2SPD-006 ASSESSMENT OF REGORAFENIB, RAMUCIRUMAB AND CABOZANTINIB AS SECONDLINE THERAPY IN HEPATOCARCINOMA AND ALFA-FETOPROTEIN VALUE ≥ 400 NG/ML

M Camean-Castillo*, S Fenix-Caballero, FJ Salmeron-Navas, M Dominguez-Cantero, JM Borrero-Rubio. *Hospital Universitario Puerto Real, Pharmacy, Puerto Real, Spain*

10.1136/ejhp-2020-eahpconf.25

Background and importance Regorafenib, ramucirumab and cabozantinib are used as secondline therapy in patients with hepatocarcinoma and alfa-fetoprotein value ≥ 400 ng/mL (HCC-AP ≥ 400). There are no direct comparisons among them.

Aim and objectives To establish whether regorafenib, ramucirumab and cabozantinib are equivalent therapeutic alternatives (ATE) in the secondline treatment of HCC-AP ≥ 400 through an indirect treatment comparison (ITC) using a common comparator.

Material and methods A search was conducted to identify phase III clinical trials with similar populations (secondline treatment of HCC-AP ≥ 400), duration and endpoints. If more than one study of the same drug was found, the results were combined in a meta-analysis (Joaquim Primo calculator). ITC was made according to Bucher's method. The variable selected to determine clinical equivalence was overall survival (OS). Delta value (Δ), maximum acceptable difference as a clinical criterion of non-inferiority, was set at 0.750 (and its inverse, 1.33), the value used in trials to calculate sample size. To establish positioning, the criteria of the ATE guide were applied. If 95% CI deviated from the delta margin, this probability was calculated using the Shakespeare method.

Results Four clinical trials were found, ramucirumab (n=2), regorafenib (n=1) and cabozantinib (n=1). Limitations found: included population (only patients with alpha-fetoprotein ≥ 400 ng/mL versus all patients, then subgroup data were used for ITC) and previous therapy as firstline (only sorafenib vs other treatments allowed, in small percentages). Ramucirumab trials were pooled, resulting in HR 0.71 (95% CI 0.58 to 0.86). The results of the ITC are shown in table 1.

Abstract 2SPD-006 Table 1

Reference	OS (HR (95% CI))
Cabozantinib-regorafenib	1.044 (0.692 to 1.576)
Ramucirumab-regorafenib	1.044 (0.726 to 1.501)
Ramucirumab-cabozantinib	1 (0.712 to 1.405)

According to the ATE guide, there was a likely clinical equivalence. The probability that the result exceeded the delta margin above and below was, respectively, 12.45% and 5.76% for cabozantinib-regorafenib, 9.57% and 3.71% for ramucirumab-regorafenib, and 5% and 4.86% for ramucirumab-cabozantinib.

Conclusion and relevance The ITC showed no statistically significant differences in OS among the drugs. The 95% CI showed a certain grade of uncertainty, exceeding the equivalence margin. According to the ATE guide, there was clinical equivalence among the drugs due to the small percentage of 95% CI outside the equivalence margin.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

2SPD-007 OUT OF SUPPLY OF CHEMOTHERAPY INJECTABLE MEDICINES OVER 9 MONTHS: PATIENT IMPACT

F Charbonneau*, Y Brasleret, MA Zilavec, C Naine, J Grimaux, G Svrcek. *Soissons Hospital Centre, Pharmacy Unit, Soissons, France*

10.1136/ejhp-2020-eahpconf.26

Background and importance For several years, healthcare facilities have noted an increase in out of supply medicines, including those in the oncology field.

Aim and objectives The aim of this study was to establish which chemotherapy injectable medicines were out of supply and determine the impact on patients.

Material and methods We took a census of chemotherapy injectable medicines out of supply between January and September 2019 from an Excel database indexing out of supply medicines, updated with information from laboratories or the national agency for medicines and healthcare product safety. Then, using patient files from Chimio and Easily software, we determined the patients affected by these out of supply medicines.

