# Exagamglogene autotemcel for treating severe sickle cell disease

This is not a HST topic – this STA is being considered by the HST committee due to scheduling and capacity

Slides contain no confidential information

Highly specialised technology committee 10<sup>th</sup> October 2024, assessing ID4016 as a single technology appraisal - appraisal committee meeting 3

Chair: Paul Arundel

External assessment group: Warwick Evidence

Technical team: Cara Gibbons, Alan Moore, Lorna Dunning

Company: Vertex

© NICE 2024. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

## Exa-cel for treating severe sickle cell disease

- Appraisal history
- □ Key issues
- Cost effectiveness
- □ Summary

## **Appraisal history**

NICE

**Marketing authorisation:** SCD in patients 12 years of age and older with recurrent vaso-occlusive crises who have the  $\beta S/\beta S$ ,  $\beta S/\beta +$  or  $\beta S/\beta 0$  genotype, for whom HSCT is appropriate, and a human leukocyte antigen matched related haematopoietic stem cell donor is not available



## Exa-cel for treating severe sickle cell disease

- Appraisal history
- ✓ Key issues
- Cost effectiveness
- □ Summary

## **Key issues**

NICE

Issue	ACM2 conclusion	ICER impact
<ul> <li>Source of complication rates</li> <li>Uncertainty remains about the appropriate rates and application method for inclusion of complications in model</li> <li>Uncertainty on if the BOI study is representative of people eligible for treatment with exa-cel in the NHS</li> </ul>	UK BOI study - 12-35 subgroup complication rates	Moderate
<ul> <li>Severity modifier</li> <li>Cost-effectiveness results for exa-cel and the appropriate severity decision modifier are sensitive to complication values</li> </ul>	Severity modifier not met	Large

Abbreviation: ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; BOI, burden of illness; ACM, appraisal committee meeting

## **Complication rates: appraisal history**

NICE



ACM2 summary

## **Key issue: Complication rates (1)**

#### Summary of model data sources

- CLIMB SCD-121 single arm, Phase 1/2/3 study in people aged 12-35 who have severe SCD, people from UK
- Severe SCD: ≥ 2 VOCs per year during 2-year period before screening (baseline annual VOC rate: 4.2 per year)
- VOC definition: acute pain, acute chest syndrome, priapism or splenic sequestration needing hospital treatment
- Data used to inform effectiveness of exa-cel arm in model

<u>Vertex unpublished UK BOI study</u> - real world retrospective study of the clinical burden of SCD with recurrent VOCs

- Data from primary care records (CRPD) linked with secondary care data (HES) in England, aged 1-86 years
  - Annual VOC rates (follow-up) by age: 0-11yrs 2.36; 12-17yrs 4.92; 18-35yrs 6.66; 36+ 7.52
- Disease severity criterion: patient with a SCD diagnosis has ≥ 2 VOCs in the second consecutive year
- VOC definition: primary or secondary diagnosis of SCD with crisis, priapism or acute chest syndrome
- People followed up for mean 4.69 years (SD: 2.86 years; range: 1-11 years)

#### Summary of modelled complications

- Model tracks people with start age of 21.2 years over lifetime and estimates proportions with complications in each 1-month cycle, assuming acute complications can recur, but chronic complications can occur only once
  - $\circ~$  Complication rates impact mostly on the QALYs and costs for SoC group
- UK BOI study informs complication estimates as people age, calculated based on number of events observed and number of years of follow-up per patient from baseline to event/censoring date
  - o Recorded complication rates for people aged 0-11yrs, 12-17yrs, 18-35yrs, 36+yrs, and 12-35yrs at baseline

**NICE** Abbreviations: BOI, burden of illness, SoC, standard of care; QALYs, quality-adjusted life years; VOCs, vaso-occlusive crisis; SCD, sickle cell disease; CPRD, Clinical Practice Research Datalink; HES, Hospital Episode Statistics

## **Key issue:** Complication rates (2)

Age and sex distribution for different complication scenarios

Base	line characteristics	Model	CLIMB SCD-121	BOI stu	dy
Ν		-	43	1117	
		44.2		Overall (2+) population	51.4
	Female (%)		44.2	12-35 population	51.2
				12+ population	53.0
			21.2	Overall (2+) population	24.96 (1-86)
Moan basol	ino ago (voare) (min-max)	21.2		12-35 population	23.57 (12-35)
	ine age (years) (initi-max)	21.2	(12-34)	12-35 (aligned with trial)*	23.36 (12-35)
				12+ population	29.17 (12-86)
Rasolino ago	0-11	-	-	219 (19.6)	
(categorical)	12-17	-	12 (27.9)	110 (9.9)	
N (%)	18-35	-	31 (72.1)	539 (48.3)	
	36+	-	-	249 (22.3)	
Mean a	annualised VOC rate	4.2**	4 2 (at baseline)	Overall (2+) population	5.84 (follow-up)
				12-35 population	6.37 (follow-up)
	Pulmonary hypertension	0	0	5.7	
	Chronic kidney disease	0	0	0.7 / 3.0	
Chronic	Post-stroke	0	0	-	
complications	Avascular necrosis	0	27.9	15.5	
at baseline	Retinopathy	14.3	14.3	10.7	
(%)	Heart failure	0	0	2.5	
	Neurocognitive impairment	2.9	2.9	1.9	
	Liver disease	0	0	4.3	

\*Subgroup aged 12-35 who had no clinical trial exclusion conditions – 51.75% of study population \*\*CLIMB SCD-121 baseline VOC rate used as fixed VOC rate overtime in the model

Abbreviations: BOI, burden of illness, VOC, vaso-occlusive crisis; SD, standard deviation; SCD, sickle cell disease

