

# 1 **Contrasting Evidence to Reimbursement Reality for Off-label use** 2 **(OLU) of Drug Treatments in Cancer Care – Rationale and Design of** 3 **the CEIT-OLU-project**

4 Herbrand AK<sup>1</sup>, Schmitt AM<sup>1</sup>, Briel M<sup>2,3</sup>, Diem S<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Ewald H<sup>2,7</sup>, Hoogkamer A<sup>1</sup>, Joerger M<sup>5</sup>, Mc Cord  
5 KA<sup>2</sup>, Novak U<sup>8</sup>, Sricharoenchai S<sup>2</sup>, Hemkens LG<sup>2#</sup>, Kasenda B<sup>1,9#</sup>

6 1 Department of Medical Oncology, University Hospital Basel and University of Basel, Basel,  
7 Switzerland.

8 2 Basel Institute for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Department of Clinical Research,  
9 University Hospital Basel and University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

10 3 Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton,  
11 Canada.

12 4 Department of Oncology and Hematology, Spital Grabs, Grabs, Switzerland.

13 5 Department of Oncology and Hematology, Cantonal Hospital, St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland.

14 6 Department of Immunobiology, Cantonal Hospital St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland.

15 7 University Medical Library, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

16 8 Department of Medical Oncology, Bern University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland.

17 9 Department of Hematology/Oncology and Palliative Care, Klinikum Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany.

18 # Shared senior authorship (The authors contributed equally to this work.)

19 **Corresponding Author:** Amanda K Herbrand, University Hospital Basel, Department of Medical  
20 Oncology, Petersgraben 4, 4051 Basel, Switzerland. Email: [amanda.herbrand@gmail.com](mailto:amanda.herbrand@gmail.com)

21 **Contact details of all authors:** [andreasmichael.schmitt@usb.ch](mailto:andreasmichael.schmitt@usb.ch); [matthias.briel@usb.ch](mailto:matthias.briel@usb.ch);  
22 [stefan.diem@srrws.ch](mailto:stefan.diem@srrws.ch); [hannah.ewald@unibas.ch](mailto:hannah.ewald@unibas.ch); [anouk.hoogkamer@stud.unibas.ch](mailto:anouk.hoogkamer@stud.unibas.ch);  
23 [markus.joerger@kssg.ch](mailto:markus.joerger@kssg.ch); [kimberlyalba.mccord@usb.ch](mailto:kimberlyalba.mccord@usb.ch); [urban.novak@insel.ch](mailto:urban.novak@insel.ch);  
24 [sirintip.sricharoenchai@stud.unibas.ch](mailto:sirintip.sricharoenchai@stud.unibas.ch); [lars.hemkens@usb.ch](mailto:lars.hemkens@usb.ch); [benjamin.kasenda@usb.ch](mailto:benjamin.kasenda@usb.ch)

## 25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Off-label drug use (OLU) reflects a perceived unmet medical need, which is common in  
27 oncology. Cancer drugs are often highly expensive and their reimbursement is a challenge for many

1 health care systems. OLU is frequently regulated by reimbursement restrictions. For evidence-based  
2 health care, treatment ought to be reimbursed if there is sufficient clinical evidence for treatment  
3 benefit independently of patient factors not related to the treatment indication. However, little is known  
4 about the reality of OLU reimbursement and its association with the underlying clinical evidence. Here  
5 we aim to investigate the relationship of reimbursement decisions with the underlying clinical evidence.

6 **Methods/ Design:** We extract patient characteristics and details on treatment and reimbursement of  
7 cancer drugs from over 3000 patients treated in three Swiss hospitals. We systematically search for  
8 clinical trial evidence on benefits associated with OLU in the most common indications. We will  
9 describe the prevalence of OLU in Switzerland and its reimbursement in cancer care, and use  
10 multivariable logistic regression techniques to investigate the association of approval/rejection of a  
11 reimbursement requests to the evidence on treatment effects and to further factors, including type of  
12 drug, molecular predictive markers and the health insurer.

13 **Discussion:** Our study will provide a systematic overview and assessment of OLU and its  
14 reimbursement reality in Switzerland. We may provide a better understanding of the access to cancer  
15 care that is regulated by health insurers and we hope to identify factors that determine the level of  
16 evidence-based cancer care in a highly diverse Western health care system.