Results Three chemotherapeutic pharmaceutical specialities were identified as being out of supply in 2019: bleomycin, mitomycin (Ametycine) and docetaxel (Taxotere). Of the 285 patients treated by injectable chemotherapy in our healthcare facility, 7 were affected by these out of supply medicines and 1 patient was affected by 2 out of supply medicines.

For bleomycin, two patients with ovarian cancer did not have an alternative. For mitomycin, the treatment of two patients with bladder cancer had been delayed for 7 days and one patient with anorectal squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) had to change his protocol. For docetaxel, two patients (one with prostate cancer and one with anorectal SCC) did not have an alternative and one patient with prostate cancer had to change his protocol.

Conclusion and relevance The out of supply of chemotherapy injectable medicines requires patients to adapt to the treatment when the treatment should adapt to the patient. The out of supply medicines lead to loss of hope for patients, even if it is hard to quantify. One of the consequences is that we have to explain to patients why the treatment is different from the one initially planned and sometimes it can be difficult to reassure them. We can ask the question if there will be a decline in the quality of care of certain cancers in the coming years facing more and more regular out of supply medicines, sometimes with no alternative for the patient.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

2SPD-008 IMPACT OF FRENCH EXPERIMENT FOR INCENTIVISING ETANERCEPT BIOSIMILAR USE AFTER 10 MONTHS

P Paubel*, A Degrasat-Théas, F Bocquet. *Faculté De Pharmacie De Paris, Institut Droit Et Santé-Inserm Umr S 1145, Paris, France*

10.1136/ejhp-2020-eahpconf.27

Background and importance In order to ensure the sustainability of the French healthcare system, the government launched

two incentives to increase biosimilar use in August 2018, within the framework of the social security funding law. The first redirected 20% of the price difference between the reference product and its biosimilar to the hospital, for every biosimilar prescription from the hospital, and provided it in retail pharmacies. The second (called article 51) was an experiment where 40 hospitals were selected after a call for a proposal. The clinical units of these 40 hospitals received 30% of the price difference between the reference product and its biosimilar for every biosimilar prescription from the hospital.

Aim and objectives The aim of this study was to compare the efficacy of both incentives 10 months after implementation in October 2018.

Material and methods IQVIA Xponent data were used to evaluate public hospital prescriptions of etanercept. These are based on 14 000 retail pharmacy panels (60% of the French retail pharmacies) and allows observation of the number of boxes delivered in retail pharmacies linked to the initial hospital prescription. Data from the 40 hospitals selected in the experiment were compared with hospitals not in the experiment. We assessed savings that could be made if the experiment was extended to every hospital after 10 months.

Results In July 2019, the average use of etanercept biosimilar reached 44.2% (+19.5 points compared with October 2018) in the 40 hospitals selected in the experiment whereas it increased by 10.5 points in the other hospitals. After 10 months of the experiment, there was a difference of 12.3 points between the groups. The government expected to reach a difference of 15 points to prove the efficacy of this measure after 3 years. The 40 selected hospitals represent about 46% of potential etanercept prescriptions. If all hospitals reach 44.2% biosimilar use, the savings could be doubled, from 650k€ to 1.4M€.

Conclusion and relevance The first results of this experiment show that incentives to prescribe etanercept biosimilars seem to have an impact on biosimilar use in France.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements to Iqvia and Biogen France.

Conflict of interest Corporate sponsored research or other substantive relationships: Iqvia and Biogen France.

2SPD-009 COST MINIMISATION STUDY OF THE BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT OF INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE: USTEKINUMAB VERSUS VEDOLIZUMAB

L Cantarelli*, F Gutierrez Nicolas, B Del Rosario García, J Ramos Rodriguez, J García Cairos, JA Morales Barrios, S García Gil, GA Gonzalez De La Fuente, J Gonzalez García, GJ Nazco Casariego. *Complejo Hospitalario Universitario De Canarias, Pharmacy, Santa Cruz De Tenerife, Spain*

10.1136/ejhp-pharm-2020-eahpconf.28

Background and importance Therapy for inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) has included ustekinumab and vedolizumab in cases where antitumour necrosis factor-alpha (TNF α) drugs or conventional therapy has failed. Currently, both drugs constitute a high economic impact at the hospital level.