## **Key issue**: Complication rates (3)

#### **Decision support unit**

#### There are differences between BOI study and CLIMB SCD-121 population (see <u>next slide</u>):

- BOI population is more severe at baseline than trial  $\rightarrow$  higher VOC rate and baseline complications
  - o E.g., VOC rate in BOI overall population is higher than CLIMB SCD-121 (5.84 vs 4.2 per year)
  - E.g., Model assumes no baseline comorbidities except 14% retinopathy and 3% neurocognitive impairment, but unclear if BOI study baseline comorbidity is much higher than model or not reported
    - ↓ Applying BOI complication rates may overestimate complication risk for model population
- Mean age of BOI 12-35 similar to CLIMB SCD-121 but data will not reflect age as patients in model get older
- Applying BOI rates assumes 1) population reflects those eligible for exa-cel, 2) observed CLIMB SCD-121 treatment benefit applicable to more severe population
- Overlap between BOI study and CLIMB SCD-121 not reported  $\rightarrow$  not possible to see if matching feasible
  - $\circ$   $\,$  Unclear which population better represents decision problem
    - Which population best represents the target NHS population BOI study or CLIMB SCD-121?
    - What is the most appropriate starting age and sex distribution to use in the model?

## **Key issue**: Complication rates (4)

#### **Company post-ACM2 comments**

- Disagree with committee preference to use BOI 12-35 years subgroup, does not reflect decision problem (12+)
- Using entire severe BOI study cohort is more appropriate captures complications across all ages and better represents disease progression in the model

#### 12–35 complication rates (EAG ACM2 base case)

- Applying 12-35 rates to those aged 12+ significantly underestimates SCD severity over patient's lifetime
  - ↓ Inaccurately reflects disease progression, particularly as modelled SoC median survival is 52 years
- Constant rate applied = when people turn 35+, complications develop at lower rate than would otherwise
  - □ Complications increase with age and as SCD progresses = underestimates QoL and cost at end of model

#### Severe SCD (2 yrs +) complication rates (company ACM2 base case)

 More generalisable to UK severe SCD population = captures natural disease progression and risk of complications across all ages (including increase in complication risk with age)

#### 12+ years complication rates (company ACM3 base case)

- Weighted mean complication rates in patients aged 12+ yrs, based on the 12-35yrs and 36+ yrs subgroups
- Matches decision problem and a more accurate reflection of lifelong SCD-related morbidity

## **Key issue:** Complication rates (5)

#### **EAG comments**

- Major limitation that no systematic review of complication data/studies was conducted by the company
- Still prefer 12-35 population at least age matches model starting cohort (BOI: 23.6 yrs vs 21.2 yrs)
  - But higher VOC rates and higher baseline burden of disease of BOI cohort may still overestimate SOC complication rates
- License is unrestricted but CLIMB SCD-121 restricted to ≤35 years no data supporting people aged 35+ yrs
- Agree age-dependent complication rates are reasonable, but data provided is not fit for purpose
- Applying 12+ rates increases model bias and uncertainty affected by methodological issues
  - Without re-analysis of BOI data, weighted method is more conservative than company's other approaches

#### Methodological issues:

- 1. Age group complication rates combined using weights proportional to number of people in BOI age groups
  - Weights applied should reflect model and CLIMB SCD-121 population composition
  - BOI baseline age distribution does not match trial, but age is predictor of complication rates = model rates biased
    - └ BOI: 12-17yrs (9.9%), 18-35yrs (48.3%), CLIMB SCD-121: 12-17 years (27.9%), 18-35 (72.1%)
- 2. Baseline age distribution (model and BOI study) is cross-sectional, but the complication data is longitudinal
  - $\circ~$  Complications measured over time as people age, but study did not recorded age at which they occur

Average follow-up: 4.7 years

## **Key issue:** Complication rates (6)

#### **EAG comments continued**

#### Implications:

- 1. Constant complication rate applied in model that includes all ages 12+
  - Amplifies overestimation of complications in earlier cycles (where population and potential bias largest), and downplays underestimation in later cycles
- 2. <u>12-35 and 36+ cohort data  $\neq$  data from single population followed up longitudinally from 12 to 35+ years</u>
  - $\circ$  36+ group has higher VOC than 12-35 unknown if due to age or other uncontrollable factors
    - ↓ E.g., survivor bias (36+ yrs healthier), or healthcare practice changed (e.g., treatment improved over time and people diagnosed earlier than the older cohort when they were younger)
  - Cannot rule out that 2 cohorts are 'different' for reasons other than just age and rates may be confounded
    - □ Combining as if 1 longitudinal cohort may introduce uncontrollable biases and increase uncertainty
- 3. Methodologically flawed to apply separate 12-35 and 35+ rates for different model ages (data longitudinal)
  - 4.7yrs follow-up = data for people aged 31-35 at baseline included in 12-35 and 36+ age group = overlap
  - Applying separate rates using a cut-off double counts complications for cycles relating to 35-40 years
  - $\circ$  Regression model accounting for age at time of complication would allow for matching  $\rightarrow$  data unavailable

## **Key issue**: Complication rates (7)

#### **Decision support unit**

- BOI study recorded complication rates for baseline ages 0-11yrs, 12-17yrs, 18-35yrs, 36+yrs, and 12-35yrs
- Ideal analysis: statistical model of relationship between complications and age → need data broken down into narrower age bands and re-analysed according to age at which complications occurred
  - Company: do not have granular level of data e.g., did not record the age at point complications occurred
  - $\circ~$  Cannot do further statistical modelling of BOI data to predict complication risks by age
- Ran analyses to further explore impact of age-specific complication rates on exa-cel cost-effectiveness
  - ↓ Different complication rates for specific age bands applied once people reach a particular age in model
- 1. 12-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates
  - o 12-35yrs rates applied to modelled patients until age 36, then 36+yrs rates for all subsequent model cycles

