

CADTH Reimbursement Review

# CADTH Reimbursement Recommendation

(Draft)

Dupilumab (Dupixent)

Indication: For the treatment of patients aged 6 months and older with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable.

Sponsor: Sanofi-Aventis Canada Inc.

Recommendation: Reimburse with Conditions

**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 Canadian Drug Expert Committee (CDEC) recommends that dupilumab be reimbursed for the treatment of patients aged 6 months to 12 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis (AD) whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable, only if the conditions listed in Table 1 are met.

The CDEC recommendation for dupilumab for the treatment of patients aged 12 years and older with moderate-to-severe AD dated February 06, 2023, continues to apply to patients who are not included in the population evaluated in this submission.

## Rationale for the Recommendation

Two double-blind, randomized clinical trials (RCTs) (LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL, N = 162, and LIBERTY AD PEDS, N = 367) evaluated the use of dupilumab in patients with AD whose disease was not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies. LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL enrolled patients 6 months to less than 6 years of age with moderate-to-severe AD, and LIBERTY AD PEDS enrolled patients 6 years to less than 12 years of age with severe AD. Both LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL and LIBERTY AD PEDS trials demonstrated that, compared with placebo in combination with topical corticosteroids (TCSs), 16 weeks of treatment with dupilumab in combination with TCSs was associated with statistically significant and clinically meaningful improvements in a range of outcomes that are important to patients, caregivers, and clinicians in the management of AD, including overall severity of AD (Eczema Area and Severity Index [EASI] and Investigator's Global Assessment [IGA] response), intensity of itching (itch numeric rating scale [NRS]), and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) (Dermatitis Family Index [DFI], Children's Dermatology Life Quality Index [CDLQI], and Infants' Dermatology Quality of Life Index [IDQoL], the last of which was only assessed in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial).

Patients and caregivers identified a need for treatment options that effectively manage the disease, improve symptoms, improve HRQoL, and are simpler to administer. CDEC concluded that dupilumab appears to address some of these needs, such as improving all disease-related symptoms, including itching and disease severity, and also meaningful improvement in HRQoL.

Using the sponsor submitted price for dupilumab and publicly listed prices for all other drug costs, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for dupilumab plus best supportive care (BSC) was \$130,945 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained compared with BSC alone. At this ICER, dupilumab is not cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY willingness to pay (WTP) threshold for patients aged 6 months to <12 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable. A price reduction is required for dupilumab to be considered cost-effective at a \$50,000 per QALY threshold.

**Table 1: Reimbursement Conditions and Reasons**

Reimbursement condition	Reason	Implementation guidance
<b>Initiation</b>		
1. Patients 6 months to less than 12 years old with moderate-to-severe AD whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable.	The LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL and LIBERTY AD PEDS trials enrolled patients with 6 months to less than 6 years old with moderate-to-severe AD and 6 years to less than 12 years old with severe AD, respectively.	Based on the trials, moderate-to-severe AD is defined as an EASI score of 16 points or higher, or an IGA score of 3 or 4.  Adequate control and refractory disease are optimally defined using similar criteria to those used in the dupilumab RCTs, such as achieving an EASI-75.
2. The physician must provide the Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) score and Investigator Global Assessment score at the time of initial request for reimbursement	The LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial enrolled patients 6 months to 6 years old with an EASI score of 16 points or higher, and an IGA score of 3 or higher. The LIBERTY AD PEDS trials enrolled patients with an EASI score of 21 points or higher, and an IGA score of 4.	—
3. The maximum duration of initial authorization is 6 months.	Response to treatment in the pivotal trials was assessed at 16 weeks; however, the clinical experts noted to CDEC that an initial authorization period of 6 months would be reasonable considering that atopic dermatitis is a chronic disease and dupilumab is expected to be a relatively long-term treatment	—
<b>Renewal</b>		
4. The physician must provide proof of beneficial clinical effect when requesting continuation of reimbursement, defined as a 75% or greater improvement from baseline in the EASI score (EASI-75) 6 months after treatment initiation.	The EASI-75 was a key secondary end point in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL and LIBERTY AD PEDS trials.  The clinical expert noted to CDEC that in clinical practice, the response to treatment is assessed 6 months after initiating dupilumab, then every 6 months thereafter.	—
5. The physician must provide proof of maintenance of EASI-75 response from baseline every 6 months for subsequent authorizations.		The clinical experts noted to CDEC that if the patient reaches age 12 years old after initiating dupilumab, renewal is not contingent upon the attempt of or failure of other systemic therapy and/or phototherapy but rather on maintaining EASI-75 response.
<b>Prescribing</b>		
6. The patient must be under the care of a dermatologist, allergist, clinical immunologist, or pediatrician who has expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe AD.	Accurate diagnosis and follow-up of patients with refractory moderate-to-severe AD is important to ensure that dupilumab is prescribed to the most appropriate patients.	CDEC noted that in communities with limited access to specialists, family physicians may need to be considered by jurisdictions to prescribe dupilumab in consultation with a dermatologist, allergist, clinical immunologist, or pediatrician who has expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe AD.

Reimbursement condition	Reason	Implementation guidance
7. Dupilumab should not be used in combination with phototherapy, any immunomodulatory drugs (including biologics or a JAK inhibitor treatment) for moderate-to-severe AD	There is no evidence to demonstrate a beneficial effect of dupilumab when used in combination with phototherapy, any immunomodulatory agents (biologics or JAK inhibitor treatment) for moderate-to-severe AD.	—
<b>Pricing</b>		
8. A reduction in price	<p>The ICER for dupilumab plus BSC is \$130,945 when compared with BSC alone.</p> <p>A price reduction of 54% would be required for dupilumab to achieve an ICER of \$50,000 per QALY gained compared to BSC alone.</p>	—
<b>Feasibility of adoption</b>		
9. The feasibility of adoption of dupilumab must be addressed	At the submitted price, the incremental budget impact of dupilumab is expected to be greater than \$40 million in year 1, 2, and 3. The magnitude of uncertainty in the budget impact must be addressed to ensure the feasibility of adoption, given the difference between the sponsor's estimate and CADTH's estimate(s).	—

AD = atopic dermatitis; CDEC = Canadian Drug Expert Committee; EASI = Eczema Area and Severity Index; EASI-75 = improvement of 75% or greater in the Eczema Area and Severity Index total score; IGA = Investigator Global Assessment; JAK = Janus Kinase; TCI = topical calcineurin inhibitors; TCS = topical corticosteroid.

