

CADTH REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW

Stakeholder Feedback on Draft Recommendation

LISOCABTAGENE MARALEUCEL (Breyanzi)

(Celgene Inc., a Bristol Myers Squibb company)

Indication: For the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory (R/R) large B-cell lymphoma after two or more lines of systemic therapy, including diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) not otherwise specified, primary mediastinal large B-cell lymphoma (PMBCL), high grade B-cell lymphoma, and DLBCL arising from follicular lymphoma.lymphoma, primary mediastinal large B-cell lymphoma (PMBCL), and follicular lymphoma grade 3B (FL3B) after at least 2 prior therapies.

June 16, 2022

Disclaimer: The views expressed in each submission are those of the submitting organization or individual; not necessarily the views of CADTH or of other organizations. As such, they are independent of CADTH and do not necessarily represent or reflect the view of CADTH. No endorsement by CADTH is intended or should be inferred.

By filing with CADTH, the submitting organization or individual agrees to the full disclosure of the information. CADTH does not edit the content of the submissions.

CADTH does use reasonable care to prevent disclosure of personal information in posted material; however, it is ultimately the submitter's responsibility to ensure no identifying personal information or personal health information is included in the submission. The name of the submitting organization or individual and all conflict of interest information are included in the submission; however, the name of the author, including the name of an individual patient or caregiver submitting the feedback, are not posted.

CADTH is committed to treating people with disabilities in a way that respects their dignity and independence, supports them in accessing material in a timely manner, and provides a robust feedback process to support continuous improvement. All materials prepared by CADTH are available in an accessible format. Where materials provided to CADTH by a submitting organization or individual are not available in an accessible format, CADTH will provide a summary document upon request. More details on CADTH's accessibility policies can be found https://example.com/here.



CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information				
CADTH project number	PG0258-000			
Brand name (generic)	Lisocabtagene maraleucel (Breyanzi)			
Indication(s)	For the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or			
	refractory (R/R) large B-cell lymphoma after two or more lines of			
	systemic therapy, including diffuse large B-cell lymphoma			
	(DLBCL) not otherwise specified, primary mediastinal large B-cell			
	lymphoma (PMBCL), high grade B-cell lymphoma, and DLBCL			
	arising from follicular lymphoma.			
Organization	Ontario Health (CCO) Hematology Cancer Drug Advisory Cor	nmitte	е	
Contact information ^a	Name: Dr. Tom Kouroukis			
Stakeholder agreement wi	th the draft recommendation			
1 Dogo the stakeholder of	wee with the committee's recommendation	Yes	\boxtimes	
1. Does the stakeholder ag	ree with the committee's recommendation.	No		
follicular lymphoma grade 3E		. ()		
•	eration of the stakeholder input	Yes		
2. Does the recommendation demonstrate that the committee has considered the stakeholder input that your organization provided to CADTH?				
Stakeholder input that y	our organization provided to CADTH?	No		
Clarity of the draft recomm	nendation			
		Yes	\boxtimes	
3. Are the reasons for the recommendation clearly stated?			_ <u></u>	
		No		
4. Have the implementation issues been clearly articulated and adequately			\boxtimes	
addressed in the recommendation?				
5. If applicable, are the reimbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale			\boxtimes	
for the conditions provi	ded in the recommendation?	No		

^a CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.

Appendix 2. Conflict of Interest Declarations for Clinician Groups

- To maintain the objectivity and credibility of the CADTH drug review programs, all participants in the drug review processes must disclose any real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest.
- This conflict of interest declaration is required for participation. Declarations made do not negate or preclude the use of the feedback from patient groups and clinician groups.
- CADTH may contact your group with further questions, as needed.
- Please see the Procedures for CADTH Drug Reimbursement Reviews for further details.
- For conflict of interest declarations:
 - Please list any companies or organizations that have provided your group with financial payment over the past two years AND who may have direct or indirect interest in the drug under review.
 - Please note that declarations are required for each clinician that contributed to the input.
 - If your clinician group provided input at the outset of the review, only conflict of interest declarations that are new or require updating need to be reported in this form. For all others, please list the clinicians who provided input are unchanged
 - Please add more tables as needed (copy and paste).
 - All new and updated declarations must be included in a single document.

