

CADTH Reimbursement Review

CADTH Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Calaspargase pegol (Asparlas)

Indication: As a component of a multi-agent chemotherapeutic (MAC) regimen for the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) in pediatric and young adult patients age 1 to 21 years

Sponsor: Servier Canada Inc.

Recommendation: Reimburse with Conditions

Version: 1.0
Publication Date: November 2023
Report Length: 25 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 calaspargase pegol be reimbursed as a component of a multi-agent chemotherapeutic (MAC) regimen for the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) in pediatric and young adult patients age 1 to 21 years, only if the conditions listed in Table 1 are met.

Rationale for the Recommendation

Evidence from 2 phase II, multicentre, open-label trials, COG AALL07P4 (N = 166) and DFCI 11-001 (N = 239), demonstrated that treatment with calaspargase pegol as a component of a MAC regimen may result in similar clinical benefit when compared to pegaspargase in pediatric and young adult patients with ALL. Results for serum asparaginase activity (SAA), the primary outcome in DFCI 11-001, suggested that calaspargase pegol may be as effective as pegaspargase in achieving complete asparagine depletion and prolonged asparaginase activity. Eighteen days after the induction dose, the percentage of patients with SAA levels at or above 0.1 IU/mL, the pre-determined therapeutic threshold, was ■ and ■ in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. Secondary efficacy endpoints were supportive of the results for SAA observed with calaspargase pegol. At a median follow-up time of approximately ■ months and ■ months in COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001, respectively, results for overall, event-free, and disease-free survival, were suggestive of little-to no difference compared to pegaspargase. In addition, results in both trials suggested similar efficacy compared to pegaspargase based on end-induction minimal residual disease (MRD) and complete remission (CR) status. No new safety concerns were observed with calaspargase pegol. Overall, adverse events (AEs) appeared to be reflective of each trial's backbone chemotherapies and asparaginase administration schedule. Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) was not assessed in COG AALL07P4 or DFCI 11-001.

Patients identified a need for effective treatments that have manageable side effects, improve quality of life, and ensure a more reliable drug supply and less frequent drug administration. pERC concluded that calaspargase pegol may meet some of the patients' needs as it likely has similar efficacy outcomes compared to existing treatment, a manageable toxicity profile, and an extended shelf-life which may support a more stable supply and less frequent drug administration (every 3 weeks versus every 2 weeks with continuous asparagine depletion schedules). Although patients expressed an unmet need for treatments that improve quality of life, the effect of calaspargase pegol on HRQoL in patients with ALL is unknown.

Using the sponsor submitted price for calaspargase pegol and the sponsor-provided price for pegaspargase, calaspargase pegol was determined to be more costly than pegaspargase. As there is insufficient evidence to suggest calaspargase pegol is more effective than pegaspargase, the total drug cost of calaspargase pegol should not exceed the total drug cost of pegaspargase.

Table 1. Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons

| Reimbursement condition | Reason | Implementation guidance |
|---|---|--|
| Initiation | | |
| Treatment with calaspargase pegol should be reimbursed in patients 1 to 21 years of age with ALL. | Evidence from COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 demonstrated that treatment with calaspargase pegol as a component of a MAC regimen may result in similar clinical benefit when compared to pegaspargase in children and young adults with ALL. This condition is aligned with the indication approved by Health Canada. | |
| Discontinuation | | |
| <p>1. Calaspargase pegol should be discontinued in patients who exhibit any of the following:</p> <p>1.1. development of hypersensitivity reaction or silent inactivation to calaspargase pegol</p> <p>1.2. development of other high-grade toxicities (e.g., pancreatitis, thrombosis, and hepatotoxicity)</p> <p>1.3. evidence of disease progression</p> | No evidence was identified to demonstrate that continuing treatment with calaspargase pegol in patients whose disease has progressed is effective. | <p>The continuous monitoring for silent inactivation, as well as disease progression and the development of toxicities was considered a best clinical practice point based on clinical expert consensus.</p> <p>To reliably assess the development of hypersensitivity or silent inactivation, SAA levels should be monitored; however, it is acknowledged that this test might not always be available or feasible in different settings across Canada.</p> |
| Prescribing | | |
| Calaspargase pegol should be prescribed as part of a MAC regimen in replacement of pegaspargase. | In COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 calaspargase pegol was administered as part of a MAC regimen. | — |
| Calaspargase pegol should be prescribed by clinicians with expertise in the management of ALL. | To ensure that calaspargase pegol is prescribed only for appropriate patients and adverse effects are managed in an optimized and timely manner. | — |
| Pricing | | |
| Calaspargase pegol should be negotiated so that it does not exceed the drug program cost of treatment with pegaspargase. | There is insufficient clinical evidence to justify a cost premium for calaspargase pegol over pegaspargase. | — |

Discussion Points

- pERC deliberated on the unmet therapeutic needs raised by patients and clinical experts. pERC discussed that ALL is a relatively uncommon blood cancer that mainly affects young children but also occurs in adults. pERC noted that the goal of treatment is curative and comprises multi-agent chemotherapy regimens which incorporate asparaginase therapy as established standard of care. Clinical experts noted that supplies of current asparaginase treatment (pegaspargase) have not been reliable in meeting the needs of all patients, compounded by the drug's relatively short shelf-life. pERC discussed that drug supply disruption may lead to stressful situations for patients and their caregivers. pERC acknowledged that there is a need for effective treatments with tolerable toxicity that improve drug supply chain challenges. Calaspargase pegol with its extended shelf-life may address that need. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that calaspargase pegol's triweekly dosing may be more convenient than pegaspargase' biweekly dosing when used with continuous asparagine depletion schedules.
- pERC noted that patients with Philadelphia chromosome-positive (Ph+) disease were excluded from the available evidence and a minority of patients had Down syndrome and T-cell ALL. pERC acknowledged input from the clinical experts noting that pediatric patients with Ph+ disease who receive tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) therapy are currently treated with asparaginase-based treatment in clinical practice with no toxicity concerns. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that generalizing the available evidence to patients with T-cell ALL, pediatric patients with Ph+ disease, and patients with Down syndrome may be reasonable. It is unlikely that there will be trials specifically designed for this small group of patients and there is no biological rationale to assume different outcomes with calaspargase pegol.
- pERC noted that the frequency of adverse events appeared to be overall similar between the treatment groups in DFCI 11-001; however, safety results in COG AALL07P4 were suggestive of more patients in the calaspargase pegol group experiencing hypoalbuminemia and hyperglycemia compared to the pegaspargase group. pERC acknowledged input from the clinical experts noting that since asparaginase was given as part of a multi-agent chemotherapy protocol it is challenging to attribute differences in AEs observed in small numbers of patients to a specific component of a multi-drug regimen. pERC discussed that the management of toxicity in clinical practice may need adaptation to account for calaspargase pegol's longer half-life compared to pegaspargase.
- pERC discussed the importance of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) in the management of patients treated with asparaginase as a reliable assessment of asparaginase efficacy. Monitoring SAA levels is used to initiate and monitor response throughout treatment regimens, as well as distinguishing between hypersensitivity due to an allergic reaction, silent inactivation, and other types of asparaginase reactions that do not result in inactivation. However, pERC acknowledged that the routine use of TDM might not always be available or feasible in different settings across Canada, resulting in inconsistent use in clinical practice.