## Discussion Points

- CDEC discussed that pediatric patients younger than 12 years of age should not be required to fail phototherapy or systemic immunosuppressants (e.g., cyclosporine, methotrexate, azathioprine, or mycophenolate mofetil) in order to access dupilumab as these are uncommon therapies for this age group in Canada. The clinical experts noted to CDEC that 12 years of age is not a clinically meaningful threshold and should not necessitate changes in clinical management. CDEC discussed that once they reach 12 years old, patients should not be required to try phototherapy or other systemic immunosuppressants, and that if they have initiated and meet the renewal criteria of dupilumab before the age of 12 years, they should be allowed to continue using dupilumab after that.
- The clinical experts noted to CDEC that some patients may have moderate atopic dermatitis, but an EASI score lower than 16 points. Additionally, some patients may have a low BSA, but severe lesions localized to special areas (e.g., hands, feet, scalp) who could be treated with dupilumab. CDEC discussed that there is no evidence available for this subgroup of patients.
- CDEC discussed that patients could outgrow atopic dermatitis presented during childhood; however, the clinical experts noted that this is less likely for patients with severe disease, other atopic comorbidities, or persistent and generalized atopic dermatitis. In order to ensure prudent use of the drug, the clinical experts suggested that a trial of increasing the time between injections once disease control is achieved with the plan to stop dupilumab altogether is an option to be considered between the treating physician, patient, and caregiver, though stopping the drug should not be mandated. Furthermore, CDEC discussed that patients who stop treatment after an adequate treatment response and subsequently experience residual and persistent disease requiring reinitiation of dupilumab should not be required to meet the initiation criteria again before restarting treatment if they are younger than 12 years of age or if they have already reached 12 years of age.

- No direct or indirect comparative evidence was available comparing dupilumab with other drugs commonly used in the treatment of AD. Both RCTs compared dupilumab with placebo. Hence, the magnitude of clinical benefit with dupilumab compared with alternative therapies such as systemic therapies is unknown.
- Patients identified a need for a treatment that is safe and effective. CDEC discussed that the duration of the 2 trials reviewed is not adequate to assess long-term efficacy and safety of dupilumab.
- CDEC discussed the uncertainty in the economic analysis, specifically that in the absence of comparative evidence beyond 16-weeks for the reimbursement population, the incremental gain in QALYs with dupilumab plus BSC predicted in CADTH's reanalysis may still overestimate the incremental benefits relative to BSC alone, and further price reductions may therefore be required.
- The clinical experts noted to CDEC that the distinction between moderate and severe atopic dermatitis is not well defined and likely varies among physicians. Although there is a lack of data for dupilumab in patients with moderate disease between 6 years and 12 years old CDEC also discussed that there is evidence available for moderate patients who are younger than 6 and older than 12, in addition, the experts expect that dupilumab would likely work in these patients similarly to patients with severe disease. They also noted that the magnitude of benefit may appear to be greater in patients with severe atopic dermatitis due to them having a larger range for improvement compared to patients with moderate atopic dermatitis.

## Background

Atopic dermatitis is a chronic, relapsing, inflammatory skin condition characterized by intense itching, red and swollen skin, and rash. The condition is estimated to affect 15% to 20% of children globally and in Canada, the lifetime prevalence of atopic dermatitis is up to 17% of the population. Pediatric patients with atopic dermatitis experience substantial symptom burden, poor sleep quality, reduced HRQoL, and frequent comorbidities. The care required for these pediatric patients can be time-consuming and interferes with day-to-day activities, leading to increased feelings of caregiver anxiety, depression, worry, and helplessness. According to the clinical experts consulted by CADTH, the goals of treatment for pediatric patients with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis are to reduce symptom severity and improve HRQoL with minimal adverse effects as well as reduce caregiver burden. Treatments include moisturizers and topical anti-inflammatory drugs; however, these are noted as being time consuming and can have side effects, which can lead to low compliance and refractory disease. Phototherapy and systemic immunosuppressants (off-label use) are occasionally used in patients with severe disease who do not respond to topicals or in addition to topicals, though use of systemic immunosuppressants is uncommon in patients under 5 years and rare in patients under 2 years as these therapies have significant limitations and intolerable adverse effects.

Dupilumab has been approved by Health Canada for the treatment of patients aged 6 months and older with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable, and can be used with or without TCS. Dupilumab is a recombinant human immunoglobulin G4 monoclonal antibody that inhibits interleukin (IL)-4 and IL-13. For patients 6 months to 11 years old, the drug is available as pre-filled syringes containing either 200 mg or 300 mg dupilumab for subcutaneous injection with age and weight-based dosing. For pediatric patients 6 to 17 years of age with atopic dermatitis, the recommended dose is 300 mg Q4W (15 kg to less than 30 kg), 200 mg Q2W (30 kg to less than 60 kg), or 300 mg Q2W (at least 60 kg) following an initial dose of 600 mg, 400 mg, or 600 mg, respectively. For pediatric patients 6 months to 5 years of age with atopic dermatitis, the recommended dose is 200 mg Q4W (5 kg to less than 15 kg) and 300 mg Q4W (15 kg to less than 30 kg).

