NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

GUIDANCE EXECUTIVE (GE)

Review of:


TA190: Pemetrexed for the maintenance treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer [published July 2010]

TA192: Gefitinib for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer [published July 2010]


TA258: Erlotinib for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic EGFR-TK mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer [published June 2012]

1. Recommendation

The guidance in TA181, TA190, TA192, TA227 and TA258 should be transferred to the 'static guidance list'. TA192 and TA258 should be flagged for further consideration of a review when the results of the LUX Lung 7 trial are available, currently anticipated to be in 2015. That we consult on this proposal.

2. Original remit(s)

TA181 - To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of pemetrexed, within its licensed indications, for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer.

TA190 - To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of pemetrexed, within its licensed indications, for maintenance treatment immediately after first-line chemotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer.

TA192 - To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of gefitinib, within its licensed indication, for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer.

TA227 - To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of erlotinib monotherapy within its licensed indication, for the maintenance treatment of non-small cell lung cancer after previous platinum containing chemotherapy.
TA258 - To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of erlotinib, within its licensed indication, for the first-line treatment of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) tyrosine kinase (TK) mutation positive locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer.

3. Current guidance

TA181

1.1. Pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin is recommended as an option for the first-line treatment of patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) only if the histology of the tumour has been confirmed as adenocarcinoma or large-cell carcinoma.

1.2. People who are currently being treated with pemetrexed for NSCLC but who do not meet the criteria in 1.1 should have the option to continue their therapy until they and their clinicians consider it appropriate to stop.

TA190

1.1. Pemetrexed is recommended as an option for the maintenance treatment of people with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer other than predominantly squamous cell histology if disease has not progressed immediately following platinum-based chemotherapy in combination with gemcitabine, paclitaxel or docetaxel.

TA192

1.1. Gefitinib is recommended as an option for the first-line treatment of people with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) if:

- they test positive for the epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase (EGFR-TK) mutation and
- the manufacturer provides gefitinib at the fixed price agreed under the patient access scheme.

TA227

1.1. Erlotinib monotherapy is not recommended for maintenance treatment in people with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer who have stable disease after platinum-based first-line chemotherapy.

1.2. People currently receiving erlotinib monotherapy for maintenance treatment of locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer who have stable disease after platinum-based first-line chemotherapy should have the option to continue treatment until they and their clinician consider it appropriate to stop.

TA258
1.1. Erlotinib is recommended as an option for the first-line treatment of people with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) if:

- they test positive for the epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase (EGFR-TK) mutation and
- the manufacturer provides erlotinib at the discounted price agreed under the patient access scheme (as revised in 2012).

4. Rationale

An independent Health Technology Assessment report has been published on first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer undertaken by the Liverpool Reviews and Implementation Group. The results were supportive of the evidence considered in the appraisal of pemetrexed (TA181), and provided updated results for the evidence considered in the appraisal of gefitinib (TA192).

Generic formulations have become available for gemcitabine, the comparator in TA181, which would be likely to impact on the cost-effectiveness of first-line pemetrexed, and therefore the current recommendation. However, the patent for pemetrexed is anticipated to expire shortly after any review would be undertaken. There is therefore limited value in undertaking a review of TA181, and it is appropriate for the guidance to be transferred to the ‘static list’. There has been no new evidence identified which would impact on the recommendations in TA190 and TA227, and therefore it is appropriate to transfer the guidance to the ‘static list’.

Since the publication of TA192 and TA258, tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) targeted specifically for EGFR-TK mutation-positive tumours have become established clinical practice. There is an ongoing clinical trial (LUX-lung 7 trial) comparing gefitinib with afatinib (another TKI which has recently been recommended by NICE). It is therefore considered appropriate to transfer TA192 and TA258 to the ‘static guidance list’, flagged for further consideration of a review when the results of the LUX-lung 7 trial report.

5. Implications for other guidance producing programmes

CCP are happy with the proposal to move TA181, TA190 and TA227 to the static list, and to defer the consideration of a review of TA192 and TA258. There are currently no plans to update the clinical guideline for lung cancer.

6. New evidence

Search strategies based on the original assessment reports were re-run on the Cochrane Library, Medline, Medline In-Process and Embase. References from the following dates onwards were reviewed: January 2009 (TA181); May 2009 (TAs 190 & 192); October 2009 (TA227) and September 2011 (TA258). Additional searches of

---

1 A list of the options for consideration, and the consequences of each option is provided in Appendix 1 at the end of this paper
clinical trials registries and other sources were also carried out. The results of the literature search are discussed in the ‘Summary of evidence and implications for review’ section below. See Appendix 2 for further details of on-going and unpublished studies.

