date: TBC
Report Length: 15 Pages

Disclaimer: The information in this document is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. While patients and others may access this document, the document is made available for informational purposes only and no representations or warranties are made with respect to its fitness for any particular purpose. The information in this document should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice or as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services.

While care has been taken to ensure that the information prepared by CADTH in this document is accurate, complete, and up-to-date as at the applicable date the material was first published by CADTH, CADTH does not make any guarantees to that effect. CADTH does not guarantee and is not responsible for the quality, currency, propriety, accuracy, or reasonableness of any statements, information, or conclusions contained in any third-party materials used in preparing this document. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of CADTH.

CADTH is not responsible for any errors, omissions, injury, loss, or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the contents of this document or any of the source materials.

This document may contain links to third-party websites. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third-party sites is governed by the third-party website owners' own terms and conditions set out for such sites. CADTH does not make any guarantee with respect to any information contained on such third-party sites and CADTH is not responsible for any injury, loss, or damage suffered as a result of using such third-party sites. CADTH has no responsibility for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information by third-party sites.

Subject to the aforementioned limitations, the views expressed herein are those of CADTH and do not necessarily represent the views of Canada's federal, provincial, or territorial governments or any third party supplier of information.

This document is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. The use of this document outside of Canada is done so at the user's own risk.

This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this document will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by CADTH and its licensors. These rights are protected by the Canadian *Copyright Act* and other national and international laws and agreements. Users are permitted to make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes only, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH and its licensors.

Redactions: Confidential information in this document may be redacted at the request of the sponsor in accordance with the *CADTH Drug Reimbursement Review Confidentiality Guidelines*.

About CADTH: CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs, medical devices, diagnostics, and procedures in our health care system.

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

ROMOSOZUMAB (EVENTITY — AMGEN CANADA INC.)

Therapeutic Area: osteoporosis, postmenopausal women

Recommendation

The CADTH Canadian Drug Expert Committee (CDEC) recommends that romosozumab be reimbursed for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women, only if the conditions listed in Table 1 are met.

Rationale for the Recommendation

In a phase III, double-blind, randomized controlled trial (ARCH, N = 4,093) in post-menopausal women with osteoporosis who were at high risk of fracture, romosozumab 210 mg SC monthly for 12 months followed by an oral bisphosphonate reduced the risk of fractures compared with an oral bisphosphonate alone. Fewer patients treated with romosozumab for 12 months followed by alendronate for 12 months (4.1%) had a new vertebral fracture compared with alendronate alone at 24 months (8.0%; relative risk 0.50, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.66). Treatment with romosozumab followed by alendronate was also associated with a lower incidence of clinical fracture (nonvertebral fracture and clinical vertebral fracture) compared with alendronate alone (9.7% versus 13.0%, respectively; hazard ratio 0.73, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.88). Analyses of key secondary outcomes, such as the incidence of nonvertebral fractures (including hip), favoured romosozumab followed by alendronate versus alendronate alone. Patients in their input to CADTH expressed a desire for treatments that prevent osteoporosis-related fractures because of the substantial impact that fractures, and the fear of fractures, have on patients' lives.

The sponsor's request for reimbursement specified a narrower patient population from the indication: women with postmenopausal osteoporosis with a history of osteoporotic fracture and who are at very high risk for future fracture. In this population, using the sponsor submitted price for romosozumab, and publicly listed prices for all other drug costs, CADTH estimated the sequential incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) to be \$219,799 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) relative to currently reimbursed options. A reduction in price of at least 53% is required for romosozumab to be considered cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold in this population. These conclusions rely on results from an indirect treatment comparison (ITC), which was deemed to have substantial uncertainty associated with it. Therefore, further price reductions may be required to ensure cost-effectiveness, given that romosozumab is substantially more expensive than alternatives for which there is no direct evidence.

