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Executive summary

This Summary reports the recommendations made by the WHO Expert Committee on the Selection and Use of Essential Medicines for the 2019 Essential Medicines Lists update.

The 22nd meeting of the WHO Expert Committee on the Selection and Use of Essential Medicines took place in Geneva, Switzerland, from 1 to 5 April 2019. The aim of the meeting was to review and update the 20th WHO Model List of Essential Medicines (EML) and the 6th WHO Model List of Essential Medicines for Children (EMLc).

The Expert Committee considered 65 applications, including proposals to add 53 new medicines and new formulations of 19 existing medicines, extend the indications for 34 listed medicines, and to remove 10 medicines or formulations from the lists. The Expert Committee also considered reports and recommendations from the EML Antibiotics and Cancer Medicines Working Groups. In accordance with applicable procedures, the Expert Committee evaluated the scientific evidence for the comparative effectiveness, safety and cost-effectiveness of the medicines in question.

In summary, the Expert Committee:

- recommended the addition of 28 new medicines to the EML (12 to the core list and 16 to the complementary list);
- recommended the addition of 23 new medicines to the EMLc (6 to the core list and 17 to the complementary list);
- recommended the addition of new formulations of 16 currently listed medicines;
- recommended adding additional indications for 26 currently listed medicines;
- recommended the deletion of 9 medicines and of specific formulations of a further 4 medicines; and
- rejected 21 applications for inclusion, change or deletion of 31 medicines.

The recommendations are briefly described below in order of their appearance on the Model Lists according to the classification.

A full summary of changes to the Model Lists is shown in Table 1. The applications not recommended are listed in Table 2.

Section 6: Anti-infective medicines

Section 6.2 Antibacterials

AWaRe classification of antibiotics

The Expert Committee noted the adoption and utilization of the Access, Watch and Reserve (AWaRe) classification of antibiotics on the EML by several Member States including the endorsement of AWaRe by the G20 Health Ministers in Argentina in October 2018. Furthermore, a new target indicator based on AWaRe was adopted which specifies a country level target of at least

---

1 [http://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/subcommittee/2/eeb1098%5b1%5d.pdf](http://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/subcommittee/2/eeb1098%5b1%5d.pdf)

60% of antibiotic consumption being from the Access group. This indicator is intended to monitor access to essential medicines and progress towards Universal Health Coverage under the WHO 13th General Program of Work. The Committee recognized the emerging role of the AWaRe groups for stewardship and quality improvement programs.

The Expert Committee recommended that specific listing of antibiotics in the EML and the allocation of antibiotics to the different AWaRe groups should be distinguished from each other, recognizing their distinct albeit complementary purposes. The Committee acknowledged that EML-listed antibiotics represent a parsimonious, evidence-based selection of essential narrow spectrum antibiotics for first- and second-choice empiric treatment of most common bacterial infections and a tool for stewardship. However, the AWaRe classification should extend beyond the EML to all commonly used antibiotics globally. The Committee acknowledged the contributions of the EML Antibiotics Working Group and endorsed the Working Group’s recommendations for AWaRe classification of 177 commonly used antibiotics, to better support antibiotic monitoring and stewardship activities. The Expert Committee recommended the development of an AWaRe classification database as a searchable resource for countries.

**Antibiotics not classified as Access, Watch or Reserve**

The Committee recommended, based on the advice of the EML Antibiotics Working Group, that WHO may wish to consider creating an additional group in the AWaRe classification database for antibiotics whose use is not evidence-based, nor recommended in high quality international guidelines, particularly fixed-dose combinations of multiple broad-spectrum antibiotics. Antibiotics in this group are not included on the Model Lists.

The AWaRe classification database will be published as an Online Appendix to the 2019 Model Lists and Technical Report of the meeting.

The Expert Committee recommended the re-structuring of Section 6.2 to better accommodate AWaRe classification, and that antibiotics on the EML be listed in revised sub-sections according to AWaRe groups, replacing the existing sub-sections based on chemical structure (e.g., beta-lactam and other antibacterials). The subsequent sub-sections within Section 6.2 are re-numbered accordingly:

- 6.2.1: Access group antibiotics
- 6.2.2: Watch group antibiotics
- 6.2.3: Reserve group antibiotics
- 6.2.4: Antileprosy medicines
- 6.2.5: Antituberculosis medicines

**Additions, changes and deletions**

The Expert Committee recommended for inclusion three new recently registered antibiotics for treatment of multi-drug resistant infections caused by pathogens ranked as “Critical Priority” on

---

the WHO Priority Pathogens List\(^4\) and classified under AWaRe as Reserve antibiotics: ceftazidime + avibactam, meropenem + vaborbactam and plazomicin. Four recently registered antibiotics were not recommended for EML inclusion, but were classified under AWaRE for monitoring purposes (ceftolozane + tazobactam, eravacycline and omadacycline as Reserve; delafloxacin as Watch).

The Committee recommended first- and second-choice empiric antibiotic treatment options for enteric fever, surgical prophylaxis and progressive apical dental abscess on the EML and EMLc, including the addition of cefuroxime (for surgical prophylaxis), classified under AWaRe as a Watch group antibiotic.

The Committee recommended the removal of aztreonam, fourth- and fifth-generation cephalosporins (as classes), tigecycline and daptomycin from the EML and EMLc as these antibiotics did not meet the revised criteria for inclusion on the Model Lists as individual Reserve group agents (see 6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics, below). Furthermore, the Committee agreed that fourth-generation cephalosporins should be re-classified as Watch group as they did not meet the revised criteria for classification as Reserve. The Committee also recommended the re-classification of faropenem from Watch to Reserve due to its high potential for inappropriate use. It is an orally available formulation with a broad spectrum activity whose inappropriate use may further the spread of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae.