## Submission History

Dupilumab has been previously reviewed 3 times by CADTH for the treatment of patients with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable: as a new drug in 2018, as a resubmission for an expanded indication in 2020, and as a request for advice in 2022. The initial review for dupilumab was for the treatment of adult patients with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable. The original CADTH systematic review of dupilumab included 4 DB RCTs, the SOLO-1 (N = 671), SOLO-2 (N = 708), LIBERTY AD CAFÉ (N = 325), and LIBERTY AD CHRONOS (N = 740) trials. All trials included patients with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis, and patients were randomized to

dupilumab every week or every other week, or placebo, for a treatment duration of 16 weeks (in the SOLO studies and the LIBERTY AD CAFÉ trial) or 52 weeks (in the LIBERTY AD CHRONOS trial). In July 2018, CDEC issued a recommendation that dupilumab should not be reimbursed for this indication. Reasons for the CDEC recommendation included the lack of evidence comparing dupilumab to other drugs commonly used for managing atopic dermatitis, the lack of long-term safety data, concerns over generalizability of the data to patients who would be expected to use the drug in clinical practice, and a lack of efficacy and safety data for dupilumab in patients for whom topical prescription therapies are not advisable. A resubmission was subsequently filed by the sponsor for a new indication, which expanded the initial patient population limited to adults to include adolescents. In April 2020, CDEC issued a recommendation that dupilumab should be reimbursed for the treatment of atopic dermatitis only if conditions are met. A request for advice was filed in July 2022 by the public drug programs that participate in the CADTH reimbursement review process to address discordant reimbursement conditions between dupilumab and Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors (upadacitinib and abrocitinib), which were recommended to be reimbursed with conditions for the treatment of AD. In February 2023, CDEC issued a recommendation that dupilumab should be reimbursed for the treatment of patients aged 12 years and older with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis (AD) whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable only if conditions were met.

In April 2023, dupilumab received a Notice of Compliance from Health Canada for an expansion in indication from 12 years of age and older to 6 months and older. Thus, dupilumab is currently approved for the treatment of patients aged 6 months and older with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable. The current review is for a submission filed by the sponsor and focuses on the expanded age group of patients. This submission is based on new evidence (2 RCT, and 1 long-term extension study) submitted by the sponsor evaluating the use of dupilumab in patients aged 6 months to less than 12 years of age with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable.

## Sources of Information Used by the Committee

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

- a review of 2 phase III, DB clinical studies in patients 6 months to less than 6 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis (LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL) and patients 6 years to less than 12 years with severe atopic dermatitis (LIBERTY AD PEDS)
- patients' perspectives gathered by 3 patient groups, including Eczema Society of Canada, Canadian Skin Patient Alliance, and Eczéma Québec
- input from public drug plans that participate in the CADTH review process
- 2 clinical specialists with expertise diagnosing and treating patients with atopic dermatitis
- input from 1 clinician group, including Canadian Dermatology Association
- a review of the pharmacoeconomic model and report submitted by the sponsor.

## Stakeholder Perspectives

### Patient Input

CADTH received input from 3 patient groups: Eczema Society of Canada and a joint input from Canadian Skin Patient Alliance and Eczéma Québec. The inputs were provided for a previous CADTH submission for dupilumab in 2021, where the indication was for patients aged 6 years to 11 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis. No new patient input was received for the current review of dupilumab.

According to the patient groups, the symptoms of atopic dermatitis negatively affect individuals and their families and interfere with sleep, contribute to missed school and activities, psychosocial issues, and result in an increased risk of mental health problems. The groups stated that disease symptoms, quality of life, access to care, and disease management are concerns that are associated with significant psychosocial, educational, financial, and occupational burden. The authors of the joint input stated that the complex, time-consuming skin treatment routines and other associated burdens make managing the disease very challenging and exhausting. Furthermore, comorbidities associated with pediatric atopic dermatitis require multidisciplinary management and screening to manage the disease. Patients seek a treatment that safely and effectively manages symptoms, reduces flares, and improves the quality of life of both patients and caregivers.

### Clinician input

#### *Input from clinical experts consulted by CADTH*

The clinical experts explained that current topical treatments for atopic dermatitis do not work for all patients, can be burdensome and have low adherence, can have side effects, and some are expensive and not covered by insurance plans. Likewise, systemic immunosuppressants are associated with numerous adverse effects, are poorly tolerated, and require regular blood monitoring. Phototherapy can be inaccessible to patients and is often not feasible for young children.

According to the experts, dupilumab would be used as a second line therapy after failure of an adequate trial with topical therapies (e.g., TCS, topical calcineurin inhibitor [TCI]), but before systemic immunosuppressants due to their poor safety profile. Both experts believed that it would be inappropriate to require patients under the age of 12 years to fail either phototherapy or systemic immunosuppressants before being eligible for dupilumab.

Both clinical experts indicated that patients who could receive dupilumab would be identified based on clinician examination and judgement, taking into account disease severity and inadequate response to topical therapies. They also stated that patients with severe disease that is refractory to topicals and has a major impact on their HRQoL are most in need of effective treatment.

The experts indicated that outcomes used in clinical trials can help to gauge treatment response but are not typically used in clinical practice, except when required by a health insurer. Instead, patient assessments are usually a combination of discussion with the patient and caregiver and examination of the skin. It was noted that patients receiving dupilumab can have a delayed response and that it would be reasonable to assess patients for response to treatment around 3 to 6 months after initiating treatment with dupilumab then every 6 months thereafter.

According to the experts, discontinuation of dupilumab should be considered if there is a lack of response to treatment (e.g., no improvement in rash, itch, or HRQoL) or there are intolerable adverse effects. One clinician added that patients often continue to use topical treatments alongside dupilumab, and that would not be a reason for discontinuing treatment. Although it is possible to outgrow childhood atopic dermatitis, both experts explained that this is less likely for patients with severe disease, other atopic comorbidities, or persistent and generalized atopic dermatitis. It was suggested that a trial of increasing the time between injections once disease control is achieved with the plan to stop dupilumab altogether could be an option discussed and decided on between the treating physician, patient, and caregiver, though stopping the drug should not be forced.

The experts agreed that a specialist (i.e., dermatologist) would prescribe dupilumab, and it would be initiated in a hospital or community clinical setting. In situations where there is limited access to a dermatologist or pediatric dermatologist, the experts



suggested that a general pediatrician, allergist, immunologist, or a physician with training in atopic dermatitis could prescribe the drug.

### Clinician group input

Clinician group input was provided by the Canadian Dermatology Association. The input provided was largely aligned with that of the clinical experts consulted by CADTH. According to the clinician group input, patients can experience long wait times before seeing a specialist while their atopic dermatitis remains poorly controlled. They also noted that most dermatologists in Canada are not trained in, nor are comfortable, managing pediatric safety lab work in the context of systemic immunosuppression. It was highlighted in the input that dupilumab is the only systemic treatment for atopic dermatitis indicated for this age group and does not carry the same risk profile as traditional immunosuppressants. The clinician group stated that an ideal treatment would have a proven safety record in this age group and would also be able to reduce symptoms and improve sleep, concentration at school, and the overall quality of life for both patients and caregivers. It was also emphasized that a trial of systemic immunosuppression should not be a prerequisite for dupilumab coverage in patients aged 6 months to 5 years. The authors of the input highlighted remote Indigenous communities as being vulnerable groups in which individuals with poorly controlled atopic dermatitis tend to be at higher risk for chronic skin diseases and secondary infections and that dupilumab can be a good option for patients in these communities.

