



**pan-Canadian Oncology Drug Review
Submitter or Manufacturer Feedback on a
pCODR Expert Review Committee Initial
Recommendation**

Cobimetinib (Cotellic) for Metastatic Melanoma

June 30, 2016

1 Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation

Name of the Drug and Indication(s): Cotellic (cobimetinib) - In combination with vemurafenib, for the treatment of patients with unresectable or metastatic melanoma with BRAF V600 mutation cancer.

Role in Review (Submitter and/or Manufacturer): Submitter

Organization Providing Feedback Hoffmann-La Roche

**pCODR may contact this person if comments require clarification. Contact information will not be included in any public posting of this document by pCODR.*

3.1 Comments on the Initial Recommendation

- a) Please indicate if the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) agrees or disagrees with the initial recommendation:
- agrees agrees in part disagree

Please explain why the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) agrees, agrees in part or disagrees with the initial recommendation.

Hoffmann-La Roche partially supports the clinical criteria supporting the use of Cotellic (cobimetinib) as outlined by the pERC.

Hoffmann-La Roche believes that the funding criteria for cobimetinib plus vemurafenib should be as indicated in the Health Canada label. The indication includes previously treated patients based on the totality evidence including BRIM 7 and CoBRIM.

Hoffmann-La Roche looks forward to working with provinces to make Cotellic available to Canadian patients.

- b) Notwithstanding the feedback provided in part a) above, please indicate if the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) would support this initial recommendation proceeding to final pERC recommendation ("early conversion"), which would occur within 2(two) business days of the end of the consultation period.

X_ Support conversion to final recommendation.
 Recommendation does not require reconsideration by pERC.

_____ Do not support conversion to final recommendation.
 Recommendation should be reconsidered by pERC.

c) Please provide feedback on the initial recommendation. Is the initial recommendation or are the components of the recommendation (e.g., clinical and economic evidence) clearly worded? Is the intent clear? Are the reasons clear?

Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Comments and Suggested Changes to Improve Clarity
Page 4	Summary of pERC deliberations	3 rd paragraph	Roche believes that the funding criteria for cobimetinib plus vemurafenib should be as indicated in the Health Canada label. The indication includes previously treated patients based on the totality evidence including BRIM 7 and CoBRIM. Patients with unresectable and metastatic melanoma require additional options for their disease and the combination of cobimetinib and vemurafenib showed superiority over vemurafenib monotherapy which is funded according to the label.
Page 5	Summary of pERC deliberations	Last paragraph	Roche does not believe that there is the potential for higher resource usage with the combination of vemurafenib and cobimetinib compared to other drugs. The safety profile was different than other treatment options, however it did not show higher rates of grade 3-4 adverse events than other therapies. Furthermore, we believe that the number of pills and the ability to down-dose also adds more flexibility in terms of dosing and adverse event management for healthcare professionals and patients.
Page 6	Initial Economic guidance report - Evaluation of Submitted Budget Impact Analysis		In the budget impact analysis, progression free survival was used for all the treatments included in the analysis. For the combination of cobimetinib and vemurafenib the average number of pills used in the trial was used in the analysis which is consistent with the Health Canada label. This allows for down- dosing in order to manage the adverse events. Cobimetinib and vemurafenib adds flexibility in dosing for healthcare professionals and patients and the actual number of pills in the trial should reflect the real cost of the combination in the treatment of unresectable or metastatic melanoma.

3.2 Comments Related to Submitter or Manufacturer-Provided Information

Please provide feedback on any issues not adequately addressed in the initial recommendation based on any information provided by the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) in the submission or as additional information during the review.

Please note that new evidence will be not considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission. If you are unclear as to whether the information you are providing is eligible for a Resubmission, please contact the pCODR Secretariat.

Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Comments related to Submitter or Manufacturer-Provided Information

3.3 Additional Comments About the Initial Recommendation Document

Please provide any additional comments:

Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Additional Comments

About Completing This Template

pCODR invites the Submitter, or the Manufacturer of the drug under review if they were not the Submitter, to provide feedback and comments on the initial recommendation made by pERC. (See www.cadth.ca/pcodr for information regarding review status and feedback deadlines.)

As part of the pCODR review process, the pCODR Expert Review Committee makes an initial recommendation based on its review of the clinical, economic and patient evidence for a drug. (See www.cadth.ca/pcodr for a description of the pCODR process.) The initial recommendation is then posted for feedback and comments from various stakeholders. The pCODR Expert Review Committee welcomes comments and feedback that will help the members understand why the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter), agrees or disagrees with the initial recommendation. In addition, the members of pERC would like to know if there is any lack of clarity in the document and if so, what could be done to improve the clarity of the information in the initial recommendation. Other comments are welcome as well.

All stakeholders have 10 (ten) business days within which to provide their feedback on the initial recommendation and rationale. If all invited stakeholders agree with the recommended clinical population described in the initial recommendation, it will proceed to a final pERC recommendation by 2 (two) business days after the end of the consultation (feedback) period. This is called an “early conversion” of an initial recommendation to a final recommendation.

If any one of the invited stakeholders does not support the initial recommendation proceeding to final pERC recommendation, pERC will review all feedback and comments received at the next possible pERC meeting. Based on the feedback received, pERC will consider revising the recommendation document as appropriate. It should be noted that the initial recommendation and rationale for it may or may not change following consultation with stakeholders.

The final pERC recommendation will be made available to the participating provincial and territorial ministries of health and cancer agencies for their use in guiding their funding decisions and will also be made publicly available once it has been finalized.

Instructions for Providing Feedback

- a) Only the group making the pCODR Submission, or the Manufacturer of the drug under review can provide feedback on the initial recommendation.
- b) Feedback or comments must be based on the evidence that was considered by pERC in making the initial recommendation. No new evidence will be considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission.
- c) The template for providing *Submitter or Manufacturer Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation* can be downloaded from the pCODR website. (See www.cadth.ca/pcodr for a description of the pCODR process and supporting materials and templates.)
- d) At this time, the template must be completed in English. The Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) should complete those sections of the template where they have substantive comments and should not feel obligated to complete every section, if that section does not apply. Similarly, the Submitter (or the Manufacturer of the drug under review, if not the Submitter) should not feel restricted by the space allotted on the form and can expand the tables in the template as required.

- e) Feedback on the pERC Initial Recommendation should not exceed three (3) pages in length, using a minimum 11 point font on 8 ½" by 11" paper. If comments submitted exceed three pages, only the first three pages of feedback will be forwarded to the pERC.
- f) Feedback should be presented clearly and succinctly in point form, whenever possible. The issue(s) should be clearly stated and specific reference must be made to the section of the recommendation document under discussion (i.e., page number, section title, and paragraph). Opinions from experts and testimonials should not be provided. Comments should be restricted to the content of the initial recommendation.
- g) References to support comments may be provided separately; however, these cannot be related to new evidence. New evidence is not considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission. If you are unclear as to whether the information you are considering to provide is eligible for a Resubmission, please contact the pCODR Secretariat.
- h) The comments must be submitted via a Microsoft Word (not PDF) document to the pCODR Secretariat by the posted deadline date.
- i) If you have any questions about the feedback process, please e-mail submissions@pcodr.ca.

Note: Submitted feedback may be used in documents available to the public. The confidentiality of any submitted information cannot be protected.