Table 1. Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons

Reimbursement Condition	Reason
Initiation	
1. Patients with a history of osteoporotic fracture and who are at high risk for future fracture, defined as a 10-year fracture risk \geq 20% as defined by the FRAX tool.	The ARCH trial included patients who had a history of fracture (> 99%) or a prevalent fracture (96%). Patients had a mean 10-year probability of a major osteoporotic fracture based on FRAX of 20% at baseline.
2. The patient must be treatment naïve to osteoporosis medications, except for calcium and/or vitamin D.	<p>Only 9% of patients enrolled in the ARCH trial had prior use of osteoporosis medications, such as oral bisphosphonates.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to support initiating treatment of romosozumab in patients who have been previously treated with osteoporosis medications.</p>
3. Maximum duration of reimbursement is 12 months	<p>The maximum duration of treatment with romosozumab in the ARCH trial was 12 months.</p> <p>The approved duration of treatment by Health Canada for romosozumab is limited to 12 months.</p>
Prescribing	
1. Romosozumab should not be prescribed concurrently with other osteoporosis medications, except for calcium and/or vitamin D.	There is no evidence supporting concurrent treatment with romosozumab and other osteoporosis medications. Concurrent therapy was not permitted in the ARCH trial, except with calcium and vitamin D.
Pricing	
1. Price reduction needed	<p>In the CADTH base case a sequential ICER was derived for romosozumab of \$219,799 per QALY when compared to currently funded alternatives in patients covered under the reimbursement requested population. A price reduction of 53% would be required for romosozumab to be able to achieve an ICER of \$50,000 per QALY in this population.</p> <p>These price reductions are based on an ITC which was deemed to have substantial uncertainty associated with it. Therefore, a higher price reduction may be required to ensure cost-effectiveness, given that romosozumab is substantially more expensive than alternatives for which there is no direct evidence.</p>

FRAX = World Health Organization’s Fracture Risk Assessment; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; ITC = indirect treatment comparison; QALY = quality-adjusted life-year.

Discussion Points

- CDEC discussed the place in therapy for romosozumab. Almost all patients enrolled in the ARCH trial had a history of fracture (including nonvertebral fractures and vertebral fractures), with the 10-year probability of a major osteoporotic fracture calculated by FRAX was 20%. As well, greater than 90% of patients enrolled in the ARCH trial (and the FRAME trial) were treatment naïve to osteoporosis medications. The ARCH trial was not designed to inform the effects of romosozumab in those who were intolerant to or not responsive to other osteoporosis medications, such as bisphosphonates. Thus, the currently available evidence, in addition to the bone forming mechanism of action of romosozumab, supports its use prior to an antiresorptive medication in patients who have had a fracture and who are at high risk for future fracture, and who have not previously received medications for osteoporosis.
- CDEC noted a potentially increased risk of cardiovascular events with romosozumab treatment, including an increase in myocardial infarction and stroke in the ARCH trial. Health Canada and other regulatory agencies considered that serious cardiac and cerebrovascular events were the primary events of concern. The product monograph for romosozumab has a boxed warning regarding the potentially increased risk of myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death with romosozumab treatment and that romosozumab is not recommended in patients with a history of myocardial infarction or stroke. It also indicates that treatment should be discontinued in patients who experience a myocardial infarction or stroke. During the 12-month double-blind treatment period of the ARCH study, adjudicated serious cardiovascular adverse events were reported more frequently in the romosozumab group than the alendronate group, 2.5% versus 1.9% of patients, respectively. Cardiac ischaemic events were reported in 0.8% and 0.3% and cerebrovascular events were also reported in 0.8% and 0.3% of the groups.
- CDEC discussed the results of another phase III RCT, the FRAME study, which compared romosozumab 210 mg SC monthly for 12 months with placebo in post-menopausal women with osteoporosis who were at moderate risk of fracture. Both treatment groups received denosumab for 12 months after the initial double-blind period. The study achieved the first primary outcome, demonstrating the incidence of new vertebral fractures through 12 months of treatment was lower with romosozumab (0.5%) than with placebo (1.8%). However, given the key limitations of the study (i.e., not the target patient population and placebo comparator), CDEC only considered the results of the FRAME study as supportive of the efficacy of romosozumab and not sufficient evidence to inform the comparative clinical effects of romosozumab.
- A sponsor-provided ITC suggested that romosozumab followed by an antiresorptive medication was favoured in reducing the risk of new nonvertebral fractures compared to currently available treatments. However, the results of the ITC are associated with a high degree of uncertainty due to numerous limitations leading the key assumptions related to homogeneity and transitivity not being met.

Background

Romosozumab has a Health Canada indication for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women at high risk for fracture, defined as a history of osteoporotic fracture, or multiple risk factors for fracture. Romosozumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody that inhibits the action of sclerostin, a regulatory factor in bone metabolism. It is available as a solution for subcutaneous injection in prefilled syringe, 105 mg/1.17 mL, and the Health Canada–approved dose is 210 mg administered once every month. Treatment duration of romosozumab is limited to 12 monthly doses.

The sponsor's reimbursement request was for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women with a history of osteoporotic fracture and who are at very high risk for future fracture.