### Drug Program Input

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

- considerations for initiation of therapy
- considerations for continuation or renewal of therapy
- considerations for prescribing of therapy
- generalizability of trial populations to the broader populations in the jurisdictions

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

**Table 2: Summary of Drug Plan Input and Clinical Expert Response**

Implementation issues	Response
<b>Considerations for initiation of therapy</b>	
<p>The reimbursement request is for treatment of patients aged 6 months to less than 12 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis. The pivotal trials focused on 2 separate age groups with different disease severity.</p> <p><b>LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL Part B trial:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 months to less than 6 years</li> <li>• Moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis</li> <li>• IGA &gt; 3</li> <li>• EASI ≥ 16</li> <li>• BSA ≥ 10%</li> </ul> <p><b>LIBERTY AD PEDS trial:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 years to less than 12 years</li> <li>• Severe atopic dermatitis</li> <li>• IGA = 4</li> <li>• EASI ≥ 21</li> <li>• BSA ≥ 15%</li> </ul> <p>Should there be different initiation criteria for the 2 age groups, based on the inclusion criteria for the 2 trials?</p>	<p>CDEC and the clinical expert agreed that it would be reasonable to expect that dupilumab would work similarly in patients with moderate atopic dermatitis as those with severe atopic dermatitis who are 6 years to less than 12 years old, based on results from age groups both younger and older that included patients with moderate atopic dermatitis. The clinical experts suggest that initiation criteria should include the full moderate-to-severe range of severity for both age groups.</p> <p>The experts also noted that, in practice, patients with moderate disease can have an EASI less than 16 and could also be considered for dupilumab. They noted that these assessments consider different aspects of the disease, for example, the IGA focuses on lesion severity while the EASI varies more with BSA. The experts explained that assessments performed in clinic can consist of a balance of the severity of the lesions and how widespread the disease is. They described situations in which a patient may have a low EASI score, but could be considered for dupilumab:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More severe lesions that are not widespread (i.e., low BSA) and topicals not effective</li> </ul>

Implementation issues	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low BSA affected, but localized to special areas (e.g., hands, feet, scalp) based on clinical judgement and topicals are not effective</li> </ul>
<p>The reimbursement request is for disease not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable, as per the Health Canada indication. What would be considered an adequate trial of topical prescription therapies?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that an adequate trial of topical prescription therapies would include TCSs or TCIs once or twice daily for at least 4 weeks. Mild TCS (class VI to VII) would be used on the face while moderate (class III to V) or higher would be used on the body. According to the experts, a patient who continues to experience persistent, moderate or severe dermatitis that substantially impacts their quality of life would be considered to have inadequately controlled disease.</p>
<p>Consider alignment with dupilumab for 12 years of age and older, where possible. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physicians must provide the EASI score and Physician Global Assessment score at the time of the initial request for reimbursement.</li> <li>Maximum duration of initial authorization is 6 months.</li> </ul> <p>If reimbursement criteria are recommended for patients aged 6 months to less than 12 years and they do not align with CDEC-recommended initiation criteria for those aged 12 years and older (which require the use of at least 1 systemic immunosuppressant), implementation advice will be required on transitioning patients when they turn 12 years old.</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that patients 6 months to less than 12 years old should not be required to try systemic immunosuppressants or phototherapy before accessing dupilumab. They also stated that 12 years of age is not a clinically meaningful threshold and should not necessitate changes in clinical management. The experts agreed that once reaching 12 years old, patients should not be required to try phototherapy or other systemic immunosuppressants, and that if they have initiated and are responding to dupilumab before the age of 12 years, they should be allowed to continue using dupilumab after that.</p> <p>Given that atopic dermatitis can change over time, the experts also noted to CDEC that a patient (at any age) and their caregiver can discuss with their physician if it is appropriate to stop dupilumab and see if the condition can be managed with topical therapies alone. If the patient experiences residual and persistent disease after stopping, the experts recommended that the patient restarts dupilumab. The clinical experts stated that patients between 6 months and 12 years who stop dupilumab should not be required to meet the initiation criteria again before restarting treatment if they are younger than 12 years of age. Likewise, patients who stop dupilumab before 12 years of age should not be required to meet the initiation criteria (including not having to try phototherapy or systemic immunosuppressants) before restarting treatment after 12 years of age.</p>
<p><b>Considerations for continuation or renewal of therapy</b></p>	
<p>Consider alignment with dupilumab for at least 12 years of age. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physician must provide proof of beneficial clinical effect – defined as a 75% or greater improvement from baseline in the EASI score (EASI-75) 6 months after treatment initiation.</li> <li>Physician must provide proof of maintenance of EASI-75 response from baseline every 6 months for subsequent authorizations.</li> </ul> <p>Patients who are being treated with dupilumab based on any criteria recommended for the population aged 6 months to less than 12 years may not meet the initiation criteria for those 12 years of age and older. How should these patients be assessed upon turning 12 years old (e.g., using baseline values at initiation of treatment against renewal criteria for older than 12 years of age)?</p>	<p>The clinical experts stated that proof of maintenance of disease control would be an important criterion for continuing therapy and, in general, the listed continuation criteria were acceptable for patients 6 months to less than 12 years of age. However, they were less certain if an EASI-75 would be appropriate or reasonable for all patients. They noted that some patients show meaningful improvement, but may not achieve a 75% improvement, which should not preclude them from continuing dupilumab.</p> <p>One expert also suggested that an initial authorization period of 6 months to 12 months would be reasonable considering that atopic dermatitis is a chronic disease and dupilumab is expected to be a relatively long-term treatment.</p> <p>As noted previously, the clinical experts stated that once a patient turns 12 years old, they should not be required to try phototherapy or other systemic immunosuppressants in order to access dupilumab.</p> <p>One of the implementation considerations from the previous CDEC recommendation for dupilumab in patients 12 years and older defined moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis based on the trials as, “an EASI score of 16 points or higher, or an Investigator (Physician) Global</p>