17 **Keywords:** Off-label use, evidence-based health care, reimbursement, cancer therapy

## 18 **Background**

19 Drugs prescribed in routine medical care typically require licensing and approval for defined  
20 indications by health authorities, for example the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA),  
21 the European Medicines Agency (EMA), or Swissmedic (SM) in Switzerland. Indications usually  
22 contain restrictions in drug usage to a disease in a certain setting, line of treatment, and co-treatment  
23 with another drug. Off-label use (OLU) means using the drug outside the approved indication. In  
24 particular in cancer therapy, where new agents emerge frequently, OLU is common practice (1).  
25 International estimates range from 13% to 71% of adults receiving off-label therapy during cancer  
26 treatment (1), with about 30% in Switzerland (2). When new evidence for clinical benefit of a drug  
27 emerges, OLU allows usage before the indication is formally approved and labelled (3). One example  
28 is the human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) directed agent trastuzumab, which is  
29 approved standard treatment for patients with HER2-positive breast cancer (4,5). Success of

1 trastuzumab in HER2-positive breast cancer suggested benefits for other HER2-overexpressing or  
2 amplifying tumors as well, for example gastric cancer. Indeed, in 2010 a randomized controlled trial  
3 (RCT) showed better survival for patients with advanced gastric cancer overexpressing HER2 (6).  
4 However, it took another year until a formal approval for this new indication was granted by the FDA  
5 and in the meantime, patients could only receive this promising treatment via OLU. But  
6 counterexamples exist. Drugs being approved in certain cancer indications may not work in others, as  
7 shown for irinotecan and bevacizumab in colorectal cancer. Both drugs are effective and approved in  
8 the metastatic setting (7,8), however, in the adjuvant setting, no benefit was found (9,10); such  
9 example emphasizes that OLU may do harm to patients.

10 OLU is frequently regulated by reimbursement restrictions, because cancer drugs are often highly  
11 expensive and their reimbursement is a challenge for many health care systems. This may reduce  
12 costs, but to allow evidence-based health care, reimbursement should primarily be based on evidence.  
13 The Swiss healthcare system is highly diverse. Across the 26 cantons with diverse care structures and  
14 local regulation there are 57 statutory health insurers (as of Oct 2018) (11). They base their  
15 reimbursement policies on decisions of the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), which  
16 determines the drugs and indications that have to be reimbursed. For intended OLU, an upfront  
17 request for reimbursement to the patient's health insurer is mandatory. These reimbursement requests  
18 are then appraised by reviewers (medical examiners) commissioned by the statutory health insurers,  
19 who give recommendations on acceptance of the request with subsequent access to that treatment.  
20 They may use various tools (12) to guide their decisions on whether to approve or disapprove the  
21 reimbursement for OLU and are supposed to consider the available clinical evidence but also the  
22 individual clinical circumstances and patient characteristics.

23 Although these tools are recommended, it is neither mandatory nor transparent how they would be  
24 applied. There is no structured and transparent systematic framework specifically regulating the case-  
25 by-case decisions. There is also no empirical information on the reimbursement reality, which would  
26 be a prerequisite for quality control and potential improvement of this approach. Overall, due to the  
27 high costs of oncology drugs, access of Swiss patients to drugs used in off-label indications is  
28 currently based on intransparent processes.

29 Here we describe the rationale and design of the OLU-Cancer project as part of the Comparative  
30 Effectiveness of Innovative Treatments (CEIT) project (13). The CEIT project evaluates the generation

1 of clinical trial evidence for novel drug treatments, in the case of OLU using a large sample of patients  
2 to provide empirical evidence on access to OLU in a highly diverse Western health care system.

### 3 **Methods/ Design**

4 Our main objective is to investigate the relationship of reimbursement decisions to the underlying  
5 clinical evidence on patient benefits and subsequent access to cancer drugs. We also aim to assess  
6 the role of further factors that may influence the reimbursement. Finally, we aim to describe the  
7 prevalence of OLU and its reimbursement in cancer patients within the Swiss healthcare system.

8 The project is organized in three phases: First, we identify, extract and classify the data on OLU from  
9 patient records (electronic and paper-based). Second, we determine the clinical evidence using rapid  
10 review techniques, standard approaches for evidence synthesis, and review-of-review methods.  
11 Finally, we combine the results of both phases to address our research objectives.