7. **Summary of evidence and implications for review**

The following changes to the evidence base have taken place since the original appraisals were conducted:

- Final results for the IPASS trial (registration trial for first line use of gefitinib), including mature overall survival data, have been published. The results show no statistically significant difference in median overall survival between gefitinib single agent therapy and paclitaxel plus carboplatin combination therapy.

- An independent Health Technology Assessment report on ‘first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer’ by the Liverpool Review and Implementation Group, Liverpool University has been published (referred to in this paper as ‘LRiG 2013’). In this review, evidence synthesis was carried out separately for three sub-populations of people with locally advanced and metastatic lung cancer: squamous, non-squamous and EGFR-TK mutation-positive. In line with the licensed indications for the technologies under consideration here, the relevant results relate to the evidence syntheses for the non-squamous and the EGFR-TK mutation-positive populations. For the non-squamous population, direct and indirect evidence was compared for platinum therapy (cisplatin or carboplatin) in combination with the following: paclitaxel, vinorelbine, docetaxel, gemcitabine or pemetrexed. The review found results which support the evidence already considered in TA181 (that is, a similar overall survival hazard ratio for pemetrexed plus cisplatin compared with gemcitabine plus cisplatin).

- For the EGFR-TK mutation-positive population, direct and indirect evidence was combined in LRIG 2013 for gefitinib single agent therapy compared with carboplatin plus paclitaxel and cisplatin plus docetaxel. The evidence base included the final results from the IPASS trial. Erlotinib was not included as it had not been appraised by NICE at the time. For patients with EGFR-TK mutation positive tumours, the report found no statistically significant differences in overall survival between gefitinib and a paclitaxel plus platinum combination therapy, or between gefitinib and a docetaxel plus platinum combination therapy. However, a statistically significant improvement in progression free survival was found for gefitinib when compared to either of the combination therapies. The review noted that there was significant quantitative heterogeneity between the two trials comparing gefitinib with paclitaxel plus platinum combination therapy. This new evidence requires further consideration of whether a review of TA192 should be recommended (see below).

- Generic versions of gemcitabine (a comparator treatment in TA181) have become available since the appraisal. The acquisition cost of pemetrexed has
not changed since the time of publication of TA181 (however, see below for information on the expected end date for the patent). The price of gemcitabine in the original appraisal was £32.55 per 200mg vial. The Electronic Market Information Tool (eMIT)\(^2\) suggests that the average price paid by the NHS for gemcitabine is £3.17 per 200mg vial.

Other considerations:

- It is anticipated that the patent for pemetrexed will end in December 2015.
- The LUX-lung 7 trial will provide direct head to head evidence of afatinib (a tyrosine kinase inhibitor) compared with gefitinib for the first-line treatment of patients with EGFR-TK mutation-positive advanced adenocarcinoma of the lung. This phase IIb randomised open-label trial is currently ongoing. This would provide the first head to head comparison of 2 tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI).

The implications of these changes in evidence, for each of the appraisals under consideration here, are:

1. **TA181 - pemetrexed first line:** It is likely that the availability of generic gemcitabine would (unfavourably) change the cost effectiveness of pemetrexed as a first-line therapy. The LRiG 2013 study found that, because of the high price of pemetrexed in relation to the generically available comparators, pemetrexed is only considered cost effective if the willingness to pay is greater than £37,000 per QALY gained (or £50,000 per QALY gained using eMIT prices). However the potential end of the patent for pemetrexed would be likely to occur shortly after an appraisal could be scheduled into the work programme, significantly reducing the value to the NHS of reviewing the guidance. In addition, since the positive recommendation in TA181, pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin has become the standard of care for first-line treatment of non-small cell lung cancer, replacing the comparator at the time of the original appraisal (gemcitabine plus cisplatin). The availability of generic formulations of gemcitabine therefore becomes of limited relevance. For these reasons it is recommended that TA181 should be placed on the static list.

2. **TA190 – pemetrexed maintenance treatment:** there is no change in the evidence base for this appraisal and nothing to suggest a review of TA190 is required. It is therefore recommended that this piece of guidance be placed on the static list.