Implementation issues	Response
	<p><i>Assessment score of 3 or 4,</i>” which the clinical experts felt was a reasonable definition. Furthermore, the clinical experts stated that continuation criteria should allow clinicians the same flexibility to use either the IGA or EASI.</p> <p>CDEC generally agreed with the clinical experts. CDEC also noted that assessments made every 6 months for the continuation or renewal of therapy is reasonable and that the EASI score was part of the criteria used in the previous CDEC recommendation for dupilumab. CDEC recommended to align the renewal criteria for the age group 6 month 12 years of age with that for patients who are least 12 years of age.</p>
<b>Considerations for prescribing of therapy</b>	
<p>Is alignment with the following criteria appropriate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The patient must be under the care of a dermatologist, allergist, clinical immunologist, or pediatrician who has expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis.</li> </ul> <p>In specific circumstances where in some jurisdictions, there is limited access to specialists (dermatologist, allergist, clinical immunologist, or pediatrician who has expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis), could a family physician in conjunction with a specialist prescribe dupilumab?</p>	<p>The clinical experts agreed that a specialist (i.e., dermatologist who has experience with the instruments [e.g., EASI] required to access dupilumab) would prescribe the drug. It was noted that there may be limited access to pediatric dermatologists and general dermatologists may hesitate to prescribe dupilumab in children. However, it was noted that in those instances, a general pediatrician, allergist, immunologist, a physician with training in atopic dermatitis, or a family physician in conjunction with a specialist could prescribe the drug.</p> <p>CDEC recommended that the patient must be under the care of a dermatologist, allergist, clinical immunologist, or pediatrician who has expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe AD. CDEC also noted that in communities with limited access to specialists, family physicians with expertise in the management of moderate-to-severe AD might need to be considered by jurisdictions to prescribe dupilumab</p>
<b>Generalizability</b>	
<p>The LIBERTY AD PEDS trial (6 years to less than 12 years) only included patients with severe atopic dermatitis. Would patients with moderate atopic dermatitis within this age group be considered eligible for reimbursement?</p>	<p>The clinical experts noted to CDEC that the distinction between moderate and severe atopic dermatitis is not well defined and likely varies among physicians. Although there is a lack of data for dupilumab in patients with moderate disease between 6 years and 12 years old, the experts expect that dupilumab would likely work in these patients similarly to patients with severe disease. They also noted that the magnitude of benefit may appear to be greater in patients with severe atopic dermatitis due to them having a larger range for improvement compared to patients with moderate atopic dermatitis.</p>

BSA = body surface area; CDEC = Canadian Drug Expert Committee; EASI = Eczema Area and Severity Index; EASI-75 = improvement of 75% or greater in the Eczema Area and Severity Index total score; IGA = Investigator’s Global Assessment; TCI = topical calcineurin inhibitor; TCS = topical corticosteroid.

## Clinical Evidence

### Pivotal Studies and RCT Evidence

#### *Description of studies*

Two phase III, DB, RCTs assessed whether dupilumab with TCS reduced a patient’s IGA score to 0 or 1 compared to placebo with TCS after 16 weeks of treatment in patients 6 months to less than 6 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis (the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, N = 162) or 6 years to less than 12 years with severe atopic dermatitis (the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, N = 367). Patients enrolled in both studies had disease that was not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies. Key secondary outcomes included the proportion of patients with an EASI-75, percent change from baseline in EASI score, and percent change from baseline in weekly average of daily worst itch NRS score at week 16. In both studies HRQoL outcomes were assessed

as other secondary outcomes, and included the Dermatitis Family Index (DFI), Children's Dermatology Life Quality Index (CDLQI), and Infants' Dermatology Quality of Life Index (IDQoL), the last of which was only assessed in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial.

The IGA is a 5-point scale that provides a global clinical assessment of atopic dermatitis severity ranging from 0 (clear) to 4 (severe atopic dermatitis). A decrease in score relates to an improvement in signs and symptoms. The EASI is a tool used in clinical trials to assess the severity and extent of atopic dermatitis. For this scale, 4 disease characteristics of atopic dermatitis (erythema, thickness, scratching, and lichenification) are assessed for severity by the investigator on a scale of 0 (absent) to 3 (severe), and the scores are added up for each of the 4 body regions (head, arms, trunk, and legs). The area affected by atopic dermatitis is assessed as a percentage by each body region and is converted to a score of 0 to 6, where the area is expressed as 0 (none), 1 (1% to 9%), 2 (10% to 29%), 3 (30% to 49%), 4 (50% to 69%), 5 (70% to 89%), or 6 (90% to 100%). Each of the body area scores are multiplied by the area affected. Therefore, the total EASI score ranges from 0 to 72 points, with a higher score indicating worse disease severity. The itch NRS is a tool that patients use to report the intensity of their itch with a daily recall period. Patients rate their overall (average) and maximum intensity of itch experienced during the previous 24 hours, based on a scale of 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst itch imaginable). The DFI is an atopic dermatitis-specific, self-administered, 10-item questionnaire designed to assess the impact of disease on the quality of life of families of children affected by disease based on a 1-week recall. Responses are scored on a 4-point Likert scale (from 0 to 3) and the total score ranges from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating greater impairment in family quality of life. The CDLQI is a questionnaire completed by the child (ages 3 to 16 years) designed to measure the impact of any skin disease on the quality of life with a recall period of 7 days. It consists of 10 questions asking about the impact of a skin disease on the life of the affected child, including symptoms, embarrassment, friendships, clothes, playing, sports, bullying, sleep, and impact of treatment. Each response is rated on a 4-point Likert scale (from 0 to 3) and the total score ranges from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating a greater degree of impairment in HRQoL. The IDQoL is a questionnaire designed to measure the impact of the skin disease on the quality of life of infants and preschool children younger than 4 years of age. It consists of 10 questions that examine the impact of the disease on the life of the affected child and includes, but is not limited to mood, sleep, and daily activities. Each question is rated on a 4-point Likert scale (from 0 to 3) and the total score ranges from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating worse quality of life.

Overall, baseline patient characteristics were balanced among treatment groups in either trial. In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, the mean age of patients was 3.8 years, there were fewer females (38.9%) than males (61.1%), and the mean EASI score of patients was 34.1. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, the mean age of patients was 8.5 years, males and females were evenly balanced, and the mean EASI score of patients was ■.