#### 12 **I Reimbursement reality**

##### 13 **Eligibility Criteria**

14 In August 2018, we started to screen patient records for reimbursement requests at three collaborating  
15 major hospitals, all being tertiary referral centers: University Hospital Basel (Department of Medical  
16 Oncology and Department of Hematology), University Hospital Berne (Department of Medical  
17 Oncology), and a large general district hospital in St. Gallen (Department of Oncology/Hematology).

18 We screen all patients who had their first consultation between January 2015 and July 2018. Patients  
19 were eligible if they have a malignant disease (solid or hematological) and receive systemic anti-  
20 cancer treatment with a drug or biologic. Patients with at least one reimbursement request issued by  
21 the treating physician will be included in data extraction (see figure 1). We exclude patients who have  
22 only a one-time appointment for a second opinion, whose disease is not treated with drugs but surgery  
23 or radiotherapy only, or for whom no reimbursement request was issued.

##### 24 **Sample size considerations**

25 Based on a previous study on OLU in Switzerland (2), we assume that at least one reimbursement  
26 request for OLU has been issued for around 20% to 30% of eligible patients. In addition, preliminary  
27 data from the three sites revealed a proportion of 20% OLU. To account for the uncertainty on the  
28 actual frequency of OLU requests (both approved and disapproved), we consider a range of plausible

1 proportions (15%, 20%, and 25%) of OLU among all patients. To achieve a high precision of  
2 estimates, we plan to screen around 3000 eligible patients. This which would result in the following  
3 frequencies and proportions with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for OLU per patient:

- 4 - 450/3000 (15%, 95% CI: 13.8% to 16.3%)
- 5 - 600/3000 (20%, 95% CI: 18.6% to 21.5%)
- 6 - 900/3000 (30%, 95% CI: 28.4% to 31.7%)

7 We find all of them acceptable. To determine the actual proportion of disapproved reimbursement  
8 requests for OLU is a central objective of this project, however, based on preliminary data from this  
9 project and data from a single department that has implemented monitoring of its reimbursement  
10 requests since 2017, we assume that around 30% of OLU requests are disapproved. Considering the  
11 above-mentioned range of plausible frequencies of OLU requests, this would result in the following  
12 frequencies and proportions with 95% CIs for disapprovals per OLU request:

- 13 - 135/450 (30%, 95% CI 25.8% to 34.5%)
- 14 - 180/600 (30%, 95% CI 26.4% to 33.9%)
- 15 - 270/900 (30%, 95% CI 27.0% to 33.1%)

16 Thus, we consider a sample of 3000 eligible patients as sufficient to determine the prevalence of OLU,  
17 the prevalence of disapproved OLU, and also for our planned multivariable regression modelling (see  
18 III).

### 19 **Extraction of patient-related health and reimbursement data**

20 To assess the prevalence of OLU requests, we will screen patient records of all eligible patients for  
21 any reimbursement request. For those patients, we will extract patient demographics, disease and  
22 treatment details, and information on reimbursement requests and correspondence with the respective  
23 health insurer. This information will be stored in a relational database that we generated for this  
24 purpose. Details of the collected variables are available in the appendix (Table A1).

### 25 **Definition and categorization of OLU**

26 We will define OLU as any drug use that does not agree with the Swissmedic drug label. We will also  
27 assess unlicensed use (drug marketing is not licensed by Swissmedic for Switzerland, but approved  
28 by the FDA or EMA), and compassionate use (drug is neither licensed by the FDA, EMA nor  
29 Swissmedic) (see table 1). We will further sub-categorize OLU according to disease, intended

- 1 treatment setting (e.g. adjuvant), line of treatment (e.g. first-line) and use as single agent or drug
- 2 combination. This allows us to investigate the prevalence of OLU in different situations.

Category	FDA or EMA licensed	Swissmedic licensed	Agreement with Swissmedic label
Compassionate use	No	No	-
Unlicensed use	Yes	No	-
OLU	Yes	Yes	No
On-label	Yes	Yes	Yes

3 **Table 1:** Categorization of drug use depending on license, label and limitations. Abbr.: FDA= Food  
4 and Drug Association, EMA= European Medicines Agency

### 5 **Timeline of licensing and approval**

6 Licensing of a cancer drug often starts with a single indication and, over time, additional indications  
7 are approved. Drug labels and on- and off-label status may change over time. We will systematically  
8 record the approval dates of all requested drugs for each disease and new indication in a structured  
9 database. We will identify these dates by searching for publications and press releases of Swissmedic  
10 and the FOPH to develop a timeline for each drug and its label changes.