A. Assistance with Providing the Feedback		
1. Did you receive help from outside your clinician group to complete this submission?	No	
	Yes	\boxtimes
Ontario Health provided secretariat functions to the DAC.		
2. Did you receive help from outside your clinician group to collect or analyze any	No	\boxtimes
information used in this submission?	Yes	
If yes, please detail the help and who provided it.		ı
B. Previously Disclosed Conflict of Interest		
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was	No	П
submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained	Yes	\boxtimes
unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.		
If yes, please list the clinicians who contributed input and whose declarations have not changed:		
Dr. Tom Kouroukis		

CADTH Reimbursement Review

Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information					
CADTH project number		PG0258			
Name of the drug and		Lisocabtagene maraleucel for RR DLBCL			
Indication(s)					
Organization Provid	ding	PAG			
Feedback	Feedback				
4 . D					
1. Recommendat Please indicate if the recommendation.		sions older requires the expert review committee to reconsider or clari	fy its		
Request for		evisions: A change in recommendation category or patient tion is requested			
Reconsideration	Minor r	revisions: A change in reimbursement conditions is requested			
No Request for	Editoria request	al revisions: Clarifications in recommendation text are ed			
Reconsideration	No req	uested revisions	Х		
		ation category or conditions or or minor revisions are requested			
	on if edit	orial revisions are requested for the following elements			
a) Recommendat	ion ratio	onale			
None					
b) Reimbursement conditions and related reasons					
None					
c) Implementation guidance					
None	None				



CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information					
CADTH project number	PG0258-000				
Brand name (generic)	Breyanzi (lisocabtagene maraleucel)				
Indication(s)	For the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory (R.	/R) larç	je B-		
	cell lymphoma after two or more lines of systemic therapy, including				
	diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) not otherwise specified, p	•			
	mediastinal large B-cell lymphoma (PMBCL), high grade B-cell ly				
	and DLBCL arising from follicular lymphoma.lymphoma, primary				
	mediastinal large B-cell lymphoma (PMBCL), and follicular lymph	noma g	rade		
	3B (FL3B) after at least 2 prior therapies.				
Organization	Lymphoma Canada				
Contact information ^a	Name: Antonella Rizza				
Stakeholder agreement w	ith the draft recommendation				
1 Does the stakeholder a	gree with the committee's recommendation.	Yes	\boxtimes		
1. Does the stakeholder at	gree with the committee 3 recommendation.	No			
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo	grees with CADTH's recommendation for liso-cel for this indicating reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by the telephones.	eferend ions.	ces		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propagation of the conger survival and longer remission and choice in treatment opto-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by	eferend ions.	ces		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee consideration	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment optio-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by ell therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input	eferend ions.	ces		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee consideration.	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment opt o-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by ell therapies.	eferend ions. y short	ces		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee considerate. 2. Does the recommendate stakeholder input that y	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the	eferencions. y short Yes No	ces 🗵		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee considerate. 2. Does the recommendate stakeholder input that y Yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following:	Yes No	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee considerate considerate commendate stakeholder input that your yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting-Patients identified a need for the recommendate considerate consider	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propagation of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: To reatment options that provide better survival and response of	Yes No	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee conside 2. Does the recommendati stakeholder input that y Yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting -Patients identified a need for with better health-related qu	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input Ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Inale for the recommendation our patient group submission was only the following: Ior treatment options that provide better survival and response containing the following and les toxicity.	Yes No	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee consider 2. Does the recommendating stakeholder input that years according to the ration particularly when highlighting a need for with better health-related queron particularly when highlighting and provided the related queron particularly when highlighting and particularly when highlighting an	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: for treatment options that provide better survival and response of the properties of the provide in	Yes No conside	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee consider 2. Does the recommendating stakeholder input that years according to the ration particularly when highlighting a need for with better health-related queron particularly when highlighting and provided the related queron particularly when highlighting and particularly when highlighting an	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input Ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Inale for the recommendation our patient group submission was only the following: Ior treatment options that provide better survival and response containing the following and les toxicity.	Yes No conside	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee conside 2. Does the recommendati stakeholder input that y Yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting -Patients identified a need for with better health-related quality-patients are seeking impro- liso-cel may meet some of option	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the provided access to CAR-T therapies, which is currently limited. The needs identified by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by pati	Yes No conside	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of lis supply of existing CAR-T ce Expert committee considers. 2. Does the recommendating stakeholder input that your yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting -Patients identified a need from the with better health-related querous provides are seeking improseliso-cel may meet some of	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the provided access to CAR-T therapies, which is currently limited. The needs identified by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by pati	Yes No conside	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional trof improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T celegard committee considers. Expert committee considers at a commendation of the recommendation of	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the vour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: for treatment options that provide better survival and response of the provided access to CAR-T therapies, which is currently limited. The needs identified by patients by providing an effective alternation.	Yes No conside	⊠ □ ered		
cel provides an additional trof improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T celegard committee considers. Expert committee considers at a commendation of the recommendation of	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the rour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the provided access to CAR-T therapies, which is currently limited. The needs identified by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and the provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by patients by providing an effective alternative and provided by pati	Yes No consider	⊠ □ □ ered es,		
cel provides an additional tr of improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T celegate in the supply of existing CAR-T	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propager survival and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the vour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was only the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the provided access to CAR-T therapies, which is currently limited. The needs identified by patients by providing an effective alternative mendation Tecommendation clearly stated? The state of the recommendation clearly stated? The state of the stakeholder input The sta	Yes No considerative	ered es,		
cel provides an additional trof improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T celegard committee considers. Expert committee considers. Expert committee considers. 2. Does the recommendation stakeholder input that your Yes, according to the ration particularly when highlighting. Patients identified a need for with better health-related quere provided and provided in the same of the committee of the draft recommendation. Clarity of the draft recommendation of the reasons are clearly. 4. Have the implementation of the supplementation of the supplementation.	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propagation and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the vour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For each of the stakeholder input The recommendation our patient group submission was on the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity.	Yes No Ative Yes No Yes Yes	ered es,		
cel provides an additional trof improved quality of life, lo Further the availability of liss supply of existing CAR-T celegard committee considers. Expert committee considers at a commendation of the recommendation of	reatment option to patients with LBCL that aligns with patient propagation and longer remission and choice in treatment option-cel would prevent unnecessary delays in treatment caused by all therapies. Peration of the stakeholder input ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the vour organization provided to CADTH? Tale for the recommendation our patient group submission was ong the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For each of the stakeholder input The recommendation our patient group submission was on the following: For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity. For treatment options that provide better survival and response of the callity of life, and les toxicity.	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	es Esces		