**Section 6.2.1 Access group antibiotics**

This category includes antibiotics that have activity against a wide range of commonly encountered susceptible pathogens while showing lower resistance potential than antibiotics in Watch and Reserve groups. The following 19 Access group antibiotics are recommended as first or second choice empiric treatment options for infectious syndromes reviewed by the Expert Committee and are listed as individual medicines on the Model Lists to promote optimal use and with the goal of improving global “access to Access” antibiotics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access group antibiotics included on the 2019 Model Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzathine benzylpenicillin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.2.2 Watch group antibiotics**

The Watch group includes antibiotics that have higher resistance potential and includes most of the highest priority agents among the Critically Important Antimicrobials (CIA) for Human Medicine\(^5\) and/or antibiotics that are at relatively high risk of selection of bacterial resistance. These

---

\(^4\) The WHO PPL is tool to guide the research and development (R&D) of new antibiotics, ensuring that R&D responds to public health needs. The list is divided into three tiers – critical, high and medium risk pathogens. Gram negative bacteria are shown to be the most critical priority need (https://www.who.int/medicines/areas/rational_use/PPLreport_2017_09_19.pdf?ua=1).

\(^5\) The WHO CIA list is aimed at preserving medically important antimicrobials for human use by decreasing their use in the food chain (http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/251715/1/9789241511469-eng.pdf?ua=1).
medicines should be prioritized as key targets of national and local stewardship programs and monitoring. The following 11 Watch group antibiotics are recommended as essential first or second choice empiric treatment options for a limited number of specific infectious syndromes and are listed as individual medicines on the WHO Model Lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watch group antibiotics included on the 2019 Model Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefixime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarithromycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefotaxime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftazidime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piperacillin + tazobactam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics

The Reserve group includes antibiotics that should be reserved for treatment of confirmed or suspected infections due to multi-drug-resistant organisms. Reserve group antibiotics should be considered as “last resort” options. Seven selected Reserve group antibiotics are listed as individual medicines on the WHO Model Lists as they have a favourable benefit-risk profile and proven activity against “Critical Priority” or “High Priority” pathogens as identified by the WHO Priority Pathogens List, most notably carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae. These antibiotics should be globally accessible, but their use should be tailored to highly specific patients and settings, when alternatives are not suitable or have failed. To preserve their effectiveness these Reserve group antibiotics should be prioritized as key targets of national and international stewardship programs including regular monitoring and reporting of their use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve group antibiotics included on the 2019 Model Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceftazidime + avibactam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem + vaborbactam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colistin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plazomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosfomycin (intravenous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polymyxin B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linezolid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EML ANTIBIOTICS/AWaRe WORKING GROUP

The Expert Committee acknowledged that the existing EML listings and the classification of individual medicines to specific AWaRe groups may change slightly over time, due to the evolving epidemiology of infectious diseases and antimicrobial resistance, changes in the availability of antibiotics and emergence of new scientific evidence. The ongoing revision and consolidation of the antibiotics included on the EML and of AWaRe classification is a key activity of the Working Group, with the aim of balancing the objectives of preserving antibiotic effectiveness while guaranteeing necessary access. Therefore, the Committee recommended the continuation of the activities of the EML Antibiotics/AWaRe Working Group.

The Committee recommended that the Working Group should assess the adoption of AWaRe across countries and further explore how AWaRe can assist in activities to promote optimal antibiotic stewardship. Some areas needing more investigation are the incorporation of AWaRe in national essential medicines lists and clinical practice guidelines, and the adaptation of AWaRe for...
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educational activities to improve antibiotic use. The Committee recommended the Working Group develop antibiotic stewardship algorithms for Reserve antibiotics to define how these medicines should be used and how their misuse can be prevented. This includes the identification of evidence gaps for the recommended uses in clinical practice. The Committee noted that the current regulatory approval process for new antibiotics, most of which qualify for the Reserve category due to their activity against priority multidrug-resistant pathogens (usually carbapenem resistant pathogens), does not result in adequate evidence to judge their role for their optimal clinical use and guide appropriate policy interventions. The Working Group should identify and document these evidence gaps and propose research strategies for how to address them. In general, the AWaRe groups, WHO’s Priority Pathogens List and the WHO list of critically important antimicrobials should become more closely aligned with regard to definitions and terminology to avoid confusion and the Working Group should support and expand this effort.

Additional proposed activities of the Working Group include the development of policy documents assessing optimal antibiotic dosage and treatment duration for common infectious syndromes in both adults and children. This information, together with the Model Lists and AWaRe should inform production of a WHO handbook outlining antibiotic treatment guidance for high-burden bacterial syndromes. This information should be made available also in an easily accessible electronic format, e.g. by incorporating this information in the electronic EML.

Section 6.2.4: Antituberculosis medicines

The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of meropenem and of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment for MDR-TB. The Committee recommended that imipenem + cilastatin could be considered as an alternative to meropenem for use in adults. The Committee expressed concern in relation to increased use of carbapenem antibiotics (classified as Watch group) in the empiric treatment of MDR-TB and the development of carbapenem resistance and recommended that ongoing monitoring for the development of resistance be undertaken.

The Committee recommended the addition of several new formulations of currently listed medicines for use in children: cycloserine, ethambutol, ethionamide, isoniazid, levofloxacin, linezolid, and moxifloxacin. The addition of child-friendly formulations of antituberculosis medicines is fully in line with the latest WHO guideline recommendations on the management of MDR- and isoniazid-resistant TB.

The Committee recommended the deletion of capreomycin and kanamycin from the complementary list of the EML and EMLc, noting that their use is no longer recommended in WHO guidelines due to increased treatment failure and toxicity when compared to alternative oral therapeutic options. The Committee also recommended the deletion from the EML of fixed-dose combination of ethambutol + isoniazid, and specific formulations/strengths of fixed-dose combinations of isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin and isoniazid + rifampicin, no longer recommended in WHO guidelines due to their association with higher rates of treatment failure.

The Committee recommended the addition of bedaquiline to the complementary list of the EMLc the treatment of MDR-TB in children aged 6 years and older, as extrapolation of evidence from adult data suggests good efficacy and benefits outweigh risks. The Committee did not recommend a
change to the age restriction (≥6 years) that applies to the listing of delamanid on the Model Lists, as the evidence used to support the lowering of the age limit in the WHO Guidelines used a formulation and strength of delamanid that is not currently commercially available, nor bioequivalent to the formulation and strength included in the EMLc.

