

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Proposed Health Technology Appraisal

Fenfluramine for treating Dravet syndrome

Draft scope (pre-referral)

Draft remit/appraisal objective

To appraise the clinical and cost effectiveness of fenfluramine within its marketing authorisation for treating Dravet syndrome.

Background

Dravet syndrome, previously known as severe myoclonic epilepsy of infancy (SMEI), is a severe form of epilepsy that affects children and adults. It is caused by defects in genes required for the proper function of brain cells.¹ Seizures in Dravet syndrome begin within the first year of life, and are characterised by initial prolonged seizures accompanying a fever (febrile seizures), which are typically associated with one side of the brain (lateralisation). Subsequently infants develop multiple seizure types (including myoclonic, absence, focal and generalised tonic–clonic seizures) and are affected by developmental delay or regression. People with Dravet syndrome are particularly prone to status epilepticus, a state of continuous seizure requiring emergency medical care.²

In the UK, the incidence of Dravet syndrome has been estimated between 1 in 19,000 to 1 in 40,000 live births.³ Dravet syndrome-related mortality is estimated to be around 20%, with most deaths occurring before 10 years of age. Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) and status epilepticus cause around half and a third of deaths in this condition respectively.⁴

Dravet syndrome is primarily managed with anti-epileptic drugs, and may be supported by a ketogenic diet or vagus nerve stimulation. NICE clinical guideline 137 recommends sodium valproate or topiramate as first-line treatment options, and if seizures are inadequately controlled, clobazam or stiripentol are recommended as adjunctive treatment. Many children with Dravet syndrome seem to respond best to a specific combination of sodium valproate, stiripentol and clobazam.⁵ NICE technology appraisal 614 recommends cannabidiol with clobazam as an option for treating seizures associated with Dravet syndrome in people aged 2 years and older, only if: the frequency of convulsive seizures is checked every 6 months, and cannabidiol is stopped if the frequency has not fallen by at least 30% compared with the 6 months before starting treatment.

The technology

Fenfluramine (brand name unknown, Zogenix International) acts primarily as a serotonin releasing drug. Serotonin-releasing drugs may have an effect on epileptic activity in the brain. It is administered orally.

Fenfluramine does not currently have a marketing authorisation in the UK for Dravet syndrome. It has been studied in placebo controlled trials as an adjuvant treatment for inadequately controlled Dravet syndrome in people taking one or more anti-epileptic drugs.

Intervention(s)	Fenfluramine in addition to current clinical management
Population(s)	People with Dravet syndrome whose seizures are inadequately controlled by established clinical management
Comparators	Established clinical management without fenfluramine, which may include combinations of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sodium valproate • topiramate • clobazam • stiripentol • levetiracetam • ketogenic diet • vagus nerve stimulation • cannabidiol with clobazam
Outcomes	The outcome measures to be considered include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • seizure frequency (overall and by seizure type) • response rate (overall and by seizure type) • seizure severity • incidence of status epilepticus • mortality • adverse effects of treatment • health-related quality of life

Economic analysis	<p>The reference case stipulates that the cost effectiveness of treatments should be expressed in terms of incremental cost per quality-adjusted life year.</p> <p>The reference case stipulates that the time horizon for estimating clinical and cost effectiveness should be sufficiently long to reflect any differences in costs or outcomes between the technologies being compared.</p> <p>Costs will be considered from an NHS and Personal Social Services perspective.</p>
Other considerations	<p>Guidance will only be issued in accordance with the marketing authorisation. Where the wording of the therapeutic indication does not include specific treatment combinations, guidance will be issued only in the context of the evidence that has underpinned the marketing authorisation granted by the regulator.</p>
Related NICE recommendations and NICE Pathways	<p>Related Technology Appraisals: Cannabidiol for adjuvant treatment of seizures associated with Dravet syndrome (TA614)</p> <p>Related Guidelines: Cannabis based medicinal products (2019) NICE clinical guideline 144. Review date 2022. Epilepsies: diagnosis and management (2016) NICE clinical guideline 137. Review date 2018.</p> <p>Related Quality Standards: Quality standard for the epilepsies in adults (2013) NICE quality standard 26. Quality standard for the epilepsies in children and young people (2013) NICE Quality Standard 27</p> <p>Related NICE Pathways: Epilepsy (2019) NICE pathway</p>
Related National Policy	<p>The NHS Long Term Plan, 2019. NHS Long Term Plan NHS England (2018/2019) NHS manual for prescribed specialist services (2018/2019) Chapter 78. Neuropsychiatry services (adults and children)</p> <p>Department of Health and Social Care, NHS Outcomes Framework 2016-2017: Domains 1, 2, 4 and 5. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-outcomes-framework-2016-to-2017</p>

