



IQWiG Reports – Commission No. A21-71

**Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor  
(combination with ivacaftor;  
cystic fibrosis, 12 years and  
older, F508del mutation, gating  
mutation, heterozygous) –**

**Benefit assessment according to §35a  
Social Code Book V<sup>1</sup>**

**Extract**

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation of Sections 2.1 to 2.5 of the dossier assessment *Ivacaftor/Tezacaftor/Elexacaftor (Kombination mit Ivacaftor; zystische Fibrose, ab 12 Jahre, F508del-Mutation, Gating-Mutation, heterozygot) – Nutzenbewertung gemäß § 35a SGB V* (Version 1.0; Status: 30 August 2021). Please note: This document was translated by an external translator and is provided as a service by IQWiG to English-language readers. However, solely the German original text is absolutely authoritative and legally binding.

# Publishing details

## **Publisher**

Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care

## **Topic**

Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor (combination with ivacaftor; cystic fibrosis, 12 years and older, F508del mutation, gating mutation, heterozygous) – Benefit assessment according to §35a Social Code Book V

## **Commissioning agency**

Federal Joint Committee

## **Commission awarded on**

27 May 2021

## **Internal Commission No.**

A21-71

## **Address of publisher**

Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen  
Im Mediapark 8  
50670 Köln  
Germany

Phone: +49 221 35685-0

Fax: +49 221 35685-1

E-mail: [berichte@iqwig.de](mailto:berichte@iqwig.de)

Internet: [www.iqwig.de](http://www.iqwig.de)

**Medical and scientific advice**

- Thomas O. F. Wagner

IQWiG thanks the medical and scientific advisor for his contribution to the dossier assessment. However, the advisor was not involved in the actual preparation of the dossier assessment. The responsibility for the contents of the dossier assessment lies solely with IQWiG.

**IQWiG employees involved in the dossier assessment**

- Ulrike Mikulić
- Gertrud Egger
- Ulrich Grouven
- Marco Knelangen
- Katrin Nink
- Daniela Preukschat
- Min Ripoll
- Sonja Schiller

**Keywords:** Ivacaftor, Tezacaftor, Elexacaftor, Cystic Fibrosis, Child, Adolescent, Adult, Benefit Assessment, NCT04058353

# Table of contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>List of tables</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>2 Benefit assessment</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.1 Executive summary of the benefit assessment</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.2 Research question</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 Information retrieval and study pool</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.4 Results on added benefit</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.5 Probability and extent of added benefit</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>References for English extract</b> .....	<b>8</b>

**List of tables<sup>2</sup>**

	<b>Page</b>
Table 2: Research question of the benefit assessment of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor .....	1
Table 3: Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor – probability and extent of added benefit .....	3
Table 4: Research question of the benefit assessment of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor .....	4
Table 5: Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor – probability and extent of added benefit .....	7

---

<sup>2</sup> Table numbers start with “2” as numbering follows that of the full dossier assessment.

**List of abbreviations**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
ACT	appropriate comparator therapy
CFTR	cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator
FEV1	forced expiratory volume in 1 second
G-BA	Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss (Federal Joint Committee)
IQWiG	Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen (Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care)
RCT	randomized controlled trial
SGB	Sozialgesetzbuch (Social Code Book)

## 2 Benefit assessment

### 2.1 Executive summary of the benefit assessment

#### Background

In accordance with § 35a Social Code Book (SGB) V, the Federal Joint Committee (G-BA) commissioned the Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG) to assess the benefit of the drug ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor in combination with ivacaftor. The assessment is based on a dossier compiled by the pharmaceutical company (hereinafter referred to as the “company”). The dossier was sent to IQWiG on 27 May 2021.

#### Research question

The aim of this report is to assess the added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor in combination with ivacaftor (hereinafter referred to as “ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor”) in comparison with the appropriate comparator therapy (ACT) in cystic fibrosis (CF) patients aged 12 years or older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H mutation) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele.