The Committee did not recommend the addition of injectable formulations of ethambutol, isoniazid, p-aminosalicylic acid (PAS) and rifampicin: the Committee noted that WHO recommends oral treatment regimens, ideally administered in fixed-dose combinations. The Committee also noted that the availability of the proposed injectable agents was limited and recognized the potential for inappropriate use of prolonged parenteral anti-TB medicines. The Committee did not recommend the addition of a new strength formulation of isoniazid oral liquid, giving preference to dispersible tablet formulations.

Section 6.4.2: Antiretrovirals
For the treatment of HIV infection, the Committee recommended the addition of the fixed-dose combination of dolutegravir + lamivudine + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate to the EML, and the addition of dolutegravir to the EMLc, in line with recommendations in WHO Guidelines. The Committee also recommended addition of new formulations of raltegravir, ritonavir, and lopinavir + ritonavir. Formulations of abacavir + lamivudine and zidovudine were recommended for deletion, while formulations of raltegravir and ritonavir proposed for deletion were recommended to be retained until the availability of newer, preferred formulations is assured.

Section 6.4.4.2: Medicines for hepatitis C
This section of the list has been amended to differentiate between pangenotypic and non-pangenotypic direct acting antivirals, and other antivirals for hepatitis C.

Section 6.4.4.2.1: Pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral combinations
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of the fixed dose combination of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir to the EML for the treatment of adult patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection based on evidence of pan-genotypic effectiveness with acceptable safety, supported by current WHO guidelines. The Committee noted that the EML now contains multiple pangenotypic treatment options for hepatitis C (sofosbuvir + velpatasvir, sofosbuvir/daclatasvir, glecaprevir + pibrentasvir) and recommended that they be considered as therapeutically equivalent to facilitate selection and procurement at country level.

Section 6.4.4.2.2: Non-pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral combinations
The Committee also recommended the deletion from the EML of simeprevir, whose place in therapy has been superseded by the pangenotypic options. Other non-pangenotypic treatments could be considered for deletion in the future.

Section 6.5.3.2: (Antimalarial medicines) For prophylaxis
The Expert Committee recommended listing of fixed-dose combination formulations of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine on the EML for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment of malaria in pregnancy (IPTp), and on the EMLc for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment of malaria in infancy (IPTi); and the addition of co-packaged formulations of
amodiaquine and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine dispersible tablets to the EMLc for seasonal malaria chemoprevention, in line with recommendations in WHO Guidelines for the treatment of malaria.

Section 6.5.5.1: African trypanosomiasis
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of fexinidazole to the EML and EMLc as an orally-administered treatment for treatment of 1st and 2nd stages of human African trypanosomiasis due to *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* infection.

Section 6.6: (NEW) Medicines for ectoparasitic infections
The Expert Committee recommended listing of ivermectin on the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment of scabies, in a new sub-section of the list for ectoparasitic infections. The Committee noted the potential advantages of single-dose oral administration of ivermectin compared to topically administered alternatives in terms of improved compliance.

Section 7: Antimigraine medicines
The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of sumatriptan to the EML for the treatment of adult patients with acute migraine. The Committee noted that available evidence supports the greater effectiveness of sumatriptan compared to placebo, but evidence comparing sumatriptan with analgesics currently included on the EML for treatment of migraine (aspirin and paracetamol) showed varying results, including no difference in effect. At its next meeting, the Committee would welcome a review of additional data of the role in therapy of sumatriptan in the context of other migraine therapies and current guideline recommendations.

Section 8: (RE-NAMED) Immunomodulators and antineoplastics
Section 8.1 (RE-NAMED) Immunomodulators for non-malignant disease
**Anti-TNF biologics for chronic inflammatory conditions:** The Expert Committee recommended the addition of adalimumab to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of chronic inflammatory autoimmune disorders – rheumatoid arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis and Crohn’s disease based on a positive benefit-risk profile as second-line treatment (after methotrexate). Adalimumab is listed with a square box, representative of the class of tumour necrosis factor alpha (TNF-α) inhibitors, including biosimilars. Alternatives were limited to etanercept and infliximab on the EMLc and to etanercept, infliximab, certolizumab pegol and golimumab on the EML. The Committee recognized that these medicines are associated with a significant budget impact to health systems as they are used for long periods and often are highly priced. However, the availability of several therapeutically equivalent alternatives and increased availability of biosimilar products could lead to more market competition and reduced prices.

**Medicines for multiple sclerosis:** The Expert Committee recognized the public health need for effective and affordable treatments for multiple sclerosis (MS) but did not recommend the addition to the EML and EMLc of glatiramer acetate, fingolimod and ocrelizumab at this time. The Committee acknowledged the application’s approach to increase access to MS treatments by prioritizing selected treatment options. However, the Committee noted that some relevant therapeutic options for MS were not included in the application (azathioprine and natalizumab) or
were not given full consideration (rituximab). The superiority of presented medicines over other therapeutic options in the outcomes considered (benefits, harms, affordability) did not clearly emerge. The Committee would therefore welcome a revised application which comprehensively reviews the relative roles of relevant available medicines for MS.

Section 8.2: (RE-NAMED) Antineoplastic and supportive medicines

This section has been updated and amended to include sub-sections that better represent the pharmacologically diverse medicines currently listed:

- 8.2.1: Cytotoxic medicines
- 8.2.2: Targeted therapies
- 8.2.3: Immunomodulators
- 8.2.4: Hormones and antihormones
- 8.2.5: Supportive medicines

Applications for new cancer medicines were received from various sources, including a WHO Secretariat-led effort to engage with expert stakeholders through the Cancer Medicines Working Group to identify and prioritise the most effective cancer medicines for indications where they have clinically relevant benefits.

