

CADTH Reimbursement Review

# CADTH Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Lurbinectedin (Zepzelca)

Indication: For the treatment of adult patients with stage III or metastatic small cell lung cancer who have progressed on or after platinum-containing therapy

Sponsor: Jazz Pharmaceuticals Inc.

Recommendation: Do Not Reimburse

Version: 1.0  
Publication Date: August 2022  
Report Length: 12 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.

## Recommendation

The CADTH pCODR Expert Review Committee (pERC) recommends that lurbinectedin not be reimbursed for the treatment of adult patients with stage III or metastatic small cell lung cancer (SCLC) who have progressed on or after platinum-containing therapy.

## Rationale for the Recommendation

The efficacy and safety of lurbinectedin was evaluated in a cohort of patients with SCLC who had received 1 prior line of platinum-containing chemotherapy (N = 105) within a phase II, open-label, single-arm basket trial (Study B-005) in patients with advanced solid tumours. The primary end point for the SCLC cohort, objective response rate (ORR) per investigator assessment (IA), was 35.2% (95% confidence interval [CI], 26.2% to 45.2%) with lurbinectedin treatment. The lack of a control group limited the interpretation of the results and led to uncertainty in the magnitude of any clinical benefit with lurbinectedin. Although indirect treatment comparisons (ITCs) were submitted that compared lurbinectedin versus IV topotecan, carboplatin plus etoposide, [REDACTED], numerous limitations in the analyses meant that conclusions could not be drawn on the efficacy and safety of lurbinectedin versus relevant comparators in this setting. Health-related quality of life (HRQoL), an outcome that is important to patients, was not assessed in Study B-005 and it is unknown how HRQoL with lurbinectedin treatment compares with other available treatments. Patients identified a need for treatments that improve survival, delay disease progression, relieve cancer symptoms, minimize side effects, and maintain or improve quality of life, but pERC could not conclude from the trial and ITC evidence that lurbinectedin meets any of these needs.

## Discussion Points

- pERC noted that the lack of a control group in Study B-005 particularly limited the interpretation of the overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS) results and no conclusions could be drawn regarding OS and PFS. In addition, there was no adjustment for multiple outcomes and hypothesis testing was conducted only for ORR per IA.
- There were limitations in all 3 ITCs that meant conclusions could not be drawn for any of them. Potential residual confounding was a limitation of all the ITCs. In addition, the selection of the comparator trial for the simulated treatment comparison (STC) was not transparent. For the combined matching adjusted indirect comparisons (MAICs) and network meta-analyses (NMAs), the validity of the approach of combining these analyses is unknown and the MAICs were limited by imprecision and poor overlap of the study populations.
- There is a high need for treatments to delay disease progression, improve HRQoL, and minimize adverse effects. pERC noted that there are other treatment options in this setting (carboplatin or cisplatin plus etoposide, topotecan, irinotecan with or without cisplatin or carboplatin, and cyclophosphamide plus doxorubicin plus vincristine [CAV]). Input from patient and clinician groups noted that lurbinectedin may be better tolerated than these options, but there is insufficient clinical evidence that lurbinectedin offers benefit in HRQoL or adverse effects over any of these options.
- pERC noted that the Health Canada Notice of Compliance for lurbinectedin is conditional on the results of trials to verify its clinical benefit and is currently being studied in a phase III randomized trial. The LAGOON study is a randomized open-label trial comparing lurbinectedin monotherapy, lurbinectedin plus irinotecan, and investigator's choice of irinotecan or topotecan in patients with SCLC who have failed 1 line of platinum-containing chemotherapy. Results for the LAGOON study, when they become available, will provide a direct comparison of efficacy and safety for lurbinectedin versus an active comparator arm.
- The phase III ATLANTIS trial (N = 613) was a randomized open-label trial of lurbinectedin plus doxorubicin versus investigator's choice of CAV or topotecan in patients with SCLC who failed 1 prior line of platinum-containing chemotherapy. The study did not meet its primary end point and there was no OS benefit with lurbinectedin plus doxorubicin. The ATLANTIS trial used a lower dosage of lurbinectedin than the Health Canada–approved dosage and was not included in the CADTH review, but pERC noted it demonstrates the feasibility of conducting a phase III trial for the second-line treatment of SCLC.