11 Two trained oncologists/hematologists will independently determine the OLU status for each request  
12 at the time of the request. Disagreements will be solved by discussion. Because the off-label status is  
13 time-dependent, we will match the date of the OLU request with the approval-timeline of the respective  
14 drug label.

### 15 **OLU prevalence**

16 We will estimate the prevalence of OLU and the frequency of reimbursement. Specifically, we will  
17 investigate:

- 18 • The frequency and proportion of all reimbursement requests among all eligible patients treated  
19 for a malignant disease.
  - 20 ○ The frequencies and proportions of OLU, compassionate and unlicensed use among all  
21 reimbursement requests.

- 1           ○ Frequency and proportion of OLU requests for a drug targeting a molecular predictive
- 2           marker irrespective of tumor site of origin.
- 3           ● Frequency and proportion of approval/rejection among all reimbursement requests for OLU,
- 4           unlicensed and compassionate use.
- 5           ○ Frequency and proportion of how costs for requested drugs are covered stratified by
- 6           approval/rejection
- 7           ○ Frequency and proportion of rebuttals to rejections among all reimbursement requests for
- 8           OLU, unlicensed and compassionate use
- 9           ○ Frequency of how many decisions were changed from rejection to approval by rebuttal of
- 10          the treating physician
- 11          ● The time between reimbursement request and approval/disapproval of reimbursement decision.
- 12          Unit of calculation is the individual request. We will re-evaluate all these factors in subgroups of
- 13          requests clustered by the patient's health insurer (insurer as per index date of first reimbursement
- 14          request).

## 15   **II Clinical evidence**

16   We will systematically evaluate the evidence for treatment effects on overall survival (OS) and  
17   progression-free survival (PFS) in OLU situations.

### 18   **Literature search**

19   For the most common off-label indications, we will generate overarching clinical questions following  
20   the PICO structure (14), composed of population (disease, treatment setting, treatment line),  
21   intervention (drug, single agent or combination), control (any comparator), and outcome (PFS or OS).  
22   Most common OLU indications and resulting PICO questions will be derived from the extracted patient  
23   data (for details see appendix, table A1).

24   We will use rapid review techniques to identify systematic reviews (SRs) of RCTs addressing these  
25   questions. If there are no eligible systematic reviews available, we will directly search for RCTs. We  
26   will search PubMed and use pertinent keywords and subject headings for cancer sites and generic  
27   drug terms. Standard search filters for SRs and RCTs will be used (15). In general, we will include  
28   publications reporting treatment effects on PFS and OS that are published in English or German. No  
29   further limits will be applied. Further evidence will be sought by backward citation chasing (16)

1 (screening the reference lists of included publications). Search strategies will be created by an  
2 information specialist and will be peer-reviewed.

3 We will additionally evaluate literature provided by the requesting physician and consult guidelines  
4 provided by the European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO) and verify if our search identifies any  
5 RCTs not found in our systematic literature searches (17).

## 6 **Study selection and data extraction**

7 Overall, for feasibility and efficiency reasons, we use the SRs primarily to identify pertinent RCTs and  
8 their results. In a first step, we will select the most recent systematic review publication identified in the  
9 SR search that is covering the PICO. We will always prefer a recent Cochrane Review due to the  
10 comparatively high methodological quality and standardized and transparent reporting. We only  
11 consider SRs that are sufficiently transparent in reporting key methods. This means, we include only  
12 SRs that adequately report the PRISMA items “identification”, “screening”, “eligibility”, “included” (18).  
13 We deem reporting adequate if it would let us replicate the search for RCTs. Selection of SRs will be  
14 done independently by two reviewers and confirmed by a third reviewer in case of uncertainty.

15 In a second step, we will identify the pertinent RCTs included in eligible SRs. From each eligible SR  
16 article, we extract bibliographic details of the SR, search details (search date, databases), and any  
17 RCT and corresponding publication matching our PICO of interest. From each pertinent RCT article,  
18 we extract bibliographic information and the date of publication (earliest available: online or printed if  
19 printed publication was available before published online). We will extract the treatment effects directly  
20 from the RCT publication, based on the main analysis of the intention to treat population (ITT), where  
21 available. The rationale behind this is that we want to depict the evidence as it was at the time of  
22 request. In case of multiple reported effect estimates, we prefer that one clearly labeled as  
23 prespecified, main analysis, or first reported in the abstract (acknowledging possible spin by relying on  
24 prominently reported results for consistency, which will be addressed in sensitivity analyses).