Sources of Information Used by the Committee

To make their recommendation, CDEC considered the following information:

- A review of two RCTs in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis
- Patients' perspectives gathered by one patient group, Osteoporosis Canada
- Input from public drug plans that participate in the CADTH review process
- Input from one clinical specialist with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with osteoporosis
- A review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor

Stakeholder Perspectives

Patient Input

One patient group, Osteoporosis Canada, submitted input of patients' perspectives obtained from in-person interviews and surveys that they conducted.

The patient group indicated that the most important and feared consequence of osteoporosis is the risk of fracture. From the patient perspective, the impact of a fracture can be substantial: fractures in the older population are associated with acute and often chronic pain, changes in levels of or loss of independence, decreased mobility, social isolation resulting in depression, or institutionalization as a result of a fragility fracture. Hip fracture in particular is associated with significant decline in the patient's ability to live independently and higher death rates resulting from complications. For younger seniors, this may result in time away from work, possibly with a financial impact.

It was expressed that patients value a new treatment option that works differently from conventional options, especially if easier to administer with and fewer side effects. Respondents to the Osteoporosis Canada survey reported the outcomes that were of most importance to them were the following: preserving health-related quality of life (HRQoL), preventing fracture-related deaths, preventing admission to long-term care homes, preserving their ability to perform daily physical and social activities, preventing osteoporotic fractures and avoiding serious side effects.

Clinician Input

The expert indicated that even though oral bisphosphonates are most commonly prescribed for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women, they are associated with limitations such as inconvenient administration, gastrointestinal toxicities and low absorption rates. Use of parenteral bisphosphonates is relatively limited because they are perceived as drugs to be prescribed by a specialist and some patients are reluctant to receive intravenous infusion or subcutaneous injection. Treatment options for certain patient groups, such as those with renal insufficiency and renal failure, are limited.

In the expert's opinion, romosozumab can be used as a first-line treatment for patients with the lowest BMD and greatest risk of fracture.

The expert stated that treatment response is assessed using change in BMD after the treatment and suggested that measurement of BMD be conducted at 12 months when the patient transitions to antiresorptive therapy, and again 12 to 18 months later after a treatment change.

The expert indicated that romosozumab treatment should be discontinued if the patient experiences intolerable adverse events. When a cardiovascular event occurs, the clinician should consider stopping the treatment.

Drug Program Input

Table 2. Responses to Questions from the Drug Programs

Implementation Issues	Response
Considerations for Initiation of Therapy	
<p>The product monograph advises no dosage adjustment may be required in patients with severe renal impairment (eGFR 15 to 29 mL/min/1.73 m²) or end-stage renal disease requiring hemodialysis; however, romosozumab should be used with caution. How will clinicians consider use of romosozumab in patients with renal impairment?</p>	<p>Clinical expert input agreed that use of romosozumab in patients with kidney impairment or end-stage kidney disease would be considered with caution. For a patient with kidney impairment or failure and low bone formation, it is reasonable to use romosozumab. However, the clinical expert suggested that patients who have high bone turnover and high bone resorption, due to secondary hyperparathyroidism and treatment with glucocorticoids, use of romosozumab is inappropriate.</p>

