### **A.4** BRAF/MEK inhibitors - unresectable or metastatic melanoma with a BRAF V600 mutation dabrafenib plus trametinib, vemurafenib plus cobimetinib, and encorafenib plus binimetinib Does the application adequately address the issue of the public health □ No need for the medicine? ☐ Not applicable Comments: Briefly summarize the role of the The submission seeks approval for three separate BRAF inhibitor plus MEK inhibitor proposed medicine(s) relative to other two-drug combinations for the treatment of unresectable or metastatic melanoma therapeutic agents currently included in where the role of the combinations is definite and for which no controversies exist. the Model List, or available in the The three combinations are: dabrafenib plus trametinib; vemurafenib plus market. cobimetinib; and encorafenib plus binimetinib. All belong to the class of the mitogenactivated protein kinase (MAPK) pathway inhibitors, specifically they are BRAF/MEK inhibitors. All three combinations have been approved for the treatment of patients with irresectable or metastatic melanoma with a BRAFV600 mutation. Have all important studies and all relevant evidence been included in the □ No application? ☐ Not applicable All relevant evidence has been addressed in the application. The relevant studies are cited and briefly summarized. The application leverages the review of data by ESMO in Europe and NCCN in the United States, noting "the majority of the data referred in this application, particularly for the clinical trials evaluating the three BRAF/MEK combinations proposed, has been referred in the ESMO and NCCN guidelines for the management of advanced melanoma"

Does the application provide adequate
evidence of efficacy/effectiveness of the
medicine for the proposed indication?

 $\boxtimes$  Yes

 $\square$  No

☐ Not applicable

Three different two drug combinations of a BRAF inhibitor and a MEK inhibitor have received regulatory approvals worldwide for the treatment of patients with advanced melanoma. Four randomized phase III trials including coBRIM [vemurafenib plus cobimetinib], COMBI-d and COMBI-v [dabrafenib plus trametinib] and COLUMBUS [encorafenib plus binimetinib] compared the combinations with BRAF inhibitor monotherapy and showed improved survival outcomes in melanomas harboring BRAFV600 mutations. These results support the use of combined targeted therapy instead of monotherapy as targeted therapy in patients with whose melanoma harbors BRAFV600 mutations. The efficacy and survival outcomes are very similar with the three BRAF/MEK inhibitor combinations. There are no clinical trials evaluating the three combinations head-to-head making the choice of which combination to use an arbitrary one

Study	Combination targeted therapy				
	COMBI-d	COMBI-v	CoBRIM	COLUMBUS	
Agent(s)	D+T	D+T	V + C	E + B	E + B
Patients, n (study arm)	211	352	247	577 (1)	258 (2)
Follow up, months	≥ 36.0	23	21.2	36.8	
Median OS, months	25.1	26.1	22.5	33.6	
Median DOR, months	12	13.8	13.0	18.6	12.7
Related AEs, %	97	99	99	98	98
Discontinuation due to AE %	14	16	13	15	12
CTCAE grade 3/4 AEs, %	48	57	77	64	47
Median DOR, months	12	13.8	13.0	18.6	12.7
Related AEs, %	97	99	99	98	98
Discontinuation due to AE %	14	16	13	15	12
CTCAE grade 3/4 AEs, %	48	57	77	64	47
Median DOR, months	12	13.8	13.0	18.6	12.7
Related AEs, %	97	99	99	98	98
Discontinuation due to AE %	14	16	13	15	12
CTCAE grade 3/4 AEs, %	48	57	77	64	47
Median DOR, months	12	13.8	13.0	18.6	12.7
Related AEs, %	97	99	99	98	98
Discontinued due to AE %	14	16	13	15	12
CTCAE grade 3/4 AEs, %	48	57	77	64	47

