TITLE: Plerixafor for Patients Failing Stem Cell Mobilization: Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness and Guidelines

DATE: 19 November 2015

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of plerixafor for the treatment of patients who are failing or who have failed stem cell mobilization?

2. What is the cost-effectiveness of plerixafor for the treatment of patients who are failing or who have failed stem cell mobilization?

3. What are the evidence-based guidelines regarding the use of plerixafor for the treatment of patients who are failing or who have failed stem cell mobilization?

KEY FINDINGS

Thirty-five non-randomized studies, five economic evaluations, and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the use of plerixafor for the treatment of patients who are failing stem or who have failed cell mobilization.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library, University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. Methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval to health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic studies. A second guidelines search was conducted expanding to include stem cell terms. Methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval to guidelines. Both searches were combined and limited to English-language documents, for the human population where possible, and published between January 1, 2010 and November 14, 2015. Internet links were provided, where available.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations, and evidence-based guidelines.

Thirty-five non-randomized studies, five economic evaluations, and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the use of plerixafor for the treatment of patients who are failing or who have failed stem cell mobilization. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or randomized controlled trials were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies


**Pediatric Population**


**Economic Evaluations**


**Guidelines and Recommendations**

See: Recommendation 3, page 4

PREPARED BY:
Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health
Tel: 1-866-898-8439
www.cadth.ca
APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Clinical Practice Guidelines - Unspecified Methodology


Review Articles


