Is the Juice Worth the Squeeze? Overall Survival gain per unit treatment time as a metric of clinical benefit of systemic treatment in incurable cancers.

Nuradh Joseph ^{1,2}

Vodathi Bamunuarachchi^{2,3}

Vimukthini Peiris^{2,4}

Sidath Wijeskera^{2,5}

Daminda Rajapakse^{2,6}

Sanjeeva Gunasekera^{2,3}

- 1. District General Hospital, Hambantota, Sri Lanka.
- 2. Sri Lanka Cancer Research Group, Maharagama, Sri Lanka.
- 3. Apeksha Hospital, Maharagama, Sri Lanka
- 4. District General Hospital, Vavuniya, Sri Lanka.
- 5. District General Hospital, Avissawella, Sri Lanka.
- 6. Teaching Hospital, Ratnapura, Sri Lanka.

Keywords: cost-effectiveness, oncology, clinical benefit, overall survival, treatment duration

Funding: This work did not receive any specific funding from any governmental, private or notfor-profit organization.

Conflicts of Interest: None declared

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Nuradh Joseph MD MRCP FRCR Consultant Clinical Oncologist, District General Hospital, Hambantota, Hambantota, Sri Lanka Tel: +94777745544 Email: <u>m23355@pgim.cmb.ac.lk</u>

Abstract

Introduction

Novel systemic therapeutic options such as enzyme inhibitors and monoclonal antibodies have transformed the practice of medical oncology in the recent past. However, survival gains remain modest in most cases. Quantifying the magnitude of benefit against financial and non-financial toxicity of treatment is pivotal in deciding treatment. We describe a novel metric which can be used to assess effectiveness novel therapeutics for incurable cancers.

Methods

The median overall survival was divided by the median duration of treatment to obtain the overall survival gain per treatment time which was the primary end-point of the study. This parameter was compared with the European Society of Medical Oncology Magnitude of clinical benefit scale (ESMO-MCBS) score. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to test the association between the novel metric and the ESMO-MCBS scores.

Results

Data were available for 30 drugs across 60 indications. The median overall survival per unit treatment time ranged from 0.68 (range 0.2-0.51). Only 18/60 indications had a ratio greater than 1 while 13/60 indications had a ratio less than 0.5. The median treatment duration was not mentioned in 11 indications and median progression free survival was substituted for the analysis. The ESMO-MCBS score was available for 49 of the indications. The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was 0.44575 and showed a statistically significant association between survival gain per unit treatment time and the ESMO-MCBS score (p = 0.00133).

Conclusions

Along with other metrics, the ratio of survival gain over treatment duration is a useful parameter to assess effectiveness of novel therapeutics in the palliative setting.

Introduction

Although cure rates have improved significantly over the last couple of decades, nearly 50% of all cancers are still incurable (1). For patients with incurable cancer, the objective of treatment is to prolong survival while improving or maintaining quality of life. A large number of novel cancer therapeutic agents ranging from complex monoclonal antibodies to small molecule enzyme inhibitors and new types of hormonal treatment, have been approved for use in incurable cancers and while this has led to modest improvements in survival it comes at the price of significant toxicity as well as a heavy financial burden on health systems (2).

Oncologists prescribe systemic treatment in incurable cancer with a view to shrinking the tumour and/or preventing its growth but eventually the cancer develops resistance and progresses through treatment. The outcome end-points response rate, duration of response and progression free survival capture these aspects of treatment. However, they are not a robust surrogate marker for the overall survival which is considered as the primary end-point of choice (3,4).

Systemic treatment of incurable cancers is continued until tumour progression, which is defined as an increase in the sum of maximum tumour diameters of at least 20%, the development of any new lesions, or an unequivocal increase in non-measurable malignant disease, in comparison to the preceding assessment. Intolerable toxicity is another factor which could lead to a premature termination of treatment (5). The duration of treatment is an important metric that ought to be reported in all publications of trials involving novel cancer agents (6). It is the primary determinant of the direct cost of treatment and the time of exposure to treatment will impact on treatment toxicities.