Implementation Issues	Response
	<p>CDEC noted that most patients with an eGFR < 30 mL/min/1.73 m² are followed by a nephrologist who can help determine if romosozumab is appropriate to prescribe.</p> <p>Patients with an eGFR of < 35 ml/min/1.73m² were excluded from the ARCH and FRAME trials.</p>
<p>The trial data are in women aged 55 to 90 years. Would postmenopausal women younger than 55 years of age be considered for romosozumab in practice?</p>	<p>Clinical expert input indicated that bone mass declines in postmenopausal women, increasing the risk of fracture. Therefore, postmenopausal women who are younger than 55 years of age would be considered for romosozumab therapy in practice. Postmenopausal women should include those with premature ovarian failure and those who have had a surgical menopause, e.g., post-ovariectomy, which can occur at any premenopausal age.</p> <p>CDEC concluded that reimbursement of romosozumab should be based on clinical factors and not on age.</p>
<p>For patients who are currently receiving active treatment for osteoporosis, e.g., bisphosphonates, would they be switched to romosozumab in practice?</p>	<p>CDEC discussed clinical expert input that in practice settings if patients are receiving active treatment for osteoporosis and not achieving treatment goals are still at high risk of fracture, clinicians would likely switch to romosozumab.</p> <p>However, CDEC noted that the ARCH and FRAME trials were designed to include patients who had not been treated with osteoporosis medications. Although the ARCH trial included patients who had previously been treated with an osteoporosis medication (9%, mostly oral bisphosphonates) despite the eligibility criteria, the trial was not designed to evaluate the effects of switching to romosozumab. Therefore, there is no evidence for the effects of switching from osteoporosis medications to romosozumab.</p>
<p>Would patients who have tried teriparatide and not achieved treatment goals be prescribed romosozumab?</p>	<p>Similar to the previous response, there is no evidence to inform switching from treatment with teriparatide to romosozumab. Only 1% of patients included in the ARCH trial had previously been treated with PTH or PTH derivative. However, the study was not designed to evaluate switching from previous treatments to romosozumab.</p>
<p>Would the drug be initiated in the hospital setting post-fracture, and then maintained in the community setting?</p>	<p>CDEC determined that patients could be started on romosozumab in the hospital setting, depending on hospital formulary availability, and continued in the community setting.</p>
<p>Considerations for Continuation or Renewal of Therapy</p>	
<p>Are there any issues with access to BMD testing within jurisdictions, especially in the COVID-19 context? Is testing difficult to access in rural areas?</p>	<p>Access to BMD testing varies across the country. During the lockdown phases of the pandemic, it was not possible to have BMD testing. The clinical expert consulted indicated that at present, BMD testing has returned to normal in most areas of the country. Rural areas have reduced access to BMD among other radiological procedures.</p>
<p>The trial data and the product monograph support use of romosozumab as a 12-month treatment course. However,</p>	<p>Clinical expert input noted that if a patient had no discernible benefit from a first treatment course of romosozumab, it is unlikely</p>

Implementation Issues	Response
neither provide clear guidance on re-treatment with romosozumab. How would this be considered in clinical practice? Especially if there is evidence after the initial treatment that treatment goals were not achieved? What factors would lead you to think re-treatment with romosozumab would not benefit the patient?	<p>that a second course would be beneficial, although this remains an evidence gap. The clinical expert indicated that, in clinical practice settings, if a patient had obvious gains in BMD with romosozumab and then after an interval showed a marked decline in BMD and/or new fragility fractures, re-treatment with romosozumab would be considered.</p> <p>No evidence was available for CDEC to deliberate on regarding retreatment with romosozumab.</p>
If a dose of romosozumab is missed or treatment needs to be temporarily stopped (e.g., a patient undergoing a procedure that requires its discontinuation), how would this be handled in clinical practice? Is the regimen restarted or does the patient transition to another form of therapy or does the patient receive the rest of the medication for a total of 12 months?	<p>Clinical expert input indicated that patients should receive a full 12-month treatment with romosozumab, even if the treatment may be interrupted. If the treatment interruption is expected to last several months, the patient should be treated with an antiresorptive until romosozumab can be resumed.</p> <p>CDEC noted that there was no evidence that addressed this issue.</p>
Considerations for Discontinuation of Therapy	
Aside from serious adverse events (e.g., major cardiovascular events), are there any reasons treatment with romosozumab would be discontinued prior to completing the recommended 12-month regimen?	<p>The clinical expert noted that in practice settings the main reason for treatment discontinuation would be serious adverse effects of the medication.</p> <p>CDEC noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher percentage of patients treated with romosozumab than with alendronate had a cardiovascular event (2.5% versus 1.9%) during first 12-months of treatment in the ARCH trial. • The product monograph for romosozumab describes the potentially increased risk of myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death with romosozumab treatment. It recommends discontinuing treatment if the patient experiences a myocardial infarction or stroke
Considerations for Prescribing of Therapy	
Will romosozumab be prescribed initially by a clinical specialist, e.g., endocrinologist? There may be limited access to specialists within some regions.	Primary care prescribers as well as specialists should be able to prescribe romosozumab.
Romosozumab is recommended for use as monotherapy, but are there scenarios when physicians may want to prescribe it in concurrent combination (instead of sequential) with other treatments for osteoporosis such as oral bisphosphonates?	<p>Evidence on any potential benefit from combination therapy with romosozumab is lacking.</p> <p>However, patients should receive optimized calcium and vitamin D intake in combination with romosozumab. All patients in the ARCH and FRAME trials received calcium and vitamin D.</p>

BMD = bone mineral density; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; PTH = parathyroid hormone.

Clinical Evidence

Pivotal Studies and Protocol Selected Studies

Description of studies

Two phase III studies (ARCH, N = 4,093 and FRAME, N = 7,180;) were included in the CADTH systematic review. The trials enrolled postmenopausal women (age 55 to 90 years) with osteoporosis.

