

CADTH REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW

Stakeholder Feedback on Draft Recommendation

VERICIGUAT (Verquvo)

(Bayer Inc.)

Indication: for the treatment of symptomatic chronic heart failure in adult patients with reduced ejection fraction who are stabilized after a recent heart failure decompensation event requiring hospitalization and/or intravenous diuretic therapy. VERQUVO should be used in combination with standard of care therapy for heart failure.

June 2, 2023

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 here.



CADTH Reimbursement Review

Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information	
CADTH project number	SR0758
Name of the drug and	Vericiguat (Verquvo) for chronic heart failure
Indication(s)	
Organization Providing	FWG
Feedback	

1. Recommendation revisions Please indicate if the stakeholder requires the expert review committee to reconsider or clarify its recommendation.				
Request for Reconsideration	Major revisions: A change in recommendation category or patient population is requested			
	Minor revisions: A change in reimbursement conditions is requested			
No Request for Reconsideration	Editorial revisions: Clarifications in recommendation text are requested	Х□		
	No requested revisions			

2. Change in recommendation category or conditions Complete this section if major or minor revisions are requested

Please identify the specific text from the recommendation and provide a rationale for requesting a change in recommendation.

3. Clarity of the recommendation Complete this section if editorial revisions are requested for the following elements a) Recommendation rationale Please provide details regarding the information that requires clarification. b) Reimbursement conditions and related reasons Please provide details regarding the information that requires clarification. c) Implementation guidance



Please provide high-level details regarding the information that requires clarification. You can provide specific comments in the draft recommendation found in the next section. Additional implementation questions can be raised here.



CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information					
CADTH project number	SR0758-000				
Brand name (generic)	vericiguat				
Indication(s)	Heart failure				
Organization	HeartLife				
Contact information ^a	Name:Marc Bains				
Stakeholder agreement wi	th the draft recommendation				
1. Does the stakeholder agree with the committee's recommendation.					
possible, please identify the	eholder agrees or disagrees with the draft recommendation. W specific text from the recommendation and rationale.	'henev	er		
Expert committee consideration of the stakeholder input					
2. Does the recommendation demonstrate that the committee has considered the			\boxtimes		
stakeholder input that your organization provided to CADTH?					
If not, what aspects are missing from the draft recommendation?					
Clarity of the draft recomm	nendation				
2 Are the recent for the	rocommondation algority stated?	Yes	\boxtimes		
3. Are the reasons for the l	recommendation clearly stated?	No			
If not, please provide details regarding the information that requires clarification.					
4. Have the implementation issues been clearly articulated and adequately			\boxtimes		
addressed in the recommendation?					
If not, please provide details	regarding the information that requires clarification.				
5. If applicable, are the reimbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale for the conditions provided in the recommendation?			\boxtimes		
If not, please provide details	regarding the information that requires clarification.				

^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 <u>Procedures for CADTH Drug Reimbursement Reviews</u> for further details.

A. Patient G	roup Information					
Name	Marc Bains					
Position	Co-Founder Co-Founder					
Date	21/05/2023					
	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 you	receive help from outside you	r potiont arou	n ta aammiata u	aur faadbaak?	No	\boxtimes
1. Did you	receive help from outside you	r patient grou	p to complete y	our reeupack?	Yes	
If yes, please	e detail the help and who provide	d it.				
2. Did you receive help from outside your patient group to collect or analyze any						\boxtimes
information used in your feedback?						
• • •	e detail the help and who provide					
	ly Disclosed Conflict of Interes					
	onflict of interest declarations				. No	
	ed at the outset of the CADTH ged? If no, please complete se			ations remained	d Yes	
D. New or U	pdated Conflict of Interest Dec	laration				
	companies or organizations t o years AND who may have dir		interest in the	drug under revi	ew.	over the
Check Appropriate Dollar Range				nge		
Company		\$0 to 5,000	\$5,001 to 10,000	\$10,001 to 50,000	In Excess of \$50,000	
Add compan	y name					
Add compan	y name				[3
Add or remo	ve rows as required					



CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation

Stakeholder information				
CADTH project number	SR0758-000			
Brand name (generic)	VERQUVO (vericiguat)			
Indication(s)	Heart Failure			
Organization	Bayer			
Contact information ^a				
Stakeholder agreement wi	ith the draft recommendation			
1. Does the stakeholder agree with the committee's recommendation.				
rationale, which includes the clinical meaningful reduction for heart failure" and that VE added clinical benefit for pa	ADTH recommendation for VERQUVO (vericiguat), and the e clinical evidence of VERQUVO providing a "statistically sign in the hazard of a first event of cardiovascular (CV) death or hos ERQUVO, "when added to dual or triple background HF therapy tients…". Bayer is also in agreement with the committee's conceidentified in patients with HFrEF" treated with VERQUVO.	nificant spitaliza result	and ation ed in	
Expert committee conside	eration of the stakeholder input			
	on demonstrate that the committee has considered the	Yes	\boxtimes	
stakeholder input that y	our organization provided to CADTH?	No		
Bayer disagrees that there was stated in previous input guided by those proposed (SCTI) and the US Food and CV deaths is considered	ne committee considered most of the input provided by Bayer was "the potential misclassification of CV deaths in the VICTOR provided by Bayer, the endpoint definitions of the VICTORIA by the Standardized Data Collection for Cardiovascular Triand Drug Administration (FDA). The inclusion of undetermined a common analytical approach by the SCTI and standard such, Bayer maintains that the classification of CV deaths in the	RIA trial v ls Initial I death d for I	al". were ative as as large	
Clarity of the draft recomm	mendation			
3. Are the reasons for the	recommendation clearly stated?	Yes No		
The reasons for the recomm	nendation are clearly stated.			
4. Have the implementation addressed in the recommendation and the r	n issues been clearly articulated and adequately mendation?	Yes No		

The implementation issues have been clearly articulated and adequately addressed in the

recommendation.

5. If applicable, are the reimbursement conditions clearly stated and the rationale		\boxtimes
for the conditions provided in the recommendation?		

Bayer acknowledges the clarity of the reimbursement conditions but does not agree with the pricing condition and the underlying rationale provided. A recommended "price reduction of 14%" was based on CADTH's application of highly conservative assumptions in the economic evaluation, including extrapolating a linear declining treatment effect for VERQUVO that Bayer considers to be clinically implausible. It is well documented that heart failure hospitalizations (HFH) are positively associated with an increased and sustained risk of subsequent HFH and death. As VERQUVO has been shown to reduce HFH and CV mortality over the trial duration, a longer-term positive impact of VERQUVO treatment on future HFH and death than what was assumed in the CADTH economic re-analysis is a more likely outcome.

References

- 1) Hicks KA, Mahaffey KW, Mehran R, Nissen SE, Wiviott SD, Dunn B, et al. 2017 Cardiovascular and Stroke Endpoint Definitions for Clinical Trials. Circulation. 2018;137(9):961-72.
- 2) Fanaroff AC, Clare R, Pieper KS, Mahaffey KW, Melloni C, Green JB, et al. Frequency, Regional Variation, and Predictors of Undetermined Cause of Death in Cardiometabolic Clinical Trials: A Pooled Analysis of 9259 Deaths in 9 Trials. Circulation. 2019;139(7):863-73.

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