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**Appendix 3: Uncertainties based on Morrell’s classification system**

*Key uncertainties outlined in the DCA’s of indication in the CDF, beginning with the indication with the most specified uncertainties*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Drug | Indication (from CDF list) | Immature survival data | Lack of comparator | Relevant patient population | Duration of use | Quality of life | Trial design | Pathway | Cost estimates |
| Olaratumab | With doxorubicin advanced soft tissue sarcoma in ADULT patients | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |
| Atezolizumab | Locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer (ineligible for cisplatin) | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |
| Crizotinib | ROS1-positive inoperable locally advanced/metastatic non squamous non small cell lung cancer | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daratumumab | Relapsed and refractory multiple myeloma | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| Ixazomib (with lenalidomide and dexamethasone) | Relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |
| Nivolumab | Previously treated locally advanced or metastatic non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| Nivolumab | Previously treated locally advanced or metastatic squamous non-small cell lung cancer | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| Nivolumab | Recurrent or metastatic squamous-cell carcinoma of the head and neck after platinum-based chemotherapy | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| Osimertinib | Locally advanced or metastatic epidermal growth factor receptor and T790M mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| Pembrolizumab | Untreated PD-L1 positive metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Venetoclax | Chronic lymphatic leukaemia in the ABSENCE of 17p deletion | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ventoclax | Chronic lymphatic leukaemia in the PRESENCE of 17p deletion | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ibrutinib | Waldenstrom’s Macroglobulinaemia | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| Niraparib | Maintenance for relapsed, platinum-sensitive and high grade serous ovarian, fallopian tube or primary peritoneal carcinoma who are in response following platinum-based SECOND line chemotherapy and who HAVE a germline BRCA mutation | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Niraparib | Maintenance for relapsed, platinum-sensitive and high grade serous ovarian, fallopian tube or primary peritoneal carcinoma who are in response following platinum-based SECOND OR LATER line chemotherapy and who DO NOT HAVE a germline BRCA mutation | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pembrolizumab | Locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer previously treated with platinum-based chemotherapy | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pembrolizumab | First line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer in patients who are ineligible for cisplatin-based chemotherapy | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pembrolizumab | Relapsed or refractory classical Hodgkin lymphoma in ADULTS who are stem cell transplant-ineligible and have failed brentuximab vedotin | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| Obinutuzumab with bendamustine | Treatment of follicular lymphoma refractory to rituximab | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Categories based on Morrell’s** (Morrell, Wordsworth et al. 2018)  Included: Immature survival data, lack of comparator/s, trial design, relevant patient population, quality of life, duration of use, cost estimates, pathway.  Not included: Observational data, adverse events, cost-effectiveness (because these were not specified a key uncertainty in any of the DCAs)  ✓ indicates that this uncertainty was important in this case.  A blank cell indicates that this uncertainty was not mentioned in the DCA uncertainty section  NB: It is likely that more certainties than are ticked apply to each indication and drug. | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix 4: FOI requests and replies**