In this work, we explore the novel metric overall survival gain per unit treatment time as a useful parameter to supplement other established measures of clinical benefit such the European Society of Medical Oncology - Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) and the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) Value Framework score (7,8).

Methods

Data on median overall survival gain and median duration of treatment were obtained from publications of phase III randomised clinical trials for novel anti-cancer therapeutics in the palliative setting.

In trials with significant treatment cross-over estimates of median survival gain were substituted where such data was available. Studies were excluded if no overall survival gain was demonstrated and where there were no published studies of estimates of overall survival gain.

Trials in which median overall survival was not reached were also excluded from the analysis. If the median duration of treatment was not reported the median time to progression was substituted for it.

The median overall survival was divided by the median duration of treatment to obtain the overall survival gain per treatment time which was the primary end-point of the study. This parameter was compared with the ESMO-MCBS score. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to test the association between the novel metric and the ESMO-MCBS scores. The statistical Software R version 4.1.1 was used for analysis

Results

Data were available for 30 drugs across 60 indications. Supplementary table S1 gives the full dataset of the analysis including the referenced publications from which data was extracted. Table 1 presents the values of the metric for 40 selected indications. The median overall survival was 5.8 months (range 1.4 - 42.2 months) and the median treatment duration was 8 months (rage, 1.9-78 months). The median overall survival per unit treatment time ranged from 0.68 (range 0.2-0.51). Supplementary Figure S1 depicts in the form of a histogram the number of indications for each survival gain per unit treatment time. Since the distribution was skewed a logarithmic transformation was performed to achieve greater normality, and the histogram of the logarithm of the metric is presented in Figure 1. The median of the logarithm of the survival gain per unit treatment time vas -0.17 (range -0.71-0.7).

Only 18/60 indications had a ratio greater than 1 while 13/60 indications had a ratio less than 0.5. The median treatment duration was not mentioned in 11 indications and median progression free survival was substituted for the analysis. The ESMO-MCBS score was available for 49 of the indications. The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was 0.44575 and showed a statistically significant association between survival gain per unit treatment time and the ESMO-MCBS score (p = 0.00133).

Discussion

In this work, we present a novel metric, survival gain per unit treatment time, as a useful parameter that could complement other measures of clinical benefit such as the ESMO-MCBS score. Ideally clinicians would want the benefit of treatment to outlast its duration, leaving a prolonged therapeutic legacy of benefit to the patient. This can be achieved if the novel drugs result in significant tumour shrinkage which is sustained for a prolonged time period. Treatments with a survival gain per treatment time > 1 would fall into this category, and are likely to be preferred by patients since the gain in survival is greater than exposure to the drug and its toxicity. In addition, they are likely to be more cost-effective since the cost of treatment is related

to drug exposure time. A value of less than 0.5 with our novel metric, would indicate that patients need to be exposed to the treatment for almost twice the duration of survival gain, and these are likely to pose a heavy burden in terms of toxicity, both financial and non-financial for modest benefit.

A significant proportion of patients are not fit for second line treatment at the time of disease progression and there is a trend to use the most efficacious agents earlier in the course of the disease trajectory of metastatic cancer with a view to improving survival. The rationale for this approach is firmly rooted in the proportional hazards model, where for the same relative reduction of risk of death a higher absolute gain can be achieved if treatment is initiated early.

It was interesting to note that when considering first-line versus later line of treatment in the same disease for the same agent, it could be discerned that the survival gain per treatment time is higher when used in later lines of treatments for most drugs. Since treatment duration is often longer when used in the first line setting, it follows that the cost of treatment would also be greater in comparison to use of the same agent in the second line. The lower survival gain per treatment time in first line use would suggest that more robust biomarkers are needed to distinguish patients who would benefit from first line treatment from those who are suitable for sequential treatment. A notable exception to this trend was observed with the use of abiraterone in hormone sensitive metastatic prostate cancer where the survival gain per treatment time was greater in this setting than in the castration resistant phases of the disease.

