

Sent by email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Pfizer Limited
Walton Oaks
Dorking Road
Walton on the Hill
Tadworth
Surrey
KT20 7NS

4 October 2017

Dear [REDACTED]

Appeal against Final Appraisal Determination (FAD): Inotuzumab ozogamicin for treating relapsed or refractory B cell acute lymphoblastic leukaemia

Thank you for your letter of 26 September 2017 responding to my views on initial scrutiny. This is my final decision on the valid appeal points.

Ground 1 (a)

Ground 1.1 The appraisal committee has seemingly failed to consider the cost effectiveness of inotuzumab applicable to UK clinical practice when used in accordance with its marketing authorisation

Already accepted as valid.

Ground 1.2 The fact that the clinical experts were not invited to the second meeting of the Appraisal Committee meant that important clinical advice was not available to guide the preparation of the FAD

Already accepted as valid.

Ground 1.3 The Committee has provided no explanation for its decision to reject the utilities proposed in the revised Pfizer base case for the post HSCT period and submitted in response to consultation

Having reviewed your additional argument I now agree this is a valid appeal ground.

Ground 2

2.1 The Appraisal Committee's reasons for disregarding key assumptions used for the purposes of NICE's appraisal of blinatumomab do not explain the choices that were made in relation to inotuzumab

Already accepted as valid.

2.2 The Committee has seemingly misunderstood the utilities submitted by Pfizer in response to consultation on the ACD

Already accepted as valid.

2.3 The Committee has misinterpreted Pfizer's revised submission on administration costs

I have considered your additional explanation carefully. However I am afraid it does not seem to address the questions raised in my initial scrutiny letter and has not taken me any further forward. Therefore I cannot see any arguable basis on which the committee can be said to have misinterpreted your submission on administration costs and I am not allowing this point to proceed.

The valid appeal points are 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1 and 2.2.

Yours sincerely

Dr Rosie Benneyworth
Vice Chair
National Institute for Health and Care Excellence