D + T = Dabrafenib + Trametinib

V + C = Vemurafenib + Cobimetinib

E + B = Encorafenib + Binimetinib

Does the application provide adequate evidence of the safety and adverse effects associated with the medicine?	<ul> <li>☑ Yes</li> <li>☐ No</li> <li>☐ Not applicable</li> <li>Comments: Sufficient data provided but clarity as to what toxicities are due to BRAF inhibitor alone or the combination of a BRAF inhibitor and a MEK inhibitor is wanting</li> </ul>					
		Adverse Event	D+T	V + C	E + B	
		Photosensitivity	<10	47 / 4	<10	
		Keratoacanthoma / SCC	1-3	6	<10	
		Arthralgia	28 /<1	<10	26 / 1	
		Pyrexia	63 / 5	28/2	18 / 4	
		Fatigue	59 / 5	<10	43 / 3	
		Chills	37 / 1	10/0	<10	
		Rash	37 / <1	16 / 1.6	22 / 1	
		Headache	39 / 1	<10	22 / 2	
		Nausea	40 / <1	41/1	41 / 2 <10	
		Diarrhea Vamiting	33 / <1 28 / <1	60 / 6 24 / 1	30 / 2	
		Vomiting Blurred vision	6	15 / <1	<10	
		Decreased ejection fraction	5	-26-	<10	
		SCC = squamous cell carcinoma	3	20	110	
		Toxicity reported as All grades /	>G3. Single	number if no	breakdown	
		Note: <10 when data reported o	_			
		D + T = Dabrafenib + Trametinib	[COMBI-d a	nd COMBI A	/D data]	
		V + C = Vemurafenib + Cobimetii	-	-		
		E + B = Encorafenib + Binimetinil	b [COLUMBU	S data]]		
Are there any adverse effects of concern, or that may require special	⊠ Yes □ No					
monitoring?	☐ Not applicable  Comments: May need to ensure access to specialized support for: (1) ophthalmo					
3					Ala a losa a la acco	
			-			
		ison a category that includes	_			
	detachment;	(2) cardiology for decreased	l ejection f	raction; ar	nd (3) derma	tology for
	the occasion	al SCC				
Briefly summarize your assessment of	Combination	s of a BRAF inhibitor with a I	MEK inhibi	tor (dabra	fenib plus tra	ametinib.
the overall benefit to risk ratio of the		plus cobimetinib, and encor				
medicine (e.g. favourable, uncertain,		its with unresectable or met	-			
	·					
etc.)		e effective and reasonably w		-		
		the clinical trials their benef			•	
	prolongation	of survival compared to sing	gle agent E	RAF inhib	itors. An imp	ortant
	attribute tha	t has emerged from these st	udies is th	e ameliora	ation of some	toxicities
	seen at highe	er rates with single agent BRA	AF inhibito	rs with the	e combinatio	ns. Thev
	_	as the single example where				-
		fully combined. Overall, the			-	-
	favourable	itully combined. Overall, the	bellellt to	TISK TALIO	can be regard	ueu
	ravourable					
Briefly summarize your assessment of	The overall q	uality of the individual evide	nce is ver	good con	ning from lar	ge
the overall quality of the evidence for				_	_	_
the medicine(s) (e.g. high, moderate,	prospectively randomized multi-institutional trials. The data suffers in that there are					
	no head-to-head comparisons leaving one to make cross-trial comparisons that are					
low etc.)	always difficult. However, at the same time, the redundancy of some of the data					
	contributes t	o its validity.				
Are there any special requirements for	⊠ Yes					
the safe, effective and appropriate use	□No					
of the medicine(s)?						
	☐ Not applic					
(e.g. laboratory diagnostic and/or	Comments: As noted above, may need to ensure access to specialized support for: (1)					
monitoring tests, specialized training for	ophthalmology for blurred vison a category that includes amongst others uveitis and retinal detachment; (2) cardiology for decreased ejection fraction; and (3)					
health providers, etc)						
		for the occasional SCC	-,		, (-)	