Background

Acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) is the most common type of leukemia diagnosed in young children. It is estimated that ALL represents 75% to 80% of acute leukemias among children. ALL is the least common type of leukemia diagnosed in adults representing an estimated 20% of all leukemias among adults. In 2018, the incidence rate of ALL for all ages in Canada (excluding Quebec) was 1.3 per 100,000, with the majority of patients being under the age of 19 years. ALL is a heterogeneous group of disorders that result from the clonal proliferation and expansion of malignant lymphoid cells in the bone marrow, blood, and other organs, classified into two major subtypes, i.e., B-lymphoblastic and T-lymphoblastic leukemia, with further division according to the presence and type of genetic abnormalities. ALL of the B-cell phenotypes occurs in approximately 80% to 85% of pediatric patients and nearly 75% of adult patients. The frequency of Ph+ disease in patients with ALL is about 3% to 5% among pediatric patients, and 25% to 30% among adult patients. Signs and symptoms of ALL are highly variable, with most patients experiencing bruising, bleeding, dyspnea, dizziness, infections due to neutropenia, anemia, thrombocytopenia, and pain. The goal of treatment is curative and comprises multi-agent chemotherapy regimens which incorporate asparaginase therapy as established standard of care. Two different childhood ALL treatment strategies are commonly used across Canada, originating from the Children's Oncology Group (COG) and the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI) consortia; both protocols currently include pegaspargase. According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH, patients who are unable to receive asparaginase treatment (e.g., lack access to a consistent supply of treatment drug or experience intolerance) are less likely to be cured with chemotherapy alone.

The mechanism of action of calaspargase pegol is the same as that of the established standard of care, pegaspargase. To mitigate the risk of drug shortages, the sponsor developed calaspargase pegol to extend the shelf life and half-life relative to the sponsor's original product pegaspargase. Both calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase contain the same asparaginase specific enzyme derived from *E. coli*, as a conjugate of L-asparaginase linked to a similar monomethoxypolyethylene glycol. The only difference between the two products is the linker connecting the two components. Pegaspargase contains a succinimidyl succinate linker, while calaspargase pegol contains a succinimidyl carbonate linker, the latter being less prone to enzymatic hydrolysis and more stable. As a result of the improved stability, calaspargase pegol has a 36-month shelf life compared to 8 months for the pegaspargase formulation.

Calaspargase pegol has received Health Canada authorization for the treatment of patients with ALL in pediatric and young adult patients age 1 to 21 years. It is available as an IV infusion and the dosage recommended in the draft Product Monograph is 2,500 units/m² given no more frequently than every 21 days as a component of a MAC regimen.

Sources of Information Used by the Committee

To make its recommendation, the committee considered the following information:

- a review of 1 randomized controlled trial (RCT) in patients aged 1 year to 30 years with newly diagnosed high-risk B-cell ALL, and 1 RCT in patients aged 1 year to 21 years with newly diagnosed ALL or lymphoblastic lymphoma.
- patients' perspectives gathered by 1 patient group, Leukemia and Lymphoma Society of Canada (LLSC).
- input from public drug plans that participate in the CADTH review process
- input from 2 clinical specialists with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with ALL
- input from 1 clinician group, Ontario Health – Cancer Care Ontario (OH-CCO)
- a review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor

Stakeholder Perspectives

Patient Input

CADTH received one patient group submission from LLSC. LLSC is a national charitable status organization dedicated to finding a cure for blood cancers and to improve the quality of life of people affected by blood cancers and their families by funding life-enhancing research and providing educational resources, services, and support.

LLSC conducted an online survey with 74 respondents from 10 provinces of Canada during April to May 2023. The majority of respondents (n = 47) identified as patients with ALL and 20 respondents indicated that they were caregivers of patients with ALL. Respondents who indicated that they were neither a patient with ALL nor a caregiver of patient with ALL were disqualified from the survey. About half of the patients with ALL indicated that they were above the age of 30 at the time of their ALL diagnosis while the other half was below the age of 30.

LLSC stated that the questions in this survey were not intended to measure the efficacy of the drug under review because it was assumed to be as effective as current treatment options and was also budget neutral. The questions in this survey were aimed at highlighting the importance of safeguarding the healthcare system to ensure that treatment medications are supply secure for those experiencing ALL.

Survey respondents reported their experience with drug shortage at some point during their ALL treatment. Responses highlighted extreme stressful conditions, fear treatment will be unsuccessful, feeling powerless and let down by the system, poor quality of life, and lack of sleep because of stress, anxiety, mood swings, and spending time trying to find an alternative solution. Some respondents noted financial impacts, as they had to pay for alternative therapies and buy products to help them cope.

Respondents indicated that they needed to feel included in decision making as their treatment plan for ALL would have effects on many areas of their lives. In addition to the effectiveness of the treatment, factors that were important to the patients when evaluating new treatments for ALL, included side effects, physician's recommendation, quality of life, cost, secure supply, and number of treatments.

LLSC highlighted that ALL progresses quickly and aggressively and that in order to prevent disease progression, immediate start of treatment upon diagnosis is vital. Survey respondents expressed that delaying start of treatment may lead to cancer progression, their bodies being less receptive and tolerable to treatment, and potentially death.

LLSC noted the importance of having alternative treatments available to ensure treatment can continue should manufacturers run into supply issues. Having a secure supply of treatment options would provide comfort and peace of mind to patients and their caregivers during an already difficult and challenging time. Most of the survey respondents indicated that they would be supportive of the idea of a government providing public funding for an alternative treatment option for ALL that would work equally well with similar costs to the healthcare system and would provide treatment assurance in case an alternative ALL medication would become unavailable.

LLSC asked survey respondents to rate the level of impact treatment shortage due to supply issues would have on their lives. Respondents noted the following areas as being most impacted (listed in order of importance to survey respondents): mental health, physical health, quality of life, home life, social life, work life, and finances.

Respondents were asked by LLSC to describe in 3 words their emotional response to being told that a drug that was part of their treatment regimen was suddenly not available due to supply issues. Survey respondents mostly reported words associated with fear, stress, despair, and defeat.

Clinician Input

Input From Clinical Experts Consulted by CADTH

Two clinical specialists with expertise in the diagnosis and management of ALL reported that the goal of treatment for patients with ALL is curative, aimed at maximizing survival while minimizing short- and long-term toxicities. Current treatment for ALL in Canada

was identified by the clinical experts consulted by CADTH to comprise of multi-agent chemotherapy regimens which include pegylated-asparaginase, using pediatric protocols developed by the COG or the DFCI among children or pediatric-inspired protocols among adults. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that patients who do not respond to treatment require high-dose chemotherapy and/or allogeneic stem cell transplantation and experience high rates of treatment failure. According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH, patients would benefit from a consistent supply of asparaginase, with a shorter frequency of dosing, and treatments with improved tolerability.

Asparaginase is an essential component of front-line ALL therapy, and two extended half-life formulations have been developed for clinical use. Pegylated asparaginase has a half-life of 5.7 days and is administered every 14 days. Calaspargase pegol has a half-life of 16.1 days and is administered every 21 days. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH did not expect a shift in the current treatment paradigm with calaspargase pegol; rather, they believed that it would replace pegaspargase, given its prolonged half-life, longer dosing interval and the need for fewer administration over the course of treatment.

The clinical experts consulted by CADTH indicated that all patients with newly diagnosed ALL would benefit from treatment with calaspargase pegol, since asparaginase has a unique mechanism of action and considered to comprise an essential component of therapy in ALL. Patients with relapsed ALL were also considered by the clinical experts consulted by CADTH to potentially benefit from calaspargase pegol, if there was no known prior intolerance to other forms of asparaginase. Patients of any age, with Ph+ status (except for adult patients due to potential overlapping toxicities with tyrosine kinase inhibitors), and B-cell or T-cell immunophenotype were considered by the clinical experts consulted by CADTH to be eligible for asparaginase treatment and therefore appropriately targeted for treatment with calaspargase pegol. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH specified that several risk factors are considered prior to starting treatment to help inform the protocol used, including age older than 10 years, white blood cell (WBC) below $50 \times 10^9/L$ at presentation or diagnosis, adverse genetic features including karyotype (e.g., translocations (t(9;22)(q34;q11), hypodiploidy), molecular studies (e.g., BCR-ABL, KMT2A mutations), and gene expression (e.g., IKZF, CRLF2).

