P14 THERAPEUTIC BENEFIT OF MEPOLIZUMAB IN THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE (NICE) SUB-POPULATION– A POST-HOC META-ANALYSIS OF PHASE IIB/III TRIALS

H Marwaha, CEA Hartmann, RA Mehta, NB Gunsoy, FC Albers. *GlaxoSmithKline, Research Triangle Park, NC, US*

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210983.156

Rationale NICE provide evidence-based recommendations and guidance to the NHS regarding newly licensed drugs. Positive guidance for the use of mepolizumab, an anti IL-5 mAb, was issued for adults with severe refractory eosinophilic asthma in a sub-population who 1) have had eosinophils of ≥ 300 cells per microlitre ($0.30 \times 10^9/L$) within the previous twelve months, and 2) have had ≥ 4 asthma exacerbations needing systemic corticosteroids in the previous 12 months, or have had continuous oral corticosteroids (of at least the equivalent of prednisolone 5 mg/day) for six months previously. A post-hoc meta-analysis of 3 pivotal phase III studies was done to inform healthcare professionals' understanding of mepolizumab's efficacy in this subgroup.

Methods Three randomised double-blind, placebo-controlled studies (DREAM [NCT01000506], MENSA [NCT01691521], SIRIUS [NCT01691508]), using the licensed 100 mg SC dose or the bioequivalent 75 mg IV dose of mepolizumab, were identified. Both treatment arms were combined for analysis purposes. Data for key outcome measures (exacerbations, asthma control, and health-related quality of life) included within these trials was analysed in the sub-population and combined using the inverse-variance method. Data from SIRIUS was included in a sensitivity analysis due to differences in design and inclusion criteria from DREAM and MENSA.

Results 228 patients were included in the meta-analysis from DREAM and MENSA, 289 including SIRIUS. The mean patient age was 52.1 and 51.4 years, respectively, with a respective 60% and 61% female. In the meta-analysis of the UK NICE-specific subpopulation of DREAM and MENSA, a 53% (95% CI: 0.36, 0.62; $p < 0.001$) reduction in clinically significant exacerbations was seen, with a 49% (95% CI: 0.01, 0.64, $p < 0.001$) reduction including sensitivity analysis with SIRIUS. An improvement in ACQ score of -0.50 (95% CI: -0.73 , -0.27 ; $p < 0.001$) and -0.53 (95% CI: -0.73 , -0.33 ; $p < 0.001$) was observed, respectively. SGRQ was used as an outcome measure in MENSA and SIRIUS only, showing an improvement in score of -7.3 (95% CI: -11.1 , -3.5 , $p < 0.001$).

Conclusion In the NICE sub-population, mepolizumab showed clinically meaningful and statistically significant effectiveness. These Results aim to inform UK healthcare professionals' understanding of the likely treatment effect of mepolizumab in this sub-population.

Funding GSK (NCT01000506, NCT01691521, NCT01691508).

P15 COST EFFECTIVENESS OF MEPOLIZUMAB FOR SEVERE EOSINOPHILIC ASTHMA FROM THE UK PERSPECTIVE

¹S Doyle, ²K Westerhout, ¹S Cockle, ¹N Gunsoy, ²B Verheggen. ¹GlaxoSmithKline, London, UK; ²Pharmerit, Rotterdam, Netherlands

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210983.157

Introduction Severe asthma patients have limited therapeutic options. These patients remain at risk of exacerbations, their quality of life is negatively impacted and they place a significant burden on the health service. Mepolizumab is licensed for use in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma. As reimbursement authorities expect evidence of health economic benefits, this study aimed to estimate the cost-utility of mepolizumab as an add-on therapy to standard of care (SOC) versus SOC alone.

Methods A *de novo* Markov cost-utility model was produced which compared the costs and outcomes of mepolizumab vs. SOC over a lifetime horizon. Primary analysis was based on data from the MENSA clinical trial (NCT01691521). Patients entering the model were assigned to mepolizumab or SOC and experienced treatment-specific probabilities of exacerbation events with an associated risk of mortality and disutility. The model included a continuation criteria where patients on mepolizumab who failed to demonstrate an exacerbation reduction were transitioned to the SOC arm. Costs and health outcomes were discounted annually at 3.5%. The model did not account for indirect costs or value in steroid reduction.

Results In the basecase analysis (patients with ≥ 300 eosinophil cells/ μL and ≥ 4 exacerbations in the previous 12 months) the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of add-on mepolizumab compared with SOC was £30,268/QALY gained. Scenario analyses showed that the ICER was sensitive to the starting age of the cohort, the source of utility and asthma-related mortality.

Conclusion Mepolizumab represents a clinically efficacious and cost-effective alternative to SOC.

P16 IMPLICATIONS OF NICE GUIDANCE IN ENGLAND AND WALES ON ELIGIBILITY FOR TREATMENT WITH MEPOLIZUMAB AND OMALIZUMAB – AN IDEAL STUDY ANALYSIS

CEA Hartmann, H Starkie Camejo, NB Gunsoy, RA Mehta, FC Albers. *GlaxoSmithKline, Research Triangle Park, NC, US*

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210983.158

Rationale Severe asthma (SA) patients are a heterogeneous population with diverse clinical characteristics and biomarkers, including eosinophils and IgE. It is of clinical relevance to understand the relationship between different severe asthma phenotypes and thus eligibility for biologic therapies. The IDEAL study (Identification and Description of Severe Asthma Patients in a Cross-Sectional Study) aimed to define the proportion of patients in England and Wales who are eligible for anti IL-5 (mepolizumab) or anti-IgE (omalizumab) targeted therapy, and those who may be eligible for both, given current NICE guidance.

Methods IDEAL, an observational study, included SA subjects aged ≥ 12 years defined according to ATS/ERS guidelines by treatment with high-dose ICS plus additional controller(s) for ≥ 12 months. A post hoc analysis of IDEAL was conducted to identify eligibility to mepolizumab and omalizumab in accordance with current NICE guidance for each. Mepolizumab eligibility was defined as per NICE guidance: 'severe refractory eosinophilic asthma patients who have eosinophils ≥ 300 cells/microlitre ($0.30 \times 10^9/L$) or more in the previous 12 months and have had ≥ 4 asthma exacerbations needing systemic corticosteroids in the previous 12 months, or