## *Efficacy Results*

For the primary efficacy end point, there was a larger proportion of patients in the dupilumab group who achieved an IGA 0 or 1 compared to the placebo group at week 16 with a between treatment group difference of 23.8% (95% CI, 13.27% to 34.37%;  $P < 0.0001$ ) in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial. Results were similar in the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial with a larger proportion of patients in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups who achieved an IGA 0 or 1 compared to the placebo group at week 16 with a between treatment group differences of 21.4% (95% CI, 11.36% to 31.45%;  $P < 0.0001$ ) and 18.1% (95% CI, 8.28% to 27.97%;  $P < 0.0001$ ), respectively.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, a larger proportion of patients in the dupilumab group achieved an EASI-75 score compared to the placebo group at week 16 with a between treatment group difference of 42.3% (95% CI, 29.47% to 55.16%;  $P < 0.0001$ ). Similarly, there was a larger percent change from baseline to week 16 EASI score observed in the dupilumab group compared to the placebo group, with a between treatment group LSM difference of -50.4% (95% CI, -62.38% to -38.40%;  $P < 0.0001$ ). Results for the proportion of patients achieving a 90% or greater improvement in the EASI total score (EASI-90) at week 16 also favoured treatment with dupilumab. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, a larger proportion of patients in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups achieved an EASI-75 score compared to the placebo group at week 16 with between treatment group differences of 42.8% (95% CI, 31.54% to 54.15%;  $P < 0.0001$ ) and 40.4% (95% CI, 28.95% to 51.82%;  $P < 0.0001$ ), respectively. Likewise, there was a larger percent change from baseline to week 16 EASI score observed in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups compared to the placebo group with between group LSM differences of -33.4% (95% CI, -40.06% to -26.82%;  $P < 0.0001$ ) and -29.8% (95% CI, -36.33% to -23.24%;  $P < 0.0001$ ), respectively. Results for the proportion of patients achieving an EASI-90 at week 16 also favoured treatment with dupilumab.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, for the itch NRS score, a larger percent change from baseline to week 16 was observed in the dupilumab group compared to the placebo group with a between group LSM difference of  $-47.1\%$  (95% CI,  $-59.47\%$  to  $-34.79\%$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ). Results for the proportion of patients achieving an improvement of at least 4 points in itch NRS score from baseline to week 16 also favoured treatment with dupilumab. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, a larger percent change from baseline to week 16 was observed for the itch NRS score in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups compared to the placebo group with between group LSM differences versus placebo of  $-28.6\%$  (95% CI,  $-36.47\%$  to  $-20.82\%$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ) and  $-31.0\%$  (95% CI,  $-38.76\%$  to  $-23.26\%$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ), respectively. Results for the proportion of patients achieving an improvement of at least 4 points in itch NRS score from baseline to week 16 also favoured treatment with dupilumab.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, a larger change from baseline to week 16 in the DFI score was observed in the dupilumab group compared to the placebo group with a between group LSM difference of  $-7.80$  (95% CI,  $-9.79$  to  $-5.81$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ). In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, a larger change from baseline to week 16 in the DFI score was observed in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups compared to the placebo group with between group LSM differences versus placebo of [REDACTED] respectively.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, a larger change from baseline to week 16 in the CDLQI score was observed in the dupilumab group compared to the placebo group with a between group LSM difference of  $-7.5$  (95% CI,  $-10.29$  to  $-4.75$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ). In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, a larger change from baseline to week 16 in the CDLQI score was observed in both dupilumab Q4W and Q2W groups compared to the placebo group with between group LSM differences versus placebo [REDACTED] respectively.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, a larger change from baseline to week 16 in the IDQoL score was observed in the dupilumab group compared to the placebo group with a between group LSM difference of  $-8.96$  (95% CI,  $-11.71$  to  $-6.20$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ). This was not an outcome in the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial.

### *Harms Results*

During the 16-week treatment period, more than half of patients in any treatment group for either trial experienced at least 1 treatment-emergent adverse event (TEAE). In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, 63.9% of patients in the dupilumab group and 74.4% of patients in the placebo group reported a TEAE with the most frequently reported events being atopic dermatitis (13.3% dupilumab and 32.1% placebo), nasopharyngitis (8.4% dupilumab and 9.0% placebo), and upper respiratory tract infection (6.0% dupilumab and 7.7% placebo). In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 65.0% of patients in the dupilumab Q4W group, 67.2% of patients in the dupilumab Q2W group, and 73.3% of patients in the placebo group reported a TEAE with the most frequently reported events also being nasopharyngitis (12.5% dupilumab Q4W, 6.6% dupilumab Q2W, and 6.7% placebo), upper respiratory tract infection (10.8% dupilumab Q4W, 8.2% dupilumab Q2W, and 10.0% placebo), and atopic dermatitis (6.7% dupilumab Q4W, 8.2% dupilumab Q2W, and 14.2% placebo).

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, there were 4 patients who reported serious adverse events (SAEs) in the placebo group and 0 in the dupilumab group. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, there were 2 patients who reported SAEs in the dupilumab Q4W group, 0 patients in the dupilumab Q2W group, and 2 patients in the placebo group. No SAE was reported by more than 1 patient per trial.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, 2 patients stopped treatment due to adverse events (AEs) due to atopic dermatitis (dupilumab group) and nightmare (placebo group). In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 4 patients stopped treatment due to AEs: 2 due to food allergy and bacterial conjunctivitis (both patients were in the dupilumab Q2W group) and 2 due to atopic dermatitis and asthma (both patients were in the placebo group).

There were no patient deaths in either trial.

### *Notable harms*

There were no reports of anaphylactic reaction in either trial.

There were no reports of hypersensitivity in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, no treatment-related events of hypersensitivity or anaphylaxis occurred during the study.