The clinical experts consulted by CADTH reported that a clinically meaningful treatment response should be assessed using overall survival (OS), CR post-induction, MRD-negative status post-induction, and SAA levels following administration of asparaginase to monitor adequate asparaginase depletion and clinical reactions (e.g., allergic or infusion-related reaction, silent inactivation). According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH, treatment with asparaginase including calaspargase pegol should be discontinued in the event of notable adverse events (e.g., hypersensitivity reaction including silent inactivation, allergic reaction, development of neutralizing antibodies, severe liver toxicity, severe pancreatitis, severe thrombotic or hemorrhagic event, persistent severe hepatic dysfunction). The clinical experts consulted by CADTH indicated that patients with ALL are often treated in hospital or cancer centres, as inpatients or outpatients, by hematologists or oncologists.

Clinician Group Input

CADTH received one clinician group submission from the OH-CCO Hematology Cancer Drug Advisory Committee comprising 2 clinicians. The clinician group noted no significant unmet need among patients who are eligible for standard induction of ALL treatment with pegaspargase; however, patients treated with calaspargase pegol as a component of MAC may benefit from less frequent dosing and should be assessed for treatment response using standard leukemia response criteria, with treatment to be discontinued upon progressive disease or significant intolerance. OH-CCO noted that the appropriate setting for treatment with calaspargase pegol is an acute leukemia treatment center with presence of leukemia specialists.

Drug Program Input

Input was obtained from the drug programs that participate in the CADTH reimbursement review process.

The clinical experts consulted by CADTH provided advice on the potential implementation issues raised by the drug programs. Refer to Table 2 for details.

Table 2. Responses to Questions from the Drug Programs

| Implementation issues | Response |
|---|---|
| Relevant comparators | |
| <p>Two studies, one in newly diagnosed ALL or lymphoblastic lymphoma (patients aged 1-21 years) and the other in newly diagnosed high-risk B-cell ALL (patients aged 1-30 years) compared to pegaspargase. Pegaspargase is funded by several jurisdictions and would be a relevant comparator. Of note, pegaspargase has not been reviewed by CADTH pCODR. Other potentially relevant comparators are crisantaspase and erwinia-derived asparaginase (Erwinase) - although this is for the setting of hypersensitivity or silent inactivation of the E-coli-derived asparaginase. Is there any data for comparators other than pegaspargase?</p> | <p>pERC agreed with the clinical experts consulted by CADTH that pegaspargase is currently used as a component of a multi-agent chemotherapy regimen for the treatment for patients with ALL, and therefore considered to be an appropriate comparator for calaspargase pegol. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH were not aware of data or clinical trials to date that use other comparators.</p> |
| Considerations for initiation of therapy | |
| <p>The clinical trials were completed in patients under the age of 21 years in the DFCI 11-001 study and under 31 years in the COG AALL07P4 study.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Should patients over the age of 21 years be eligible for calaspargase? 2) The clinical trials were completed in patients with newly diagnosed disease. Is there evidence to support use in relapsed or refractory ALL? 3) Should patients with lymphoblastic lymphoma be eligible for calaspargase? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) HC issued market authorization for calaspargase pegol for the treatment of ALL in pediatric and young adult patients aged 1 to 21 years. The clinical experts agreed that patients below the ages of 1 or above 21 are currently treated with asparaginase-based treatment in clinical practice. Given the similar mechanism of action between pegaspargase and calaspargase pegol, pERC agreed with the clinical experts that it would be reasonable to extrapolate the results from the available evidence for calaspargase pegol to patients aged below 1 or above 21. 2) DFCI 11-001 and COG AALL07P4 did not enroll patients with relapsed or refractory ALL. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that calaspargase pegol may also be used for patients with relapsed or refractory ALL, if there was no evidence of prior allergic reaction or hypersensitivity to asparaginase. 3) While COG AALL07P4 excluded patients with lymphoblastic lymphoma; 9 patients with lymphoblastic lymphoma participated in DFCI 11-001. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that it would be reasonable to generalize the results of DFCI 11-001 to pediatric and young adult patients with LL as they anticipated that treatment outcomes in these patients would be very similar to patients with ALL. |
| Considerations for prescribing of therapy | |
| <p>According to the US product monograph, the standard dose of calaspargase pegol is 2,500 IU/m² in 100 mL normal saline/dextrose 5% in water IV over 1 hour every 21 days. It comes as a 3,750 IU single use vial, which means that for patients over 1.5 m², there will be wastage. However, this is the same dose and vial size as pegaspargase, which is given every 14 days, so there is an advantage to the calaspargase pegol in terms of number of infusions as well as wastage to prepare those doses. In some protocols, pegaspargase is capped at 3,750 IU as a maximum dose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Would capping also apply to calaspargase pegol? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The clinical experts noted that capping the dose of asparaginase products (pegaspargase or calaspargase pegol) at 3,750 IU is permitted according to institutional preference and at the discretion of the treating clinician. The clinical experts reported that the difference in dosing schedule for calaspargase pegol as compared to pegaspargase is less notable for COG-based protocols which use a discontinuous asparaginase depletion strategy than for DFCI-based protocols which use a continuous asparaginase depletion strategy. <p>pERC agreed with the clinical experts. pERC noted that monitoring of SAA levels may inform decisions on dose capping.</p> |

| Implementation issues | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>2) Can pERC clarify the dosing schedule for calaspargase pegol as there may be differences in the frequency of administration with pegaspargase?</p> | <p>2) DFCI protocols employ a prolonged intensification phase aimed at continuous asparagine depletion within multi-agent chemotherapy. The clinical experts anticipated that for adult patients who receive calaspargase pegol, the administration schedule for asparaginase would change from an interval of every 14 days (which is used for pegaspargase) to an interval of every 21 days (which is recommended for calaspargase pegol).</p> <p>The clinical experts noted that current COG protocols, unlike DFCI protocols, use a discontinuous asparaginase administration strategy. Thus, current COG protocols do not include repeated every 14-day dosing recommendations for pegaspargase.</p> <p>pERC agreed with the assessment of the clinical experts.</p> |
| <p>Alignment of the existing funding for pegaspargase would need to be considered (e.g., some jurisdictions fund pegaspargase on a per vial basis and also fund inpatient use).</p> | <p>Comment from the drug programs to inform pERC deliberations.</p> |
| <p>Generalizability</p> | |
| <p>Should there be any consideration for switching patients receiving pegaspargase to calaspargase pegol?</p> | <p>The clinical experts consulted by CADTH did not anticipate any issues switching patients who were receiving pegaspargase to calaspargase pegol since the asparaginase component is the same for both drugs. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that patients could be switched from pegaspargase to calaspargase pegol depending on availability. pERC agreed with the clinical experts that they would not switch from pegaspargase to calaspargase pegol for toxicity or inactivation.</p> |
| <p>Care provision issues</p> | |
| <p>Pegaspargase may be given by intramuscular or intravenous route of administration. Calaspargase pegol is only indicated for intravenous administration.</p> <p>According to the US product monograph, patients should be monitored for hypersensitivity for 1 hour after administration. Product is stored in the refrigerator; therefore, sufficient fridge space is required.</p> | <p>Comment from the drug programs to inform pERC deliberations.</p> |
| <p>System and economic issues</p> | |
| <p>Consideration for pricing should the usual cost-effectiveness analyses, but also should not exceed the per-cycle drug program cost of treatment with the least costly comparator reimbursed.</p> | <p>Comment from the drug programs to inform pERC deliberations.</p> |
| <p>There tend to be ongoing shortages of asparaginase products and having alternatives is helpful. Will pegaspargase be available once calaspargase pegol is Health Canada approved (i.e., will both products be available)?</p> | <p>pERC and the clinical experts noted that they were unable to comment.</p> <p>The sponsor has noted in submission materials received by CADTH for this review, that "(...) North American COG and DFCI consortia are currently transitioning and amending existing protocols to include calaspargase pegol, as a replacement to pegaspargase. (...) Following regulatory approval of calaspargase pegol by Health Canada, Servier will also be transitioning to calaspargase pegol in the near future, to securely provide a more reliable supply of a high-quality standard pegylated E. coli-derived asparaginase."</p> |