The Expert Committee recommended listing for a number of new high-priced cancer medicines for specific indications on the complementary list of the EML.

**Melanoma:** nivolumab (with a square box indicating pembrolizumab as a therapeutically equivalent alternative) for front-line monotherapy in patients with unresectable and metastatic melanoma. Both these medicines demonstrated highly relevant increases in overall survival and represent the first medicines on the EML for metastatic melanoma.

**Multiple myeloma:** bortezomib, lenalidomide, thalidomide and melphalan for the treatment of patients with newly-diagnosed multiple myeloma in both non-transplant and transplant eligible/available settings. These medicines demonstrated large improvements in survival with acceptable safety and represent the first medicines on the EML for multiple myeloma.

**Lung cancer:** erlotinib (with a square box indicating afatinib and gefitinib as therapeutically equivalent alternatives) for front-line treatment of EGFR mutation positive advanced non-small cell lung cancer. These medicines demonstrated relevant survival benefits (similar to that of cytotoxic chemotherapy) and offer better toxicity profiles and improved quality of life compared to chemotherapy.

**Prostate cancer:** abiraterone for the treatment of patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. Abiraterone demonstrated relevant survival benefits for patients and an acceptable safety profile. It is associated with potential advantages in terms of emerging dosing strategies, lower pill burden and availability of generics which would be associated with cost-savings compared to similarly effective enzalutamide. Enzalutamide was not recommended for listing on the EML.
Leukaemias (EML and EMLc): arsenic (oral and IV formulations) for use in the treatment of patients with acute promyelocytic leukaemia. Arsenic-containing regimens were associated with less toxicity, high response rates and greater survival benefits compared to standard regimens. Pegaspargase was recommended for treatment of patients with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia as it is associated with less immunogenicity and antibody development compared to asparaginase.

The listings of some cancer medicines currently on the EML were recommended to be extended to include new indications of cervical cancer and multiple myeloma. Additionally, listing of 10 medicines currently included on the EML were recommended to be extended to the EMLc and additional indications were recommended for 11 cancer medicines currently included on the EMLc to improve access to these medicines for children. Refer to Table 1 for details.

Among the applications for cancer medicines that were not recommended for listing on the EML were:

- nivolumab, pembrolizumab and atezolizumab for the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer, as the Committee considered that their place in therapy for this condition is still evolving and that more data with longer follow-up are needed to better demonstrate estimates of their actual magnitude of benefit;

- pertuzumab for HER-2 positive breast cancer, as the evidence did not demonstrate a clinically meaningful survival benefit in early stage disease. A large overall survival benefit has been demonstrated in a single trial in metastatic disease, but similar results have not been seen in other trials. The Committee recommended further independent analysis of data from existing and ongoing trials be undertaken to inform future consideration for EML listing.

- Trastuzumab emtansine for HER-2 positive breast cancer, because while it demonstrates a relevant survival benefit, its use as second-line treatment of metastatic disease was considered not to be a priority in the context of treatment of breast cancer, and alternative EML-listed options are available.

- Subcutaneous formulations of rituximab and trastuzumab, as the Committee was concerned that listing of these formulations, for which biosimilars are not yet available, could limit competition and therefore limit access for patients.

**EML CANCER MEDICINES WORKING GROUP**

The Expert Committee acknowledged the work of the EML Cancer Medicines Working Group and endorsed the Working Group’s recommendations that WHO adopt a threshold for benefit of at least 4-6 months survival gain to be considered as candidates for EML inclusion. The Committee acknowledged the role of the ESMO Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO–MCBS) as a screening tool to identify cancer treatments that have potential therapeutic value that warrants full evaluation for EML listing. Potential new EML cancer medicines, in general, should have a score on the ESMO-MCBS of A or B in the curative setting and of 4 or 5 in the non-curative setting. These

---

6 [https://www.esmo.org/score/cards](https://www.esmo.org/score/cards)
scores would support a medicine being evaluated by the Expert Committee for inclusion in the EML through a full application.

The Committee recommended the continuation and further expansion of the activities of the Working Group. This should include the updated revision of treatment protocols for cancers previously considered by the Committee and identification of new cancer medicines that meet the above-mentioned criteria to be candidates for consideration of inclusion on the EML.

The Working Group should also review the issues being experienced at country level in relation to implementation of EML cancer medicine recommendations and access to cancer medicines. The Committee recommended the need for consolidation of cancer medicine recommendations and EML listings through a broader technical advisory group meeting, with country engagement to support implementation within a UHC perspective.

**Section 10: Medicines affecting the blood**

**Section 10.2 Medicines affecting coagulation**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of dabigatran to the core list of the EML, with a square box (representative of the direct oral anticoagulants including apixaban, edoxaban and rivaroxaban) for the prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation, and for the treatment of venous thromboembolism. These medicines have a similar overall benefit-risk profile compared to warfarin, are associated with a lower risk of major bleeding, and may be particularly beneficial in settings where warfarin monitoring is not available.

**Section 12: Cardiovascular medicines**

**Section 12.3 Antihypertensive medicines**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of four, two-drug fixed dose combination formulations to the core list of the EML for the treatment of hypertension: lisinopril + amlodipine, lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide, telmisartan + amlodipine and telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide. Each component is listed with a square box as representative of the relevant pharmacological classes. The Committee accepted that fixed-dose combinations may confer advantages for patients over single medicines given concomitantly in terms of better adherence and reduced pill burden. However, the Committee considered that the ongoing availability of single agent antihypertensive medicines remains critical to allow treatment modification where necessary.

**Section 12.5.2 Thrombolytic medicines**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of alteplase to the complementary list of the EML for use in patients diagnosed with acute ischaemic stroke. The Committee noted that alteplase thrombolysis is associated with reductions in death and dependence when administered within 4.5 hours of the onset of stroke symptoms. Optimal use will require timely and highly organized care pathways, in facilities equipped and capable of managing stroke patients.