3. **TA192 – gefitinib first-line:** gefitinib was the first TKI to be appraised and as such, was compared with chemotherapies that do not target the EGFR-TK mutation. By the time of the first-line erlotinib appraisal (TA258) the Committee accepted that non-targeted therapies were no longer valid.

---

\(^2\) Electronic market information tool produced by the Commercial Medicines Unit of the Department of Health, which provides estimated mean product prices for generic medicines drawn from information from about 95% of NHS trusts.
comparators due to their declining use in EGFR-TK mutation-positive non-small cell lung cancer. In the recent appraisal of afatinib, the scope included erlotinib and gefitinib as comparators for the first-line use of afatinib (that is, non-targeted chemotherapies were not included). The latest information available to the technical team therefore suggests that the scope for a reappraisal of gefitinib would need to be amended to reflect the treatments that would be displaced by gefitinib in current clinical practice. Instead, a more appropriate decision problem would be to compare the different targeted TKI therapies. Whilst the recent appraisal of afatinib (TA310) examined the incremental cost effectiveness of all 3 targeted therapies, as a Single Technology Appraisal was only able to issue recommendations for afatinib. The LUX Lung 7 trial (comparing afatinib with gefitinib) is anticipated to report in 2015, and this evidence would be of value for a decision to review. It is therefore suggested that TA192 is placed on the static guidance list, flagged for further consideration of a review when this head to head evidence is available.

4. TA227 – erlotinib maintenance treatment: there is no change in the evidence base for this appraisal and therefore nothing to suggest a review of TA227 is required. The technical team therefore recommends that this piece of guidance be placed on the static list.

5. TA258 – erlotinib first-line: the discussion for TA192 (see above) is directly relevant to this appraisal. Accordingly, this guidance should be placed on the static guidance list, flagged for further consideration of a review in line with that for TA192.

**Summary of Recommendations**

Technology appraisal guidance 181, 190, 192, 227 and 258 should be placed on the static list.

Technology appraisal guidance 192 and 258 should be flagged for further consideration of a review when the results of the LUX Lung 7 trial are available.

**8. Implementation**

A submission from Implementation is included in Appendix 3.

Based on this submission it is apparent that, following NICE guidance which recommends the use of pemetrexed as first-line and maintenance treatment for people with locally advanced or metastatic NSCLC, the volume and cost of prescriptions of pemetrexed in the NHS has increased substantially. Similarly, following NICE guidance recommending gefitinib for the treatment of adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with activating mutations of EGFR-TK, the volume and cost of prescriptions of gefitinib in the NHS has increased substantially

**9. Equality issues**

None
GE paper sign off: Helen Knight, September 2014
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Appendix 1 – explanation of options

When considering whether to review one of its Technology Appraisals NICE must select one of the options in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Selected – ‘Yes/No’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A review of the guidance should be planned into the appraisal work programme.</td>
<td>A review of the appraisal will be planned into the NICE’s work programme.                                                                                                                                                                                                urus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to review the guidance should be deferred until the results of the LUX-lung 7 trial report, currently anticipated to be in 2015.</td>
<td>NICE will reconsider whether a review is necessary at the specified date.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the guidance should be combined with a review of a related technology appraisal.</td>
<td>A review of the appraisal(s) will be planned into NICE’s work programme as a Multiple Technology Appraisal, alongside the specified related technology.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the guidance should be combined with a new technology appraisal that has recently been referred to NICE.</td>
<td>A review of the appraisal(s) will be planned into NICE’s work programme as a Multiple Technology Appraisal, alongside the newly referred technology.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guidance should be incorporated into an on-going clinical guideline.</td>
<td>The on-going guideline will include the recommendations of the technology appraisal. The technology appraisal will remain extant alongside the guideline. Normally it will also be recommended that the technology appraisal guidance is moved to the static list until such time as the clinical guideline is considered for review. This option has the effect of preserving the funding direction associated with a positive recommendation in a NICE technology appraisal.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Selected – ‘Yes/No’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guidance should be updated in an on-going clinical guideline.</td>
<td>Responsibility for the updating the technology appraisal passes to the NICE Clinical Guidelines programme. Once the guideline is published the technology appraisal will be withdrawn. Note that this option does not preserve the funding direction associated with a positive recommendation in a NICE Technology Appraisal. However, if the recommendations are unchanged from the technology appraisal, the technology appraisal can be left in place (effectively the same as incorporation).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guidance should be transferred to the ‘static guidance list’.</td>
<td>The guidance will remain in place, in its current form, unless NICE becomes aware of substantive information which would make it reconsider. Literature searches are carried out every 5 years to check whether any of the Appraisals on the static list should be flagged for review.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NICE would typically consider updating a technology appraisal in an ongoing guideline if the following criteria were met:

i. The technology falls within the scope of a clinical guideline (or public health guidance)

ii. There is no proposed change to an existing Patient Access Scheme or Flexible Pricing arrangement for the technology, or no new proposal(s) for such a scheme or arrangement

iii. There is no new evidence that is likely to lead to a significant change in the clinical and cost effectiveness of a treatment

iv. The treatment is well established and embedded in the NHS. Evidence that a treatment is not well established or embedded may include:

   • Spending on a treatment for the indication which was the subject of the appraisal continues to rise

   • There is evidence of unjustified variation across the country in access to a treatment

   • There is plausible and verifiable information to suggest that the availability of the treatment is likely to suffer if the funding direction were removed
• The treatment is excluded from the Payment by Results tariff

v. Stakeholder opinion, expressed in response to review consultation, is broadly supportive of the proposal.
Appendix 2 – supporting information

Relevant Institute work

Published

Quality standard for lung cancer. QS17, issued: March 2012.


Suspended/terminated

Bevacizumab for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer. Technology Appraisal TA148 (terminated appraisal). Terminated in 2007 after the manufacturer informed NICE that they would not be seeking a marketing authorisation for this indication.

Cetuximab for the treatment of advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Technology Appraisal (suspended). Suspended in 2012 after the manufacturer informed NICE that they had withdrawn their license application for this indication.

Erlotinib, in combination with bevacizumab for the maintenance treatment of non-squamous advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer after previous platinum-containing chemotherapy. Technology Appraisal (suspended). Suspended in 2012 after the manufacturer informed NICE that regulatory approval for this indication was no longer being sought.

Details of new products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug (manufacturer)</th>
<th>Details (phase of development, expected launch date, )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dacomitinib (Pfizer)</td>
<td>1st line. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimesna (Takeda)</td>
<td>1st line. Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipilimumab (Bristol-Myers Squibb)</td>
<td>1st line. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug (manufacturer)</td>
<td>Details (phase of development, expected launch date, )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liposomal Cisplatin (Regulon)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line. Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necitumumab (Eli Lilly)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paclitaxel, albumin bound (Celgene)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line. Phase III. Launched in the US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talactoferrin alfa (Agennix)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG4010 (Transgene)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDK378 (Novartis)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} line, ALK positive. Phase III.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Registered and unpublished trials