ALL = acute lymphoblastic leukemia; COG = Children's Oncology Group; DFCI = Dana-Farber Cancer Institute; LL = lymphoblastic lymphoma; IU = international units.

Clinical Evidence

Systematic Review

Description of Studies

Two phase II, multi-centre, randomized, open-label trials assessed the efficacy and safety of calaspargase pegol 2,500 IU/m² compared with pegaspargase 2,500 IU/m². COG AALL07P4 enrolled 166 patients aged 1 year to 30 years in 23 study sites, all located in the US, with newly diagnosed high-risk B-cell ALL. The primary objective of COG AALL07P4 was to determine the pharmacokinetic (PK) comparability (asparaginase activity) of the interventions during induction and consolidation while patients were receiving augmented Berlin-Frankfurt-Münster chemotherapy therapy. Secondary endpoints of COG AALL07P4 included pharmacodynamic (PD) parameters during induction and consolidation, MRD (day 29), CR rate (day 29), survival (event-free survival [EFS], disease-free survival [DFS] of CR, and OS), and treatment-emergent events (TEAEs). DFCI 11-001 enrolled 239 patients aged 1 year to 21 years in the US (6 sites) and Canada (3 sites) with newly diagnosed ALL or lymphoblastic lymphoma. The primary objective of DFCI 11-001 was to determine the PK comparability of the interventions during remission induction and post-induction, i.e., determine SAA levels, and assessment of harms. Secondary endpoints of DFCI 11-001 included MRD (day 32), CR rate (day 32), EFS, DFS of CR, and OS.

Across both the COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 trials, there were notable similarities and differences in baseline demographics. In COG AALL07P4, most patients were older than 10 years of age (66.3%). In DFCI 11-001, most patients were younger than 10 years of age (75%). All patients in COG AALL07P4 and nearly all patients (96%) in DFCI 11-001 had ALL. Most patients in DFCI 11-001 had B-cell ALL (87%) including a minority of patients with T-cell ALL. Patients with B-cell immunophenotype were exclusively enrolled in COG AALL07P4. Most patients had a central nervous system (CNS) status of 1 in both trials with a minority of patients designated as CNS3 in COG AALL07P4 (fewer than 10% of patients) and DFCI 11-001 (fewer than 2% of patients). Most patients did not have steroid therapy prior to study treatment in COG AALL07P4 (■ of patients) or DFCI 11-001 (■ of patients). While the majority of patients were older than 10 years of age in COG AALL07P4 (median 11 years old), most patients were younger than 10 years of age in DFCI 11-001 (median 5.2 years old). Approximately 62% of patients were diagnosed when they were 10 years or older in COG AALL07P4, whereas nearly 75% of patients were diagnosed below 10 years of age in DFCI 11-001. Patients in COG AALL07P4 were distributed equally across combined age and WBC categories, whereas over 70% of patients in DFCI 11-001 were below 10 years of age with WBC count below 50 x 10⁹/L.

Efficacy Results

Results in the COG AALL07P4 trial were based on the December 31, 2015 data cut-off date. Results in the DFCI 11-001 trial were based on the October 5, 2016 data cut-off date, and where indicated, from a Day 120 follow-up with updated data cut-off date of June 12, 2017.

OS

In COG AALL07P4, median OS was not reached at data cut-off on December 31, 2015. Patients had been followed for a median of 62.6 months (range, ■■■■■). The 1-year OS rate (95% CI) among patients in the full analysis set (FAS) population was ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. The 4-year OS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS population was ■■■■■ in the calaspargase pegol and ■■■■■ in the pegaspargase group, respectively. The HR (95% CI) in the FAS population was ■■■■■ in the calaspargase pegol versus pegaspargase group. Findings of the intention-to-treat (ITT) population were consistent with results for the FAS population.

In DFCI 11-001, median OS was not reached at data cut-off on October 5, 2016. Patients had been followed for a median of ■■■■■ months (range, ■■■■■). The 1-year OS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS ALL population was ■■■■■ for calaspargase pegol and ■■■■■ for pegaspargase. At the day 120 cut-off, the median follow-up duration was ■■■■■ months and ■■■■■ months for the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. The 2-year OS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS ALL population was ■■■■■ for calaspargase pegol and ■■■■■ for pegaspargase. Findings of the ITT ALL population were consistent with results for the FAS population.

DFS from complete remission

In COG AALL07P4, the 1-year DFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS population was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. The 4-year DFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS population was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. The HR (95% CI) was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group versus pegaspargase. DFS results in the ITT population were identical to the FAS population.

In DFCI 11-001, the 1-year DFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS ALL population who achieved CR was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. At day 120 follow-up, the 2-year DFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS ALL population who achieved CR was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol versus pegaspargase, respectively. Results of DFS among patients achieving CR in the ITT ALL population were identical to the FAS ALL population.

EFS

In COG AALL07P4, the 1-year EFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS population was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. The 4-year EFS rate (95% CI) was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. The HR (95% CI) was [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol when compared with pegaspargase. Findings for EFS in the ITT population were consistent with results for the FAS population.

In DFCI 11-001, the 1-year EFS rate (95% CI) among patients in the FAS ALL population was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. At day 120 follow-up, the 2-year EFS rate (95% CI) at the 120 update was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. Results of EFS among patients in the ITT ALL population were consistent with results for the FAS ALL population.

Complete remission

In COG AALL07P4, the proportion of patients in the FAS population who achieved CR (95% CI) by day 29 was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. Findings for CR at end of induction day 29 for the ITT population were consistent with results for the FAS population.

In DFCI 11-001, the proportion of patients in the FAS ALL population who achieved CR (95% CI) by day 32 was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. Results for CR by day 32 in the ITT ALL population were consistent with results for the FAS ALL population.

Minimal residual disease

In COG AALL07P4, the proportion of patients in the MRD-evaluable ITT population with positive MRD ($\geq 0.1\%$ detectable leukemia cells in bone marrow biopsy or aspirate with validated 6-color multi-parameter flow cytometry) at induction day 29 was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. Findings for positive MRD ($\geq 0.1\%$) at end of induction day 29 in the ITT population were consistent with results in the FAS population.

In DFCI 11-001, the proportion of patients in the FAS ALL population with MRD of 0.01 or greater was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. Findings for MRD of 0.01 or greater at end of induction day 32 in the ITT ALL population were consistent with results in the FAS ALL population.

Serum asparaginase activity

SAA levels were not reported in the COG AALL07P4 trial.