#### 2. 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates

- o 18-35yrs rates applied to modelled patients until age 36, then 36+yrs rates for all subsequent model cycles
- 3. 12-17yrs, 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates, including lag to account for follow-up
  - o Apply 5-year lag in attempt to align BOI patient age with appropriate time point in modelled age
  - 12-17yrs rates applied to modelled patients until age <23 years, 18-35yrs subgroup rates applied whilst patients aged 23-41 years, then 36+yrs complication rates for all subsequent model cycles

#### 4. 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroups complication rates, including a lag to account for follow-up duration

o 18-35yrs rates applied to modelled patients until age 41, then 36+yrs rates for all subsequent model cycles

## Key issue: Complication rates (8)

#### **Decision support unit continued**

• None of the available options for incorporating complication rates into the company's model are ideal

#### EAG ACM2 approach: apply 12-35yrs subgroup data

- Does not account for complications increasing with age as constant rates are applied every cycle
- $\circ$  Data may not reflect complication risks in older ages  $\rightarrow \sim 82\%$  SoC arm predicted to survive beyond age 36

#### Company ACM3 approach: weighted average of 12-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup data

- o Underlying rates incorporate different effects by age, but applied as constant age-independent rates
- Approach may inflate complication risks for younger patients in model

#### DSU preferred analysis: 12-17yrs, 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup data, including ~5-year time lag

- Applies age-band specific rates in line with model age prefer as expect complications to increase with age
- o Allows some age-dependence but relies on broad age groups may mask true age/complication relationship
- o Including time lag aims to better reflect age at which BOI complications occur, rather than baseline age
  - L→ But cannot estimate exact age when complications occurred = likely inaccuracy in model predictions
- Using age-band rates reduces number of patients/events at specific ages e.g., 12-17yrs subgroup (n=110)

## **Key issue**: Complication rates (9)

Company, EAG and DSU apply complication rate data in different ways, based on different age groups

Scenarios	Method	SoC QALYs		
Company ACM2 (2+)	Overall population complication rates applied as constant rate each cycle	10.42		
EAG ACM2 (12-35)	12-35 age group specific complication rates applied as constant rate applied each cycle	11.00		
Company ACM3 (12+)	Weighted average of 12-35 and 36+ rates applied as constant rate each cycle	10.43		
DSU scenarios 1	Age dependent, apply rates from each age band until reach equivalent age in model • 12-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates	10.50		
DSU scenarios 2	Age dependent, apply rates from each age band until reach equivalent age in model • 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates	10.42		
DSU scenario 3	<ul> <li>Age dependent, apply rates from each age band until reach equivalent age in model, but includes time lag to account for follow-up and age at time of complication</li> <li>12-17yrs, 18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates</li> </ul>	10.71		
DSU scenario 4	<ul> <li>Age dependent, apply rates from each age band until reach equivalent age in model, but includes time lag to account for follow-up and age at time of complication</li> <li>18-35yrs and 36+yrs subgroup complication rates</li> </ul>	10.61		
Literature (ACM2 discussion)	Apply specific complication rates from a variety of literature sources	9.78		
Which source and method should be used to estimate complication rates? Consideration of uncertainty: does the preferred scenario for modelling complication rates accurately estimate / overestimate / underestimate?				

Abbreviation: DSU, decision support unit, BOI, burden of illness; QALY, quality-adjusted life years; SoC, standard of care

## QALY weighting for severity (1)



#### **ACM2 conclusions:**

• Severity modifier did not apply, using committee's preferred BOI study 12-35 subgroup to model complications

#### Company ACM2:

- Progressive diseases where mortality increases and HRQoL deteriorates substantially over time are unfairly penalised by discounted QALY approach. HST, where undiscounted QALYs are used is more appropriate
- Where case for non-reference discount rate, no discount rate, or 1.5% discount rate should apply in QALY shortfall calculation – in this scenario, 1.7 QALY weight could apply

#### Other considerations from patient and clinical experts/groups and web comments after ACM1:

- Strongly feel severity for SCD and those living with it has been misjudged and not been fully appreciated
- SCD is a severe condition & patients die very prematurely (early 40s), even with best available treatment
- There are potential gaps in knowledge and evidence concerning SCD severity and the impact on QoL

#### NICE methods (sections 6.2.12 to 6.2.17):

- Committee will consider the severity of condition, defined as the future health lost by people living with the condition with standard care in the NHS. Extent of unmet health need is reflected within severity definition
- Expected SoC QALYs is equivalent to total QALYs gained with established NHS practice
- Data used to estimate absolute and proportional QALY shortfall should focus on specific population for which the new technology will be used and be based on established clinical practice in the NHS
- Population EQ-5D data and survival data used for estimates should be based on recent and robust source
- Absolute and proportional shortfall calculations should include discounting at the reference case rate

**NICE** Abbreviations: SoC, standard of care; QALY, quality-adjusted life year; SCD, sickle cell disease; QoL, quality of life; HRQoL, health-related quality of life; HST, highly specialised technology

## QALY weighting for severity (2)

#### Severity modifier decisions in other technology appraisals

• Decisions about whether the severity modifier is met should take account of all the evidence presented as part of appraisal

#### TA896 - Bulevirtide for treating chronic hepatitis D

 Committee recognised the limited evidence for hepatitis D, noting NICE's manual states it can accept a higher degree of uncertainty, especially in rare diseases. All but 1 scenario met 1.2 modifier, so committee agreed to apply 1.2 weighting

#### TA949 - Belumosudil for treating chronic graft-versus-host disease after 2+ systemic treatments in people 12+ years

• Committee acknowledged the condition significantly impacts QoL but noted it did not have sufficient evidence for most appropriate source to inform some health state utility values. It agreed with the EAG that no severity modifier should apply

#### ID4024 - Vamorolone for treating Duchenne muscular dystrophy – Draft Guidance, appraisal ongoing

- Committee: data used likely overestimated SoC survival, which would have underestimated AS
- Committee: severity calculations sensitive to model assumptions. Considering all evidence available, including expert opinion, the committee concluded that a severity weight of 1.7 was appropriate.