 Request to PHE, NHS England and NICE exploring protocols for SACT studies

|  |
| --- |
| Request: to PHE, NICE and NHS England |
| “I am writing to you under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to request a copy of the protocols for all Systemic Anti-Cancer Therapy (SACT) dataset studies, for all drugs and indications currently covered by the Cancer Drugs Fund (CDF). Official documentation about the CDF project makes clear that there is a Data Collection Agreement, and a protocol for data analysis, for each drug and indication covered by the CDF. However, I am unable to find these online. The relevant drugs and indications whose protocols I seek are listed at the bottom of this email. (If I omitted any drugs and indications or others have entered the fund since I created this list please also send them.)    For any data analysis assessing the effectiveness of a treatment one would expect to see a pre-specified study protocol covering: the research question/s to be addressed; the study design; a detailed description of the methods including population, exposure, comparison, and outcome measures; a clear plan for the statistical analysis; and a publication and dissemination plan.  The document “Specification for the cancer drugs fund data collection arrangement” states that each drug and indication will have analyses using SACT data. It says that the Data Collection Arrangement will include “accountability for the protocol” for the SACT study. And, it states that “the DCA working group will prepare an analysis plan and timescales”. These analyses may quantify the benefits and toxicities of treatments, describe the number of patients treated, and can be linked to other data sets such as Hospital Episode Statistics.    The Cancer Drugs Fund specification document states there will be an a priori documentation of the following: “The population of patients to be treated, the numbers of patients needed for robust analysis in the data collection, comparators (where appropriate), the key outcomes to address the appraisal committee’s issues of uncertainty (which will subsequently be used in economic modelling in the appraisal review after the CDF), analysis plan and the timeframe for the studies and/or Public Health England data, including SACT data, will be identified by the DCA working group. Relevant stakeholders, including the company, and clinical and patient experts present at the appraisal committee meeting, will be asked to comment.” |

Replies to my FOI request from PHE, NICE and NHS England, my conclusion and my action

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reply from: | | |
| PHE | NICE | NHS England |
| The Data Collection Agreements (DCAs) are part of the Managed Access Agreements (MAAs) for the Cancer Drugs Fund. These are all available online on the NICE webpage. PHE’s full report, including methodology and data (redacted as needed to safeguard patient confidentiality) will be published by NICE on their webpage for each relevant indication. Therefore, in accordance with the Section 22 - Information intended for future publication, exemption this information is exempt from disclosure.  The report will be published as part of the Appraisal Committee papers along with the Appraisal Consultation Document or Final Appraisal Document, dependent on the decision. An Appraisal Consultation Document is normally published on the NICE website within 20 working days of the appraisal committee meeting, and a Final Appraisal Document is normally published on the NICE website within 30 working days of the appraisal committee meeting. | Information on the data collection arrangement and data analysis plan can be found within the Managed Access Agreement (MAA) document for each of the technology appraisal topics you have listed above. These MAA documents can be accessed from the NICE website  ([1]www.nice.org.uk). Therefore, the information you’ve requested is exempt from disclosure under Section 21 of the Act, since we consider it is information that is reasonably accessible to you. To be helpful, I can describe where you can find the information.  If you visit the main webpage for each of the technology appraisal topics you have listed above (for example,[2]www.nice.org.uk/TA492) and then click on the ‘Tools and resources’ section for that topic, you can find the Managed Access Agreement PDF document for that appraisal. | Please find below an up to date list of indications (as at 14 June 2018) funded via a Cancer Drugs Fund (CDF) managed access agreements (MAA), which incorporate the relevant data collection agreement (DCA). All CDF MAAs and DCAs are published on NICE’s website and the hyperlink for each is extracted in the table below.  Each DCA is developed collaboratively in a working group by NICE, Public Health England, NHS England and the company. Where necessary, the DCA working group seeks input and clarification from clinical experts and patient and professional organisations. Clinical and patient expert input is always included via the standard NICE technology appraisal processes in terms of written evidence submissions and verbally at the appraisal committee meeting.  The DCA is structured to include details of…. (states structure of DCA) |
| Possible conclusion: | | |
| There may, or may not be, a protocol. There is more detailed methodology than in the DCA, AND the data will be published on the NICE website shortly after the appraisal committee have made their decision. | The DCA is the protocol and is already available on the NICE website. | he DCA is the protocol and is already available on the NICE website. |
| Action: clarification to follow up on details from PHE, NICE and NHS England | | |