Our metric places a higher premium on indications for which there are existing treatment options, since the novel agent has to achieve a survival gain relative to its treatment duration. We believe that this is a strength of the metric since it helps select treatments which are robustly effective from those which achieve only modest gains.

Since its publication the ESMO-MCBS has found widespread application as a robust tool of stratifying the benefit of each novel agent since it weaves together improvements in prolongation of survival while considering toxicity and quality of life into a single parameter. In the palliative setting the ESMO-MCBS classifies reported outcomes into five levels 1-5 with higher values indicating a higher clinical benefit. For trials reporting improvements in overall survival, the ESMO-MBCS scoring is based upon a consideration of the absolute gain in median overall survival, the lower limit of the confidence interval of the hazard ratio as well as reported gains in quality of life as well reduced grade 3 or 4 toxicity in comparison to the control arm.

It has been shown that although the cost of novel cancer drugs has increased over the past decade, clinical benefits did not follow a similar trend (9). Although there was a statistically significant association between our metric and the ESMO-MBCS score. The highest values for the novel metric was seen with the use of the PD-1 inhibitors nivolumab and pembrolizumab in

metastatic melanoma, for which the ESMO-MBCS score was 4. However, while ribociclib in premenopausal metastatic breast cancer had a maximum value of 5 within the ESMO-MBCS scoring, it had a low value of 0.45 with our metric. Sunitinib in the second line treatment of unresectable gastrointestinal stromal tumours had a high value of 2.67 in our study but had an ESMO-MBCS score of just 3.

Unlike the ESMO-MBCS which is reported as a score of an ordinal scale, our metric is a continuous variable. Reporting the survival gain per treatment duration along with the conventional end-points such as response rates, median overall survival and the ESMO-MBCS would enable clinicians and patients to make more informed therapeutic decisions especially when weighing the benefit against toxicity.

It needs to be emphasised that the median duration of treatment was not disclosed in 11/60 studies that were screened. As mentioned previously, treatment duration is pivotal in deciding the cost of treatment which is an integral component of all cost-effectiveness and health technology modelling studies, and its reporting needs to be made mandatory in publications of phase III randomised trials.

There are a number of limitations in our study and in our novel metric. First, we excluded studies in which no overall survival gain was established. In many trials, when the primary end-point of a gain in progression-free survival is met crossover is permitted, adding to the complexity of determining the impact of the novel drug on overall survival (10,11). It would also mean that treatments that achieve improvements in quality of life without prolonging survival were also not considered in this analysis (12). Second, we used median progression-free survival as a surrogate in studies which did not report the median duration of treatment. As mentioned before, treatment in the non-curative setting is continued until disease progression or development of treatment toxicity and as such, progression free survival would therefore be longer than the duration of treatment in most instances. This may have led to underestimation of the survival gain per unit treatment time for certain indications.

Conclusion

Overall survival gain per unit treatment duration is a potentially useful metric that would provide vital insights in quantifying the benefit of treatment of novel cancer therapeutics in the palliative setting. The juice in the form of survival gain must certainly do justice to the squeeze both in terms of financial and somatic toxicities.