The G-BA’s specification of the ACT results in the research question presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Research question of the benefit assessment of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor

Indication	ACT <sup>a</sup>
CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> allele.	Ivacaftor
a. Presented is the ACT specified by the G-BA. ACT: appropriate comparator therapy; CFTR: cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator; G-BA: Federal Joint Committee	

The company designated ivacaftor as the ACT, thus following the G-BA’s specification. The company also reports that the ACT as well as the drug to be assessed were administered in addition to the best available individualized symptomatic treatment. This benefit assessment was conducted in comparison with the ACT specified by the G-BA, ivacaftor. Providing additional symptomatic treatment for the patient population is appropriate.

The assessment was conducted by means of patient-relevant outcomes on the basis of the data submitted by the company in the dossier. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with a minimum duration of 24 weeks were used for the derivation of added benefit.

**Evidence provided by the company*****VX18-445-104 study***

In its dossier, the company used the VX18-445-104 study for assessing the added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor in comparison with ivacaftor. This double-blind RCT included CF patients aged 12 years and older who had a heterozygous F508del mutation in the CFTR gene. The 2<sup>nd</sup> allele had to have either a gating mutation (including the R117H mutation) or a residual function mutation. Depending on the type of mutation, the comparator therapy was either ivacaftor (gating mutations) or tezacaftor/ivacaftor + ivacaftor (residual function mutations). At screening, patients also had to have a forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1)  $\geq 40\%$  and  $\leq 90\%$  of predicted normal for age, sex, and height. For the present benefit assessment, the subpopulation with a gating mutation (including R117H mutation) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele is relevant.

The study consisted of a 28-day run-in phase, followed by an 8-week treatment phase and a 28-day follow-up observation phase. Following the treatment phase, an open-label extension study was available.

***Insufficient study duration***

Due to a study duration of only 8 weeks, the VX18-445-104 study submitted by the company is unsuitable for a benefit assessment in the therapeutic indication of CF – a chronic disease requiring lifelong treatment. No conclusions can be drawn on the basis of short-term studies as to whether short-term effects will persist over a longer period. Additionally, it is impossible to record any effects that become apparent only in the longer term, e.g. for pulmonary exacerbations and their consequences or for adverse events.

Overall, studies of at least 24 weeks' duration are necessary to compare benefit and harm in benefit assessments in the therapeutic indication of CF. However, due to the rarity of the mutations to be investigated and the fact that children are affected in this therapeutic indication, the VX18-445-104 study and the corresponding short-term results are presented as supplementary information in the appendix of the dossier assessment. No conclusion on added benefit is derived from them.

**Results on added benefit**

No suitable data are available for assessing the added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor versus the ACT in CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele. Consequently, there is no hint of any added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor in comparison with the ACT; an added benefit is therefore not proven.



### Probability and extent of added benefit, patient groups with therapeutically important added benefit<sup>3</sup>

Table 3 shows a summary of the probability and extent of added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor.

Table 3: Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor – probability and extent of added benefit

Indication	ACT <sup>a</sup>	Probability and extent of added benefit
CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> allele.	Ivacaftor	Added benefit not proven
a. Presented is the ACT specified by the G-BA. ACT: appropriate comparator therapy; CFTR: cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator; G-BA: Federal Joint Committee		

The G-BA decides on the added benefit.

<sup>3</sup> On the basis of the scientific data analysed, IQWiG draws conclusions on the (added) benefit or harm of an intervention for each patient-relevant outcome. Depending on the number of studies analysed, the certainty of their results, and the direction and statistical significance of treatment effects, conclusions on the probability of (added) benefit or harm are graded into 4 categories: (1) “proof”, (2) “indication”, (3) “hint”, or (4) none of the first 3 categories applies (i.e., no data available or conclusions 1 to 3 cannot be drawn from the available data). The extent of added benefit or harm is graded into 3 categories: (1) major, (2) considerable, (3) minor (in addition, 3 further categories may apply: non-quantifiable extent of added benefit, added benefit not proven, or less benefit). For further details see [1,2].

## 2.2 Research question

The aim of this report is to assess the added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor in combination with ivacaftor (ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor) in comparison with the ACT in CF patients aged 12 years or older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H mutation) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele.