*Clarifications to my FOI request to PHE, NICE and NHS England*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Clarification message from me: | | |
| PHE | NICE | NHS England |
| Can you please tell me:  1) Is my summary correct: “the methods used for analysis will only be publicly available after the drug has been appraised, within 30 days of a decision being made by NICE at their Appraisal Committee Meeting”?  2) For each SACT analysis, to establish the effectiveness of drug on each indication:  a) When is the “methodology” determined?  b) Is a protocol for data analysis written before the data is analysed?  c) Is a protocol for data analysis written before the data is collected?  d) If a protocol for data analysis is produced before data collection, and/or data analysis, why is it not made publicly available?  e) Please can you tell us what documents have already been produced regarding the methods for data analysis for each drug and indication?  f) Please can you send us a copy of any documents produced regarding the methods for data analysis for each drug and indication, or if not, explain why these documents are being withheld.  g) Will the “methodology” section of the NICE report on the effectiveness of each treatment be the only document describing the methods used for data analysis? Or are there other more detailed internal documents which will not be publicly shared? | Many thanks for your reply. You write that “Information on the data collection arrangement and data analysis plan can be found within the Managed Access Agreement (MAA) document for each of the technology appraisal topics”.  Could you confirm for me that I have understood correctly:  1)That the information in the DCA is the pre-specified protocol  2)That you are unaware of any other protocol for these data analyses? | I asked for the protocols for SACT studies, and you have directed my to the Data Collection Agreements (DCAs). By implication, I therefore assume that you are saying that the DCA contains the protocol.  Could you confirm for me that I have understood correctly:  1) That the information in the DCA is the pre-specified protocol?  2) That you are unaware of any other protocol for these data analyses? |

*Replies to my clarifications of FOI requests from PHE, NICE and NHS England, and my conclusion*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reply from: | | |
| **PHE** | **NICE** | **NHS England** |
| 1)  Is my summary correct: “the methods used for analysis will only be publicly  available after the drug has been appraised, within 30 days of a decision being  made by NICE at their Appraisal Committee Meeting”?  We plan to share the general methodology for the approach we will take for evaluations in advance of this date.  In accordance with Section 22 – future publication exemption this information is currently exempt from disclosure.  2) For each SACT analysis, to establish the effectiveness of drug on each indication:   a)  When is the “methodology” determined?   The Data Collection Agreements set out the clinical uncertainties to be addressed. The methodology is finalised before the analysis of the final report for each indication.   b)  Is a protocol for data analysis written before the data is analysed? Yes   c)  Is a protocol for data analysis written before the data is collected? No. The general approach is to use data that is already being routinely collected.  d)  If a protocol for data analysis is produced before data collection, and / or data  analysis, why is it not made publicly available?   See answer to question 1 above.   e)  Please can you tell us what documents have already been produced regarding the methods for data analysis for each drug and indication? See answer to question 1 above.  f)  Please can you send us a copy of any documents produced regarding the methods for data analysis for each drug and indication, or if not, explain why these documents are being withheld. See answer to question 1 above.  g) Will the “methodology” section of the NICE report on the effectiveness of each treatment be the only document describing the methods used for data analysis? Or are there other more detailed internal documents which will not be publicly shared?  See answer to question 1 above. | I can confirm that the DCA gives an overview of the data that will be collected.  The sponsor (typically a pharmaceutical company) will hold the protocol for clinical trials. | In relation to question one, The Data Collection Agreement (DCA) provides an outline of how NICE, Public Health England, NHS England and the company propose to address the clinical uncertainties that were identified by the NICE committee. The DCA is primarily concerned with the data that will be collected and how to ensure all uncertainties are able to be addressed. It also includes consideration of many of the factors that are likely to be set out in a protocol as outlined in our initial response.  In relation to question two, the primary data source is most often the company’s clinical trial with its associated protocol and SACT data will be used to provide a real world perspective on results reported by the clinical trial. The methods for pembrolizumab for first line PD-L1 positive non-small-cell lung cancer and brentuximab vedotin for CD30-positive Hodgkin lymphoma are published on NICE’s website as part of the committee papers for these topics and should be of interest. Public Health England is developing a methodology for the CDF analyses that will  be reported in 2019. Public Health England will publish both their general methodology for CDF analysis as well as specific methods for bespoke analyses as required. As such, you may wish to redirect your enquiry to Public Health England. |
| Possible conclusion | | |
| PHE are planning a general methodology paper but will not share it for now.  The methodology is written after the data is collected but before they are analysed. | I am unclear what the answer to the question is for SACT studies. (There is a protocol for trials with the study sponsor for trials) | The DCA is an outline. Parts of the DCA are similar to areas of a protocol.  SACT studies will most commonly provide a real world perspective on results reported by the clinical trial.  There are two case studies where methodology is published on the NICE website.  PHE are planning an overarching methods paper which will be published in 2019. |