In DFCI 11-001, the proportion of patients with SAA levels of 0.10 IU/mL or greater (95% CI) were [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol versus [REDACTED] for pegaspargase at 5 minutes to 10 minutes after infusion on induction day 7 (odds ratio [OR] [REDACTED]; 90% CI, [REDACTED]). The proportion of patients with SAA levels of 0.10 IU/mL or greater was [REDACTED] (95% CI, [REDACTED]) for calaspargase pegol versus [REDACTED] (95% CI, [REDACTED]) for pegaspargase at 4 days after infusion on day 11 (OR [REDACTED]; 90% [REDACTED]). The proportion of patients with SAA levels of 0.10 IU/mL or greater (95% CI) were [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol versus [REDACTED] for pegaspargase at 11 days after infusion on day 18 (OR [REDACTED]; 90% CI, [REDACTED]). The proportion of patients with SAA levels of 0.10

IU/mL or greater (95% CI) were [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol versus [REDACTED] for pegaspargase at 18 days after infusion on day 25 (OR [REDACTED]; 90% CI, [REDACTED]). The proportion of patients with SAA levels of 0.10 IU/mL or greater (95% CI) were [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol versus [REDACTED] for pegaspargase at 25 days after infusion on day 32 (OR [REDACTED]; 90% CI, [REDACTED]). Estimates of treatment effect on SAA levels using adjusted analyses (controlled for age, sex, initial risk group, disease type, and baseline WBC count) were similar to unadjusted analyses.

Harms Results

The analysis population for harms included all patients who received at least 1 dose of any study drug, with patients grouped according to the treatment received. Safety data were from the primary safety analyses for COG AALL07P4 (data cut-off date of December 31, 2015) and DFCI 11-001 (data cut-off date of October 5, 2016).

In COG AALL07P4, the percentage of patients reporting any TEAEs was [REDACTED] for calaspargase pegol and [REDACTED] for pegaspargase. In DFCI 11-001, the percentage of patients who experienced any TEAEs was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. In COG AALL07P4, the most common TEAEs occurring in at least 25% of patients in either treatment group (calaspargase pegol versus pegaspargase) were hypoalbuminemia (27.9% versus 5.8%), hyperglycaemia (79.1% versus 50.0%), blood bilirubin increased (62.8% versus 50.0%), neutrophil count decreased (55.8% versus 51.9%), febrile neutropenia (55.8% versus 42.3%), alanine aminotransferase increased (34.9% versus 38.5%), platelet count decreased (34.9% versus 25.0%), WBC decreased (37.2% versus 28.5%), hypokalemia (27.9% versus 11.5%), anemia (25.6% versus 26.9%), activated partial thromboplastin time prolonged (30.2% versus 19.2%), peripheral motor neuropathy (27.9% versus 19.2%), and abdominal pain (32.6% versus 11.5%). In DFCI 11-001, the most common TEAEs occurring in at least 25% of patients in either treatment group (calaspargase pegol versus pegaspargase) were hypoalbuminemia (81.4% versus 82.4%), alanine transaminase increased (78.8% versus 77.3%), aspartate aminotransferase increased (53.4% versus 58.8%), blood bilirubin increased (45.8% versus 43.7%), hypokalemia (45.8% versus 39.5%), febrile neutropenia (33.9% versus 40.3%), hyperglycaemia (33.9% versus 28.6%), hypoglycaemia (30.5% versus 36.1%), hypertriglyceridemia (28.0% versus 36.1%), and stomatitis (25.4% versus 20.2%).

In COG AALL07P4, the percentage of patients with at least 1 serious adverse event (SAE) was not reported. The percentage of patients with at least one grade 3 or 4 TEAE was 97.7% in the calaspargase pegol group and 90.4% in the pegaspargase group. The most common grade 3 or 4 TEAEs in the calaspargase pegol versus the pegaspargase group were neutrophil count decreased (55.8% versus 51.9%), febrile neutropenia (55.8% versus 42.3%), WBC decreased (37.2% versus 28.8%), and hyperglycemia (37.2% versus 17.3%). In DFCI 11-001, the percentage of patients who experienced grade 3 or 4 TEAEs was [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol group and [REDACTED] in the pegaspargase group. The most common grade 3 or 4 TEAEs in the calaspargase pegol versus the pegaspargase group were alanine aminotransferase increased (49.2% versus 60.5%), hypokalemia (43.2% versus 36.1%), febrile neutropenia (33.9% versus 40.3%), and hypoalbuminemia (27.1% versus 27.7%). The percentages of patients who experienced at least 1 SAE were 24.6% and 21.8% in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. SAEs that occurred in at least 2% of patients in the calaspargase pegol versus the pegaspargase group were lipase increased (4.2% versus [REDACTED]), pancreatitis (5.9% versus [REDACTED]), sepsis (3.4% versus [REDACTED]), hyperglycemia (2.5% versus [REDACTED]), febrile neutropenia (1.7% versus [REDACTED]), amylase increased (0.8% versus [REDACTED]), alanine aminotransferase increased (2.5% versus [REDACTED]), aspartate aminotransferase increased (2.5% versus [REDACTED]), and neutropenic colitis (2.5% versus [REDACTED]).

In COG AALL07P4, the percentage of patients who stopped study treatment due to an AE was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase group, respectively. Reasons for stopping study treatment due to an AE were not reported. In DFCI 11-001, the percentage of patients who stopped study treatment due to an AE was 28.0% in the calaspargase pegol group and 19.3% in the pegaspargase group. Withdrawals due to AEs in the calaspargase pegol group versus the pegaspargase were due to hypersensitivity (8.5% versus [REDACTED]), lipase increased (6.8% versus [REDACTED]), pancreatitis (5.9% [REDACTED]), drug hypersensitivity (5.1% versus [REDACTED]), amylase increased (4.2% versus [REDACTED]), and anaphylactic reaction (1.7% versus [REDACTED]).

[REDACTED]

Notable harms identified in the CADTH review included hypersensitivity reactions, anaphylactic reactions, silent inactivation, pancreatitis, thrombosis, hemorrhage, and hepatotoxicity. In COG AALL07P4, [REDACTED] of patients in the calaspargase pegol and [REDACTED] of

patients in the pegaspargase group experienced hypersensitivity events. In DFCI 11-001, █ of patients in the calaspargase pegol group and █ of patients in the pegaspargase group experienced hypersensitivity events. In COG AALL07P4, 25.6% of patients in the calaspargase pegol group and 19.2% of patients in the pegaspargase group experienced anaphylactic reactions. In DFCI 11-001, █ of patients in each treatment group experienced anaphylactic reactions. In COG AALL07P4, silent inactivation was not reported by any patient. In DFCI 11-001, 1.7% of patients in the calaspargase pegol group experienced silent inactivation and were switched to Erwinia asparaginase treatment. In COG AALL07P4, 18.6% and 7.7% of patients experienced pancreatitis in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. In DFCI 11-001, 11.9% and 16.8% of patients experienced pancreatitis in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. In COG AALL07P4, venous thrombosis was █. In DFCI 11-001, █ of patients experienced venous thrombosis in each of the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups. █ experienced hemorrhage in COG AALL07P4 or DFCI 11-001. In COG AALL07P4 the percentage of patients who experienced increased blood bilirubin was 62.8% and 50.0%; the percentage of patients who experienced increased alanine aminotransferase was 34.9% and 38.5% in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. In DFCI 11-001, the percentage of patients who experienced increased blood bilirubin was 45.8% and 43.7%, and for increased alanine aminotransferase was 78.8% and 77.3% in the calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase groups, respectively. █ in the calaspargase pegol group experienced hepatic failure.