### First line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial name and registration number</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A Study of Alimta/Cisplatin/Gefitinib for Asian Non-smoking Patients With Non Small Cell Lung Cancer**  
NCT01017874; 21, H3E-CR-S131. | First-line pemetrexed/cisplatin followed by gefitinib vs. gefitinib alone.  
n=226  
Estimated primary completion date: April 2013  
Estimated study completion date: October 2014 |
| **A Study of Tarceva (Erlotinib) or Placebo in Combination With Platinum-Based Therapy as First Line Treatment in Patients With Advanced or Recurrent Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer**  
NCT00883779; MO22201. |  
n=451  
Estimated study completion date: August 2014 |
| **A Study of Tarceva (Erlotinib) Versus Gemcitabine/Cisplatin as First-Line Treatment in Patients With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer With EGFR Mutations**  
NCT01342965; YO25121. |  
n=210  
Estimated primary completion date: December 2013  
Estimated study completion date: December 2013 |
| **ZD 1839 Plus Chemotherapy in Treating Patients With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer**  
NCT00006049; CDR0000068065, ZENECA-1839IL/0017, MSKCC-00100. | Two doses of gefitinib in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin vs. placebo in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin  
n=1029  
Current status unknown. |
| **ZD 1839 Plus Combination Chemotherapy in Treating Patients With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer**  
NCT00006048; CDR0000068064; ZENECA-1839IL/0014 | Two doses of gefitinib in combination with gemcitabine and cisplatin vs. placebo, gemcitabine and cisplatin  
n=1029  
Current status unknown. |
| **Iressa v BSC (Best Supportive Care) in First Line NSCLC**  
NCT00259064; 1839IL/0711; D7913C00711 |  
n=200  
Estimated primary completion date: December 2012  
Estimated study completion date: December 2012 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial name and registration number</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Randomized Gefitinib Trial        | Gefitinib vs. platinum-based chemotherapy  
n = unknown  
completed |
| NCT00807066; RANGE; ONC-2008-001  |         |
| Erlotinib in Treating Patients With Stage III or Stage IV Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer  
NCT00275132; CDR0000457755, LLCG-TOPTICAL, EU-20313. | Erlotinib vs. placebo  
n=670  
Ongoing  
Estimated primary completion date: March 2012  
Estimated study completion date: March 2012 |
| Influence of Prior Chemotherapy on Clinical Benefit With Erlotinib in Patients With Advanced Non-Squamous Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer With or Without EGFR Gene Mutation  
NCT01204307; 99-1896C. | Docetaxel/cisplatin vs. pemetrexed cisplatin with erlotinib second line in both arms  
n=250  
Estimated primary completion date: July 2012  
Estimated study completion date: December 2012 |
| A Study With Tarceva and Chemotherapy vs. Chemotherapy Alone in Patients With Advanced Lung Cancer  
NCT00047736; NCT00029016; OSI2298g | n = unspecified  
Completed: |
| First-line Gefitinib Versus Chemotherapy for Lung Adenocarcinoma in Never Smoker  
NCT00455936; NCCCTS-05-126, D7913L00054 | n=315  
Completed |
| Chemotherapy in Treating Patients With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer  
NCT00520676; 11626, H3E-CR-S380 | Pemetrexed + carboplatin vs. docetaxel + carboplatin  
n= 260  
Completed. Results available at clinicaltrials.gov |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial name and registration number</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Study of Patients With Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer  
NCT00948675; 13258, H3E-US-S130 | Pemetrexed and carboplatin followed by pemetrexed maintenance; or paclitaxel, carboplatin, and bevacizumab followed by bevacizumab maintenance  
n=360  
Estimated primary completion date: August 2012  
Estimated study completion date: June 2013 |
| A Study Comparing Two Different Chemotherapy Types in Chinese Patients With Advanced Non Small Cell Lung Cancer  
NCT01005680; 12878, H3E-CR-JMIL. | Pemetrexed plus cisplatin vs. gemcitabine plus cisplatin  
n=256  
Estimated primary completion date: November 2012  
Estimated study completion date: November 2012 |
| Quality of Life Comparison in Advanced Non-squamous Non Small Cell Lung Cancer  
NCT01303926; ERACLE; Goim 2903; 2009-015807-19 | Induction pemetrexed and cisplatin followed by pemetrexed as maintenance vs carboplatin-paclitaxel and bevacizumab followed by bevacizumab as maintenance  
n=118  
Estimated primary completion date: June 2012  
Estimated study completion date: June 2012 |
| TaxoteRe Plus Cisplatin Versus Allmta Plus Cisplatin in 1st Line Non-squamous Cell Type Lung Cancer  
NCT01282151; TRAIL; docetaxel ET_L_05478. | Docetaxel + cisplatin vs. pemetrexed + cisplatin.  
n=562  
Estimated primary completion date: June 2014  
Estimated study completion date: June 2014 |
| BIBW 2992 (Afatinib) Versus Chemotherapy as First Line Treatment in NSCLC With EGFR Mutation  
NCT00949650; 1200.32; 2008-005615-18. | Afatinib vs. cisplatin + pemetrexed  
n=330  
Estimated study completion date: December 2013 |