**Appendix 5:  redactions in DCAs**

NB the size of the redacted area does not reflect the size in the original document. The rest of the text and cut and pasted where feasible.

*Table of redactions in DCAs*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Drugs | Indication | Number of redactions | Information redacted | Surrounding text  (XXX = redacted area) |
| Crizotinib | 1st or subsequent line systemic therapy for ROS1-positive inoperable locally advanced/metastatic non squamous nonsmall cell lung cancer | 2 | Anticipated date of  1) data collection completion and  2) analysis | 1) The final analysis of OxOnc is due to be performed after the last patient’s last visit and will follow the analysis plan outlined in the trial protocol (due approximately by XXX).  2) The final analysis of PROFILE1001 is due to be performed after the last patient last visit and will follow the analysis plan outlined in the trial protocol (due approximately by XXX). |
| Obinutuzumab with bendamustine | Follicular lymphoma refractory to rituximab | 2 | 1) Name of industry contact.  2) Anticipated date of data collection completion. | 1) XXX, Head of HESP.  2) The latest prediction for the 226th event to occur is by mid-XXX (XXX with 95% CI, XXX–XXX) |
| Osimertinib | Locally advanced or metastatic epidermal growth factor receptor and T790M mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) | 2 | 1) Results from a trial.  2) Anticipation of OS data. | 1) Table showing "results from the ongoing studies evaluating osimertinib in the licensed indication will become available over the next 24 months as summarised below".  2) This analysis will be performed when the OS data are XXX. |
| Pembrolizumab | relapsed or refractory classical Hodgkin lymphoma in ADULTS who are stem cell transplant-ineligible and have failed brentuximab vedotin | 3 | 1) Duration of treatment from a trial.  2) Anticipated date of data collection completion.  3) Unclear | 1) The expected mean duration of treatment, based on patients who received a stem cell transplant from the KEYNOTE-087 trial, is XXX XXX. 2) Survival data: “It is due to complete data collection in XXX.  3) Final updated survival report for KEYNOTE-087 based on a XXX. |
| Atezolizumab | treatment of locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer in patients who are ineligible for cisplatin based chemotherapy | 3 | 1) Anticipated number of patients per year.  2) Adjusted anticipated number of patients per year. 3) Details of the analysis plan outlined in the protocol. | 1) It was originally estimated a maximum of XXX patients would to receive treatment per annum.  2) Following the updated marketing authorisation, a maximum of XXX patients with high PD-L1 expression are estimated to receive treatment per annum.  3) The final analysis will follow the analysis plan outlined  in the trial protocol XXX. |
| Olaratumab | In combination with doxorubicin for advanced soft tissue sarcoma in ADULT patients | 5 | 1) Name of industry contact.  2) Anticipated number of patients per year.  3) Treatment duration  4) Unknown detail about a trial  5) Unknown detail about a trial | 1) (Lilly) Agreement Manager XXX  2) Row 2 of first table expected annual uptake XXX in year 1, 2 and 3.  3) Average treatment duration XXX, in the Phase II JGDG clinical trial, XXX.  4) Phase III clinical trial  5) Phase III clinical trial |

Appendix 6

**What are the key standards for the CDF, and for the DCAs?**

Table 1 and Table 2 show statements from the two core documents from NHS England and NICE (verbatim), and the way I have adapted them to make standards (NHS England Cancer Drugs Fund Team, 2016 and NICE, 2016f) .