References

- 1. Cancer Research UK Available at: https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/healthprofessional/cancer-statistics/survival/all-cancers-combined (Accessed 15th February 2023).
- Latino NJ, Galotti M, Cherny NI, de Vries EGE, Douillard JY, Kaidarova D, Ilbawi A. Prioritising systemic cancer therapies applying ESMO's tools and other resources to assist in improving cancer care globally: the Kazakh experience. ESMO Open. 2022 Feb;7(1):100362. doi: 10.1016/j.esmoop.2021.100362.
- Gyawali B, Eisenhauer E, Tregear M, Booth CM. Progression-free survival: it is time for a new name. Lancet Oncol. 2022 Mar;23(3):328-330. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(22)00015-8.
- 4. Booth CM, Eisenhauer EA. Progression-free survival: meaningful or simply measurable? J Clin Oncol. 2012 Apr 1;30(10):1030-3. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2011.38.7571.
- Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, Schwartz LH, Sargent D, Ford R, Dancey J, Arbuck S, Gwyther S, Mooney M, Rubinstein L, Shankar L, Dodd L, Kaplan R, Lacombe D, Verweij J. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). Eur J Cancer. 2009 Jan;45(2):228-47. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2008.10.026.
- Haslam A, Olivier T, Thawani R, Prasad V. Duration of treatment in oncology clinical trials: does the duration change when the same drug moves from the experimental arm to the control arm? ESMO Open. 2022 Jun;7(3):100480. doi: 10.1016/j.esmoop.2022.100480.
- Schnipper LE, Davidson NE, Wollins DS, Blayney DW, Dicker AP, Ganz PA, Hoverman JR, Langdon R, Lyman GH, Meropol NJ, Mulvey T, Newcomer L, Peppercorn J, Polite B, Raghavan D, Rossi G, Saltz L, Schrag D, Smith TJ, Yu PP, Hudis CA, Vose JM, Schilsky RL. Updating the American Society of Clinical Oncology Value Framework: Revisions and Reflections in Response to Comments Received. J Clin Oncol. 2016 Aug 20;34(24):2925-34. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2016.68.2518.
- Cherny NI, Dafni U, Bogaerts J, Latino NJ, Pentheroudakis G, Douillard JY, Tabernero J, Zielinski C, Piccart MJ, de Vries EGE. ESMO-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale version 1.1. Ann Oncol. 2017 Oct 1;28(10):2340-2366. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdx310.

- Saluja R, Arciero VS, Cheng S, McDonald E, Wong WWL, Cheung MC, Chan KKW. Examining Trends in Cost and Clinical Benefit of Novel Anticancer Drugs Over Time. J Oncol Pract. 2018 May;14(5):e280-e294. doi: 10.1200/JOP.17.00058.
- Daugherty CK, Ratain MJ, Emanuel EJ, Farrell AT, Schilsky RL. Ethical, scientific, and regulatory perspectives regarding the use of placebos in cancer clinical trials. J Clin Oncol. 2008 Mar 10;26(8):1371-8. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2007.13.5335.
- 11. Jönsson L, Sandin R, Ekman M, Ramsberg J, Charbonneau C, Huang X, Jönsson B, Weinstein MC, Drummond M. Analyzing overall survival in randomized controlled trials with crossover and implications for economic evaluation. Value Health. 2014 Sep;17(6):707-13. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2014.06.006
- Zhang B, Nilsson ME, Prigerson HG. Factors important to patients' quality of life at the end of life. Arch Intern Med. 2012 Aug 13;172(15):1133-42. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2012.2364.

List of Tables and Figures

 Table 1 Overall survival gain per unit treatment time (selected indications)

Figure 1 Distribution of indications against logarithm of survival gain per unit treatment time

Supplementary Table 1 Overall survival gain per unit treatment time (Full Dataset)

Supplementary Figure S1 Distribution of indications against survival gain per unit treatment time

Table 1

Overall survival gain per unit treatment time (selected indications)