Critical Appraisal

COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 were phase II, randomized, open-label RCTs. Randomization appeared to be adequate in COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 since treatment groups were generally balanced for key baseline characteristics and therefore likely to be at low risk for selection bias. The open-label study design may have biased outcomes with subjective assessments for harms due to knowledge of assigned treatment, although the direction for potential bias is unclear. The COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 trial were not designed to assess comparative efficacy between calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase. The sample sizes (N = 97 in COG AALL07P4 and N = 239 in DFCI 11-001) were relatively small and the magnitude of the treatment effect estimates observed in a small study sample may not be replicable in a larger study sample. Findings from COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 were not controlled for multiple comparisons. There were balanced between-group proportions of patients who were censored or had missing outcome data that was unlikely to substantially impact findings in COG AALL07P4 or DFCI 11-001 despite lack of imputation. Differences in trial population and backbone treatment protocols in COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 precluded the ability to combine findings across outcomes. In COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 median survival estimates were not reached at time of data cut-off. Assessments for CR and MRD at day 29 appeared to be appropriate to capture presence or absence of disease at end of remission induction. SAA levels were a primary end point in DFCI 11-001 and have been reported to serve as an important endpoint in assessing calaspargase pegol's ability to maintain asparagine suppression in the plasma, its half-life duration, and its ability to be administered with less dosing frequency than pegaspargase. HRQoL was not assessed in either of the two trials. The comparator used in COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 was appropriate as pegaspargase is a pegylated formulation of asparaginase (calaspargase pegol uses the same mechanism of action as pegaspargase) and is a component of current standard of care. Calaspargase pegol is intended to substitute pegaspargase and would be used for patients who would otherwise received a pegaspargase containing MAC.

COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 were phase II trials and enrolled small samples of patients with ALL. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH remarked that small patient populations are expected given the disease area and a phase III RCT would likely neither be feasible nor ethical to conduct. While patients in the COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 trials were considered representative of patients with ALL, subpopulations of patients excluded from enrollment included pediatric patients with Ph+ status (excluded from COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001), patients with T-cell (excluded from COG AALL07P4), and patients with relapse or refractory disease (excluded from COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001). According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH, effects of treatment with calaspargase pegol could be generalizable to these patients. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that it is anticipated that patients would benefit from treatment with calaspargase pegol based on its similarity to and extrapolation of findings for pegaspargase. Different backbone therapies were employed, with an intermittent versus continuous asparagine depletion protocol for COG AALL07P4 versus DFCI 11-001, respectively. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH observed both COG-based and DFCI-based protocols to be employed by institutions across Canada. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH expected outcomes to be similar regardless of the treatment protocol employed for patients with ALL. Outcomes reported in COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 appeared to be aligned with outcomes of interest for patients with ALL according to the clinical

experts consulted by CADTH. The clinical experts consulted by CADTH highlighted the importance of SAA levels in therapeutic drug monitoring for both efficacy (i.e., adequate asparagine depletion and sustained SAA levels of 0.10 IU/mL or greater) and safety (e.g., hypersensitivity reactions including silent inactivation). In general, the clinical experts consulted by CADTH did not anticipate clinically meaningful differences in efficacy between calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase.

Long-Term Extension Studies

No long-term extension studies were submitted in the systematic review evidence.

Indirect Comparisons

No indirect treatment comparisons were submitted in the systematic review evidence.

Studies Addressing Gaps in the Evidence From the Systematic Review

No additional studies addressing important gaps in the systematic review evidence were identified.

GRADE Summary of Findings and Certainty of the Evidence

Methods for Assessing the Certainty of the Evidence

For pivotal studies and RCTs identified in the sponsor's systematic review, GRADE was used to assess the certainty of the evidence for outcomes considered most relevant to inform CADTH's expert committee deliberations, and a final certainty rating was determined as outlined by the GRADE Working Group. Following the GRADE approach, evidence from RCTs started as high-certainty evidence and could be rated down for concerns related to study limitations (which refers to internal validity or risk of bias), inconsistency across studies, indirectness, imprecision of effects, and publication bias.

The selection of outcomes for GRADE assessment was based on the sponsor's Summary of Clinical Evidence, consultation with clinical experts, and input received from patient and clinician groups and public drug plans. The following list of outcomes was finalized in consultation with expert committee members: survival (OS, DFS, and EFS), CR at end of induction, MRD at end of induction, SAA levels, and harms (withdrawal due to adverse events [WDAEs], hypersensitivity reactions, anaphylactic reactions, and silent inactivation). When possible, certainty was rated in the context of the presence of an important (nontrivial) treatment effect; if this was not possible, certainty was rated in the context of the presence of any treatment effect (i.e., the clinical importance is unclear). In all cases, the target of the certainty of evidence assessment was based on the point estimate and where it was located relative to the threshold for a clinically important effect (when a threshold was available) or to the null. The target of the certainty of evidence assessment was the presence or absence of a clinically important effect for CR at end of induction based on a threshold informed by the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for this review. The target of the certainty of evidence assessment was the presence or absence of any (non-null) effect for survival rates (OS, DFS from CR, EFS), MRD at end of induction, SAA during induction, and harms.

For the GRADE assessments, findings from COG AALL07P4 and DFCI 11-001 were assessed individually because the trials were different in terms of enrolled populations (patients with high-risk B-cell ALL in COG AALL07P4 and patients with ALL and lymphoblastic lymphoma in DFCI 11-001) and employed different treatment protocols (intermittent asparagine depletion in COG AALL07P4 and continuous asparagine depletion in DFCI 11-001).

Table 3: Summary of Findings for Calaspargase pegol Versus Pegaspargase for Patients With High-Risk B-cell Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia in COG AALL07P4

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | | Pegaspargase 2,500 IU/m2 | Calaspargase pegol 2,500 IU/m2 | Difference | | |
| Overall Survival – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive at 1 year Median follow-up: 62.6 months | | | | | | Low ^a | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in overall survival at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Probability of being alive at 4 years Median follow-up: 62.6 months | | | | | | Low ^a | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in overall survival at 4 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Disease-Free Survival from Complete Remission – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive disease-free from complete remission at 1 year Median follow-up: 62.6 months | | | | | | Low ^b | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in disease-free survival from complete remission at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Probability of being alive disease-free from complete remission at 4 years Median follow-up: 62.6 months | | | | | | Moderate ^c | Calaspargase pegol likely results in little to no difference in disease-free survival from complete remission at 4 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Event-Free Survival – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive event-free at 1 year Median follow-up: 62.6 months | | | | | | Low ^a | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in event-free survival at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | Pegaspargase 2,500 IU/m ² | Calaspargase pegol 2,500 IU/m ² | Difference | | |
| Probability of being alive event-free at 4 years Median follow-up: 62.6 months | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | Low ^a | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in event-free survival at 4 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Complete Remission At End of Induction Day 29 – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Complete remission rate at end of induction Follow-up: Day 29 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | Low ^d | Calaspargase pegol may result in an increase in complete remission at end of induction day 29 when compared with pegaspargase. |
| Minimal Residual Disease (positive MRD, ≥ 0.1%) At End of Induction Day 29 – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Positive minimal residual disease (≥ 0.1%) rate at end of induction Follow-up: Day 29 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | Low ^a | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in positive minimal residual disease (≥ 0.1%) at end of induction day 29 when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum Asparaginase Activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL During Remission Induction | | | | | | | |
| Serum asparaginase activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL rate | NA | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | NA | There is no evidence for the effect of calaspargase pegol on serum asparaginase activity when compared with pegaspargase. |
| HRQoL | | | | | | | |
| HRQoL due to treatment | NA | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | NA | There is no evidence for the effect of calaspargase pegol on HRQoL when compared with pegaspargase. |
| Harms – Safety Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Withdrawals due to adverse events Follow-up: Throughout study | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | Very low ^{e,f} | The evidence is very uncertain about the effects on withdrawals due to adverse events of calaspargase pegol when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | Pegaspargase 2,500 IU/m ² | Calaspargase pegol 2,500 IU/m ² | Difference | | |
| Hypersensitivity reactions Follow-up: Throughout study | ████ | █ | ████ | ████ | ██████████ | Low ^f | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in hypersensitivity reactions when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Anaphylactic reactions Follow-up: Throughout study | ████ | █ | ████ | ████ | ██████████ | Low ^f | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in anaphylactic reactions when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Silent inactivation Follow-up: Throughout study | NA | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | NA | There is no evidence for the effect of calaspargase pegol on silent inactivation when compared with pegaspargase. |