The G-BA's specification of the ACT results in the research question presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Research question of the benefit assessment of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor

Indication	ACT <sup>a</sup>
CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> allele.	Ivacaftor
<p>a. Presented is the ACT specified by the G-BA.</p> <p>ACT: appropriate comparator therapy; CFTR: cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator; G-BA: Federal Joint Committee</p>	

The company designated ivacaftor as the ACT, thus following the G-BA's specification. The company also reported that the ACT ivacaftor as well as the drug to be assessed, ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor, were administered in addition to the best available individualized symptomatic therapy. This benefit assessment was conducted in comparison with the ACT specified by the G-BA, ivacaftor. Providing additional symptomatic treatment for the patient population is appropriate.

The assessment was conducted by means of patient-relevant outcomes on the basis of the data submitted by the company in the dossier. RCTs with a minimum duration of 24 weeks were used for the derivation of added benefit. This deviates from the company's inclusion criteria, which specified a minimum study duration of 8 weeks.

### 2.3 Information retrieval and study pool

The study pool of the assessment was compiled on the basis of the following information:

Sources cited by the company in the dossier:

- study list on ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor (status: 15 March 2021)
- bibliographic literature search on ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor (most recent search on 15 March 2021)
- search in trial registries / study results databases on ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor (most recent search on 15 March 2021)
- search on the G-BA website for ivacaftor/tezacaftor/ivacaftor + ivacaftor (most recent search on 15 March 2021)

The company's search strategies are documented in the dossier.

To check the completeness of the study pool:

- Search in trial registries for studies on ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor (most recent search on 14 March 2021); see Appendix B of the full dossier assessment for the search strategies.

No relevant study was identified from the check.

#### Evidence provided by the company

##### *VX18-445-104 study*

In its dossier, the company used the VX18-445-104 study [3-5] for the assessment of added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor in comparison with ivacaftor. This double-blind RCT included CF patients aged 12 years and older who had a heterozygous F508del mutation in the CFTR gene. The 2<sup>nd</sup> allele had to have either a gating mutation (including the R117H mutation) or a residual function mutation. Depending on the type of mutation, the comparator therapy was either ivacaftor (gating mutations) or tezacaftor/ivacaftor + ivacaftor (residual function mutations). At screening, patients additionally had to exhibit an FEV1  $\geq 40\%$  and  $\leq 90\%$  of predicted normal for age, sex, and height. In the present assessment, the subpopulation with a gating mutation (including R117H mutation) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele corresponds to the therapeutic indication to be assessed. From this subpopulation, 50 patients were randomly allocated to the study's intervention arm and 45 to the control arm.

The study consisted of a 28-day run-in phase, followed by an 8-week treatment phase and a 28-day follow-up observation phase. Following the treatment phase, an open-label extension study was available. During the run-in phase, all patients received 150 mg IVA twice daily. While in the control arm, this treatment was continued after randomization, patients in the intervention arm switched to treatment with ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor (150/100/200 mg)

in the morning in combination with 150 mg ivacaftor in the evening. The study protocol specified for the individual patients' pretreatment to be continued at a stable dose. However, Module 4 C reveals that individualized adjustments were made in some cases. Treatment with ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor or ivacaftor was administered in compliance with the Summary of Product Characteristics [6,7].

The primary outcome of the study was percent change in FEV1 from baseline. Patient-relevant secondary outcomes were symptoms, health-related quality of life, and adverse events.

### ***Insufficient study duration***

Due to a study duration of only 8 weeks, the VX18-445-104 study submitted by the company is unsuitable for a benefit assessment in the therapeutic indication of CF – a chronic disease requiring lifelong treatment. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) guideline recommends a minimum duration of 6 months for the investigation of a clinical outcome [8]. IQWiG's General Methods 6.0 also consider long-term studies to be necessary for the benefit assessment of chronic diseases [1]. In the therapeutic indication of CF, short-term studies (with a treatment duration of less than 24 weeks) are unsuitable for the benefit assessment since ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor in combination with ivacaftor is a long-term treatment. No conclusions can be drawn on the basis of short-term studies as to whether short term effects persist in the longer term. Additionally, it is impossible to record any effects that become apparent only in the longer term, e.g. for pulmonary exacerbations and their consequences or for adverse events. In Module 4 C, the company justified its inclusion criterion of 8 weeks by arguing that this had been the maximum treatment duration of the only randomized study in the therapeutic indication. The company's rationale was not found plausible.