**Maintenance therapy**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial name and registration number</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intercalating and Maintenance Use of Iressa Versus Chemotherapy in Selected Advanced Non Small Cell Lung Cancer NCT01404260; CTONG 1102. | Gefitinib, gemcitabine & carboplatin vs. gemcitabine & carboplatin.  
 n=218  
 Estimated primary completion date: July 2013  
 Estimated study completion date: April 2014 |
| Erlotinib or Placebo Following Chemoradiotherapy (Chemo/RT) in Stage III Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) NCT00153803; D-0410. | n=380  
 Estimated primary completion date: December 2012  
 Estimated study completion date: December 2012 |
| A Study of First-line Maintenance Tarceva (Erlotinib) Versus Tarceva at Time of Disease Progression in Patients With Advanced Non-small Cell Lung Cancer After Chemotherapy NCT01328951; BO25460. | n=610  
 Estimated primary completion date: June 2016  
 Estimated study completion date: June 2016 |
| IFCT-GFPC 05.02 A Randomized Phase III Trial Assessing in Patients With Advanced Non-small Cell Lung Cancer NCT00300586; 2005.386 | Maintenance gemcitabine vs “sequential” erlotinib vs. observation  
 n=842  
 Completed (~March 2011) |
| A Randomized Phase III Trial of Chemotherapy Alone Versus Chemotherapy Followed by Gefitinib in Stage IIIB/IV Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer NCT00144066; WJTOG0203. | n=600  
 Completed ~2005 |
| Genius Study to Compare Efficacy and Safety of Gefitinib/ Pemetrexed With Pemetrexed Alone as Maintenance Therapy in Patients With Stage IV EGFR Mutation Negative or T790M Single Mutation Who Respond to Pemetrexed/ Platinum as First-line Therapy NCT01579630; D7913L00077 | n=338  
 Estimated primary completion date: June 2013 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial name and registration number</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategies for Maintenance Therapies in Advanced Non Small Cell Lung Cancer NCT01631136; IFCT-GFPC-1101 | Pemetrexed vs. gemcitabine  
n=932  
Estimated primary completion date: July 2014  
Estimated study completion date: July 2016 |
| Bevacizumab or Pemetrexed Disodium Alone or In Combination After Induction Therapy in Treating Patients With Advanced Non-Squamous Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer NCT01107626; CDR0000666482; ECOG-E5508 | n=1282  
Estimated primary completion date:  
Estimated study completion date: October 2012 |
| MODEL (Maintenance Versus Observation After inDuction Chemotherapy in Non-progressing Elderly Patients With Advanced Non-small Cell Lung Cancer) NCT01850303; IFCT-1201. | Pemetrexed or gemcitabine maintenance vs. observation.  
n=549  
Estimated completion date: April 2020 |

**Additional information**
None.

**References**


Appendix 3 – Implementation submission – TAs 181, 190, 192

Routine healthcare activity data

1.1 Hospital Pharmacy Audit Index data

This section presents Hospital Pharmacy Audit Index (HPAI) data on the cost and volume of Pemetrexed prescribed and dispensed in hospitals in England between October 2004 and January 2012. These data need to be treated with caution as there is more than one indication for Pemetrexed\(^3\).

Figure 1 Cost and volume of Pemetrexed prescribed and dispensed in hospitals in England

\[^3\] NICE TA135 Pemetrexed for the treatment of malignant pleural mesothelioma (January 2008)

NICE TA124 Pemetrexed for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer (August 2007)
1 Implementation studies from published literature

Information is taken from the uptake database (ERNIE) website.

2.1 Richards, M (2010) Extent and causes of international variation in drug usage: A report for the Secretary of State for Health

This report looks at medicines usage between countries, using IMS Health data. The WHO defined daily dose or the maximum or prescribed daily dose was used to measure usage. Results rank the UK relative to other countries usage and present
calculations showing how close or otherwise the UK is to the average use across groups of other countries. It should be noted that countries other than the UK would not be expected to adhere to NICE guidance making comparisons between countries not possible.

2 Qualitative input from the field team

The implementation field team have recorded the following feedback in relation to this guidance:

Nothing to add at this time.
Notes on implementation submission: Healthcare activity data definitions

IMS HEALTH Hospital Pharmacy Audit Index (IMS HPAI)
IMS HEALTH collects information from pharmacies in hospital trusts in the UK. The section of this database relating to England is available for monitoring the overall usage in drugs appraised by NICE. The IMS HPAI database is based on issues of medicines recorded on hospital pharmacy systems. Issues refer to all medicines supplied from hospital pharmacies: to wards; departments; clinics; theatres; satellite sites and to patients in outpatient clinics and on discharge.

Measures of prescribing
Volume: The HPAI database measures volume in packs and a drug may be available in different pack sizes and pack sizes can vary between medicines.

Cost: Estimated costs are also calculated by IMS using the drug tariff and other standard price lists. Many hospitals receive discounts from suppliers and this is not reflected in the estimated cost.

Costs based on the drug tariff provide a degree of standardization allowing comparisons of prescribing data from different sources to be made. The costs stated in this report do not represent the true price paid by the NHS on medicines. The estimated costs are used as a proxy for utilization and are not suitable for financial planning.

Data limitations
IMS HPAI data do not link to demographic or to diagnosis information on patients. Therefore, it cannot be used to provide prescribing information on age and sex or for prescribing of specific conditions where the same drug is licensed for more than one indication.