## Background

SCLC accounts for 10% to 15% of all lung cancers and is classically staged into limited-stage (LS) or extensive-stage (ES) disease; approximately two thirds of patients present with metastatic ES disease, while approximately one quarter have stage III LS disease at diagnosis. The initial symptoms of SCLC are nonspecific and include cough, chest pain, trouble breathing, wheezing, hoarseness, loss of appetite, weight loss, and fatigue. For patients with metastatic ES stage disease, median OS is less than 1 year and the 5-year survival rate is approximately 5%. In Canada, the standard first line systemic therapy for patients with both LS (stage III or earlier) or ES (metastatic) SCLC is a platinum agent (cisplatin or carboplatin) plus etoposide for 4 to 6 cycles. Starting in 2021, standard first-line therapy for patients with ES disease includes platinum doublet therapy plus durvalumab. Second line treatment options available to both patients with ES and LS disease include re-challenge with platinum plus etoposide (if progression occurs after an appropriate interval), topotecan, and cyclophosphamide plus doxorubicin and vincristine (CAV). Third line treatment options include topotecan, CAV, and irinotecan with or without a platinum agent.

Lurbinectedin is an alkylating agent that is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with Stage III or metastatic SCLC who have progressed on or after platinum-containing therapy. The drug is supplied as a 4 mg vial and administered at a dose of 3.2 mg per m<sup>2</sup> by intravenous (IV) infusion over 60 minutes repeated every 21 days. The sponsor estimated that there would be 521 patients per year (as of 2022) in Canada outside of Quebec who would be eligible to receive lurbinectedin.

## Sources of Information Used by the Committee

To make their recommendation, the Committee considered the following information:

- A review of one Phase II, multicenter, open-label, single-arm basket trial (Study B-005) in patients with advanced solid tumours including a cohort of patients with SCLC who had received 1 prior line of platinum-containing chemotherapy (N = 105)

- Patients' perspectives gathered by two patient groups, Lung Cancer Canada (LCC) and the Lung Health Foundation (LHF, previously known as the Ontario Lung Association)
- Input from public drug plans and cancer agencies that participate in the CADTH review process
- Two clinical specialists with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with Stage III or metastatic SCLC
- Input from two clinician groups, the LCC Medical Advisory Committee and the Ontario Health-Cancer Care Ontario Lung Cancer Drug Advisory Committee
- A review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor

## Stakeholder Perspectives

The information in this section is a summary of input provided by the patient groups who responded to CADTH's call for patient input and from clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the purpose of this review.

### Patient Input

Two patient groups provided input for this review: Lung Cancer Canada (LCC) and the Lung Health Foundation (LHF), previously known as the Ontario Lung Association. LCC conducted phone interviews with 2 Canadian patients with SCLC (1 localized and 1 metastatic) and environmental scans with 1 patient and 2 caregivers of patients with metastatic SCLC from the USA in March 2022; all had experience with lurbinectedin. LHF conducted an online survey (2 respondents, no demographic or disease information collected) and phone interviews (3 Canadian patients with lung cancer; type and stage not reported) from September to December 2021 and collected input from two additional individuals (one registered nurse and one certified respiratory educator); none had experience with lurbinectedin. Patients highlighted the non-specific early symptoms of SCLC and the resulting delays in diagnosis, as well as the physical (e.g., shortness of breath, cough, fatigue, pain), emotional, and social toll of a SCLC diagnosis. Patients acknowledged that while existing treatments for SCLC (e.g., surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, targeted therapy, immunotherapy) prolonged survival and delayed disease progression, the side effects of currently available second- and third-line chemotherapies for metastatic SCLC (e.g., nausea, fatigue, weight, and hair loss) were sometimes severe and negatively impacted HRQoL, employment, and ability to perform activities of daily living. Patients identified an unmet need for additional second line treatment options for metastatic SCLC that can prolong survival, delay disease progression, manage cancer symptoms, and maintain HRQoL while having minimal side effects. Patients emphasized that stopping or delaying disease progression was the most important factor in choosing treatments and were more receptive to the potential side effects of efficacious therapies. Patients who had experience with lurbinectedin felt that the drug had reduced or stabilized tumour size, delayed disease progression, helped them continue or resume activities of daily living including employment, and had more manageable side effects and a shorter recovery time compared with other SCLC therapies they had received.