ARCH was a double-blind RCT that assessed the efficacy and safety of romosozumab 210 mg SC monthly followed by alendronate 70 mg weekly versus alendronate 70 mg weekly alone for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women at high risk of fracture. The initial double-blind treatment phase was 12 months long, followed by a 12-month open-label alendronate treatment phase. The primary efficacy endpoints in ARCH were incidence of new vertebral fracture at Month 24 and incidence of clinical fracture (nonvertebral fracture and clinical vertebral fracture) during the primary analysis period, which refers to randomization to the timepoint that clinical fractures were confirmed for ≥ 330 patients, and all patients completed the month 24 study visit. Secondary efficacy endpoints included the incidence of various types of fracture and change from baseline in BMD T-score. In this study, the mean age of the patients at baseline was 74 years and almost all patients had a historical of osteoporotic fracture or a prevalent fracture at baseline. The mean 10-year probability of a major osteoporotic fracture in this patient population at baseline was 20%, reflecting a high-risk population.

FRAME was a double-blind RCT that assessed the efficacy and safety of romosozumab versus placebo for the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. Eligible patients were randomized to receive romosozumab 210 mg SC or placebo once a month for 12 months. After the 12-month double-blind treatment period, both groups received open-label denosumab 60 mg every 6 months for an additional 12 months. After the first 24-month treatment (12 months with romosozumab or placebo, followed by 12 months with denosumab), patients entered a 12-month open-label extension period, where they continued to receive denosumab 60 mg every 6 months. The co-primary efficacy endpoints were incidence of new vertebral fracture at Month 12 and Month 24. Secondary efficacy endpoints included the incidence of various types of fracture and change from baseline in BMD T-score. In this study, the mean age of the patients at baseline was 71 years and 41% of the patients had historical fracture. The mean 10-year probability of a major osteoporotic fracture in this patient population at baseline was 13%, reflecting a moderate-risk population.

Efficacy Results

In ARCH, treatment with romosozumab for 12 months followed by alendronate therapy for another 12 months was associated with a reduced risk of new vertebral fracture (relative risk 0.50, 95% CI, 0.38 to 0.66) compared with treatment with alendronate for two years. Romosozumab followed by alendronate was also associated with a lower incidence of new clinical fracture versus alendronate alone (hazard ratio 0.73, 95% CI, 0.61 to 0.88). Results on other fracture related outcomes in this study (nonvertebral fracture, new vertebral fracture, clinical fracture, hip fracture, major nonvertebral fracture, major osteoporotic fracture, and all osteoporotic fracture) also favored romosozumab followed by alendronate over alendronate alone. The estimated difference in rates of nonvertebral fractures was found to be statistically significant for patients on romosozumab compared to alendronate. Firm conclusions cannot be drawn for other fracture endpoints as they were not adjusted for multiple comparisons.

In FRAME, treatment with romosozumab was associated with a reduction in new vertebral fractures through 12 months of treatment versus placebo (relative risk 0.73, 95% CI, 0.53 to 0.84). Results on a number of fracture-related outcomes (nonvertebral fracture, major nonvertebral fracture, new or worsening vertebral fracture, hip fracture, major osteoporotic fracture and multiple new/worsening vertebral fracture) favored romosozumab as fewer patients in the romosozumab group developed these fractures compared to placebo. Estimated differences in risk of fracture between romosozumab and placebo groups was statistically significant for clinical fractures but failed to reach statistical significance for nonvertebral fractures. Firm conclusions for all other secondary endpoints cannot be made as the testing procedure was stopped after the failed test for nonvertebral fractures.

HRQoL assessment was an exploratory outcome in both the ARCH and FRAME studies. It was evaluated using the generic quality of life assessment tool EuroQoL-5 Dimensions Health Survey (EQ-5D) and a disease-specific questionnaire Osteoporosis Assessment Questionnaire Short Version (OPAQ-SV). Results of the two studies did not show consistent or clinically meaningful changes on either of these tools between romosozumab and the comparators.

Change in BMD from baseline was measured at lumbar spine, total hip and femoral neck in the ARCH and FRAME studies. In the ARCH study, treatment with romosozumab was associated with increased BMD from baseline at all three sites compared to alendronate. Similar results were observed in the FRAME study when comparing romosozumab to placebo; however, BMD endpoints were not adjusted for multiple comparisons in this study.