#### TA981 - Voxelotor for treating haemolytic anaemia caused by SCD (Pfizer is withdrawing voxelotor from market)

- Company and EAG base case did not meet severity modifier concluded unable to apply 1.2 QALY weighting
  <a href="mailto:Differences from this appraisal">Differences from this appraisal</a>: population people aged 12+ yrs with haemolytic anaemia caused by SCD who are ineligible for,
  or intolerant of hydroxycarbamide, or hydroxycarbamide alone is insufficiently effective = less severe than CLIMB SCD-121
  <a href="mailto:Considerations:">Considerations:</a></a>
- *Model start age:* voxelotor company average age in NHS likely lower than modelled age (licensed for 12+ yrs)
  - EAG: If model built on data significantly different to NHS population, results unsuitable for decision making
  - True QALY loss: company people with chronic conditions from early age adapt and report better QoL
- Rounding up of QALY shortfall: EAG rounding up to 12 (i.e., when >11.5) is inappropriate and would lower severity threshold
- Uncaptured severity: committee concluded that the model may not have fully captured the severity of the disease

#### NICE

Abbreviations: SoC, standard of care; QALY, quality-adjusted life year; SCD, sickle cell disease; QoL, quality of life; AS, absolute QALY shortfall

#### **QALY** weighting for severity (3) Proportional QALY Absolute shortfall shortfall weight 1.2 severity modifier met if SoC QALYs ≤10.53 Less than Less than x1 12 0.85 Very narrow range of QALY shortfall values (11.53 – 12.11) x1.2 12 to 18 0.85 to 0.95 x1.7 At least 18 At least 0.95 DSU preferred EAG preferred Company preferred General Total Absolute (proportional) Weight SoC Estimated QALY shortfalls for different scenarios population **QALY** shortfall QALEs QALYs 9.78 12.74 (56.58%) 1.2 l iterature value 22.53 Company ACM2 base case (severe population, 2+yrs) 12.11 (53.74%) 22.53 10.42 1.2 11.53 (51.17%) EAG ACM2 base case (12-35yrs subgroup) 22.53 11.00 1.0 Company post-ACM2 - weighted average complication 12.10 (53.70%) 22.53 10.43 1.2 rates (12+yrs) DSU 1: Age-dependent complication rates (12-35yrs) 22.53 10.50 12.03 (53.39%) 1.2 and 36+yrs) DSU 2: Age-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs) 1.2 22.53 10.42 12.11 (53.74%) and 36+yrs) DSU 3: Age-dependent complication rates (12-17yrs, 22.53 10.71 11.82 (52.46%) 1.0 18-35yrs and 36+yrs), including ~5-year lag DSU 4: Age-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs) 11.92 (52.90%) 22.53 10.61 1.0 and 36+yrs), including ~5-year lag NICE

Abbreviations: QALE / Y, quality-adjusted life expectancy / year; SCD, sickle cell disease

#### CONFIDENTIAL QALY weighting for severity (4)

Uncertainties in the current model inputs:	SoC QALY impact
Model structure: Appropriate for decision making, but associated with uncertainties (see below)	Unknown
<ul> <li>SoC mortality modelling:</li> <li>Model SoC median survival: 52 years - DG: need validation about most accurate life expectancy</li> <li>UK BOI study mean death age: 40 years (range: 8-79 years) – only based on 41 / 1,117 people</li> <li>Company: model overestimates survival in severe SCD population, should be 39-43 yrs (EAG: 43-55 yrs)</li> </ul>	Potentially overestimated
<ul> <li>Complications:</li> <li>Concerns complete BOI study population represents a more severe cohort than CLIMB         <ul> <li>If BOI more severe = may overestimate complications = underestimate SoC QALYs</li> </ul> </li> <li>Clinical experts ACM1: some significant complications missing from model e.g., acute multi-organ failure         <ul> <li>If complications underestimated = may overestimate SoC QALYs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Potentially underestimated, alternative scenarios ACM3 Potentially overestimated
<ul> <li>Starting age (see <u>next slide</u>):</li> <li>Model: 21.2 years (CLIMB SCD-121 FAS, age distribution: 27.9% [12-17]; 72.1% [18-35])</li> <li>UK BOI study mean age: 24.96 years (2+ years); 29.17 years (12+ years), 23.57 years (12-35 years)</li> <li>Clinical advisory board: would prioritise treating younger people (aged 18-25). May expand this overtime <ul> <li>Proportion aged 36+ would be fit enough to have myeloablation, but excluded from trial</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Unknown, younger age = higher QALYs. Impact based on modelling of complication rates
<ul> <li>Utilities:</li> <li>SoC baseline utility: 0.81 - DG: 'suggests severe SCD QoL is reasonable compared to general population'</li> <li>With complication disutilities applied, QoL declines overtime ( at baseline, see modelled SoC utility)</li> <li>DG: 'committee recognised that the EQ-5D may not fully capture the QoL of people with SCD'</li> <li>Clinical experts: QoL is difficult to capture in congenital conditions and SCD fluctuates in severity</li> </ul>	Unknown, but likely to align with complication rates
Baseline VOC rate: likely to be underestimated as only includes VOCs needing treatment in hospital	Potentially overestimated
<b>NICE</b> Abbreviations: BOI, burden of illness, SoC, standard of care; QALY, quality-adjusted life year; SCD, sickle cell disease; QoL,	quality of life; VOC, vaso- <b>19</b>

occlusive crisis; FAS, final analysis set; DG, draft guidance

19

## Severity weighting scenarios (1)

Marketing authorisation: treatment of SCD in people 12 years of age or older

Scenarios 1 & 2 do not reflect data from CLIMB or BOI study. Clinical advisory board: prioritise treating younger people (aged 18-25).