25 If no appropriate SR can be identified, we will apply the same procedure to the RCT search.

## 26 **Evidence synthesis and overview**

27 We will synthesize the evidence by using cumulative meta-analysis techniques (19,20). We will  
28 combine all trials on the same PICO question and determine for the time point, when new evidence is  
29 available, the current knowledge on clinical benefits (that is the summary treatment effect estimate for



1 OS and PFS from all RCTs up to that point). This allows us to describe the evolution of clinical  
2 knowledge from RCTs in any oncological off-label indication with clinical trial evidence over time.

3 We will categorize the available evidence on patient-relevant treatment benefits from RCTs (summary  
4 treatment effect from meta-analyses) for each drug and indication into:

- 5 1. The combined analysis shows OS benefit (nominal statistical significance).
- 6 2. The combined analysis shows PFS benefit (nominal statistical significance), but no OS benefit.
- 7 3. No indication for benefit or harm (no nominal statistically significant OS or PFS effect).
- 8 4. Inconclusive (nominal statistical treatment benefit for OS but significant harm for PFS or vice  
9 versa).
- 10 5. The combined analysis shows OS harm.
- 11 6. The combined analysis shows PFS harm.
- 12 7. Unclear (no randomized trial evidence available).

### 13 **III Contrasting Evidence to Reimbursement Reality**

14 Finally, we will investigate the association between the reimbursement decision for OLU and clinical  
15 evidence using multilevel multivariable logistic regression. Furthermore, we aim to identify other  
16 factors than clinical evidence explaining any potential discrepancies between clinical evidence and  
17 reimbursement.

#### 18 **Association of reimbursement to evidence**

19 We will use multilevel multivariable logistic regression to investigate the association between the  
20 clinical evidence supporting OLU and the likelihood for reimbursement of OLU. We have chosen  
21 multilevel modelling, because requests are clustered by patients and health insurers. We will  
22 condense the seven categories of clinical evidence into three groups (A-C) and summarize treatment  
23 benefits:

- 24 A) Clear patient-relevant benefit (corresponds to category 1)
- 25 B) Potential patient-relevant benefit (corresponds to category 2)
- 26 C) No proven patient-relevant benefit (corresponds to category 3-7)

27 We will determine the category for the time when each reimbursement was requested. Category A will  
28 be the reference for this categorical variable, which is the independent variable in the regression  
29 analysis. Rejection of a request for reimbursement of OLU will be the dependent binary variable

1 (rejected versus approved). The association will be expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95%  
2 confidence intervals, with an  $OR > 1$  indicating a higher likelihood for the reimbursement to be rejected  
3 by the health insurer. We hypothesize that the risk for rejection will be higher in situations of category  
4 C than B and higher for category B than A.

5 The above-mentioned consideration of time points in our data collection and analysis will allow us to  
6 investigate potential time lags between occurrence of new evidence for treatment benefit and  
7 Swissmedic approval/labeling. In such periods, patients can only access new drugs through OLU  
8 reimbursement by the health insurer or extended access programs by the respective drug  
9 manufacturer. However, the latter is completely at the discretion of the drug manufacturer, therefore,  
10 requesting OLU from the health insurer is often the only way to receive the drug. We will therefore  
11 additionally investigate the following:

- 12 • The time lag between availability of evidence for treatment benefit (category A or B) and  
13 approval of the drug by Swissmedic. This time will be calculated from the earliest date of trial  
14 publication to the date of approval by Swissmedic.
- 15 • The number of cases in this time period, for each indication, in which an OLU request was  
16 issued and the number of these requests rejected for reimbursement, although evidence for  
17 treatment benefit (category A or B) was available.