**Section 17: Gastrointestinal medicines**

**Section 17.2 Antiemetic medicines**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of aprepitant to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for management of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in patients
undergoing moderately- to highly-emetogenic chemotherapy, as it has been shown to be more effective than standard antiemetics. The Expert Committee also recommended the addition of a square box to the current listings of ondansetron on the EML and EMLc, indicating therapeutic equivalence among 5HT3 receptor antagonists.

Section 17.5 Medicines used in diarrhoea

The Expert Committee recommended listing on the core list of the EMLc of a co-packaged presentation of oral rehydration salts and zinc sulfate tablets, noting the recommendations for co-administration of the two components in the management of diarrhoea in children. The co-packaged product was considered practical, and likely to support better adherence to treatment.

Section 18: (RE-NAMED) Medicines for endocrine disorders

This section has been updated and amended to include only medicines for endocrine disorders in revised sub-sections as follows:

- 18.1: Adrenal hormones and synthetic substitutes
- 18.2: Androgens
- 18.3: Estrogens
- 18.4: Progestogens
- 18.5: Medicines for diabetes
- 18.6: Medicines for hypoglycaemia
- 18.7 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines

Contraceptives and other medicines for reproductive health have been transferred to Section 22 (see below).

Section 18.5 Medicines for diabetes

The Expert Committee acknowledged that insulin is a life-saving essential medicine for which a compelling public health need exists. Yet, despite being available for almost 100 years, achieving reliable, equitable and affordable access to insulin remains a public health challenge in many countries. The Committee recognized the need for a wider understanding of the complexities of access to insulin and the current insulin market and recommended WHO prioritize the coordination of a series of actions to address the issues of insulin access and affordability.

This WHO coordinated approach should aim at tackling the different aspects of the current situation of suboptimal access to insulin in many countries. This includes:

- establishment of a WHO technical working group on access to insulin;
- consultation with Member States and other stakeholders to identify/clarify barriers to access at country level;
- strategies to address current regulatory barriers for biosimilar insulins, including the expansion of the WHO Prequalification Programme;
- development of a comprehensive approach to address insulin prices, including new mechanisms for pooled procurement through UN supply agencies (UNICEF and UNDP) and through providing support for countries;
identification of evidence and research gaps regarding insulin use and supply, including setting-specific differences in clinical practice and health systems.

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of insulin analogues to the EML, reiterating the conclusion of the 2017 Expert Committee, that while long-acting insulin analogues are an effective treatment for type 1 diabetes, the available evidence shows efficacy and safety advantages of analogues compared to human insulin which are insufficiently large to justify the cost differential that continues to exist. In the absence of other coordinated actions, the Committee considered that the inclusion of insulin analogues for adults on the EML would be inadequate to address the underlying issues of poor access and affordability of insulins. The Expert Committee would therefore welcome a report that comprehensively describes the actions that are undertaken over the next two years and an application that reviews more in depth current challenges for optimal global access and the role insulin analogues in children.

Section 18.6 Medicines for hypoglycaemia

The Expert Committee recommended addition of diazoxide on the complementary list of the EMLc for the management of hypoglycaemia secondary to prolonged hyperinsulinism based on a positive benefit to risk ratio and for its impact on reducing the serious neurological consequences of untreated hyperinsulinism in newborns.

Section 18.7 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of methimazole with a square box to the core list of the EML and to the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of primary hyperthyroidism. Carbimazole is a therapeutically equivalent alternative. The Committee also recommended that the square box be removed from the listing of propylthiouracil on the EML. Propylthiouracil remains the recommended first-line treatment for women in the first trimester of pregnancy, and in patients for whom first-line treatment with methimazole (or carbimazole) is not appropriate or available. Propylthiouracil remains listed on the complementary list of the EMLc for use in patients for whom alternative first-line treatment is not appropriate or available.

Section 19.3 Vaccines

This section was updated by the Secretariat for consistency and alignment with the most recent WHO immunization policy recommendations and vaccine position papers. Dengue vaccine was added to the EML and EMLc for use in some high-risk populations, in line with the September 2018 dengue vaccine WHO position paper.

Section 22: (RE-NAMED) Medicines for reproductive health and perinatal care

This section has been updated and amended to include contraceptives and other medicines for reproductive health, maternal and neonatal care (from Sections 18, 22 and 29).

https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274315/WER9336.pdf?ua=1
Section 22.3 Uterotonics

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of heat-stable carbetocin injection to the core list of the EML for the prevention of postpartum haemorrhage based on similar effects compared to oxytocin for efficacy and safety outcomes. The Committee agreed that heat-stable carbetocin may offer advantages over oxytocin in some settings as it does not require cold-chain transport or refrigerated storage.

The Expert Committee did not recommend deletion of the indication of prevention of postpartum haemorrhage for misoprostol, noting that misoprostol is recommended in WHO guidelines as an alternative to oxytocin in settings where injectable uterotonics are not available or cannot be safely administered.

The Expert Committee recommended the transfer of mifepristone – misoprostol from the complementary to the core list of the EML, and removal of the note accompanying the listing stating, “Requires close medical supervision”, based on the evidence presented that close medical supervision is not required for its safe and effective use. The Committee also recommended the addition of a co-packaged presentation of mifepristone and misoprostol to the core list of the EML.

Recalling that their role and responsibility is to provide WHO with technical guidance in relation to the selection and use of essential medicines, the Expert Committee noted that its mandate did not extend to providing advice regarding the statement “Where permitted under national law and where culturally appropriate”. Subsequent to the Expert Committee meeting, the Director General, in consultation with the Department of Essential Medicines and Health Products, decided that no change to the statement be made.

Section 22.6 Other medicines administered to the mother

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of tranexamic acid to the core list of the EML for the new indication of treatment of post-partum haemorrhage, to be used as part of the standard PPH treatment package, including fluid replacement, uterotonics surgical and non-surgical interventions in accordance with WHO guidelines.

Section 24: Medicines for mental and behavioural disorders

The Expert Committee did not recommend inclusion of methylphenidate on the Model Lists for the treatment of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) due to uncertainties in the estimates of benefit, and concerns regarding the quality and limitations of the available evidence for both benefit and harm.