	Scenario	Age (yrs)	Female (%)
1	Younger population 1	15	44
2	Younger population 2	18	44
3	CLIMB SCD-121 (model)	21	44
4	BOI 12–35-year (aligned with CLIMB SCD-121)	23	52
5	BOI 12–35-year subgroup	24	51
6	BOI 12+ group	29	53

Is there the potential for the population to change over time?

QALY shortfalls scenarios	Total SoC QALYs	Absolute QALY shortfa
	10.34	1. <mark>13.07</mark>
	10.06	2. <mark>12.93</mark>
Literature value	9.78	3. <mark>12.75</mark>
	9.63	4. <mark>12.56</mark>
	9.49	5. <mark>12.53</mark>
	8.83	6. <mark>12.27</mark>
	11.08	1. <mark>12.33</mark>
	10.76	2. <mark>12.23</mark>
Company ACM2 base case (2+yrs)	10.42	3. <mark>12.11</mark>
	10.26	4. 11.93
	10.10	5. 11.92
	9.35	6. 11.75
	11.37	1. <mark>12.04</mark>
DSII 1: Age-dependent	10.94	2. <mark>12.05</mark>
complication rates (12-35vrs	10.50	3. <mark>12.03</mark>
and $36+vrs$	10.25	4. 11.94
	10.04	5. 11.98
	9.03	6. <mark>12.07</mark>
	11.26	1. <mark>12.15</mark>
DSIL2: Age-dependent	10.85	2. <mark>12.14</mark>
complication rates (18 35/rs	10.42	3. <mark>12.11</mark>
and $36+vrs$	10.18	4. <mark>12.01</mark>
	10.11	5. 11.91
	8.99	6. <mark>12.11</mark>

shortfall not presented, ranged from 51.44% to 58.15% (not near PS severity cut off)

Abbreviations: QALE / Y, quality-adjusted life expectancy / year; SCD, sickle cell disease; SoC, standard of care; PS, proportional QALY shortfall

## Severity weighting scenarios (2)

EAG preferred Company preferred

DSU preferred

QALY shortfalls scenarios	Total SoC QALYs	Absolute QALY shortfall	
	11.73	1. 11.68	
	11.37	2. 11.62	
EAG ACM2 base case (12-35yrs	11.00	3. 11.53	
subgroup)	10.82	4. 11.37	
	10.64	5. 11.38	
	9.82	6. 11.28	
	11.09	1. <mark>12.32</mark>	
Company ACM2 base ages	10.76	2. <mark>12.23</mark>	
Company ACING base case -	10.43	3. <mark>12.10</mark>	
	10.27	4. 11.92	
(12+y15)	10.11	5. 11.91	
	9.36	6. 11.74	
	11.79	1. 11.62	
DSU 3: Ago dopondont rates (12	11.37	2. 11.62	
17 yrs 18 35 yrs and 36+yrs)	10.71	3. 11.82	
including $\sim 5$ year lag	10.40	4. 11.79	
including ~3-year lag	10.21	5. 11.81	
	9.30	6. 11.80	
	11.40	1. <mark>12.01</mark>	
DSUL4: Age dependent complication	11.02	2. 11.97	
rates (18-35yrs and 36+yrs), including ~5-year lag	10.61	3. 11.92	
	10.40	4. 11.79	
	10.21	5. 11.81	
	9.30	6. 11.80	
Note: highlighted are scenarios that m	eet a 1.2 QALY wei	ght. Proportional QALY	
shortfall not presented, ranged from 49.65% to 55.92% (not near PS severity cut off)			

	Scenario	Age (yrs)	Female (%)
1	Younger population 1	15	44
2	Younger population 2	18	44
3	CLIMB SCD-121 (model)	21	44
4	BOI 12–35-year (aligned with CLIMB SCD-121)	23	52
5	BOI 12–35-year subgroup	24	51
6	BOI 12+ group	29	53

- Does the model accurately capture SoC utility, mortality and complications? If not, how does this affect SoC QALYs?
- 2. How should age and sex distribution align with other data sources and committee assumptions in model?
- 3. Has the severity modifier been met? If so, which QALY weight should be applied?

Abbreviations: QALE / Y, quality-adjusted life expectancy / year; SCD, sickle cell disease; SoC, standard of care; PS, proportional QALY shortfall

## Exa-cel for treating severe sickle cell disease

- Appraisal history
- □ Key issues
- Cost effectiveness
- □ Summary

**NICE** National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

## **Cost-effectiveness results**

Exa-cel is above the committee's preferred cost-effectiveness threshold in all scenarios

Ontion	ICER (with and without severity)	ICER (with and without severity)					
Οριιοπ	3.5% discount rate	1.5% discount rate					
Scenario using lite	Scenario using literature*						
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
Scenario using ove	erall cohort (2+yrs) complication rates*						
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
Scenario using spe	ecific age-group complication rates (12-35	yrs)					
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
Scenario using we	ighted average complication rates (12+yrs	S)*					
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
DSU scenario 1: Aç	ge-dependent complication rates (12-35yrs	s and 36+yrs)*					
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
DSU scenario 2: Aç	ge-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs	s and 36+yrs)*					
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
DSU scenario 3: Ag	ge-dependent complication rates (12-17yrs	s, 18-35yrs and 36+yrs), including ~ 5-year lag					
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
DSU scenario 4: Age-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs and 36+yrs), including ~5-year lag							
Exa-cel vs SoC	Above £35,000	Above £35,000					
*Scenarios met sev	verity modifier of 1.2						

NICE

Abbreviations: QALY, quality-adjusted life years; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; DSU, decision support unit; SoC, standard of care