### Clinician Input

#### *Input from Clinical Experts Consulted by CADTH*

Two clinical specialists with expertise in the diagnosis and management of stage III and metastatic SCLC provided input for this review. According to the clinical experts, patients with stage III or metastatic SCLC manifest rapid responses to first line chemotherapy but these are not sustained. Currently available second line chemotherapy options (e.g., topotecan, CAV, irinotecan) have significant drawbacks including toxicity and inconvenience (e.g., topotecan has a dosage regimen of 5 consecutive days of IV treatment every 3 weeks). The clinical experts stated that lurbinectedin would be used for second- or third-line therapy of stage III or metastatic SCLC following first line platinum plus etoposide therapy and potential re-challenge; if disease progression following first line therapy occurred after a relatively long interval (e.g., 6 to 12 months), many clinicians would rechallenge with platinum plus etoposide as second line therapy prior to using lurbinectedin. The clinical experts emphasized that all patients with ES SCLC need additional treatment options to prolong survival and maintain HRQoL. According to the clinical experts, the patient population best suited to treatment with lurbinectedin would be patients with ES SCLC who progress following treatment with platinum plus etoposide with or without durvalumab, while patients with poor performance status (e.g., Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group [ECOG] performance status [PS] of 3 or greater) or limited organ function would be least suitable for treatment with lurbinectedin. According to the clinical experts, response to lurbinectedin would be assessed based on imaging scans (approximately every 3 months), clinical

improvement, and laboratory markers. Clinically meaningful responses to treatment would be manifested by improvement in symptoms and improvement or stabilization of HRQoL. The clinical experts stated that lurbinectedin should be discontinued in patients when disease progression or unacceptable toxicities occur, or by patient choice. The clinical experts stated that lurbinectedin would be given in an outpatient setting and would be ordered by a medical oncologist.

### *Clinician Group Input*

Two clinician groups, the LCC Medical Advisory Committee (10 medical oncologists, 2 respirologists, 1 thoracic surgeon, and 1 pathologist) and the Ontario Health-Cancer Care Ontario Lung Cancer Drug Advisory Committee (5 medical oncologists), provided input for this review. No major contrary views were presented. Clinician groups echoed the high unmet need for additional efficacious second line treatment options for stage III and metastatic SCLC that have fewer side effects and are more convenient to administer. The clinician groups noted that some clinicians would perform imaging evaluations slightly more frequently (every 2 to 3 cycles or 6 to 9 weeks vs. every 3 months) and that in addition to improvement or stabilization of symptoms and HRQoL, clinically meaningful responses to lurbinectedin would be manifested through tumour shrinkage observed on imaging scans. In addition, the clinician groups noted that it was not yet clear if retreatment with platinum plus etoposide would be the preferred option in patients with platinum-sensitive disease who have treatment-free periods beyond some cutoff (e.g., 6 months).

### Drug Program Input

Input was obtained from the drug programs that participate in the CADTH reimbursement review process. The following were identified as key factors that could potentially impact the implementation of a CADTH recommendation for lurbinectedin:

- Considerations for initiation of therapy
- Considerations for prescribing of therapy
- Care provision issues
- System and economic issues
- Potential need for a provisional funding algorithm

The clinical experts consulted by CADTH provided advice on the potential implementation issues raised by the drug programs.

## Clinical Evidence

### Pivotal Studies and Protocol Selected Studies

#### *Description of Studies*

One Phase II, multicenter, open-label basket trial (Study B-005) designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of lurbinectedin in previously treated patients with advanced solid tumours provided evidence for this review; only data for the SCLC cohort (N=105) are described in this report. The primary objective of the study was to assess the ORR per IA of lurbinectedin in patients with advanced SCLC who had received one prior line of systemic therapy. Secondary objectives included ORR per independent review committee (IRC), duration of response (DOR) per IA and IRC, clinical benefit rate per IA and IRC, PFS per IA and IRC, and OS. Adult patients (age 18 years and older) with SCLC who had received one previous line of systemic therapy for advanced disease and met the eligibility criteria were enrolled at 26 sites primarily in Europe (predominantly Spain; no sites in Canada). Patients were treated with lurbinectedin (3.2 mg per m<sup>2</sup> on day 1 of a 21-day treatment cycle) until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity.