Section 24.2.1 Medicines used in depressive disorders

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of a square box to the listing of fluoxetine on the core list of the EML for the treatment of depressive disorders. The Committee noted that medicines within the pharmacological class of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) have demonstrated efficacy, but can differ in terms of pharmacokinetics, adverse events and drug-interaction profiles. The availability of different SSRIs as essential medicines may be beneficial at country level to expand therapeutic alternatives for patients and support better procurement. The Committee considered that it was not necessary to add escitalopram to the EML, as the addition of the square box to fluoxetine would allow the selection of escitalopram at national level.
Section 25: Medicines acting on the respiratory tract

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of tiotropium to the core list of the EML, with a square box as representative of the pharmacological class of long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMA) for the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, based on evidence of effectiveness in controlling COPD symptoms and reducing exacerbations, and acceptable safety.

Section 27: Vitamins and minerals

The Expert Committee recommended a correction to the listed strength of iodine capsules to 190 mg, to accurately reflect the quantitative composition of this product.

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of multiple micronutrient powders to the core list of the EMLc for the prevention of anaemia in infants and children, noting that a standardized product monograph is to be included in the United States Pharmacopoeia.

Section 29: Medicines for diseases of joints

Formerly Section 30. Re-numbered following the transfer of medicines specific for neonatal care to Section 22. The former Section 30 has been deleted.

Follow up decisions from the 2017 Expert Committee meeting

Oseltamivir

The Expert Committee noted the advice from the WHO Secretariat that the WHO Guidelines for clinical management of influenza are in the process of being updated, but the recommendations of the guideline development group were not yet available. The Committee recommended that no change be made to the current listing for oseltamivir on the Model Lists until the updated guidelines and supporting evidence can be reviewed.

Ready to use therapeutic food (RUTF)

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of RUTF to the Model Lists for the treatment of severe acute malnutrition, but again acknowledged the effectiveness of this product for this condition. The Committee considered that the comprehensive report prepared by the WHO Department of Nutrition in response to the request of the previous Expert Committee, highlighted the divided opinions and ongoing uncertainty of the implications at country level of listing RUTF as a medicine on the Model List.

Working group on Transparency and access to clinical trial data

The Expert Committee reiterated its recommendation from 2017 to establish a Working Group on transparency and timely public disclosure of all clinical trial results and available data. The Working Group should identify strategic actions to address factors known to impact the availability of reliable data informing applications for the inclusion or removal of medicines on the Model Lists. Such factors include selective outcome reporting, publication bias and open access to clinical trial results. This Working Group could also action the recommendation made by the Expert Committee for further independent analysis of data for pertuzumab in breast cancer.
Improving access to and affordability of essential medicines

Throughout the meeting, the Expert Committee repeatedly noted and discussed the issue of improving access to high-priced essential medicines (e.g., insulin, immunomodulators and new cancer medicines) and the issue of affordability for health systems and patients.

The Committee acknowledged the limited role of WHO in price setting at country level, but identified several different actions that could contribute to making some of the recently listed essential medicines more affordable at country level:

1. A wider adoption of biosimilars
2. Expanding the remit of the medicines patent pool
3. The role of pooled procurement/tendering
4. Use of flexibilities enshrined in the WHO TRIPS agreement
5. Other existing instruments

1. Biosimilars

With the addition of new biological medicines to the Model Lists in 2019, the Expert Committee recognized that biologicals, including biosimilars, are associated with a significant budget impact to health systems. However, the availability of several therapeutically equivalent alternatives and the increasing availability of biosimilar products could lead to greater market competition, improved patient access and reduced costs. Access to biosimilars is critical for achieving affordable access to many biological medicines including new cancer treatments and immunomodulators for chronic inflammatory conditions such as rheumatoid arthritis. The Committee noted, with concern, the limited progress to date with access to biosimilars of some essential medicines (e.g. rituximab).

The Committee recommended that WHO expand its pre-qualification programme to include biosimilars of medicines listed on the EML, such that they are routinely evaluated along with the reference product, to ensure accessibility and affordability to quality-assured products.

The Expert Committee considered the issue of interchangeability of biosimilar products as a very important one for wider access and a crucial aspect to foster competition. The Committee recommended that EML Secretariat develops a concept note to summarise all the issues and barriers to full interchangeability for wider access to affordable biosimilars for consideration by the Expert Committee in 2021.

Finally, the Committee considered that where biosimilars of listed essential medicines exist, these are considered therapeutically equivalent also for procurement purposes.

2. The expanded role of MPP

The Medicines Patent Pool (MPP), a public health organization funded by Unitaid, has played a significant role in facilitating affordable access to essential medicines in the field of HIV and HCV through its public health oriented licences with originator companies. To date, the MPP has licences on 14 medicines on the WHO EML. Licensing through the MPP of patented essential medicines for the treatment of tuberculosis (e.g. bedaquiline) would also be a welcome contribution to improving access.

The recent expansion of the MPP to other patented essential medicines beyond HIV, hepatitis C and tuberculosis represents a real opportunity to facilitate affordable access to some of the new medicines that have been added to the list this year in low and middle-income
countries. Licensing through the MPP could, for example, contribute to facilitating access to some of the cancer medicines, the novel oral anticoagulants, the new antibiotics and the heat-stable formulation of carbetocin. In the case of cancer, it would be important that the MPP also explore the application of its model to biotherapeutics so as to facilitate early entry of biosimilars through voluntary licensing agreements in low and middle-income countries.

3. The role of pooled procurement and tendering

The square box symbol (•) is primarily intended to indicate similar clinical performance within a pharmacological class of medicines on the EML. The listed medicine should be the example of the class for which there is the best evidence for effectiveness and safety. In some cases, this may be the first medicine that is licensed for marketing; in other instances, subsequently licensed compounds may be safer or more effective. Where there is no difference in terms of efficacy and safety data, the listed medicine should be the one that is generally available at the lowest price, based on international drug price information sources. Examples of pharmacological classes with established therapeutic equivalence include proton pump inhibitors, ACE inhibitors and erythropoietins.