Harms Results

The percentages of patients who had an adverse event (75.7% versus 78.6%), a serious adverse event (12.8% versus 13.8%), or a discontinuation of study treatment due to an adverse event (3.4% versus 3.2%) were similar in patients who received romosozumab and patients who received alendronate at 12 months in the ARCH trial. Thirty (1.5%) and 21 (1.0%) patients in the romosozumab and alendronate groups, respectively, died during this phase of the study. The differences between the treatment groups for adverse events remained similar through to month 24. Death occurred in 60 (2.9%) patients in the romosozumab followed by alendronate group and 69 (3.5%) patients in the alendronate alone group during the open-label alendronate treatment period, resulting in a cumulative total of 90 (4.4%) deaths in the romosozumab followed by alendronate group and 90 (4.5%) deaths in the alendronate alone group.

In the FRAME trial, adverse events occurred at similar frequencies between the romosozumab and placebo groups (78.4% versus 79.7%) during 12 months of treatment. Likewise, the percentages of patients who experienced serious adverse events (9.6% versus 8.7%) and who withdrew due to adverse events (2.9% versus 2.6%) were also similar between the romosozumab and placebo groups at month 12. The percentage of adverse events between the romosozumab followed by denosumab and the placebo followed by denosumab groups were the same at month 24 of the study. Twenty-nine (0.8%) patients in the romosozumab group and 23 (0.6%) patients in the placebo group died during double-blind treatment. A cumulative total of 52 (1.5%) deaths in the romosozumab/denosumab group and 47 (1.3%) deaths in the placebo/denosumab group occurred by month 24.

At Month 12 in the ARCH study, hypersensitivity occurred in 6.0% of patients in the romosozumab group and 5.9% of patients in the alendronate group. Serious cardiovascular events were reported in 2.5% of patients treated with romosozumab and 1.9% of patients treated with alendronate. Of the major adverse cardiac events, ischemic cardiac events (0.8% versus 0.3%) and cerebrovascular events (0.8% versus 0.3%) were more frequent in the romosozumab group. At Month 24, hypersensitivity occurred in 10.0% of patients in the romosozumab followed by alendronate group and 9.2% of patients in the alendronate alone group. Serious cardiovascular events were reported in 6.5% of patients treated with romosozumab followed by alendronate and 6.1% of patients treated with alendronate alone. One case of osteonecrosis of the jaw occurred in each treatment group through to month 24.

In the FRAME trial, hypersensitivity occurred in 6.8% of patients in the romosozumab group and 6.9% of patients in the placebo group. Serious cardiovascular events were reported in 1.2% of patients treated with romosozumab and 1.1% of patients treated with placebo. At Month 24, hypersensitivity occurred in 8.8% of patients in the romosozumab group and 9.3% of patients in the placebo group. Serious cardiovascular events were reported in 2.3% of patients treated with romosozumab and 2.2% of patients treated with placebo. Two cases of osteonecrosis of the jaw occurred in the romosozumab/denosumab treatment group through to month 24, while no cases occurred in the placebo/denosumab group.

Critical Appraisal

The completion rate after one year of treatment was over 80% in FRAME and 77% in ARCH after two-years of treatment. The reasons for dropout were similar between treatment groups. The dropout rates were consistent with other clinical trials of medications for osteoporosis. Nonetheless, the dropout rates were still high and may impact the validity of the study results considering the proportion of data that needed to be imputed for analyses. In both studies, a last observation carried forward method was used to account for missing data for most efficacy endpoints. Sensitivity analyses that did not assume that missing data were missing at random were conducted. These sensitivity analyses confirmed that the trial results were generally robust to the handling of missing data in the primary and secondary analyses.

In the FRAME and ARCH studies, multiplicity was controlled for based on a step-down procedure, with the primary and selected secondary outcome measures being included. Outcomes outside of the testing hierarchy, such as HRQoL (an exploratory outcome in both studies), need to be interpreted with consideration for the possible inflated type 1 error.

It is difficult to determine the magnitude of the treatment effect with romosozumab from the FRAME study. The comparator was placebo during the first 12-month treatment period. At month 24, patients treated with romosozumab followed by denosumab had 2 years of active treatment while those in the placebo followed by denosumab group had only 1 year of active treatment and therefore the groups had different risks of fracture and were likely not comparable.

There is limited direct evidence between romosozumab and relevant comparators with only a comparison with alendronate in the ARCH study to inform the comparative efficacy and safety of romosozumab versus other osteoporosis medications (see ITC limitations).