ALL = acute lymphoblastic leukemia; CI = confidence interval; HRQoL = health-related quality of life; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported; RCT = randomized controlled trial

Note: Study limitations (which refers to internal validity or risk of bias), inconsistency across studies, indirectness, imprecision of effects, and publication bias were considered when assessing the certainty of the evidence. All serious concerns in these domains that led to the rating down of the level of certainty are documented in the table footnotes.

^a Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. There is no established MID and clinical experts consulted by CADTH could not provide a threshold of important difference. In the absence of a known threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the upper and lower bounds of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of both benefit and harm.

^b Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. No threshold was identified in the literature, but according to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, any difference in disease-free survival could be considered clinically meaningful, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the upper and lower bounds of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of both benefit and harm.

^c Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. No threshold was identified in the literature, but according to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, any difference in disease-free survival could be considered important, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH review team judged that the effect estimate was unlikely to include any important effect; however, the upper bound of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of benefit.

^d Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. No threshold was identified in the literature, but according to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, a 5% difference between groups in complete remission could be considered clinically meaningful; however, the upper and lower bounds of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of both important benefit and important harm.

^e Rated down 1 level for risk of bias. The open-label study design may have biased withdrawals due to adverse events from patients' and assessors' knowledge of assigned treatment, although the direction of potential bias is unclear. Moreover, the clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that since asparaginase is given as part of a multi-agent chemotherapy protocol, it is challenging to attribute differences in AEs observed in small numbers of patients to a single treatment protocol component.

^f Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. In the absence of an established threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the effect estimate was based on very few events. Moreover, the clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that since asparaginase is given as part of a multi-agent chemotherapy protocol, it is challenging to attribute differences in AEs observed in small numbers of patients to a single treatment protocol component.

Source: COG AALL07P4 Clinical Study Report. Details included in the table were provided from sponsor in response to additional data request.

Table 4: Summary of Findings for Calaspargase pegol Versus Pegaspargase for Patients With Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia in DFCI 11-001

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | | Pegaspargase | Calaspargase pegol | Difference | | |
| Overall Survival – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive at 1 year Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Moderate ^a | Calaspargase pegol likely results in little to no difference in overall survival at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Probability of being alive at 2 years Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Low ^b | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in overall survival at 4 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Disease-Free Survival from Complete Remission – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive disease-free from complete remission at 1 year Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Low ^c | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in disease-free survival from complete remission at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Probability of being alive disease-free from complete remission at 2 years Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Moderate ^d | Calaspargase pegol likely results in little to no difference in disease-free survival at 2 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Event-Free Survival – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Probability of being alive event-free at 1 year Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Low ^e | Calaspargase may result in little to no difference in event-free survival at 1 year when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | | Pegaspargase | Calaspargase pegol | Difference | | |
| Probability of being alive event-free at 2 years Median follow-up: 26.6 months | | | | | | Moderate ^a | Calaspargase likely results in little to no difference in event-free survival at 2 years when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Complete Remission At End of Induction – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Complete remission rate at end of induction Follow-up: Day 32 | | | | | | Moderate ^f | Calaspargase pegol likely results in little to no difference in complete remission at end of induction day 32 when compared with pegaspargase. |
| Minimal Residual Disease (≥ 0.01) At End of Induction – Full Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Minimal residual disease ≥ 0.01 rate Follow-up: Day 32 | | | | | | Low ^b | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in minimal residual disease (≥ 0.01) at end of induction day 32 when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum Asparaginase Activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL During Remission Induction – Pharmacokinetic Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Serum asparaginase activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL rate Follow-up: Day 7 (4 min to 5 min post-infusion) | | | | | | Low ^h | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in SAA ≥ 0.10 IU/mL 4 minutes to 5 minutes post-infusion when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum asparaginase activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL rate Follow-up: Day 11 (4 days after dose) | | | | | | Low ^h | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in SAA ≥ 0.10 IU/mL 4 days post-infusion when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum asparaginase activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL rate Follow-up: Day 18 (11 days after dose) | | | | | | Low ^h | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in SAA ≥ 0.10 IU/mL 11 days post-infusion when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum asparaginase activity ≥ 0.10 IU/mL rate | | | | | | Moderate ⁱ | Calaspargase pegol likely results in little to no difference in SAA ≥ 0.10 IU/mL 18 days post-infusion when compared with |

| Outcome and follow-up | Patients (studies), N | Relative effect (95% CI) | Absolute effects (95% CI) | | | Certainty | What happens |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | | Pegaspargase | Calaspargase pegol | Difference | | |
| Follow-up: Day 25 (18 days after dose) | | | | | | | pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Serum asparaginase activity \geq 0.10 IU/mL rate | | | | | | Moderate ^j | Calaspargase pegol likely results in a greater proportion of patients with SAA \geq 0.10 IU/mL 25 days post-infusion when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Follow-up: Day 32 (25 days after dose) | | | | | | | |
| HRQoL | | | | | | | |
| HRQoL due to treatment | NA | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | No data available. | NA | There is no evidence for the effect of calaspargase pegol on HRQoL when compared with pegaspargase. |
| Harms – Safety Analysis Set | | | | | | | |
| Withdrawals due to adverse events | | | | | | Very low ^{k,l} | The evidence is very uncertain for the effect of calaspargase pegol in withdrawals due to adverse events when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty in the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Follow-up: Throughout study | | | | | | | |
| Hypersensitivity reactions | | | | | | Low ^l | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in hypersensitivity reactions when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Follow-up: Throughout study | | | | | | | |
| Anaphylactic reactions | | | | | | Low ^l | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in anaphylactic reactions when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Follow-up: Throughout study | | | | | | | |
| Silent inactivation | | | | | | Low ^l | Calaspargase pegol may result in little to no difference in silent inactivation when compared with pegaspargase. There is some uncertainty about the clinical importance of the estimates. |
| Follow-up: Throughout study | | | | | | | |

ALL = acute lymphoblastic leukemia; CI = confidence interval; HRQoL = health-related quality of life; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported; RCT = randomized controlled trial; SAA = serum asparaginase activity; WDAE = withdrawal due to adverse event.

Note: Study limitations (which refers to internal validity or risk of bias), inconsistency across studies, indirectness, imprecision of effects, and publication bias were considered when assessing the certainty of the evidence. All serious concerns in these domains that led to the rating down of the level of certainty are documented in the table footnotes.

^a Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. There is no known threshold and clinical experts consulted by CADTH could not provide a threshold of important difference. In the absence of a known threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the lower bound of the 95% CI for the difference between groups suggested a possibility of harm.

^b Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. In the absence of a known threshold, the CADTH team rated their certainty in a non-zero effect. Although no threshold (i.e., the null) is crossed, the effect estimate is based on very few events in each group.