More recently, the square box has been selectively applied to some listings, indicating specific acceptable alternative options such as for morphine and enoxaparin. A square box was applied to three pangenotypic regimens for hepatitis C, to indicate similar clinical performance across the combination regimens.

When there are multiple options within the same pharmacological class or in the same therapeutic area there can be substantial market competition that can allow for price reductions. Large price reductions can be the result of tendering processes at country or local level. Applying the square box concept can improve outcomes in pooled procurement activities at national or sub-national levels, and has the advantage of improving transparent governance.

The Expert Committee recommended a comprehensive review of medicines listed with a square box on the Model Lists be undertaken for consideration at its next meeting. The review will provide greater clarity for countries regarding application of the square box concept for national essential medicines lists selection and procurement.

4. Use of TRIPS flexibilities in line with the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health

Application and management of intellectual property should contribute to innovation and promotion of public health, in line with WHO global strategy and plan of action on public health, innovation and intellectual property.

Member States have the possibility to make use of the provisions which provide public health flexibilities contained in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, including the public health flexibilities recognized by the Doha Ministerial Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health in order to promote access to essential medicines.

5. Other existing instruments

Countries can define different pricing policies on how prices are set and negotiated at national level. However, medicines prices are the end result of a number of measures, actions and contextual factors (such as market size and cost structures) acting at country level. These can involve
different stakeholders that include regulators, reimbursement systems/third-party payers, competition authorities.

Competition law and policies are also instruments available to governments in addressing public health concerns, competition policy has an important role to play in ensuring access to medical technology and fostering innovation in the pharmaceutical sector.\(^8\)

All applications and documents reviewed by the Expert Committee are available on the WHO website at: https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/en/