Drug	Indication	Median Survival gain (In months)	Median Treatment Duration (In months)	Overall Survival gain per unit treatment time	ESMO-MCBS Score
Abiraterone	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Prostate Cancer	16.8	25.80	0.65	4
Abiraterone	Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer Post Docetaxel	3.9	8.00	0.49	4
Abiraterone	Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer Pre Docetaxel	4.4	13.77	0.32	4
Bevacizumab	Platinum Refractory Epithelial Ovarian Cancer	3.3	4.20	0.79	4
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Cervical Cancer	3.7	4.90	0.76	3
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Colorectal Cancer 2nd line	2.1	4.67	0.45	3
Bevacizumab	Platinum Sensitive Relapsed Epithelial Ovarian Cancer	4.9	11.20	0.44	3
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Epithelial Ovary Cancer 1st line	4.8	3 11.90	0.40	3
Cetuximab	Unresectable Squamous cell carcinoma of Head and Neck 1st Line treatment in combination with chemotherapy	2.7	4.20	0.64	3
Cetuximab	Metastatic RAS wildtype left sided colorectal cancer 1st line treatment in combination with chemotherapy	7	12.00	0.58	4
Cetuximab	Treatment Refractory RAS wildtype Metastatic Colorectal Cancer (as monotherapy)	4.7	3.70	1.27	4
Fulvestrant	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Breast Cancer 1st Line	7.8	15.00	0.52	2

Fulvestrant	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Breast Cancer 2nd Line	4.1	6.50	0.63	Not Assessed
Lenvatinib	Radioiodine Refractory Metastatic Differentiated Thyroid Cancer	11.6	23.00	0.50	2
Nab-Paclitaxel	Advanced Pancreatic Cancer	2.6	3.90	0.67	3
Nivolumab	Metastatic Melanoma	26	5.10	5.10	4
Nivolumab	Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma 2nd line	5.4	5.50	0.98	5
Nivolumab	PDL1+ Metastatic gastro-eosphageal junctional or gasric cancer Metastatic 1st line	3.3	6.80	0.49	2
Olaparib	BRCA mutant epithelial ovarian cancer maintenance treatment post 2nd line chemotherapy	16.3	29.10	0.56	4
Osimertinib	Metastatic EGFR mutant Non-small cell lung cancer 2nd line	10	13.80	0.72	4
Osimertinib	Metastatic EGFR mutatant Non-small cell lung cancer 1st line	6.8	20.70	0.33	4
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Melanoma	18.9	6.00	3.15	4
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer PD1> 50% Single agent 1st Line treatment	15.8	7.90	2.00	5
Pembrolizumab	PDL1+ Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer 2nd Line Single agent	4.2	3.50	1.20	5
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer (Non- Squamous) 1st Line in combination with chemotherapy	11.3	9.80	1.15	4
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Triple Negative Breast Cancer PDL1 > 10%	6.9	9.00	0.77	3
	Metastatic Oesophageal or Gastro-oesophageal Junctional Cancer PD1>10% 1st Line treatment in			_	
Pembrolizumab	combination with chemotherapy	5.1	7.70	0.66	4
Pertuzumab	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer first-line	15.7	16.80	0.93	4
Regorafenib	Treatment Refractory Metastatic Colorectal Cancer	1.4	2.80	0.50	1

	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Breast Cancer 2nd				
Ribociclib	Line	7.7	11.00	0.70	4
	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Breast Cancer 1st				
Ribociclib	Line	12.5	20.20	0.62	4
	Metastatic Pre-menopausalHormone Sensitive				
Ribociclib	Breast Cancer 1st Line	10.7	24.00	0.45	5
Rituximab	Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma 1st line	13	5.60	2.32	Not Assessed
Sorafenib	Advanced Hepatocellular carcinoma	2.8	5.30	0.53	Not Assessed
	Unresectable Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumour 2nd				
Sunitinib	Line	8	3.00	2.67	3
Sunitinib	Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma 1st Line	14	11.00	1.27	4
Trastuzumab	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer first-line	14.6	9.75	1.50	Not Assessed
	Metastatic HER2+ Gastric Adenocarcinoma first-				
Trastuzumab	line	2.7	5.60	0.48	3
trastuzumab					
deruxtecan	Metastatic Breast Cancer second-line	6.6	8.20	0.80	4
trastuzumab					
emtansine	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer second-line	5.8	9.40	0.62	4