Adult patients (age 18 years and older) with SCLC, ECOG PS 2 or lower, and measurable disease who had received one prior line of systemic therapy for advanced disease were eligible if they did not have known central nervous system (CNS) involvement by computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), did not have serious comorbidities, and had not received chemotherapy within 3 weeks. The median age at study entry was 60 years. Most patients (56.2%) had ECOG PS 1, while roughly one third (36.2%) had ECOG PS 0; only eight patients (7.6%) had ECOG PS 2. Most patients (93.3%) had ES disease at study entry and only two patients (1.9%) had non-metastatic disease at study entry. Nearly all patients (93.3%) had received one line of prior

systemic therapy (platinum agents: 100.0%; etoposide: 99.0%) while only 7.6% of patients had received prior immunotherapy. Based on their chemotherapy treatment-free intervals (CTFIs), 42.9% of patients had platinum-resistant disease [CTFI shorter than 90 days, including both refractory disease (20.0%, CTFI shorter than 30 days) and resistant disease (22.9%, CTFI 30 to 89 days)] while 57.1% of patients had platinum-sensitive disease [CTFI 90 days or longer, including both sensitive disease (38.1%, CTFI 90 to 179 days) and very sensitive disease (19.0%, CTFI 180 days or longer)].

Lurbinectedin (3.2 mg per m<sup>2</sup>) was administered as a 1-hour IV infusion on day 1 of a 3-week treatment cycle. The dose was capped at a body surface area of 2.0 m<sup>2</sup> (6.4 mg). Treatment was continued until disease progression (per IA), unacceptable toxicity, treatment delay 3 weeks or longer (except in the case of clear clinical benefit with sponsor's approval), requirement for more than 2 dose reductions, intercurrent illness of sufficient magnitude to preclude safe continuation of the study, major protocol deviation that may affect the risk to benefit ratio for the participating patient, investigator decision, non-compliance with study requirements, or patient refusal. During the treatment period, tumour response was evaluated for all original sites of disease involvement at baseline every two cycles until cycle 6, and then every three cycles thereafter.

## *Efficacy Results*

### **Overall Survival**

Median OS was 9.3 months overall (95% CI, 6.3 to 11.8 months). Median OS among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 5.0 months (95% CI, 4.1 to 6.3 months) and 11.9 months (95% CI, 9.7 to 16.2 months), respectively.

### **Progression-Free Survival**

Median PFS per IA was 3.5 months overall (95% CI, 2.6 to 4.3 months). Median PFS per IA among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 2.6 months (95% CI, 1.3 to 3.9 months) and 4.6 months (95% CI, 2.8 to 6.5 months), respectively.

Median PFS per IRC was 3.5 months overall (95% CI, 2.6 to 4.2 months). Median PFS per IRC among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 1.4 months (95% CI, 1.3 to 3.5 months) and 4.3 months (95% CI, 3.0 to 6.3 months), respectively.

### **Objective Response Rate**

The ORR per IA was 35.2% overall (95% CI, 26.2% to 45.2%). The ORR per IA among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 22.2% (95% CI, 11.2% to 37.1%) and 45.0% (95% CI, 32.1%, 58.4%), respectively.

The ORR per IRC was 30.5% overall (95% CI: 21.9%, 40.2%). The ORR per IRC among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 13.3% (95% CI: 5.1%, 26.8%) and 43.3% (95% CI, 30.6%, 56.8%), respectively.

### **Duration of Response**

Median DOR per IA in patients who had a confirmed complete response or partial response as best overall response was 5.3 months overall (95% CI, 4.1 to 6.4 months). Median DOR per IA among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 4.7 months (95% CI, 2.6 to 5.6 months) and 6.2 months (95% CI, 3.5 to 7.3 months), respectively.

Median DOR per IRC in patients who had a confirmed complete response or partial response as best overall response was 5.1 months overall (95% CI, 4.9 to 6.4 months). Median DOR per IRC among patients with CTFI shorter than 90 days and 90 days or longer was 4.8 months (95% CI: 2.4 to 5.3 months) and 5.3 months (95% CI, 4.9 to 7.0 months), respectively.

## *Harms Results*

Adverse events (AEs) occurred in most patients (98.1%), serious AEs occurred in 32.4% of patients, AEs leading to dose reduction occurred 26.3% of patients, and withdrawals due to AEs occurred in 3.8% of patients. Sixty-six patients (62.9%) died during the study, all due to progressive disease. Among CADTH protocol-defined notable harms, the most common myelosuppression-associated AEs in Study B-005 were anemia (95.2%), lymphopenia (85.7%), leukopenia (79.0%), neutropenia (71.4%), and thrombocytopenia (43.8%). Febrile neutropenia occurred in 4.8% of patients. The most common hepatotoxicity-associated AEs were

alanine aminotransferase increase (71.8%), gammaglutamyltransferase increase (65.0%), asparagine aminotransferase increase (44.7%), and alkaline phosphatase increase (33.0%). Peripheral neuropathy and peripheral sensory neuropathy occurred in two patients (1.9%).