Canada is a barrier that should be considered, the issue of equitable access to CAR-T is not

addressed further. Lymphoma Canada recommends that CAR-T therapy should be available equitably across all provinces so as to avoid the challenges facing an already immunocompromised population. As noted in the Access and Financial Impacts to Treatment in Canada section of our original submission, patients articulated the following challenges:

"Travel time, required ferry ride, extra hotel stays and time away from home and children"

""I likely need car T-cell therapy next and will need to travel to another province since BC does not currently offer it"

"At this point I've have full access to treatment, however, my next relapse I would like to have full access to CAR-T in my community and covered by OHIP, which at this point that I know - it isn't"

Yes, Table 1 "Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons" clearly states this information. However, under the <u>Prescribing Section</u> (Implementation Guidance) of Table 1, Lymphoma Canada recommends that additional guidance be provided on eliminating barriers to access for those patients whom are eligible for the treatment but for whom travel, family and financial considerations are important variables patients must factor into a decision for treatment if they have to leave their home province to receive CAR-T therapy.

^a CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.

Appendix 1. Conflict of Interest Declarations for Patient Groups

- To maintain the objectivity and credibility of the CADTH drug review programs, all participants in the drug review processes must disclose any real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest.
- This conflict of interest declaration is required for participation. Declarations made do not negate or preclude the use of the feedback from patient groups and clinician groups.
- CADTH may contact your group with further questions, as needed.
- Please see the *Procedures for CADTH Drug Reimbursement Reviews* for further details.

A. Patient G	roup Information						
Name	Antonella Rizza						
Position	CEO						
Date	June 15, 2022						
	I hereby certify that I have the authority to disclose all relevant information with respect to any matter involving this patient group with a company, organization, or entity that may place this patient group in a real, potential, or perceived conflict of interest situation.						
B. Assistan	ce with Providing Feedback						
4 Did	receive help from cutaide ver		. 40 00 mm 1040 v	a faadbaak	No	\boxtimes	
1. Did you	receive help from outside you	r patient grou	p to complete y	our reedback?	Yes		
If yes, please	e detail the help and who provide	d it.					
2. Did you	receive help from outside you	r patient grou	p to collect or a	nalyze any	No	\boxtimes	
informa	tion used in your feedback?				Yes		
• • •	e detail the help and who provide						
	ly Disclosed Conflict of Interes						
	onflict of interest declarations p				No		
submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section D below.				Yes			
D. New or U	pdated Conflict of Interest Dec	laration					
3. List any companies or organizations that have provided your group with financial payment over the past two years AND who may have direct or indirect interest in the drug under review.							
				priate Dollar Rai	nge		
Company		\$0 to 5,000	\$5,001 to 10,000	\$10,001 to 50,000	In Exces \$50,000	n Excess of \$50,000	
Add compar	y name]	
Add compar	y name]	
Add or remo	ve rows as required]	

CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information	
CADTH project number	PG0258
Brand name (generic)	Breyanzi (lisocabtagene maraleucel)
Indication(s)	For the treatment of adult patients with relapsed or refractory (R/R) large
	B-cell lymphoma after two or more lines of systemic therapy, including
	diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) not otherwise specified, primary
	mediastinal large B-cell lymphoma (PMBCL), high grade B-cell
	lymphoma, and DLBCL arising from follicular lymphoma.
Organization	Celgene Inc., a Bristol Myers Squibb Company
Contact information ^a	

Stakeholder agreement with the draft recommendation

1. Does the stakeholder agree with the committee's recommendation.

Yes	\boxtimes
No	

 \boxtimes

The stakeholder agrees with the draft recommendation and the specific rationale provided: "Overall, survival and response endpoints were deemed meaningful by clinical experts compared to expected outcomes in patients with DLBCL not using a CAR T-cell treatment in the third line setting." (p.3/19 - Rationale for the Recommendation - 1st paragraph) and

"Given the totality of the evidence, pERC concluded that liso-cel may meet some of the needs identified by patients and clinicians when compared to similar CAR T-cell therapies approved for use in Canada, namely by providing an effective alternative option with a potentially different safety profile for most relapsed or refractory LBCL patients." (p.3/19 - Rationale for the Recommendation - 2nd paragraph)

Expert committee consideration of the stakeholder input

2. Does the recommendation demonstrate that the committee has considered the stakeholder input that your organization provided to CADTH?

No

The recommendation has in very large part considered the stakeholder input provided to CADTH.

The summary section on the CADTH reanalysis of the PE results would, however, have benefited from increased transparency and comprehensiveness to allow external readers to properly assess and understand the range of ICERs scenarios considered by CADTH.

The section states:

- "CADTH undertook a series of exploratory analyses which indicated that the results of the model
 are highly sensitive to assumptions regarding pre-treatment, comparative efficacy and safety, and
 health state utility values. In these exploratory analyses, the ICERs for liso-cel ranged from
 \$115,000 per QALY to more than \$13M per QALY.
- There was also a scenario in which liso-cel was not on the cost-effectiveness frontier (i.e., more costly and same or fewer QALYs as other CAR-T therapies)." (p.17/19 Table 2: Summary of Economic Evaluation Last row in the table CADTH reanalyses results).

This summary statement focuses on a minority of scenarios and does not reflect the range of results generated by CADTH's own reanalyses scenarios. More specifically, it does not consider that in some of these same scenarios, one of the CAR Ts, including liso-cel, dominated one or both of the other CAR-T therapies. The ICERs for liso-cel compared to salvage chemotherapy ranged from \$115,771 per QALY to \$151,117 per QALY. Depending on whether efficacy and safety advantages were assumed or not, the range of ICERs compared to tisa-cel varied from tisa-cel being dominated to liso-cel being dominated. The range of ICERs compared to axi-cel also varied from axi-cel being dominated to liso-cel being dominated. Out of the 10 scenarios tested, in one scenario the ICER was \$13M per QALY, explained by almost no QALY difference over tisa-cel. There was also one scenario in which liso-cel was not on the cost-effectiveness frontier (i.e., more costly and same or fewer QALYs as other CAR-T therapies) and two scenarios in which liso-cel dominated over both other CAR-T therapies."

As done in other HTA recommendations, presenting the results of the probabilistic sensitivity analyses (PSA) using a scatter plot of the cost-effectiveness plane would have been useful to quickly visualize the distribution of the PSA results.

Clarity of the draft recommendation					
2. Are the reasons for the recommendation clearly stated?		\boxtimes			
3. Are the reasons for the recommendation clearly stated?					
If not, please provide details regarding the information that requires clarification.					
4. Have the implementation issues been clearly articulated and adequately	Yes	\boxtimes			
addressed in the recommendation?	No				
If not, please provide details regarding the information that requires clarification.					
5. If applicable, are the reimbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale	Yes	\boxtimes			
for the conditions provided in the recommendation?					
The stakeholder agrees with the committee's recommendation that "Liso-cel should be reimbursed in patients with secondary CNS involvement as long as they fulfill all other criteria". (p.4/19 - Table 1. Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons - 4th bullet point).					

^a CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.