There were no reports of helminthic infection in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, [REDACTED] of the dupilumab Q4W and placebo groups reported a helminthic infection and [REDACTED] in the dupilumab Q2W group.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, 3 patients in the dupilumab group and 0 patients in the placebo group reported conjunctivitis. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 5 patients, 7 patients, and 3 patients in the dupilumab Q4W, dupilumab Q2W, and placebo groups, respectively, reported conjunctivitis.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, 2 patients in the dupilumab group and 0 patients in the placebo group reported blepharitis. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, [REDACTED] in the dupilumab Q2W and placebo groups, respectively, reported blepharitis and [REDACTED] patients in the dupilumab Q4W group.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, [REDACTED] in the placebo group reported keratitis. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 1 patient in the dupilumab Q2W group reported keratitis and no patients in either dupilumab Q4W or placebo groups.

In the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial, 2 patients in the dupilumab group and 0 patients in the placebo group reported eosinophilia. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 1 patient in the dupilumab Q2W group reported eosinophilia and no patients in either dupilumab Q4W or placebo groups.

Facial erythema was not captured in either trial.

Injection site pain was not captured in the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, [REDACTED] in the dupilumab Q4W, dupilumab Q2W, and placebo groups, respectively, reported injection site pain.

### *Critical Appraisal*

In both pivotal trials, the few differences in baseline patient characteristics were mostly small, could have been due to chance, and the clinical experts did not think they were likely to change treatment outcomes. In the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial, 68 patients may have been unblinded to their treatment assignment, but the trial enrolled additional patients and included a modified full analysis set (mFAS) for supportive analyses to mitigate the issue. In both trials, fewer patients in the dupilumab groups used rescue treatment compared to the placebo groups and the difference could impact how some outcomes (e.g., harms, HRQoL) are interpreted, though the direction of bias is not clear. Additionally, there was a lack of validity and reliability evidence for the itch NRS, and no minimal important differences (MIDs) for the IGA, DFI, or IDQoL for the patient population identified from the literature.

Although the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial included only patients with severe atopic dermatitis, the clinical experts were of the opinion that the results would likely be generalizable to those with moderate disease given the evidence for age groups both younger and older than that in the trial (i.e., 6 years to less than 11 years). The experts suggested that, in practice, a patient with moderate atopic dermatitis and an EASI score lower than 16 may be eligible for dupilumab if, for example, they have severe lesions, but low percent body surface area (BSA) affected or have lesions localized to special areas (e.g., hands, feet, scalp). This is supported by the literature showing that patients with moderate atopic dermatitis can have an EASI score as low as 6. In the trials, patients who used rescue treatment were considered non-responders, which the clinical experts stated was inconsistent with clinical practice. As per the clinical experts, non-TCS topical therapies would be acceptable add-on treatment while receiving dupilumab and a short course (fewer than 8 weeks) of systemic therapies could be permitted without having to discontinue dupilumab. Although the trial outcomes addressed most of the treatment goals and patients' needs from the stakeholder input, it is unclear if Q2W or Q4W dupilumab injections meet the need for a simpler treatment, particularly if patients or their caregivers are uncomfortable with administering the injection and must receive the injections in a clinic or if patients are especially afraid of needles.

### Long-Term Extension Studies

Study 1434 is an ongoing, global, open-label, single-group, long-term extension study of patients 6 months to less than 18 years old with atopic dermatitis with the aim to assess the long-term safety and efficacy of dupilumab. Patients who participated in the parent (pivotal) trials were eligible to enroll in Study 1434; 180 patients were from the LIBERTY AD PRESCHOOL trial and 368 were from

the LIBERTY AD PEDS trial. The primary outcome was the incidence rate (events per patient-year) of TEAEs. Results presented were based on a pre-specified second-step analysis conducted on data from patients aged 6 years to less than 12 years old (data cut-off date July 22, 2019) and from a third-step analysis conducted on data from patients aged 6 months to less than 6 years old (data cut-off date July 31, 2021).

### *Efficacy Results*

At the time of this CADTH review, Study 1434 was still ongoing and no patients had completed the 260 week-assessment. However, early findings from baseline, 4, 16, 28, 52, and 104 weeks of primary and secondary efficacy end points indicated that treatment effects were maintained with continued dupilumab use.

### *Harms Results*

No new safety signals arose over the course of the Study 1434 and early safety results indicated that the drug was generally well tolerated with an acceptable safety profile.

### *Critical Appraisal*

The limited availability of long-term data (i.e., mature data), open-label design, lack of control arm, and absence of formal statistical hypothesis testing were key constraints that limit the interpretation of the long-term efficacy and safety of study outcomes for treatment with dupilumab.

### *Indirect Comparisons*

No indirect evidence was available.

### *Studies Addressing Gaps in the Pivotal and RCT Evidence*

Pediatric Study in Atopic Dermatitis (PEDISTAD), an observational study was submitted by the sponsor to address gaps in the RCT evidence comparing dupilumab to other systemic treatments, such as methotrexate or cyclosporine, for patients younger than 12 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical therapies or when those therapies are not medically advisable. PEDISTAD is an ongoing, international, longitudinal, 5-year, prospective study initiated on September 28, 2018, aiming to examine the impact of systemic treatments on disease severity, safety, and treatment discontinuation in this patient population. Patients were eligible to enroll if they were currently receiving systemic treatment for atopic dermatitis, ultraviolet therapy, immunosuppressants, or were currently on topical treatment and would be candidates for systemic treatment. All analyses were descriptive, with no comparisons performed between different systemic treatment cohorts.

### *Efficacy Results*

Based on findings from a 2-year interim analysis in the Sponsor's Summary of Clinical Evidence, there appeared to be greater numerical improvements in the EASI total score, percent BSA affected by atopic dermatitis, Patient Oriented Eczema Measure score, and combined CDLQI or IDQoL score among the patients receiving dupilumab compared to methotrexate or cyclosporine.

### *Harms Results*

Patients receiving dupilumab had a lower discontinuation rate and reported fewer AEs than those treated with methotrexate or cyclosporine.

### *Critical Appraisal*

Based on the limited available data and how they were presented, it was not possible to determine if the treatment groups were adequately similar enough to be compared to one another. Additionally, available data were limited to the 2-year interim results, which prevent long-term conclusions from being drawn for any outcome. There was a potential increased risk of uncontrolled confounding and selection bias in the study, no formal comparison between study groups was considered, and there was no information regarding how many patients had been lost to follow-up, nor how many patients were censored. The study included a

small number of patients living in Canada and it is unclear how representative the preliminary results are to the population of pediatric patients with atopic dermatitis living in Canada.