### *Critical Appraisal*

The major limitations of Study B-005 were its single-arm, non-comparative design and relatively small size with associated uncertainty in estimation of effect sizes. Other potential internal validity concerns included potential for bias in outcome assessment (e.g., tumour response) in a single arm OL study, and the descriptive nature of efficacy analyses and absence of formal statistical hypothesis testing (other than ORR per IA).

The clinical experts consulted by CADTH for this review considered the demographic and disease characteristics of patients in Study B-005 to be broadly reflective of adult patients with advanced SCLC who have received prior platinum doublet therapy in Canada. However, as with any trial population, the clinical experts felt that patients in Study B-005 were slightly younger, in better health, and more treatment-seeking than the general population of SCLC patients. Patients with CNS involvement were excluded from Study B-005, who would be expected to have worse prognoses; however, patients with short CTFI, who are excluded from many trials due to their poor prognoses, were included. Although the study assessed lurbinectedin in the second-line treatment setting, the clinical experts felt that the study results could be generalized to the third-line treatment setting as well. Stabilization of HRQoL and cancer symptoms, which were identified as important outcomes to patients and goals of treatment by clinical experts consulted by CADTH for this review, were not assessed in Study B-005.

### Indirect Comparisons

#### *Description of Studies*

Three sponsor-submitted indirect treatment comparisons (ITCs) are included in this CADTH report. [REDACTED]

The second ITC is a simulated treatment comparison (STC) facilitating the indirect comparison of lurbinectedin (using individual patient data from the B-005 trial) to topotecan IV (using aggregated data from the von Pawel 2014 randomized controlled trial) in patients with relapsed or refractory SCLC.

The third ITC is a matching-adjusted indirect comparison (MAIC) created to be used with an NMA to evaluate the comparative efficacy and safety of lurbinectedin versus competing interventions (including topotecan IV and carboplatin plus etoposide) among patients with SCLC receiving second-line treatment with respect to ORR, DOR, OS, and PFS, as well as hematological AEs of Grades 3 and 4 (including anemia, thrombocytopenia, neutropenia, and febrile neutropenia).

#### *Efficacy Results*

[REDACTED]

In the second ITC, the STC evaluated OS and PFS. Adjusted estimates showed the median OS was 10.0 months (95% CI, 8.5 to 11.6 months) and 7.8 months (95% CI, 6.6 to 8.5 months) in the lurbinectedin and topotecan trials, respectively, with a mean difference of 2 months (95% CI, 0.4 to 4.0 months). For PFS, adjusted estimates were obtained, with median PFS of 3.4 months (95% CI, 3.0 to 3.9 months) and 3.5 months (95% CI, 2.9 to 4.2 months) in the lurbinectedin and topotecan trials, respectively, with a mean difference of -0.10 months (95% CI, -0.89 to 0.69 months).

The third ITC showed results of a MAIC and a NMA evaluating OS, PFS, ORR, DoR, and harms.

For OS, from the MAIC evaluation, the hazard ratio (HR) for lurbinectedin versus carboplatin plus etoposide was 0.42 (95% CI 0.27, 0.65). In the base case NMA for OS, lurbinectedin had an HR of 0.43 (95% CrI, 0.26 to 0.70) against IV topotecan, and 0.42 (95% CrI, 0.30 to 0.58) against carboplatin plus etoposide.

For PFS assessment in the NMA, only lurbinectedin versus carboplatin plus etoposide comparison was assessed with longer PFS in the lurbinectedin arm (HR at 9 months of follow up of 0.37; 95%CrI, 0.18 to 0.73).

For ORR, when assessing the MAIC base case, no evidence of difference was detected between lurbinectedin versus carboplatin plus etoposide (odds ratio [OR] = 0.90; 95% CI, 0.41 to 1.95). While in the NMA, no evidence of difference was detected between lurbinectedin versus IV topotecan (OR = 2.36; 95% CrI, 0.89 to 6.23) or against carboplatin plus etoposide (OR = 0.85; 95% CrI, 0.40 to 1.83).