Aim and objectives This was a cost minimisation analysis between vedolizumab and ustekinumab in IBD to determine the economic impact in a third level hospital.

Material and methods A 2 year, unicentre, retrospective study (January 2017–December 2019) was carried out in all IBD patients treated with vedolizumab and ustekinumab. The

following variables were collected: patient weight, type of treatment and cost from the start of biological therapy.

The price of each drug was obtained from official data from the computer programme BOTPlus. The cost of each treatment was estimated taking into account: the posological regimen described in the technical data sheet, costs derived from the day hospital and costs related to dispensing of the drug in the ambulatory pharmacy service of the centre. To carry out the study, both therapies were considered equivalent in terms of efficacy.

Results The cost of treatment per year with vedolizumab was 13 765.05€ patient/year. The cost of treatment with ustekinumab was variable, depending on patient weight: 16 086.78€ patient/year in patients <55 kg (savings of 14.5% compared with vedolizumab), 17 868.87€ patient/year in patients 55–85 kg (savings of 23%) and 19 650.96€/patient/year in patients >85 kg (savings of 30%).

A total of 63 patients were treated with ustekinumab and vedolizumab in our hospital during the study and 34.9% received ustekinumab (n=22). Of these, 36.4% (n=8) weighed <55 kg, 59.1% (n=13) 55–85 kg and 9.1% (n=2) >85 kg. The total expenditure for ustekinumab on IBD during the study period was 388 911.39€. Application of the pharmacoeconomic model described in the present work, in our population, would have meant a saving of 76 814.24€.

Conclusion and relevance The results of this study show that vedolizumab is the most efficient alternative in all scenarios, with savings of up to 30% over the use of ustekinumab. Further cost effectiveness studies are necessary to corroborate the validity of these results.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

2SPD-010 ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SWITCHING THE ADMINISTRATION ROUTE OF TOCILIZUMAB IN POLYARTICULAR JUVENILE IDIOPATHIC ARTHRITIS

¹M Rodríguez Reyes, ²F Bossacomma Busquets*, ³M Sanchez Celma, ³J Arrojo Suarez, ³A Comes Escoda, ³C Latre Gorbé, ⁴E Iglesias Jimenez, ⁴J Anton Lopez. ¹Hospital Clinic Barcelona, Pharmacy, Barcelona, Spain; ²Hospital Sant Joan De Déu/Fundació Salut Empordà, Pharmacy, Esplugues De Llobregat, Spain; ³Hospital Sant Joan De Déu, Pharmacy, Esplugues De Llobregat, Spain; ⁴Hospital Sant Joan De Déu, Paediatrics, Esplugues De Llobregat, Spain

10.1136/ejhp-pharm-2020-eahpconf.29

Background and importance Tocilizumab is a humanised anti-interleukin-6 receptor monoclonal antibody. Intravenous tocilizumab is approved for use in children aged 2 years or older with polyarticular juvenile idiopathic arthritis (PJIA). Recently, subcutaneous tocilizumab was labelled for the same indication, demonstrating efficacy with a similar safety profile as intravenous administration.

Aim and objectives The aim of this study was to analyse treatment costs of subcutaneous tocilizumab (SC-T) versus intravenous tocilizumab (IV-T) in children with PJIA.

Material and methods This was a cross sectional study in a paediatric teaching hospital including all children with PJIA treated with intravenous tocilizumab. Variables collected were: sex, age, weight, posology of IV-T and consumption of vials and monthly cost associated with the use of IV-T. We analysed the potential cost savings if SC-T was used instead of IV-T. Costs were calculated using public prices provided by the