## 18 **Association of reimbursement to other factors**

19 To investigate whether patient or disease characteristics that are not related to the treatment indication  
20 influence the risk for rejection of request for OLU reimbursement, we will perform multilevel  
21 multivariable logistic regression analysis including seven variables. These variables are:

- 22 1. Sex (categorical variable: male vs. female)
- 23 2. Age (continuous variable)
- 24 3. Presence of molecular predictive marker (binary variable; we anticipate that presence of a  
25 marker lowers the risk of rejection because of the availability of a drug target independent of the  
26 disease)
- 27 4. Disease type (categorical variable: solid vs. hematological malignancies; we anticipate that  
28 chances for reimbursement are higher for hematological malignancies because there are often  
29 only OLU treatment options available for hematological malignancies)

- 1 5. Type of treatment (categorical variable: immunotherapy [checkpoint inhibition] vs. all others; we
- 2 anticipate that chances for reimbursement are higher for immunotherapy because this drug
- 3 class has recently been approved for several tumor entities)
- 4 6. Orphan drug status (binary variable; we anticipate that chances for reimbursement are higher
- 5 for an orphan drug/indication because there are less treatment options available)
- 6 7. Tumor incidence (continuous variable; we anticipate that chances for reimbursement are higher
- 7 for rare diseases because there are less treatment options available)

8 We assume that there is less evidence for rare diseases. However, such patients may often be  
9 particularly in need for OLU. We will rank the entities by incidence according to global cancer statistics  
10 as issued by the WHO (21) and label orphan drugs according to Swissmedic (22). For sensitivity  
11 analyses, we will consider the orphan drug designation as used by the FDA (23).

## 12 **Handling of missing data**

13 We will report frequencies (proportions) of missing data of all independent and dependent variables.  
14 The primary analysis will be based on complete cases, but we will use multiple imputations for missing  
15 data for a sensitivity analysis using all cases (24).

## 16 **Software**

17 We will use Ninox (<https://ninoxdb.de/de/>) for managing data and generating relational databases, R  
18 for data cleaning and most statistical analyses (The R Project for Statistical Computing, [https://www.r-](https://www.r-project.org/)  
19 [project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/)), and Stata (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX:  
20 StataCorp LLC) for multilevel regression modelling.

## 21 **Discussion**

22 This study will provide a comprehensive assessment of OLU and its reimbursement reality in  
23 Switzerland, a systematic overview of the comparative effectiveness of OLU in cancer care, and a  
24 thorough investigation on the association between OLU reimbursement and the underlying evidence  
25 from clinical research. By publishing this rationale and design paper, we intend to minimize ambiguity  
26 and increase transparency concerning our study (25).

27 To our knowledge, this will be the first study targeting OLU in such extent and level of detail. We will  
28 use transparent sources and apply systematic and reproducible search strategies. The collaboration

1 with three hematology/oncology departments across Switzerland will provide us with a sufficient  
2 number of patients to gain a representative sample for our planned investigations.

3 We will highly depend on the comprehensiveness of documentation in patient files, but we expect that  
4 the documentation of correspondence with the health insurer will at least be routinely included in the  
5 patient files due to the substantial economic and administrative impact.

6 This study will provide a comprehensive overview on access to off-label treatments in a highly  
7 developed country, characterized by a fragmented and expensive health care system. It will help to  
8 determine if access to perceived unmet medical needs is based on clinical evidence and if the Swiss  
9 health care system employs principles of evidence-based health care for OLU. We hope to reveal  
10 potential inequalities in access, to better understand and ultimately improve the quality of  
11 reimbursement decisions for cancer patients.

## 12 **Abbreviations**

CEIT	Comparative Effectiveness of Innovative Treatments
EMA	European Medicines Agency
FDA	Food and drugs association
FOPH	(Swiss) Federal Office of Public Health
HER2	Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
OLU	Off-label Use
OS	Overall survival
PFS	Progression free survival
PICO	Population, intervention, control, outcome
RCT	Randomized controlled study
SM	Swissmedic
SR	Systematic review

## 1 **Declarations**

### 2 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

3 We will use routinely collected health data of patients who did not explicitly give informed consent to  
4 our study. The responsible research ethics committee reviewed this project and approval was granted  
5 (EKNZ Project ID 2018-01431, approved 10th of August 2018).

6 All study personnel with access to individual patient data will sign confidentiality agreements. Patient  
7 data will be handled using a specific privacy securing system.