Supplementary Table 1

Overall survival gain per unit treatment time (Full Dataset)

Drug	Indication	Median Survival gain (In months)	Median Treatment Duration (In months)	Overall Survival gain per unit treatment time	ESMO-MCBS Score	Reference
Abiratarana	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive	16.9	25.80	0.65	1	Lancet Oncol.
Adiraterone		10.0	23.80	0.03	4	2019,20(3).080-700
Abiraterone	Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer Post Docetaxel	3.9	8.00	0.49	4	N Engl J Med. 2011;3 64(21): 1995- 2005
Abiraterone	Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer Pre Docetaxel	4.4	13.77	0.32	4	Lancet Oncol. 2015 Feb;16(2):152-60.
Azacitadine	Acute Myeloid Leukaemia	5.2	8.80	0.59	Not Assessed	Blood. 2015. 126(3):291- 299.
Bevacizumab	Platinum Refractory Epithelial Ovarian Cancer	3.3	4.20	0.79	4	J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(13):1302-8
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Cervical Cancer	3.7	4.90	0.76	3	N Engl J Med 2014; 370:734-743
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Colorectal Cancer 2nd line	2.1	4.67	0.45	3	J Clin Oncol. 2007;25(12):1539-44
Bevacizumab	Platinum Sensitive Relapsed Epithelial Ovarian Cancer	4.9	11.20	0.44	3	Lancet Oncol. 2017;18(6):779-791
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Non-squmouas Non- small Cell Lung Cancer	2	4.90	0.41	2	N Engl J Med 2006; 355:2542-2550
Bevacizumab	Metastatic Epithelial Ovary Cancer 1st line	4.8	11.90	0.40	3	Lancet Oncol 2015; 16: 928–36
Bortezomib	Multiple Myeloma (Trasnplant Inlegible) VMP vs MP	13.3	12.00	1.11	Not Assessed	Blood. 2011;118(21):476

	Unresectable Squamous cell					
	carcinoma of Head and Neck 1st					
	Line treatment in combination with					N Engl J Med 2008;
Cetuximab	chemotherapy	2.7	4.20	0.64	3	359:1116-1127
	Metastatic RAS wildtype left sided					IAMA Oncol
	colorectal cancer 1st line treatment					2017.3(2).194-20
Cetuximab	in combination with chemotherapy	7	12.00	0.58	4	2017,5(2).17 + 20
	Treatment Refractory RAS wildtype					
	Metastatic Colorectal Cancer (as					N Engl J Med 2008;
Cetuximab	monotherapy)	4.7	3.70	1.27	4	359:1757-1765
	Imatinib resistant Chronic Myeloid					
	Leukaemia (in comparison to high					Value Health. 2011
Dasatinib	dose imatinib)	15.72	78.00	0.20 Not Assessed		Dec;14(8):1057-67
						J Clin Oncol. 2012.
Decitabine	Acute Myeloid Leukaemia	2.7	4.40	0.61 Not Assessed		30(21):2670-7
	Metastatic Castration Resistant					N Engl J Med 2012;
Enzalutamide	Prostate Cancer Post Docetaxel	4.8	8.30	0.58	4	367:1187-1197
	Metastatic Castration Resistant					Eur Urol 2017;71(2):151-
Enzalutamide	Prostate Cancer Pre Docetaxel	4	18.20	0.22	4	4
	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive					N Engl J Med 2019;
Fulvestrant	Breast Cancer 1st Line	7.8	15.00	0.52	2	380:1226-1234
	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive					J Natl Cancer Inst. 2014
Fulvestrant	Breast Cancer 2nd Line	4.1	6.50	0.63 Not Assessed		Jan;106(1):djt337
	Multiple Myeloma (Trasnplant					Blood 2018 Jan
Lenalidomide	Inlegible) - Rd 18 Cycles	13.2	16.80	0.79 Not Assessed		18;131(3):301-310
	Radioiodine Refractory Metastatic					Fur I Cancer 2021
Lenvatinib	Differentiated Thyroid Cancer	11.6	23.00	0.50	2	Apr:147:51-57
Lenvatinte	Differentiated Thyrota Calleon	11.0	25.00	0.50		N Engl I Med 2013
Nab-Paclitaxel	Advanced Pancreatic Cancer	2.6	3.90	0.67	3	369:1691-1703
	Imatinib resistant Chronic Myeloid					
	Leukaemia (in comparison to high					Value Health. 2011
Nilotinib	dose imatinib)	9.12	29.28	0.31 Not Assessed		Dec;14(8):1057-67
Nivolumah	Metastatic Melanoma	26	5 10	5 10	4	J Clin Oncol 2020 Nov
orannao	internation international	20	5.10	5.10		