## Exa-cel for treating severe sickle cell disease

- □ Appraisal history
- □ Key issues
- Cost effectiveness
- ✓ Summary

NICE National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

## **Decision-making framework (1)**

Assumption	Options
Complication literature source	<ol> <li>Literature (Brousse)</li> <li>BOI study: 2+ population</li> <li>BOI study: 12-35 population</li> <li>BOI study: 12+ population</li> <li>BOI study: age dependent, 12-35 and 36+ yrs</li> <li>BOI study: age dependent, 18-35 and 36+ yrs</li> <li>BOI study: age dependent, 12-75, 18-35, 36+ yrs with lag</li> <li>BOI study: age dependent, 18-35 and 36+ yrs with lag</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>Severity</li> <li>Age and sex distribution</li> <li>Is the SoC QALY value reflective of NHS established practice?</li> <li>Weight</li> </ul>	CLIMB SCD-121 values / BOI values / other Yes / no – if no, what are the uncertainties? 1 / 1.2 / 1.7
Managed access	Yes / No
<b>Uncaptured benefits? -</b> Does committee want to account for any further uncaptured benefits (in addition to health inequalities, innovation and carer QoL)?	Yes / No If yes, what?
Are there any remaining uncertainties?	Yes / No
<b>Threshold -</b> Does committee's preferred ICER threshold remain at £35,000 per QALY gained?	Yes / No If no, what?
<b>NICE</b> Abbreviations: BOI burden of illness Ool quality of life: ICER in	cremental cost-effectiveness ratio: OALY quality-adjusted life year: SoC, standard of care 2

Abbreviations: BOI, burden of illness, QoL, quality of life; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; QALY, quality-adjusted life year; SoC, standard of care 25

## **Decision-making framework (2)**

What are committee's preferred assumptions?	Option
What is the committee's preferred ICER? (if this is a range, please state whether the committee want the lower, upper, or midpoint of range to be below threshold)	
Is the ICER below preferred ICER threshold?	Yes / No
If yes, recommend for routine commissioning? (considering uncertainty, inequalities, innovation etc that might impact decision if close to threshold)	Yes / No
If no, could key uncertainties be sufficiently resolved during period of managed access? If so:	Yes / No
<ul> <li>Standard NICE appraisal considerations:</li> <li>Has company made a managed access proposal? Is this considered feasible?</li> <li>Are any updates or amendments required to the managed access proposal?</li> <li>Has committee answered the questions in NICE's feasibility assessment?</li> <li>What is committee's preferred threshold for managed access?</li> <li>Which ICERs/assumptions represent committee's lower/upper end of uncertainty?</li> </ul>	
If not, is chair's action appropriate*?	Yes / No

\*That is, if NHSE have indicated they are willing to consider a commercial deal, and the company submit an ICER ≤ committee's preferred threshold using committee preferred assumptions, would committee be happy for the chair to approve this outside of a formal committee meeting?

NICE National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

# Thank you.

© NICE 2024. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

NICE National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

# Supplementary slides

## **Key issue**: Complication rates (1)

#### ACM2 Company

- Base case: unpublished UK BOI study severe SCD population (≥2 VOCs per year ≥2 consecutive years)
  - ↓ More robust and relevant population and VOC definition and study criteria aligns with CLIMB SCD-121
- Alternative: 'Literature' complication source derived from multiple literature sources

#### ACM2 EAG

- No systematic literature review done of complication data / studies
- Essential to match external populations to model population to avoid substantial overestimation of benefits
   o Preferred source: BOI study matches model age, but not prior complications or VOC definition
- UK BOI population is more severe than CLIMB SCD-121 and lacks predictive validity for appraisal population
  - BOI baseline VOC rate double the trial, and includes people <12 and >35 yrs (drives complication)
  - Baseline comorbidities higher than model → complication rates represent higher risk of new complication than appraisal population
- Base case: BOI 12-35 subgroup population baseline age matches model, but may overestimate complication rates because baseline VOC rate and comorbidities still higher than model
  - Approach far from ideal should match BOI data to CLIMB SCD-121 to align severity with model population

#### ACM2 conclusions

- High level of uncertainties: literature not derived systematically and BOI study unpublished
- 12-35 years BOI subgroup most appropriate source, but matching trial and BOI data would be informative

## **QALY** weighting for severity (5)

#### Comparison of BOI and CLIMB SCD-121

Age and sex distributions for different scenarios	N	Age (years)	Sex F (%)
CLIMB SCD-121 population (used in model currently)	43	21.2	44.2
Company ACM2 base case (severe population, 2+yrs)	1,117	24.96	51.39
Company post-ACM2 - weighted average complication rates (12+yrs)	898	29.17	53.01
EAG ACM2 base case (12-35yrs subgroup)	649	23.57	51.16
12-35 years with no exclusion conditions (align with clinical trial population)	578	23.36	51.56
DSU 1: Age-dependent complication rates (12-35yrs and 36+yrs)	898	-	-
DSU 2: Age-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs and 36+yrs)	788	-	-
DSU 3: Age-dependent complication rates (12-17yrs, 18-35yrs and 36+yrs), inc lag	898	-	-
DSU 4: Age-dependent complication rates (18-35yrs and 36+yrs), inc ~5-year lag	788	-	-
Literature value	-	-	-
Voxelotor appraisal	-	27.58	58
CLIMB SCD-121 and UK BOI study both had inclusion of people with $\geq$ 2 VOCs per ye	ear in >2	consecutiv	ve years