Overall, studies of at least 24 weeks' duration are necessary to compare benefit and harm in the benefit assessment for the therapeutic indication of CF. However, due to the rarity of the mutations to be investigated and the fact that children are affected in the present therapeutic indication, the VX18-445-104 study and the corresponding short-term results are presented as supplementary information in the appendix of the present dossier assessment (see Appendix A). No conclusion on added benefit is derived from them.

## **2.4 Results on added benefit**

No suitable data are available for assessing the added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor versus the ACT in CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> allele. Consequently, there is no hint of an added benefit of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor in comparison with the ACT; an added benefit is therefore not proven.

## **2.5 Probability and extent of added benefit**

Table 5 presents a summary of the results of the benefit assessment of ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor in comparison with the ACT.

Table 5: Ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor + ivacaftor – probability and extent of added benefit

<b>Indication</b>	<b>ACT<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Probability and extent of added benefit</b>
CF patients aged 12 years and older who are heterozygous for the F508del mutation in the CFTR gene and have a gating mutation (including R117H) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> allele.	Ivacaftor	Added benefit not proven
<p>a. Presented is the ACT specified by the G-BA.</p> <p>ACT: appropriate comparator therapy; CFTR: cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator; G-BA: Federal Joint Committee</p>		

The assessment described above deviates from that by the company, which derived an indication of considerable added benefit on the basis of the VX18445-104 study.

The G-BA decides on the added benefit.

## References for English extract

Please see full dossier assessment for full reference list.

The reference list contains citations provided by the company in which bibliographical information may be missing.

1. Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care. General Methods; Version 6.0 [online]. 2020 [Accessed: 22.03.2021]. URL: [https://www.iqwig.de/methoden/general-methods\\_version-6-0.pdf](https://www.iqwig.de/methoden/general-methods_version-6-0.pdf).
2. Skipka G, Wieseler B, Kaiser T et al. Methodological approach to determine minor, considerable, and major treatment effects in the early benefit assessment of new drugs. *Biom J* 2016; 58(1): 43-58. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bimj.201300274>.
3. Vertex Pharmaceuticals. A Phase 3 Study of VX-445 Combination Therapy in Cystic Fibrosis (CF) Subjects Heterozygous for F508del and a Gating or Residual Function Mutation (F/G and F/RF Genotypes) [online]. 2020 [Accessed: 18.06.2021]. URL: <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04058353>.
4. Vertex Pharmaceuticals. Clinical Study Report. Study VX18-445-104. A Phase 3, Randomized, Double-blind, Controlled Study Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of Elexacaftor Combination Therapy in Subjects With Cystic Fibrosis Who Are Heterozygous for the F508del Mutation and a Gating or Residual Function Mutation (F/G and F/RF Genotypes). 21.08.2020. Version 1.0. 2020.
5. Eucfr. A Phase 3, Randomized, Double-blind, Controlled Study Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of VX-445 Combination Therapy in Subjects With Cystic Fibrosis Who Are Heterozygous for the F508del Mutation and a Gating or Residual Function Mutation (F/G and F/RF Genotypes) [online]. 2020 [Accessed: 13.04.2021]. URL: <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2018-002835-76/DE>.
6. Vertex Pharmaceuticals. Kaftrio 75 mg/50 mg/100 mg Filmtabletten [online]. 2021 [Accessed: 16.06.2021]. URL: <https://www.fachinfo.de/>.
7. Vertex Pharmaceuticals. Kalydeco 75 mg Filmtabletten; Kalydeco 150 mg Filmtabletten [online]. 2021 [Accessed: 16.06.2021]. URL: <https://www.fachinfo.de/>.
8. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the clinical development of medicinal products for the treatment of cystic fibrosis [online]. 2009 [Accessed: 09.07.2021]. URL: [https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-clinical-development-medicinal-products-treatment-cystic-fibrosis-first-version\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-clinical-development-medicinal-products-treatment-cystic-fibrosis-first-version_en.pdf).

*The full report (German version) is published under*  
<https://www.iqwig.de/en/projects/a21-71.html>.