Are you aware of any issues regarding the registration of the medicine by national regulatory authorities?  (e.g. accelerated approval, lack of regulatory approval, off-label indication)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable Comments:
Is the proposed medicine recommended for use in a current WHO Guideline approved by the Guidelines Review Committee? (refer to: https://www.who.int/publications/whoguidelines)	☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not applicable Comments:
Briefly summarize your assessment of any issues regarding access, cost, and affordability of the medicine in different settings.	All three two-drug combinations currently retain patent protection, and this makes their costs prohibitive. Recognizing the difficulties of cross-trial comparisons, in large, randomized trials they have demonstrated similar degrees of efficacy. Additionally, while they have some differences in their toxicity profiles, this too is more similar than different. This precludes any recommendation for the approval of a best or a more tolerable combination. Thus, in choosing which to provide, cost should be a principal if not the principal consideration.
Any additional comments	Mature OS data has been reported for the three two-drug combinations in this submission. While in both the encorafenib + binimetinib [E + B] and the cobimetinib + vemurafenib [C + V] studies the vemurafenib control achieved very similar outcomes, the better results with the encorafenib + binimetinib combination and slightly better HR must be interpreted with caution. At the present time the safest conclusion is to consider the efficacy of all three two-drug combinations comparable
	Dabrafenib plus Trametinib [D +T] A total of 563 patients were randomly assigned to receive dabrafenib plus trametinib (211 in the COMBI-d trial and 352 in the COMBI-v trial). The median overall survival duration was 25.9 months (95%CI, 22.6 to 31.5). The overall survival rates were 37% (95%CI, 33 to 42) at 4 years and 34% (95%CI, 30 to 38) at 5 years. In multivariate analysis, several baseline factors (e.g., performance status, age, sex, number of organ sites with metastasis, and lactate dehydrogenase level) were significantly associated with both progression-free survival and overall survival. A complete response occurred in 109 patients (19%) and was associated with an improved long-term outcome, with an overall survival rate of 71% (95%CI, 62 to 79) at 5 years.  Author Conclusions: First-line treatment with dabrafenib plus trametinib led to long-term benefit in approximately one third of the patients who had unresectable or metastatic melanoma with a BRAF V600E or V600K mutation.
	Encorafenib + Binimetinib [E + B] The median OS in the COLUMBUS trial was 33.6 months (95%CI, 24.4-39.2) for the combination of encorafenib plus binimetinib, 23.5 months (95%CI, 19.6-33.6) for encorafenib alone and 16.9 months (95%CI, 14.0-24.5) for vemurafenib alone. The hazard ratio [HR] was 0.61 (95%CI, 0.48-0.79) for the comparison of encorafenib plus binimetinib versus vemurafenib alone.  Author Conclusions: Updated PFS and OS results for COMBO450 from the COLUMBUS trial demonstrate a long-term benefit in patients with advanced BRAF V600-mutated melanoma.
	Cobimetinib + Vemurafenib [C + V]  495 eligible adult patients were randomly assigned to the cobimetinib plus vemurafenib group (n=247) or placebo plus vemurafenib group (n=248). Median overall survival was 22·3 months (95%CI 20·3-not estimable) for cobimetinib and vemurafenib versus 17·4 months (95 CI 15·0-19·8) for placebo and vemurafenib (HR 0·70, 95%CI 0·55-0·90; p=0·005).

	<u>Author Conclusions:</u> These data confirm the clinical benefit of cobimetinib combined with vemurafenib and support the use of the combination as a standard first-line approach to improve survival in patients with advanced BRAF(V600)-mutant melanoma.
Based on your assessment of the	The submission understandably advocates recommending all three BRAF inhibitor
application, and any additional evidence	plus MEK inhibitor combinations - dabrafenib plus trametinib, vemurafenib plus
/ relevant information identified during	cobimetinib, and encorafenib plus binimetinib. Were inclusion in the WHO Model list
the review process, briefly summarize	of ESSENTIAL MEDICINES for cancer for the treatment of "adult patients with
your proposed recommendation to the	unresectable or metastatic melanoma with a BRAF V600 mutation" be recommended,
Expert Committee, including the	it should include all three two-drug combinations. However, at this time, we await
supporting rationale for your	clarification of the role of these two-drug combinations in patients previously treated
conclusions, and any doubts/concerns	with an immune checkpoint inhibitor. Pending that clarification, a delay in
in relation to the listing proposal.	recommending their inclusion is wise.
References (if required)	