Only the median DOR in the MAIC could be reported without relative treatment effects, where lurbinectedin had a median DOR of 6.24 months (95% CI, 4.76 to 6.90 months), while the median for carboplatin plus etoposide was of 5.4 months (95% CI, 2.2 to 9.3 months).

## *Harms Results*

Harms were only directly evaluated in the third ITC (MAIC and NMA).

Grade 3 or 4 anemia in MAIC estimates had lower odds in the lurbinectedin arm compared to carboplatin plus etoposide (OR = 0.23; 95% CI, 0.07 to 0.72). The NMA estimates also showed lower odds in the lurbinectedin arm when compared to carboplatin plus etoposide (OR = 0.22; 95%CrI 0.08, 0.61) and against IV topotecan (OR = 0.21; 95% CrI 0.06, 0.74) with consistent results in the sensitivity analyses.

MAIC estimates for Grade 3 or 4 thrombocytopenia also showed lower odds for lurbinectedin versus carboplatin plus etoposide (OR = 0.23; 95% CI, 0.06 to 0.95) and it was similar across sensitivity analyses. Similarly, in the NMA assessing Grade 3 or 4 thrombocytopenia, the base case analysis showed lower odds (OR = 0.23; 95% CrI, 0.08 to 0.69) and it was consistent with the sensitivity analyses.

However, lurbinectedin in the MAIC had increased odds of Grade 3 or 4 neutropenia (OR = 7.07; 95% CI, 2.89 to 17.27) when compared to carboplatin plus etoposide, but this effect was the opposite when evaluating against IV topotecan in the group of patients with any platinum sensitivity (sensitivity analysis) (OR = 0.13; 95% CI, 0.06 to 0.26) and when observing the patients with sensitive disease, CTFI larger than 90 days (OR = 0.13; 95% CI, 0.06 to 0.28). In the NMA, the results were similar with increased odds in the lurbinectedin arm against carboplatin plus etoposide (OR = 7.05; 95% CrI, 3.09 to 16.11) but not against IV topotecan (OR = 1.19; 95% CrI, 0.45 to 3.17). The reason for these differences in neutropenia rates were deemed to be explained by differences in the requirements for prophylaxis with G-CSF across studies.

## *Critical Appraisal*

The results from all ITCs have uncertainty due to imprecision in effect estimates, risk of confounding, and risk of bias in the body of evidence (e.g., violation of proportional hazards, intransitivity, poor overlap of covariates in the MAIC weighting process, use of observational data from a single-arm non-randomized trial connected through a MAIC into each NMA), with sparsity of the formed network used for the NMAs. The ORR and DOR were also uncertain, with no evidence of better ORR odds for lurbinectedin when compared to carboplatin plus etoposide or topotecan IV, and incomplete evidence for evaluating the DOR. The maturity of data for evaluating long-term outcomes was also uncertain.

Some generalizability issues arose because some arms included in the third ITC evaluated drugs not used in Canada (e.g., oral topotecan) and some variables considered important by clinical experts could not be included.

## *Other Relevant Evidence*

No other relevant evidence was identified for this review.