						20;38(33):3937-3946
	Squamous cell carcinoma of the					Oral Oncol . 2018
Nivolumab	head and neck 2nd line	2.6	1.90	1.37	5	Jun;81:45-5
	Metastatic Non-small cell lung					J Clin Oncol. 2021 Mar
Nivolumab	cancer 2nd line	3	3.00	1.00	5	1;39(7):723-733
	Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma					N Engl J Med 2015;
Nivolumab	2nd line	5.4	5.50	0.98	5	373:1803-1813
	Metastatic Squamous Cell					Lancet Oncol. 2019
Nivolumab	Carcinoma of Oesophagus 2nd line	2.5	2.60	0.96	3	Nov;20(11):1506-1517.
	PDL1+ Metastatic gastro-eosphageal					
	junctional or gasric cancer				_	Lancet 2021 Jul
Nivolumab	Metastatic 1st line	3.3	6.80	0.49	2	3;398(10294):27-40
	BRCA mutant epithelial ovarian					Longet Orgen
Olanarih	and line chemotherapy	16.3	20.10	0.56	1	Lancet Oncol. $2021 \cdot 22(5) \cdot 620$
Olapallo		10.5	29.10	0.50	4	2021,22(3).020
Osimantinih	Metastatic EGFR mutant Non-small	10	12.90	0.72	1	Ann Oncol. 2020
Osimertinio		10	15.80	0.72	4	NOV;51(11):1550-1544
	Metastatic EGFR mutatant Non-	C 0	20.70	0.00		N Engl J Med 2020;
Osimertinib	small cell lung cancer 1st line	6.8	20.70	0.33	4	382:41-50
	Metastatic RAS wildtype colorectal					N Enal I Mad 2012 San
Panitumumah	combination with chemotherapy	5.8	5 13	1 13	1	12.369(11).1023-34
1 annunnað	Treatment Refractory RAS wildtype	5.0	5.15	1.15	_	12,307(11).1023-34.
	Metastatic Colorectal Cancer (as					Br J Cancer.
Panitumumab	monotherapy)	3.1	4.00	0.78	3	2016;115:1206-1214
						Lancet Oncol. 2019
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Melanoma	18.9	6.00	3.15	4	Sep;20(9):1239-1251
	Metastatic Non-small cell lung					
	cancer PD1> 50% Single agent 1st					J Clin Oncol. 2019 Mar
Pembrolizumab	Line treatment	15.8	7.90	2.00	5	1;37(7):537-546
	Unresectable PDL1+ Squamous cell					
	carcinoma of head and neck 1st Line		2 40		_	Lancet. 2019 Nov
Pembrolizumab	Single Agent Treatment	4.2	3.40	1.24	5	23;394(10212):1915-1928