### 8 **Consent for publication**

9 Not applicable.

### 10 **Availability of data and material**

11 Not applicable.

### 12 **Competing interests**

13 BK declares consultant activities for Roche and Siemens, research grants from Roche/AbbVie, travel  
14 support from Riemser, AbbVie and Amgen. UN declares consultation or advisory role for Roche, Astra,  
15 Gilead, Celgene, and honoraria (congress participations) from Amgen, Novartis, Takeda, Roche. All  
16 other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### 17 **Funding**

18 This project was fully funded by the Swiss Cancer League with a research grant for post-doc salaries  
19 and expendables (Grant KFS-4262-08.2017). The funding body had no influence on the design of  
20 the study, the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, and on writing the manuscript.

### 21 **Authors' contributions**

22 Drafting of the manuscript: AKH, AMS, LGH, BK. Critical revision of the manuscript for important  
23 intellectual content: MB, HE, SD, UN, MJ. Collection of data: AH, KAM, SS. All authors read and  
24 approved the final manuscript.

### 25 **Acknowledgements**

26 Not applicable.

## 1 References

- 2 1. Saiyed MM, Ong PS, Chew L. Off-label drug use in oncology: a systematic review of  
3 literature. *J Clin Pharm Ther* [Internet]. 2017; Available from:  
4 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jcpt.12507>
- 5 2. Joerger M, Schaer-Thuer C, Koeberle D, Matter-Walstra K, Gibbons-Marsico J, Diem S,  
6 et al. Off-label use of anticancer drugs in eastern Switzerland: a population-based  
7 prospective cohort study. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2014 Jun;70(6):719–25.
- 8 3. Stafford RS. Regulating off-label drug use--rethinking the role of the FDA. *N Engl J Med*.  
9 2008 Apr 3;358(14):1427–9.
- 10 4. Senkus E, Kyriakides S, Penault-Llorca F, Poortmans P, Thompson A, Zackrisson S, et  
11 al. Primary breast cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment  
12 and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2013 Oct;24 Suppl 6:vi7–23.
- 13 5. Cardoso F, Costa A, Norton L, Senkus E, Aapro M, André F, et al. ESO-ESMO 2nd  
14 international consensus guidelines for advanced breast cancer (ABC2)†. *Ann Oncol*.  
15 2014 Oct;25(10):1871–88.
- 16 6. Van Cutsem E, Kang Y, Chung H, Shen L, Sawaki A, Lordick F, et al. Efficacy results  
17 from the ToGA trial: a phase III study of trastuzumab added to standard chemotherapy in  
18 first-line HER2-positive advanced gastric cancer. *J Clin Oncol*.  
19 2009;27(18)(suppl):LBA4509.
- 20 7. Douillard JY, Cunningham D, Roth AD, Navarro M, James RD, Karasek P, et al.  
21 Irinotecan combined with fluorouracil compared with fluorouracil alone as first-line  
22 treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: a multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2000  
23 Mar 25;355(9209):1041–7.
- 24 8. Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, Novotny W, Cartwright T, Hainsworth J, Heim W, et al.  
25 Bevacizumab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal  
26 cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2004 Jun 3;350(23):2335–42.
- 27 9. Saltz LB, Niedzwiecki D, Hollis D, Goldberg RM. Irinotecan fluorouracil plus leucovorin is  
28 not superior to fluorouracil plus leucovorin alone as adjuvant treatment for stage III colon  
29 cancer: results of CALGB .... *Journal of Clinical* [Internet]. 2007; Available from:  
30 <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.977.2822&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- 31 10. de Gramont A, Van Cutsem E, Schmoll H-J, Tabernero J, Clarke S, Moore MJ, et al.  
32 Bevacizumab plus oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy as adjuvant treatment for colon  
33 cancer (AVANT): a phase 3 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2012  
34 Dec;13(12):1225–33.
- 35 11. Bundesamt für Gesundheit. Verzeichnisse der zugelassenen Kranken- und  
36 Rückversicherer [Internet]. [cited 2019 May 1]. Available from:  
37 [https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/de/home/versicherungen/krankenversicherung/krankenve](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/de/home/versicherungen/krankenversicherung/krankenversicherung-versicherer-aufsicht/verzeichnisse-krankenundrueckversicherer.html)  
38 [rsicherung-versicherer-aufsicht/verzeichnisse-krankenundrueckversicherer.html](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/de/home/versicherungen/krankenversicherung/krankenversicherung-versicherer-aufsicht/verzeichnisse-krankenundrueckversicherer.html)
- 39 12. von Stokar T, Vettori A, Fliedner J. Zugangsgerechtigkeit und -sicherheit bei  
40 Krebsmedikamenten im Off-label Use. Krebsliga Schweiz (KLS), Bern [Internet]. 2013;  
41 Available from:  
42 [https://assets.krebsliga.ch/downloads/130527\\_bericht\\_zusammenfassung\\_off\\_label\\_use](https://assets.krebsliga.ch/downloads/130527_bericht_zusammenfassung_off_label_use_infras_d.pdf)  
43 [\\_infrass\\_d.pdf](https://assets.krebsliga.ch/downloads/130527_bericht_zusammenfassung_off_label_use_infras_d.pdf)

