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The Adaptive Pathways concept

1) Conditional approval scenario

Knowledge required for full approval

2nd approval

2) Expansion of indication scenario

AP route

AP route
Criteria for AP candidate selection

1. An iterative development plan: start in a well-defined subpopulation and expand, or have a Conditional Marketing Authorisation, maybe surrogate endpoints and confirm
2. Real World Data (safety and efficacy) can be acquired to supplement Clinical Trials
3. Input of all stakeholders, particularly HTAs, is fundamental

Unmet medical need is self-fulfilling.

..a product lifecycle outlook
If we look at these criteria....AP is already here even if we do not call it so.

**Lemtrada** (Multiple sclerosis)

Expensive ($160K) drug with difficult safety profile. 2 courses of treatment at month 0 and 12.

5-yr open label follow up results: 60-68% of patients did not require retreatment (remission, relapse, disability, MRI..)

Follow-up may continue to 10-15 yr. Biomarkers?

Would these results have been obtainable in an RCT?

How will these findings affect the B/R and value proposition?

Aim of AP pilot is to support development, not institute new procedures or a “qualification”
If we look at these criteria….AP is already here even if we do not call it so.

Entresto (sacubitril + valsartan; heart failure; composite endpoint of CV death or HF hospitalization.) Expensive drug with benefits realised in a long timespan.

Olysio (Sovaldi’s competitor, Genotype I) Pay-per-performance agreements reached with some payers.

Aim of AP is to bring together stakeholders who can advise prospectively on development
What have we learned on

Real World Evidence
and
Registries
RWE can support access throughout the lifecycle

**Development**
- Launch
- Patient recruitment
- Understand standard of care and NHD

**Growth phase**
- Conditional pricing review
- New competition
- Effectiveness
- Utilization/prescribing patterns
- Adherence
- Budget impact
- Post marketing commitments (safety etc.)

**Mature phase**
- New formulation/indication
- Usage
- Competitor goes generic
- Effects of switching on outcomes
- Differentiate with or vs. protected galenics
- Target populations
- Differentiation in sub-populations
- Head to head comparative effectiveness
- Conditional pricing review

**Evidence required**
- PROs
- Unmet need / disease burden
- Patient recruitment
- Trial design
- Understanding of standard of care and NHD

Source: IMI GetReal
RWE DECISION MAKING: 5 KEY ATTRIBUTES

- **Technical Feasibility**: Is the envisioned study or analysis technically feasible?
- **Acceptability of methods**: Is the study or analysis acceptable for regulators or HTA agencies?
- **Strength of Business Case**: Is evidence of effectiveness critical for access/uptake and does the benefit justify study costs?
- **Reduced Uncertainty**: More likely to support positive access decision
- **Information on Effectiveness**: To what extent does this study/analysis generate valuable information about real-world effectiveness?

**Portfolio Prioritisation**: More likely to be funded in Pharma R&D

**Evidence strategy**: What impact does this study have in the need for other studies? (e.g. post launch)?
RWE examples in AP applications (1)

• Use of existing disease registries to identify natural history of the disease, current SoC, resource utilisation, adherence to treatment.
• Single arm studies for rare diseases compared with outcomes inferred from disease registries
• Open label salvage studies in patients with no therapeutic options remaining, with the purpose of obtaining an expansion of the indication;
• Collection of efficacy and safety data from early access/compassionate use programs to supplement RCTs in small populations;
• Post-authorisation drug registries for effectiveness, long-term outcomes, drug utilisation, PROs, time to treatment failure, diagnosis confirmation
**RWE examples in AP applications (2)**

- Linking drug registries to risk-sharing schemes for reimbursement (pay per performance, annuity payments...)
- Expansion of the indication based on a mixture of disease registries and compassionate use data (for rare, severe diseases, where RCT data were available for less severe forms of the disease);
- Post authorisation studies to investigate biomarker (or other subpopulation selection criterion) status of an all-comer population;
- Investigation of non-serological outcomes for vaccines.
Learnings on RWD

Traditionally:

- Informing safety for regulators
- Important for HTAs/(relative) effectiveness

Increasing importance to supplement/inform efficacy in a real world population. Discussions within:

- EMA registries pilot
- IMI GetREAL
- Adaptive Pathways proposals

Should provide further clarity to formulate future development proposals
What have we learned on

Iteration
Proposed MA route not specified in many cases (too early, hoping to have full MA?)

Prospective CMA discussions actively encouraged after STAMP input.

Some proposals included both expansion of the indication and confirmation after CMA.

- Expansion of indication (to either less severe patients or other indications): 15/19
- Specified CMA route: 11/19 (maybe more)
- Early/surrogate endpoints proposed: 11/19
What have we learned on HTA involvement
Who participated?

Involved in at least one procedure were HTAs from:
UK, NL, SE, DE, IT, FR, AT, NO, FI
EUNetHTA as observer
Other bodies have been involved for vaccines.

Payers participated in one case to provide high-level comments on risk sharing plan.
What were the questions asked by applicants?

- Are surrogate/early endpoints acceptable?
- How do they relate to “hard” clinical endpoints?
- What QoL/ADL data and scales are needed?
- Can existing disease registries be used for SoC, disease progression, indirect analysis of comparators and outcomes, off-label use.
- Development of co-diagnostics for subpopulation identification
- Models for risk sharing
- Design of post-approval studies for dual regulatory/HTA purpose
- Validity of data from other countries
What did we learn?

- Companies provided generally a sketchy elaboration of value proposition (early stage? Risk aversion?)
- Recognised divide in perception of risk from medical/market access division of companies (Questionnaire in ADAPT SMART)
- SMEs so far have been more creative
- Resource intensive procedure: felt particularly by HTAs
- As compared to parallel SA/HTA, payers input is missed (acceptability of reduced package)
- Challenge to bring right stakeholders with right expertise into the discussion
- Procedures that progressed to parallel SA/HTA had more detailed discussion.
Other lessons learned

• AP is a **lifecycle** approach, involve PRAC, PDCO, COMP, CAT, BWP.

• CMC poses **specific challenges for ATMPs:** discuss backup plans if CMC development does not progress as expected.

• Impossible to **quantify earlier access time:** no terms of comparison, MAA planned long time in future. Qualitative answer possible.

• Need to understand/map **which stakeholders** need to be involved

• understanding of **payers’** reaction to actual proposals or hypothetical scenarios would help.
Food for thought and for discussion

1. Is prescription control to the initially licensed population achievable?

2. Are registries linked to pay-per performance or other risk sharing schemes achievable in your Member State?

3. How to engage all critical stakeholders in a meaningful and effective way? Are all relevant decision makers involved, and if not, what are the obstacles?

4. Are there any other aspects on the feasibility of adaptive approaches that should be investigated at MS level?
Additional slides
Initial experience

- 59 products submitted as candidates
- 20 selected for in-depth discussion with company (Stage I)
- 15 Stage I discussions have taken place

Of the 20 selected products:
- 4 SMEs
- 5 are Orphan drugs
- 4 are ATMP (Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products)
- 5 Anticancer

- 11 proposals selected for Stage II (in-depth meeting after Stage I) (1 ATMP, 5 Orphan, 3 SME; 3 anticancer)

- Main reasons for rejection were:
  - Development too advanced (too late to change anything)
  - Limited learning potential for a pilot (no developed proposal for use of RWD, limited iteration)