## Economic Evidence

### Cost and Cost-Effectiveness

Component	Description
<b>Type of economic evaluation</b>	Cost-utility analysis Decision tree/Markov model hybrid
<b>Target population</b>	Patients aged 6 months to <12 years with moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis whose disease is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable
<b>Treatment</b>	Dupilumab plus BSC (best supportive care; topical corticosteroids and topical calcineurin inhibitors)
<b>Dose regimen</b>	For patients aged 6 months to 5 years, the recommended dosage of dupilumab is 200 mg or 300 mg initially, followed by 200 mg or 300 mg every 4 weeks, depending on patient weight.  For patients aged 6 to 17 years, the recommended dosage of dupilumab is 400 mg or 600 mg initially, followed by 200 mg or 300 mg every 2 weeks or every 4 weeks, depending on patient weight.
<b>Submitted price</b>	Dupilumab, 200 mg, 300 mg: \$978.70 per pre-filled syringe
<b>Treatment cost</b>	For patients aged 6 months to 5 years: \$12,723 annually <sup>a</sup> For patients aged 6 to 17 years: \$26,425 in year 1 (\$25,446 in subsequent years) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Comparator</b>	BSC
<b>Perspective</b>	Canadian publicly funded health care payer
<b>Outcome</b>	QALYs, LYs
<b>Time horizon</b>	Lifetime (100 years)
<b>Key data source</b>	LIBERTY AD-PRESCHOOL, LIBERTY AD-PEDS clinical trials
<b>Key limitations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of clinical inputs used to inform the sponsor's model, including the efficacy of dupilumab beyond 16 weeks of treatment, were derived from studies involving adults. The incremental QALYs predicted with the use of dupilumab plus BSC compared to BSC alone are highly uncertain owing to the use of primarily adult data to inform the model.</li> <li>The comparative efficacy and safety of dupilumab plus BSC versus BSC alone beyond 16 weeks is highly uncertain owing to a lack of comparative clinical data for the reimbursement population.</li> <li>The efficacy of dupilumab among some subgroups is uncertain. Effectiveness of dupilumab plus BSC among patients aged 6 to &lt;12 years was informed by the LIBERTY-AD PEDS trial, which enrolled patients with severe AD, and the sponsor assumed that the treatment response would be equivalent among those with moderate AD. It is unclear whether patients for whom topical therapies are not advisable are reflected in the sponsor's pharmacoeconomic analysis, owing to uncertainty in the clinical population.</li> <li>Systemic therapies (such as cyclosporine-A, methotrexate, azathioprine, mycophenolate mofetil) were not included as comparators, which was deemed inappropriate based on their use in clinical practice for the reimbursement population.</li> <li>The sponsor incorporated treatment-specific utility values in their model, and patients who responded to dupilumab were assumed to have higher utility than patients who responded to BSC alone.</li> <li>Utility estimates were derived from adults and may not reflect the preferences of pediatric patients. Additionally, the use of utility values from multiple sources and the programming of the sponsor's model biased the analysis in favour of dupilumab.</li> <li>The savings in health care costs predicted by the sponsor with the use of dupilumab plus BSC versus BSC alone is highly uncertain and is not supported by robust data.</li> </ul>



Component	Description
<b>CADTH reanalysis results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the CADTH base case, CADTH adopted alternative estimates of the durability of treatment response with BSC; health state utility values from a single study and specific to response status; and, alternate estimates for costs related to healthcare resource use. CADTH was unable to address the lack of comparative clinical efficacy data for the reimbursement population beyond 16 weeks or the omission of systemic treatments as comparators.</li> <li>Results of the CADTH base case suggest that dupilumab plus BSC is more costly (incremental costs: \$118,787) and more effective (incremental QALYs: 0.91) than BSC alone, resulting in an ICER of \$130,945 per QALY gained. A price reduction of 54% for dupilumab would be required for dupilumab plus BSC to be cost-effective compared to BSC alone at a willingness-to-pay threshold of \$50,000 per QALY gained.</li> <li>In the absence of long-term comparative clinical evidence for the reimbursement population, the CADTH reanalysis may overestimate the incremental benefits associated with dupilumab plus BSC relative to BSC alone. Further price reductions may therefore be required.</li> </ul>

AD = atopic dermatitis; BSC = best supportive care; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; LY = life-year; QALY= quality-adjusted life-year.

<sup>a</sup> Assumes a patient weight of 15 kg.

<sup>b</sup> Assumes a patient weight of ≥ 30 kg.

## Budget Impact

CADTH identified the following key limitations with the sponsors analysis:

- The number of patients eligible to receive dupilumab is underestimated owing to assumptions made by the sponsor about eligibility for dupilumab that are not aligned with the Health Canada indication or requested reimbursement. There is additionally uncertainty in the proportion of children whose moderate-to-severe AD is not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies and the proportion of children for whom topical prescription therapies are not advisable.
- The proportion of patients covered by public drug plans is likely underestimated.
- Potentially relevant comparators were excluded.
- The market uptake of dupilumab is uncertain.

CADTH reanalysis included aligning the eligibility of dupilumab with the Health Canada indication and reimbursement request, incorporating the proportion of patients eligible for public drug plan coverage, and correcting the NIHB and ODB population size. CADTH reanalyses suggest that the reimbursement of dupilumab for the requested reimbursement population (patients aged 6 months to < 12 years) would be associated with a budgetary increase of \$1,523,349,925 over the first 3 years (Year 1: \$381,570,740; Year 2: \$504,258,676; Year 3: \$637,520,510).

The estimated budget impact is highly sensitive to the number of patients eligible to receive dupilumab and the price of dupilumab.

## CDEC Information

### Members of the Committee:

Dr. James Silvius (Chair), Dr. Sally Bean, Mr. Dan Dunsky, Dr. Alun Edwards, Mr. Bob Gagne, Dr. Ran Goldman, Dr. Allan Grill, Mr. Morris Joseph, Dr. Christine Leong, Dr. Kerry Mansell, Dr. Alicia McCallum, Dr. Srinivas Murthy, Ms. Heather Neville, Dr. Danyaal Raza, Dr. Emily Reynen, and Dr. Peter Zed.

Meeting date: August 23, 2023

### Regrets:

None

### Conflicts of interest:

None