- 1 13. Ladanie A, Speich B, Naudet F, Agarwal A, Pereira TV, Sclafani F, et al. The  
2 Comparative Effectiveness of Innovative Treatments for Cancer (CEIT-Cancer) project:  
3 Rationale and design of the database and the collection of evidence available at  
4 approval of novel drugs. *Trials*. 2018 Sep 19;19(1):505.
- 5 14. Richardson WS, Wilson MC, Nishikawa J, Hayward RS. The well-built clinical question: a  
6 key to evidence-based decisions. *ACP J Club*. 1995 Nov;123(3):A12–3.
- 7 15. Lefebvre C, Manheimer E, Glanvill J. Chapter 6: Searching for Studies. In: Higgins JPT  
8 & Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions:*  
9 *Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from:  
10 <http://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/>
- 11 16. Cooper C, Booth A, Britten N, Garside R. A comparison of results of empirical studies of  
12 supplementary search techniques and recommendations in review methodology  
13 handbooks: a methodological review. *Syst Rev*. 2017 Nov 28;6(1):234.
- 14 17. ESMO guidelines [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.esmo.org/Guidelines/ESMO-](https://www.esmo.org/Guidelines/ESMO-MCBS)  
15 [MCBS](https://www.esmo.org/Guidelines/ESMO-MCBS)
- 16 18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for  
17 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009 Jul  
18 21;339:b2535.
- 19 19. Sutton AJ, Higgins JPT. Recent developments in meta-analysis. *Stat Med*.  
20 2008;27(5):625–50.
- 21 20. Lau J, Schmid CH, Chalmers TC. Cumulative meta-analysis of clinical trials builds  
22 evidence for exemplary medical care. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1995 Jan;48(1):45–57;  
23 discussion 59–60.
- 24 21. Fact Sheets by Population [Internet]. Available from:  
25 [http://globocan.iarc.fr/Pages/fact\\_sheets\\_population.aspx](http://globocan.iarc.fr/Pages/fact_sheets_population.aspx)
- 26 22. Swissmedic. Orphan drug status. [Internet]. 2018. Available from:  
27 [https://www.swissmedic.ch/swissmedic/de/home/ueber-uns/swissmedic--](https://www.swissmedic.ch/swissmedic/de/home/ueber-uns/swissmedic--schweizerisches-heilmittelinstitut/patienten-und-anwender.html)  
28 [schweizerisches-heilmittelinstitut/patienten-und-anwender.html](https://www.swissmedic.ch/swissmedic/de/home/ueber-uns/swissmedic--schweizerisches-heilmittelinstitut/patienten-und-anwender.html)
- 29 23. US Food and Drug Administration. Search orphan drug designations and approvals.  
30 [Internet]. 2014; Available from: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/opdlisting/oopd/>
- 31 24. Sterne JAC, White IR, Carlin JB, Spratt M, Royston P, Kenward MG, et al. Multiple  
32 imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical research: potential and pitfalls.  
33 *BMJ*. 2009 Jun 29;338:b2393.
- 34 25. Godlee F. Publishing study protocols: Making them visible will improve registration,  
35 reporting and recruitment. Vol. 2. 2001.
- 36 26. Spezialitätenliste (SL) - Übersicht [Internet]. [cited 2018 Jul 12]. Available from:  
37 <http://www.xn--speziallittenliste-yqb.ch/>

38

## 39 **Figure Legends**

40 **Figure 1:** Flowchart for patient screening and eligibility criteria.

## Screening

Eligible patients:

- Malignant disease?
- No second opinion?
- Drug treatment?

**NO**

*ineligible*

**YES**

OLU Request

**NO**

*not extracted*

**YES**

## Database

Reimbursement decision

***Disapproval***

***Approval***