## Economic Evidence

### Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

Component	Description
<b>Type of economic evaluation</b>	Cost-utility analysis Partitioned survival model (PSM)
<b>Target population</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B-005 trial population: adults with SCLC who have received one prior chemotherapy-containing line of therapy</li> <li>Two subgroup analyses provided, based on prior response to platinum-based treatment               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>platinum-sensitive</li> <li>platinum-refractory</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Treatment</b>	Lurbinectedin
<b>Submitted Price</b>	Lurbinectedin, 4 mg vial: \$6,470.00 per vial
<b>Treatment Cost</b>	\$12,940 per 21-day cycle
<b>Comparators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B-005 trial population:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topotecan</li> <li>Cyclophosphamide + doxorubicin + vincristine (CAV)</li> <li>Real world evidence (RWE): basket comprised of CAV, topotecan, etoposide, carboplatin + etoposide, cisplatin + etoposide, “other platinum regimens,” and “other regimens”</li> <li>Synthetic arm evidence (SYNTH): basket comprised of CAV, etoposide, carboplatin + etoposide, cisplatin + etoposide, and “other regimens”</li> </ul> </li> <li>Platinum-sensitive subgroup: topotecan, carboplatin + etoposide, cisplatin + etoposide, carboplatin + irinotecan</li> <li>Platinum-refractory subgroup: topotecan, CAV</li> </ul>
<b>Perspective</b>	Canadian publicly funded health care payer
<b>Outcomes</b>	QALYs, LYs
<b>Time horizon</b>	Lifetime (25 years)
<b>Key data source</b>	Single-arm phase II basket trial (PM1183-B-005-14); naïve comparisons to comparators
<b>Key limitations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comparative effects of lurbinectedin on PFS and OS is unknown due to lack of head-to-head or comparative evidence for lurbinectedin to currently available treatments. The sponsor’s use of naïve comparisons to inform the pharmacoeconomic model introduces unresolvable uncertainty.</li> <li>The full Health Canada approved population was not modelled. The sponsor assessed the cost-effectiveness of lurbinectedin as a second-line treatment; the cost-effectiveness of lurbinectedin as a third-line treatment is unknown.</li> <li>The sponsor’s model predicts an OS benefit with lurbinectedin that is not supported by clinical data. The predicted gains in PFS exceed that observed in the B-005 trial, and the sponsor’s model predicts that the majority of the incremental benefits with lurbinectedin treatment will be realized after patients have discontinued lurbinectedin.</li> <li>The sponsor assumes that all patients will receive lurbinectedin for four 21-day cycles, regardless of disease progression, which is inconsistent with the monograph-recommended dosing (i.e., until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity). Drug acquisition costs are likely underestimated, biasing the results in favour of lurbinectedin.</li> </ul>
<b>CADTH reanalysis results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to the identified limitations regarding the lack of comparative clinical effectiveness, as well as issues with the submitted model, the comparative clinical effectiveness, and hence the cost-effectiveness, of lurbinectedin relative to currently available treatments is unknown.</li> <li>CADTH conducted an exploratory analysis and adopted alternative extrapolation curves for PFS and OS. Sequential analyses are not presented due to the lack of comparability among patient populations. Both the sponsor’s analysis and the CADTH exploratory reanalysis address the cost-effectiveness of lurbinectedin as a second-line treatment; the cost-effectiveness of lurbinectedin in the third-line setting is unknown owing to a lack of clinical data.</li> <li>In the CADTH exploratory reanalysis, the ICER for lurbinectedin was \$307,232 per QALY compared with SYNTH, a synthetic control arm constructed from real-world data. Based on the</li> </ul>

Component	Description
	<p>CADTH reanalysis, an 83% price reduction would be required for lurbinectedin to be considered cost-effective at a willingness-to-pay threshold of \$50,000 per QALY compared with expected usual care (i.e., SYNTH).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of the reanalysis should be viewed only as exploratory given the limitations highlighted above and the extensive uncertainty associated with the comparative clinical effectiveness and underestimated lurbinectedin acquisition costs. As such, a higher price reduction for lurbinectedin may be warranted.</li> </ul>

ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; SCLS = small cell lung cancer; QALY = quality-adjusted life-year.

## Budget Impact

CADTH identified the following key limitations with the sponsor’s analysis: the number of patients eligible for lurbinectedin is uncertain and may be underestimated; all relevant comparators were not considered and may depend on disease stage, line of therapy, and platinum sensitivity; the uptake of lurbinectedin is uncertain; the duration of lurbinectedin treatment is likely underestimated, which underestimates drug acquisition costs; and costs associated with subsequent treatment were not considered. CADTH revised the sponsor’s base case by including irinotecan-based regimens as a relevant comparator. In the CADTH base case, the budget impact of reimbursing lurbinectedin is expected to be \$9,582,252 in year 1, \$11,052,096 in year 2, and \$12,257,895 in year 3, with a three-year total of \$32,892,244. This estimate is highly sensitive to the duration of lurbinectedin treatment.

## pCODR Expert Review Committee (pERC) Information

### Members of the Committee:

#### *pERC*

Dr. Maureen Trudeau (Chair), Mr. Daryl Bell, Dr. Jennifer Bell, Dr. Matthew Cheung; Dr. Winson Cheung, Dr. Michael Crump, Dr. Leela John, Dr. Christian Kollmannsberger, Mr. Cameron Lane, Dr. Christopher Longo, Dr. Catherine Moltzan, Ms. Amy Peasgood, Dr. Anca Prica, Dr. Adam Raymakers, Dr. Patricia Tang, Dr. Marianne Taylor, and Dr. W. Dominika Wranik.

Meeting Date: July 13, 2022

### Regrets

One expert committee member did not attend.

### Conflicts of Interest

None