Table 1 Overarching commitments for the new CDF and their standards

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Standard | Phrase | Phrasing of standard |
| 1 | “A single national list of approved drugs/ indications will exist with approved criteria for funding the use of all such drugs/indications” | There is a single list of all active CDF drugs, including their indications |
| 2 | “All drugs on the previous CDF as of 31 March 2016 will be reconsidered or appraised by NICE over the course of the next 18 months” | All old CDF drugs should have a NICE technology appraisal (or equivalent for off label drugs) by September 2017 |
| 3 | “NICE is only allowed to appraise a drug within its marketing authorisation. Therefore, NHS England will be responsible for overseeing a process for considering the commissioning of cancer drugs for off-label indication use.”  “Off-label indications will have similar opportunities for gaining access to CDF funding to licensed drugs, if deemed clinically promising. For off-label indications, NHS England is in the process of commissioning clinical evidence reviews to inform their consideration.” | NHS England will oversee the evaluation of off-label drugs used within the CDF |
| 4 | “All CDF drugs need a Managed Access Agreement. This includes, a data collection arrangement and a CDF Commercial Agreement” | All CDF drugs should have a managed access agreement which includes a data collection arrangement and a commercial agreement |
| 5 | “NHS England will look to undertake a more formal evaluation of the overall operation of the scheme, no later than autumn 2017” | A completed formal evaluation of the new CDF will be published by 2017 |

Table 2: DCA commitments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Standard | Phrase | Phrasing of standard |
|  |  | The DCA will: |
| 6 | “The population to be treated,” will be in the DCA | Specify which patients will be offered treatment |
| 7 | “The number of patients needed for robust analysis in the data collection,” will be in the DCA | Quantify the number of patients who need to be treated to have sufficient data for SACT studies |
| 8 | “Comparators (where appropriate),” will be in the DCA | State what the new treatment should be compared with |
| 9 | “The key outcomes to address the appraisal committee’s issues of uncertainty (which will subsequently be used in economic modelling in the appraisal review after the CDF)” | List which outcomes are needed to address the uncertainty |
| 10 | “End of Life (EOL) criteria  The treatment is indicated for patients with a short life expectancy, normally less than 24 months; there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the treatment has the prospect of offering an extension to life, normally of a mean value of at least an additional three months, compared with current NHS treatment” | Say if a CDF drug is being considered using EOL criteria. If not, the minimum worthwhile clinical benefit should be clear |
| 11 | “Depending on the nature of the data collection question and required analyses, NICE, the Appraisal Committee and NHS England will identify the most appropriate framework for data collection” | State what types of data will be collected and what the main data source will be |
| 12 | “Based on the areas of uncertainty commonly identified in NICE technology appraisals of cancer drugs, existing Public Health England data sets are expected to be able to cover the vast majority of DCA requirements” | Whether SACT data are to be used will be clear |
| 13 | “The exact length of time that is required for appropriate data collection for each drug/indication will be informed by advice from the appraisal committee and following discussion between NICE, NHS England and the pharmaceutical company. This will then be included in the Managed Access Agreement which will be approved by the CDF Investment Group. This is dependent on the type of data and the numbers of patients required to address the specific uncertainty. The timeframe should be as short as possible, normally up to two years, but will be considered on a case by case basis. State the expected time the drug can expect in the CDF (normally no more than two years)” \* | State the expected time the drug can expect in the CDF (normally no more than two years) |
| 13 | “Time frame for the studies and/or Public Health England data including SACT data, will be identified by the working group” |
| 14 | “Analysis plan” | There should be a pre-specified protocol for the analysis of SACT data |
| 15 | “Public Health England will share the full methodology of the analysis and any assumptions with NICE and NHS England, which will then be shared with the company” | The full methodology should be publicly available for SACT studies |
| \* Standard from NHS document (NHS England Cancer Drugs Fund Team, 2016) | | |