Questions for consultation

Have all relevant comparators for fenfluramine been included in the scope? Which treatments are considered to be established clinical practice in the NHS for the treatment of Dravet syndrome?

Are the outcomes listed appropriate?

Are there any subgroups of people in whom fenfluramine is expected to be more clinically effective and cost effective or other groups that should be examined separately?

Will people with Dravet syndrome continue to use fenfluramine in adulthood?

Where do you consider fenfluramine will fit into the existing NICE pathway, [‘Epilepsy \(2019\)’](#)?

Is fenfluramine likely to require additional monitoring for the risk of adverse cardiovascular outcomes such as heart valve disease?

NICE is committed to promoting equality of opportunity, eliminating unlawful discrimination and fostering good relations between people with particular protected characteristics and others. Please let us know if you think that the proposed remit and scope may need changing in order to meet these aims. In particular, please tell us if the proposed remit and scope:

- could exclude from full consideration any people protected by the equality legislation who fall within the patient population for which fenfluramine will be licensed;
- could lead to recommendations that have a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population, e.g. by making it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology;
- could have any adverse impact on people with a particular disability or disabilities.

Please tell us what evidence should be obtained to enable the Committee to identify and consider such impacts.

Do you consider fenfluramine to be innovative in its potential to make a significant and substantial impact on health-related benefits and how it might improve the way that current need is met (is this a ‘step-change’ in the management of the condition)?

Do you consider that the use of fenfluramine can result in any potential significant and substantial health-related benefits that are unlikely to be included in the QALY calculation?

Please identify the nature of the data which you understand to be available to enable the Appraisal Committee to take account of these benefits.

To help NICE prioritise topics for additional adoption support, do you consider that there will be any barriers to adoption of this technology into practice? If yes, please describe briefly.

NICE intends to appraise this technology through its Single Technology Appraisal (STA) Process. We welcome comments on the appropriateness of appraising this topic through this process. (Information on the Institute's Technology Appraisal processes is available at <http://www.nice.org.uk/article/pmg19/chapter/1-Introduction>).

NICE has published an addendum to its guide to the methods of technology appraisal (available at <https://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/NICE-guidance/NICE-technology-appraisals/methods-guide-addendum-cost-comparison.pdf>), which states the methods to be used where a cost comparison case is made.

- Would it be appropriate to use the cost comparison methodology for this topic?
- Is the new technology likely to be similar in its clinical efficacy and resource use to any of the comparators?
- Is the primary outcome that was measured in the trial or used to drive the model for the comparators still clinically relevant?
- Is there any substantial new evidence for the comparator technologies that has not been considered? Are there any important ongoing trials reporting in the next year?

References

- 1 European Medicines Agency (2014) [Public summary of opinion on orphan designation Fenfluramine hydrochloride for the treatment of Dravet syndrome](#). Accessed January 2020
- 2 Dravet Syndrome UK (2016) [What is Dravet syndrome](#). Accessed January 2020
- 3 Dravet Syndrome UK (2016) [Facts about Dravet Syndrome](#). Accessed January 2020
- 4 Shmueli S (2016) Mortality in Dravet syndrome: A review *Epilepsy and Behaviour*. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 64, 69–74
- 5 Epilepsy Action (2016) [Dravet syndrome](#). Accessed January 2020