Pembrolizumab	PDL1+ Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer 2nd Line Single agent	4.2 3.5	0 1.20) 5	Lancet 2016; 387: 1540–
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer (Non-Squamous) 1st Line in combination with chemotherapy 1	1.3 9.8	0 1.15	5 4	J Clin Oncol 2020 May 10;38(14):1505-1517
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Non-small cell lung cancer (Squmaous) 1st Line in combination with chemotherapy	8 7.1	0 1.13	6 4	J Thoracic Oncol. 2020 Oct;15(10):1657-1669.
Pembrolizumab	Unresectable PDL1+ Squamous cell carcinoma of head and neck 1st Line treatment in combination with chemotherapy	5.9 5.8	0 1.02	2 4	Lancet. 2019 Nov 23;394(10212):1915-1928
Pembrolizumab	PD1+ Metastatic Cervical Cancer 1st line treatment in combination with chemotherapy	8 10.0	0 0.80) 4	N Engl J Med 2021; 385:1856-1867
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Triple Negative Breast Cancer PDL1 > 10%	6.9 9.0	0 0.77	3	N Engl J Med 2022; 387:217-226
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Oesophageal or Gastro- oesophageal Junctional Cancer PD1>10% 1st Line treatment in combination with chemotherapy	5.1 7.7	0 0.66	5 4	Lancet 2021; 398: 759–71
Pembrolizumab	Metastatic Oesophageal or Gastro- oesophageal Junctional Cancer PD1>10% 2nd Line treatment single agent	2.6 4.0	0 0.65	Not Assessed	J Clin Oncol. 2020 Dec 10;38(35):4138-4148
Pertuzumab	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer first-line 1	5.7 16.8	0 0.93	3 4	N Engl J Med 2015; 372:724-734
Pomalidamide	Multiple Myeloma 2nd line	7 4.6	7 1.50	Not Assessed	Br J Haematol. 2015 Mar;168(6):820-3.
Regorafenib	Treatment Refractory Metastatic Colorectal Cancer	1.4 2.8	0 0.50) 1	Lancet.2013;381(9863):30 3
Ribociclib	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Breast Cancer 2nd Line	7.7 11.0	0 0.70) 4	N Engl J Med 2020; 382:514-524

	Metastatic Hormone Sensitive					N Engl J Med 2022;
Ribociclib	Breast Cancer 1st Line	12.5	20.20	0.62	4	386:942-950
	Metastatic Pre-menopausalHormone					Clin Cancer Res. 2022 Mar
Ribociclib	Sensitive Breast Cancer 1st Line	10.7	24.00	0.45	5	5 1;28(5):851-859
Rituximab	Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma 1st line	13	5.60	2.32	Not Assessed	N Engl J Med 2002; 346:235-242 Blood. 2014; 124(21):1752 and J Natl Cancer Inst. 2007 May 2;99(9):706-14
						N Engl J Med 2008;
Sorafenib	Advanced Hepatocellular carcinoma	2.8	5.30	0.53	Not Assessed	359:378-390
Sunitinib	Unresectable Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumour 2nd Line	8	3.00	2.67	3	Lancet. 2006;368(9544):1329, Clin Cancer Res. 2012 Jun 1; 3 18(11): 3170–3179.
	Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma 1st					J Clin Oncol.
Sunitinib	Line	14	11.00	1.27	4	2009;27(22):3584-3590.
Trastuzumab	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer first-line Metastatic HER2+ Gastric	14.6	9.75	1.50	Not Assessed	J Clin. Oncol. 2005 Jul 1;23(19):4265-74.
Trastuzumah	Adenocarcinoma first-line	27	5 60	0.48	3	Lancet 2010: 376: 687_97
trastuzumah	Metastatic Breast Cancer second-	2.1	5.00	0.40	J	N Engl I Med 2022: 387.9-
deruxtecan	line	6.6	8.20	0.80	4	20
trastuzumab	Metastatic HER2+ Breast Cancer					N Engl J Med 2012;
emtansine	second-line	5.8	9.40	0.62	4	367:1783-1791



Log (Surival gain per unit treatment time)