#### Complication slides

## Modelled mean number of acute complications per patient

Highest rate Lowest rate

Scenarios	Acute kidney injury		Pulmonary embolism		Stroke		Leg ulcers		Gallstones		Infectious and parasitic diseases	
	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC
Literature value	0.10	0.41	0.15	0.61	0.07	0.29	0.71	2.91	0.33	1.34	0.19	0.79
Company ACM2 (2+ yrs) (N=1,117)	1.43	5.84	0.57	2.34	0.07	0.29	2.78	11.40	2.93	11.98	1.78	7.31
EAG ACM2 (12-35 yrs) (N=649)	0.43	1.75	0.21	0.88	0.07	0.29	1.64	6.72	2.35	9.64	1.50	6.14
Company ACM3 (12+ yrs) (N=898)	1.16	4.75	0.51	2.09	0.11	0.45	2.33	9.56	2.45	10.05	1.60	6.54
DSU scenario 1: 12-35yrs and 36+yrs (N=898)	1.68	7.52	0.72	3.21	0.14	0.60	2.83	12.17	2.52	10.42	1.67	6.92
DSU scenario 2: (N=788)	1.72	7.65	0.72	3.21	0.14	0.60	2.94	12.58	2.45	10.15	1.67	6.92
DSU scenario 3: (N=898)	1.35	6.14	0.56	2.57	0.11	0.51	2.36	10.86	2.49	10.03	1.64	6.73
DSU scenario 4: (N=788)	1.41	6.23	0.59	2.62	0.12	0.52	2.66	11.31	2.39	9.87	1.62	6.72
Acute chest syndrome not modelled as included within VOC rate												

### Modelled mean life years with chronic complications

Complication slides

Highest rate Lowest rate

Scenarios	Chronic kidney disease		Pulmonary hypertension		Avascular necrosis		Heart failure		Neuro- cognitive impairment		Post Stroke		Retinopathy		Chronic liver disease	
	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC	Exa-cel	SoC
Literature value	2.46	7.57	1.63	5.15	4.49	12.88	4.45	12.8	4.09	8.86	2.13	6.62	7.98	6.25	1.33	4.24
Company ACM2 (2+ yrs) (N=1,117)	1.12	3.59	1.84	5.76	4.17	12.11	1.59	5.01	2.57	4.36	0.47	1.44	10.02	12.28	1.48	4.69
EAG ACM2 (12-35 yrs) (N=649)	0.59	1.90	1.31	4.17	3.25	9.75	0.73	2.36	2.49	4.12	0.47	1.44	9.47	10.76	0.82	2.63
Company ACM3 (12+ yrs) (N=898)	1.07	3.42	1.87	5.86	4.02	11.76	1.48	4.68	2.67	4.69	0.72	2.20	10.11	12.53	1.33	4.24
DSU scenario 1: 12-35yrs and 36+yrs (N=898)	0.97	3.64	1.75	6.16	3.72	11.95	1.30	4.99	2.63	4.75	0.63	2.19	9.90	12.75	1.20	4.38
DSU scenario 2: (N=788)	1.06	3.88	1.90	6.54	3.82	12.14	1.41	5.26	2.61	4.70	0.63	2.19	9.94	12.82	1.18	4.34
DSU scenario 3: (N=898)	0.67	3.09	1.30	5.55	3.33	11.14	0.90	4.13	2.61	4.50	0.37	1.70	9.67	12.01	1.08	3.73
DSU scenario 4: (N=788)	0.93	3.30	1.76	5.90	3.64	11.32	1.22	4.38	2.56	4.46	0.56	1.86	9.78	12.08	1.04	3.70

NICE

## Web comments

#### Patients, carers, family, clinicians and public comments (1)

Impact of SCD	Current treatments
Everyday life significant disrupted	<ul> <li>High unmet need for an effective, well-tolerated</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Life-limiting, debilitating, unpredictable, and</li> </ul>	treatment
progressive condition	Frequent inpatient treatment interferes with daily life
Significantly reduced life expectancy	<ul> <li>Current treatments offer temporary relief and do not</li> </ul>
Severity of SCD worsens overtime	address underlying cause
Considerable QoL impact on patients and family	<ul> <li>Pain relief often fails, exacerbated by delays in following pain relief commissioning requirements</li> </ul>
• Symptoms e.g., fatigue, chronic pain, organ	poor care, conflict and confrontation
damage, other life-threatening health complications	<ul> <li>Other treatment options have been withdrawn</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Significant negative social, emotional, psychological and physical impact</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Few African and Caribbean blood donors – need other treatment forms</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Affects education, employment, finances</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Severity and long-term organ damage has not been</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Care and access to treatment options are extremely limited compared to other inherited conditions</li> </ul>

fully appreciated

## Web comments

#### Patients, carers, family, clinicians and public comments (2)

Exa-cel	Wider considerations
<ul> <li>Exa-cel should be made available - innovative, one-time and safe treatment</li> <li>Long-term benefits: <ul> <li>reduces hospitalisations, costs and treatment</li> <li>improves life expectancy and QoL</li> <li>removes clinical, social, and economic burdens</li> <li>halts bodily deterioration, enables repairs</li> </ul> </li> <li>Dramatically change lives of patients and families</li> <li>QoL and survival benefits not fully addressed</li> <li>More research and data collection needed</li> <li>Treatment R&amp;D will stop if always rejected, funding exa-cel will encourage new treatments</li> <li>Should be for available for those &lt;12 and &gt;35 years</li> <li>No biological mechanism for edited cells to revert</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Mainly affects African and Caribbean communities – more likely to experience poverty, discrimination, barriers to accessing healthcare</li> <li>Draft recommendation seen as discriminatory and people feel stuck, abandoned and forgotten</li> <li>"Burden of proof" seems higher for SCD community to be taken seriously</li> <li>Should consider factors broader than direct healthcare costs e.g., loss of earnings</li> <li>Little trust in NHS and clinical professionals – lack of understanding and pain often not believed</li> <li>Recognise exa-cel is an expensive treatment</li> <li>Lack of equity and funding for SCD</li> <li>QoL not captured e.g., cultural reasons, nature of SCD and patient adaptations</li> <li>Cure would help to redress some inequalities</li> </ul>
NICE	SCD siekle sell disease. Ool guality of life 34

## Anthony Nolan and the Sickle Cell Society

Link to severity

RECAP

35

#### 250+ responses from patients, parents, family members, clinicians and others

"My veins are a graveyard, a reminder of the many battles I have fought"