Indirect Comparisons

Description

The sponsor-submitted ITC aimed to evaluate the relative clinical efficacy of romosozumab to several treatments for osteoporosis, including denosumab, raloxifene, zoledronate, risedronate, and alendronate. Included studies enrolled postmenopausal women with primary osteoporosis or osteopenia at risk for developing fragility fractures. The outcomes analyzed were sustaining vertebral, hip, or nonvertebral fragility fractures.

Efficacy Results

The sponsor-submitted ITC used a frequentist network meta-analysis. The analysis found that romosozumab resulted in a reduction in the risk of sustaining hip, nonvertebral, or vertebral fragility fractures compared to raloxifene, and a reduction in sustaining vertebral fractures compared to alendronate and risedronate. There were no differences between romosozumab and zoledronate or denosumab on any of the fracture outcomes.

Harms Results

Adverse events were not evaluated.

Critical Appraisal

Overall, 55 out of the 107 included RCTs had a high risk of bias. The risk of bias was high in most of the RCTs involving calcitonin, calcium, and vitamin D, as well as in some older bisphosphonate trials. No RCTs were excluded based on the assessment of bias.

Clinical heterogeneity was present in the analysis due to varying study duration, blinding, dosage, fracture risk assessment, publication date, patient demographic and clinical characteristics, and clinical effect modifiers (e.g., calcium and vitamin D intake). The potential impact of these were not evaluated and adjusted for (where appropriate) in the ITC. Also, the FRAME and ARCH trials were pooled despite having differed in patient population and treatment regimen.

Some studies in the evidence network reported fractures by location without the “nonvertebral” label. In these cases, all the fractures, including hip and/or pelvis fractures, were considered nonvertebral. This resulted in the same hip fracture incidences being used in the calculations of two different outcomes: the risk of sustaining hip fractures and the risk of sustaining non-vertebral fractures. This double counting thereby reduced the comparability of the results synthesized for different outcomes and overall internal validity of the ITC.

It was not explicitly stated in the ITC whether vertebral fractures were defined and assessed in the studies as symptomatic or non-symptomatic, thereby limiting the generalizability of the synthesized results for vertebral fractures and the overall external validity of the ITC.

The definition for “placebo” was not provided; hence, it was not possible to know whether the definition for this intervention was consistent across studies.

Other Relevant Evidence

Description of Studies

The Frame Extension Study enrolled patients after the 24-month primary analysis of the FRAME study. The study was designed as a 12-month open-label extension period where patients continuing from the FRAME study remained on denosumab 60 mg every six months.

Efficacy Results

Through month 36, all fracture locations (i.e., new vertebral, clinical, nonvertebral, major nonvertebral, new or worsening vertebral, hip, major osteoporotic, and multiple new/worsening vertebral) showed an improved relative risk reduction in fracture among patients treated initially with romosozumab followed by denosumab (romosozumab/denosumab group), compared to patients treated initially with placebo followed by denosumab (placebo/denosumab group). The percent change in BMD at the lumbar spine, hip, and femoral neck from baseline to month 36 were also improved among patients in the romosozumab/denosumab group compared to patients in the placebo/denosumab group.

Harms Results

Adverse events occurred in similar frequencies across both treatment groups (88% in the romosozumab/denosumab group and 89% in the placebo/denosumab group). Serious adverse events were reported in 20% and 21% of patients in the romosozumab/denosumab and placebo/denosumab groups, respectively. Adverse events that led to treatment discontinuation were infrequently reported, occurring among 4% of patients in each treatment group. Fatal events were reported among 2% of patients in each treatment group.

Economic Evidence

Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

Table 2: Summary of Economic Evaluation

Component	Description
Type of economic evaluation	Cost-utility analysis Markov model
Target populations	<u>Health Canada approved population</u> : postmenopausal women at high risk for fracture, defined as a history of osteoporotic fracture, OR multiple risk factors for fracture. <u>Reimbursement Request population</u> : Women with postmenopausal osteoporosis with a history of osteoporotic fracture AND who are at very high risk for future fracture <u>Those approved by Health Canada but not requested for reimbursement</u> : Women with postmenopausal osteoporosis with multiple risk factors for fracture, OR prior fracture but are not deemed very high risk for future fracture
Treatment	Romosozumab followed by alendronate
Comparators	Alendronate, denosumab, raloxifene, risedronate, zoledronate
Perspective	Canadian publicly funded health care payer
Outcomes	Number of fractures, Quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), Life years (LYs)
Time horizon	Lifetime (50 years)
Key data source	Effectiveness of comparators: network meta-analysis of osteoporosis randomized controlled trials. Effectiveness of romosozumab came from the ARCH trial and the FRAME trial.