^c Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, any difference in disease-free survival could be considered clinically meaningful, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the effect estimate was based on very few events.

^d Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, any difference in disease-free survival could be considered clinically meaningful, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH review team judged the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the lower bound of the 95% CI for the difference between groups suggested a possibility of harm.

^e Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. There is no established MID and clinical experts consulted by CADTH could not provide a threshold of important difference. In the absence of a known threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the upper and lower bounds of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of both benefit and harm.

^f Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. No known threshold was identified but according to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH for the review, a 5% difference between groups in complete remission could be considered clinically meaningful. The CADTH review team judged that the effect estimate was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the lower bound of the 95% CI for difference between groups suggested a possibility of important harm.

^g Odds ratios of SAA levels were estimated using a generalized estimating equation (GEE) model for comparing categorical SAA levels between treatments, with 90% confidence intervals, adjusted for the following: treatment, actual sampling time points, and interaction of treatment and actual sampling time points as effects.

^h Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. In the absence of a known threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the effect estimate was based on very few events.

ⁱ Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. There is no known threshold and clinical experts consulted by CADTH could not provide a threshold of important difference, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the 95% CI for the difference between groups suggested a possibility of benefit.

^j Rated down 1 level for serious imprecision. There is no known threshold and clinical experts consulted by CADTH could not provide a threshold of important difference, so the null was used as the threshold. The CADTH team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was likely to include an important benefit. Both lower and upper boundaries of the 95% CI of the between-group difference suggested a possibility of benefit. Although no threshold (i.e., the null) was crossed, the effect estimate was based on relatively few events in each group.

^k Rated down 1 level for risk of bias due to open-label study design and patients' and assessors' knowledge of assigned treatment. The open-label study design may have biased withdrawals due to adverse events from knowledge of assigned treatment, although the direction of potential bias is unclear. Moreover, the clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that since asparaginase is given as part of a multi-agent chemotherapy protocol, it is challenging to attribute differences in AEs observed in small numbers of patients to a single treatment protocol component.

^l Rated down 2 levels for very serious imprecision. In the absence of an established threshold, the null was used. The CADTH review team judged that the point estimate for the between-group difference was unlikely to include an important effect; however, the effect estimate was based on very few events. Moreover, the clinical experts consulted by CADTH noted that since asparaginase is given as part of a multi-agent chemotherapy protocol, it is challenging to attribute differences in AEs observed in small numbers of patients to a single treatment protocol component.

Source: DFCI 11-001 Clinical Study Report. Details included in the table were provided from sponsor in response to additional data request.

Economic Evidence

Note: The sponsor's application was filed on a pre-Notice of Compliance (NOC) basis and the pharmacoeconomic submission is reflective of the proposed indication and information incorporated in the draft product monograph that was submitted to Health Canada and CADTH. The sponsor's submission included a broader age range than the final indication; however, other details incorporated in the final product monograph were not considered within the review, which suggested the potential for increased resource use associated with calaspargase pegol.

Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

Table 4: Summary of Economic Evaluation

| Component | Description |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Type of economic evaluation | Cost-utility analysis Combination decision tree and PSM |
| Target population | Patients with ALL receiving an asparaginase-containing MAC regimen |
| Treatment | Calaspargase pegol as a component of a MAC regimen |
| Dose regimen | 2,500 units per m ² given intravenously no more frequently than every 21 days |
| Submitted price | \$7,441.88 per 3,750 units/5 mL (750 units/mL) vial |
| Treatment cost | \$52,093 per patient, based on a 7-dose course of treatment as per the COG AALL07P4 trial protocol |
| Comparator | Pegaspargase (Oncaspar) |
| Perspective | Canadian publicly funded health care payer |
| Outcomes | QALYs, LYs |
| Time horizon | Lifetime (89 years) |
| Key data sources | The Children's Oncology Group (COG) AALL07P4 trial The Dana-Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI) 11-001 trial |
| Key limitations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparative clinical efficacy and safety of calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase is uncertain. The CADTH clinical appraisal identified uncertainty in the available clinical evidence, due to differences between groups due to small sample sizes, wide confidence intervals, and the absence of clinically meaningful thresholds. Despite the uncertainty with the clinical evidence, based on clinical expert feedback obtained by CADTH, and the CADTH appraisal, calaspargase pegol is expected to have little to no difference in OS, DFS, EFS, MRD, hypersensitivity reactions and anaphylactic reactions compared with pegaspargase. In the sponsor's submitted economic analysis, patient characteristics were assumed to be comparable with the population in the COG AALL07P4 trial. However, clinical expert feedback obtained by CADTH indicated the patient population in the COG AALL07P4 trial is not representative pediatric population observed in Canadian clinical practice, and that the DFCI trial population more accurately represents the age of the patient population with ALL at treatment initiation. The sponsor assumed both calaspargase pegol and pegaspargase treatment would be provided for 38 weeks, although clinical expert feedback indicated that the total duration of MAC treatment for patients with ALL who respond is approximately 2.5 to 3.5 years. If the treatment duration of asparaginase therapies differs, total treatment costs may differ. Comparator pricing is not publicly available. Pegaspargase acquisition costs were provided by Servier Canada and could not be validated by CADTH. CADTH noted that availability of and accessibility to pegaspargase may vary based on jurisdiction. Although the sponsor suggested that calaspargase pegol would only be used for patients who would have otherwise received pegaspargase, CADTH could not address the validity of this assertion. Therefore, it is uncertain if the reimbursement of calaspargase pegol will result in fewer incremental costs than pegaspargase. |
| CADTH reanalysis results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CADTH undertook a reanalysis to address limitations which included assuming equivalent clinical efficacy, assuming equivalent adverse event (AE) management costs and altering characteristics of patients that enter the model to more closely reflect Canadian clinical practice. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the CADTH base case, calaspargase pegol is associated with a higher cost (incremental cost = \$4,088) and equal QALYs compared with pegaspargase. • CADTH could not validate the price of pegaspargase paid by CADTH-participating drug plans. As such, the magnitude of price reduction may be required to ensure no additional costs are incurred is uncertain. |
|--|---|

AE = adverse event; ALL = acute lymphoblastic leukemia; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; LY = life-year; MAC = multi-agent chemotherapeutic; PSM = partitioned survival model; QALY= quality-adjusted life-year

Budget Impact

CADTH identified the following key limitations with the sponsor’s analysis: patient characteristics in the BIA did not align with the CUA; distribution of the DFCI 11-001 trial protocol for the pediatric population was not representative of clinical practice; and the pricing, availability, and accessibility of pegaspargase across Canada is uncertain.

CADTH reanalysis included updating the distribution of the trial protocol for the pediatric population to align with the COG AALL07P4 trial. Under this change, the CADTH reanalysis reported that the reimbursement of calaspargase pegol as a component of MAC for the treatment of patients with ALL would be associated with a budgetary increase of \$913,376 in year 1, \$1,841,318 in year 2, and \$1,856,090 in year 3, with a 3-year total of \$4,610,784. This may underestimate the budget impact of reimbursing calaspargase pegol given the uncertainty associated with the price and availability of pegaspargase across Canada.

pERC Information

Members of the Committee:

Dr. Maureen Trudeau (Chair), Mr. Daryl Bell, Dr. Phillip Blanchette, Dr. Kelvin Chan, Dr. Matthew Cheung, Dr. Michael Crump, Dr. Jennifer Fishman, Mr. Terry Hawrysh, Dr. Yoo-Joung Ko, Dr. Christian Kollmannsberger, 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: October 11, 2023

Regrets:

None

Conflicts of interest:

None