*"It's a horrific condition, every day is a battle to prevent pain and as some of the triggers are things we have little control over, it's very difficult."* 

*"I am stuck in a corner stagnant with nothing, but a heart full of sadness, and wishing and praying to one day wake up from this terrible nightmare of a life."* 

NICE

*"All we want is a better quality of life, a pain free life, a long and healthy life"* 

*"Traumatic for all involved. Day to day life is a challenge."* 

*"I wake up every day in pain, and I go to sleep in pain, I have never known a pain-free"* life

"Living with sickle cell means living with constant fear." "Constant fear – fear of the next crisis, the next hospitalisation, the next brush with death"

*"1 in 16 people with SCD die before age of 18"* 

*"He says [son] it's as if more than one thousand ants are biting his bones from inside at the same time"* 

*"It's not just the pain; it's the feeling of being trapped in your own body, unable to escape the torment"* 

"The spectre of a shortened life expectancy looms over me, a grim reminder of the fragility of my existence".

"Nothing could have prepared me for the sheer magnitude of their [child] suffering"

*"It's like a relentless storm that never lets up, slowly wearing you down until you feel like you can't go on. And it's not just the physical toll; it's the toll it takes on your spirit, your hopes, your dreams. I sometimes feel like I want to give up just for the pain to end"* 

## Anthony Nolan and the Sickle Cell Society

#### 250+ responses from patients, parents, family members, clinicians and others

"This [exa-cel] would have been literally life saving for people like me who are suffering with this dreadful condition"

*"It's difficult to convey as this is an invisible condition. Little awareness. Often, we are misbelieved"* 

"Sickle cell sufferers are living in agony in silence, we are not believed, [and] our pain is often disregarded" "Prospect of Exa-cel gives me hope, a glimmer of light in the darkness of my condition"

"Patients have learnt to cope with their daily lives because of the lack of education and knowledge surrounding the illness due systemic racism, we've adapted to being unsupported"

*"It's discerning when you have to be faced with how much others just don't care"* 

*"2013 study (sickle cell anaemia): average life expectancy of 42 years for women and 38 years for men"* 

NICE

*"I am always in pain most times and am unable to work, or even enjoy my life"* 

"Severe cases frequent experience excruciating pain, debilitating fatigue, and increased susceptibility to infections and organ damage" *"Having SCD is like a death sentence because it comes with daily excruciating bone pain"* 

"Only 50% of patients with SCD survive beyond their fifth decade"

*"[People with SCD] get used to QoL that would be considered restrictive by normal people" "How I rate my QoL doesn't correlate with the reality of it"* 

"Its heart reaching to see the volume of pain they are in and knowing there isn't anything you can do to help them!"

"Whenever we go to the hospital, we are treated differently, sometimes even being sworn at and told to be quiet during a painful sickle cell crisis." CONFIDENTIAL

## SoC utility overtime

**Complication sources** 

Company and EAG apply complication rate data in different ways, based on different age groups



CONFIDENTIAL

## SoC utility overtime

Model uncertainties



## **QALY** weighting for severity (6)

Company preferred

**DSU** preferred

QALY shortfalls for different	Total SoC	Absolute (proportional) QALY					
scenarios	QALYs	shortfall					
	11.73	1. 11.68 (49.90%)					
	11.37	2. 11.62 (50.54%)					
EAG ACM2 base case (12-	11.00	3. 11.53 (51.17%)					
35yrs subgroup)	10.82	4. 11.37 (51.24%)					
	10.64	5. 11.38 (51.68%)					
	9.82	6. 11.28 (53.46%)					
	11.09	1. <mark>12.32</mark> (52.64%)					
Company post ACM2	10.76	2. <mark>12.23</mark> (53.19%)					
Company post-ACM2 -	10.43	3. <mark>12.10</mark> (53.70%)					
complication rates (12+vrs)	10.27	4. 11.92 (53.72%)					
complication rates (12+yrs)	10.11	5. 11.91 (54.09%)					
	9.36	6. 11.74 (55.64%)					
	11.79	1. 11.62 (49.65%)					
DSU 3: Age dependent rates	11.37	2. 11.62 (50.54%)					
(12 17)rs 18 35)rs and	10.71	3. 11.82 (52.46%)					
$(12-17 \text{ yrs}, 10-00 \text{ yrs})$ and $36+\text{yrs}$ including $\sim 5 \text{ year lag}$	10.40	4. 11.79 (53.13%)					
soryis), including *5-year lag	10.21	5. 11.81 (53.63%)					
	9.30	6. <u>11.80</u> (55.92%)					
	11.40	1. <mark>12.01</mark> (51.31%)					
DSU 4: Age-dependent	11.02	2. 11.97 (52.06%)					
complication rates (18-35yrs	10.61	3. 11.92 (52.90%)					
and 36+yrs), including ~5-year	10.40	4. 11.79 (53.13%)					
lag	10.21	5. 11.81 (53.63%)					
	9.30	6. 11.80 (55.92%)					
Note: highlighted are scenarios	that meet a 1.2 C	ALY weight.					

Abbreviations: QALE / Y, quality-adjusted life expectancy / year; SCD, sickle cell disease; SoC, standard of care

	Scenario	Age (yrs)	Female (%)
1	Younger population 1	15	44
2	Younger population 2	18	44
3	CLIMB SCD-121 (model)	21	44
4	BOI 12–35-year (aligned with CLIMB SCD-121)	23	52
5	BOI 12–35-year subgroup	24	51
6	BOI 12+ group	29	53

## Marketing authorisation: treatment of SCD in people 12 years of age or older

- Does the model accurately capture SoC utility, mortality and complications? If not, how does this affect SoC QALYs?
- 2. How should age and sex distribution align with other data sources and committee assumptions in model?
- 3. Has the severity modifier been met? If so, which QALY weight should be applied?