Component	Description
Submitted results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Canada population: Romosozumab followed by alendronate dominated all other treatments i.e., romosozumab was less expensive and associated with more QALYs. Requested reimbursement population: Romosozumab followed by alendronate dominated all other treatments.
Key limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sponsor assumed that the treatment benefit of romosozumab followed by alendronate, relative to all other pharmacologic treatments, lasted for five years after discontinuing alendronate. It is not clear that the evidence used to support this applies to the high-risk population used in the model. Additionally, there is no evidence on the long-term effect of romosozumab (one-time treatment for one year) and assuming a treatment effect of nine years may be optimistic. Finally, there is no evidence on the long-term relative effect on fractures of alendronate or romosozumab compared to other treatments in the model. The cost of long-term care post fracture was assumed to be \$184.96 daily or \$67,000 annually. As the cost of long-term care post fracture was already included in the recurring direct medical costs related to fracture, this resulted in double counting. The sponsor assumed excess mortality from fracture for three years post vertebral and hip fracture. Data from the ARCH and FRAME trials do not support a difference in mortality. The CADTH clinical expert felt there may be a mortality risk directly attributed to hip fractures. This mortality risk could last one year post hip fracture due to limited mobility during this time. The sponsor assumed a hip or vertebral fracture would always influence patients' utility with effects lasting up to 29 years. The utility values used in the model, obtained from an international study, showed a trend of improvement up to 18 months, however the sponsor assumed no further improvement after 18 months. No evidence was found to support this assumption. The CADTH clinical expert suggested that many physicians will administer romosozumab themselves as they currently do with denosumab and expect less than 10% of patients to self-administer romosozumab. There is uncertainty regarding what proportion of patients in the full Health Canada indication would meet the specific requested reimbursement criteria. Values used in the cost utility analysis lacked clinical plausibility and likewise did not match values used in the sponsor's BIA analysis.
CADTH reanalysis results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To account for key limitations several changes were made to the CADTH base case: there was no relative treatment effect after 5 years when all therapies are discontinued; the additional cost of long-term care was set to \$0 as this was already included in the direct health care costs; mortality attributable to hip fracture was lowered; long term quality of life consequences associated with hip fracture were decreased; cost of administration was increased and; the proportion of patients who have multiple risk factors with no prior hip/vertebral fracture history was increased. In the full Health Canada population, CADTH estimated that the sequential ICER associated with romosozumab followed by alendronate was \$561,229 per QALY when compared to zoledronate (\$6,295 in incremental costs, 0.011 incremental QALYs). The probability of romosozumab followed by alendronate being cost effective at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold was 0%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At this ICER an 80% price reduction would be required to achieve an ICER below \$50,000 per QALY. In the reimbursement request population, CADTH estimated that the sequential ICER associated with romosozumab followed by alendronate was \$219,799 per QALY when

Component	Description
	<p>compared to zoledronate (\$5,420 in incremental costs, 0.025 incremental QALYs). The probability of romosozumab followed by alendronate being cost effective at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold was 0%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At this ICER an 53% price reduction would be required to achieve an ICER below \$50,000 per QALY.

ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; QALY= quality-adjusted life-year.

Budget Impact

CADTH reanalysis of the sponsor’s BIA included: updating the percentage of patients eligible for therapy and increasing the proportion of patients who are eligible for public drug plan coverage.

Based on CADTH reanalyses, the budget impact of reimbursing romosozumab in the full Health Canada indicated population is expected to be \$179,247,490 in Year 1, \$227,606,038 in Year 2, and \$277,342,470 in Year 3, for a three-year total budget impact of \$684,195,999. If only funded in the reimbursement requested population the budget impact decreases to \$51,154,841 over three years.

Canadian Drug Expert Committee (CDEC) Information

Members of the Committee:

Dr. James Silvius (Chair), Dr. Ahmed Bayoumi, Dr. Sally Bean, Dr. Bruce Carleton, Dr. Alun Edwards, Mr. Bob Gagne, Dr. Ran Goldman, Dr. Allan Grill, Mr. Allen Lefebvre, Dr. Kerry Mansell, Ms. Heather Neville, Dr. Danyaal Raza, Dr. Emily Reynen, Dr. Yvonne Shevchuk, and Dr. Adil Virani.

Meeting Date: September 22, 2021

Regrets

Two expert committee members did not attend.

Conflicts of Interest

None