\(^8\) http://www.who.int/iris/handle/10665/78069
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EML – New medicines added</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>EMLc – New medicines added</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiraterone</td>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>□ Adalimumab</td>
<td>Chronic systemic inflammatory conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adalimumab</td>
<td>Chronic systemic inflammatory conditions</td>
<td>All-trans retinoid acid (ATRA)</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteplase</td>
<td>Thrombolytic</td>
<td>Aprepitant</td>
<td>Nausea and vomiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprepitant</td>
<td>Nausea and vomiting</td>
<td>Arsenic trioxide</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic trioxide</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
<td>Bedaquiline</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortezomib</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Ceftazidime + avibactam</td>
<td>Reserve antibiotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboplatin</td>
<td>Post-partum haemorrhage</td>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftazidime + avibactam</td>
<td>Reserve antibiotic</td>
<td>Dasatinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant chronic myeloid leukaemia (CML)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis</td>
<td>Dengue vaccine</td>
<td>Vaccine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Dabigatran</td>
<td>Anticoagulant</td>
<td>Diltiazem</td>
<td>Hypoglycaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dengue vaccine</td>
<td>Vaccine</td>
<td>Delavirdine</td>
<td>HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolasetravir + lamivudine + tenofovir</td>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Enoxaparin</td>
<td>Anticoagulant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Erlotinib</td>
<td>Lung cancer</td>
<td>Fexinidazole</td>
<td>Human African trypanosomiasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fexinidazole</td>
<td>Human African trypanosomiasis</td>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
<td>Nasopharyngeal cancer, metastatic colorectal cancer, early colon cancer, early rectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glecaprevir + pibrentasvir</td>
<td>Hepatitis C</td>
<td>□ Imatinib</td>
<td>Chronic myeloid leukaemia, gastrointestinal stromal tumour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenalidomide</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Irinotecan</td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lisinopril + □ amlodipine</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>□ Methimazole</td>
<td>Hyperthyroidism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lisinopril + □ hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Multiple micronutrient powders</td>
<td>Prevention of anaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melphalan</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Nilotinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant CML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem + vaborbactam</td>
<td>Reserve antibiotic</td>
<td>Oxaliplatin</td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer, early colon cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Methimazole</td>
<td>Hyperthyroidism</td>
<td>Pegasparagse</td>
<td>Acute lymphoblastic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivolumab</td>
<td>Metastatic melanoma</td>
<td>Procarbazine</td>
<td>Hodgkin lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasparagse</td>
<td>Acute lymphoblastic leukaemia</td>
<td>RIF oral arsenic formulation</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plazomicin</td>
<td>Reserve antibiotic</td>
<td>Rituximab</td>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF oral arsenic formulation</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Telmisartan + □ amlodipine</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Telmisartan + □ hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalidomide</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Tiotropium</td>
<td>COPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EML - New / changed indications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>New Indication</th>
<th>EMLc - New / changed indications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>Dental abscess</td>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis, MDR-TB</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid Surgical prophylaxis, MDR-TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>Enteric fever</td>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbofuran</td>
<td>Cervical cancer</td>
<td>Bleomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefazolin</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis</td>
<td>Cefazolin Surgical prophylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>Enteric fever</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>Enteric fever</td>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
<td>Cervical cancer</td>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclophosphamide</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Cyclophosphamide Diffuse large B cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexamethasone</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Cytarabine Acute myeloid leukaemia, acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxorubicin</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>Daunorubicin Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis</td>
<td>Doxorubicin Diffuse large B cell lymphoma, Kaposi sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivermectin</td>
<td>Scabies</td>
<td>Gentamicin Surgical prophylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem</td>
<td>MDR-TB</td>
<td>Hydroxycarbamide Chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td>Surgical prophylaxis</td>
<td>Ivermectin Scabies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenoxymethylpenicillin</td>
<td>Dental abscess</td>
<td>Mercaptopurine Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prednisolone</td>
<td>Multiple myeloma, prostate cancer</td>
<td>Meropenem MDR-TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine</td>
<td>Malaria - Intermittent preventive treatment in pregnancy</td>
<td>Methotrexate Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranexamic acid</td>
<td>Post-partum haemorrhage</td>
<td>Metronidazole Surgical prophylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prednisolone</td>
<td>Portal hypertension</td>
<td>Phenoxymethylpenicillin Dental abscess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine</td>
<td>Malaria – intermittent preventive treatment in infancy</td>
<td>Vincristine Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, Kaposi sarcoma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EML – New formulation/ strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>New Formulation</th>
<th>EMLc – New formulation/ strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcium folinate</td>
<td>Tablet 5 mg and 25 mg</td>
<td>Amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine Co-package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclophosphamide</td>
<td>Tablet 50 mg</td>
<td>Calcium folinate Tablet 5 mg and 25 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etoposide</td>
<td>Capsule 50 mg</td>
<td>Cyclophosphamide Tablet 50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifepristone-misoprostol</td>
<td>Co-package</td>
<td>Cycloserine Solid oral dosage form 125 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raltegravir</td>
<td>Granules 100 mg</td>
<td>Ethambutol Dispersible tablet 100 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritonavir</td>
<td>Oral powder 100 mg</td>
<td>Ethionamide Dispersible tablet 125 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML – Medicines / formulations deleted</td>
<td>EMLc – Medicines / formulations deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abacavir + lamivudine</td>
<td>Dispersible tablet 60 mg + 30 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztreonam</td>
<td>Powder for injection 1 g; 2 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capreomycin</td>
<td>Powder for injection 1 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daptomycin</td>
<td>Powder for injection 350 mg, 500 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethambutol + isoniazid</td>
<td>Tablet 400 mg + 150 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth-generation cephalosporins: e.g., ceftaroline</td>
<td>Powder for injection 400 mg; 600 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth-generation cephalosporins: e.g., cefepime</td>
<td>Powder for injection 500 mg; 1 g; 2 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin</td>
<td>Tablet 150 mg + 500 mg + 150 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid + rifampicin</td>
<td>Tablet 60 mg + 60 mg; 150 mg + 150 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanamycin</td>
<td>Powder for injection 1 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeprevir</td>
<td>Capsule 150 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigecycline</td>
<td>Powder for injection 50 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidovudine</td>
<td>Dispersible tablet 60 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other changes to listings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clofazimine</th>
<th>Replace ‘capsule’ with ‘solid oral dosage form’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rifabutin</td>
<td>Replace ‘capsule’ with ‘solid oral dosage form’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propylthiouracil</td>
<td>Remove square box, add note “for use when alternative first-line treatment is not appropriate or available; and in patients during the first trimester of pregnancy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propylthiouracil</td>
<td>Add note “for use when alternative first-line treatment is not appropriate or available”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>Add square box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodine capsules</td>
<td>Amend strength from 200 mg to 190 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondansetron</td>
<td>Add square box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifepristone-misoprostol</td>
<td>Transfer from complementary to core list, remove note regarding requirement for close medical supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to terminology of indications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlamydia trachomatis</td>
<td>Sexually transmitted infection due to Chlamydia trachomatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</td>
<td>Gonorrhoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichomonas vaginalis</td>
<td>Trichomonias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute myelogenous leukaemia</td>
<td>Acute myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilms tumour</td>
<td>Nephroblastoma (Wilms tumour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to sections and sub-sections of the Model Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 6.2: Antibacterials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 Beta-lactam medicines</td>
<td>6.2.1 Access group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2 Other antibacterials</td>
<td>6.2.2 Watch group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3 Antileprosy medicines</td>
<td>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4 Antituberculosis medicines</td>
<td>6.2.4 Antileprosy medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Medicines for ectoparasitic infections</td>
<td>6.6 Medicines for ectoparasitic infections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6.4.4.2: Medicines for hepatitis C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4.2.1 Nucleotide polymerase inhibitors</td>
<td>6.4.4.2.1 □ Pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4.2.2 Protease inhibitors</td>
<td>6.4.4.2.2 Non-pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4.2.3 NS5A inhibitors</td>
<td>6.4.4.2.3 Other antivirals for hepatitis C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4.2.4 Non-nucleoside polymerase inhibitors</td>
<td>6.4.4.2.4 Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4.2.5 Other antivirals</td>
<td>6.4.4.2.5 Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8: RENAMED - Immunomodulators and antineoplastics (was Antineoplastics and immunosuppressives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Immunosuppressive medicines</td>
<td>8.1 Immunomodulators for non-malignant disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Cytotoxic and adjuvant medicines</td>
<td>8.2 Antineoplastics and supportive medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.1 Cytotoxic medicines</td>
<td>8.2.1 Targeted therapies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.2 Targeted therapies</td>
<td>8.2.2 Immunomodulators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.3 Immunomodulators</td>
<td>8.2.3 Hormones and antihormones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.4 Hormones and antihormones</td>
<td>8.2.5 Supportive medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Hormones and antihormones</td>
<td>8.3 Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 18: RENAMED - Medicines for endocrine disorders (formerly Hormones, other endocrine medicines and contraceptives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1 Adrenal hormones and synthetic substitutes</td>
<td>18.1 Adrenal hormones and synthetic substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2 Androgens</td>
<td>18.2 Androgens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3 Contraceptives</td>
<td>18.3 Estrogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4 Estrogens</td>
<td>18.4 Progestogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5 Insulins and other medicines used for diabetes</td>
<td>18.5 Medicines for diabetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6 Ovulation inducers</td>
<td>18.6 Medicines for hypoglycaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7 Progestogens</td>
<td>18.7 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 18.8 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22.1 Oxytocics</th>
<th>22.1 Contraceptives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.2 Antioxytocics (tocolytics)</td>
<td>22.2 Ovulation inducers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.3 Uterotonic</td>
<td>22.4 Antioxytocics (tocolytics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5 Other medicines administered to the mother</td>
<td>22.6 Medicines administered to the neonate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 22: RENAMED - Medicines for reproductive health and perinatal care (formerly Oxytocics and antioxytocics)**

**Section 29: RENAMED – Medicines for diseases of joints (formerly Specific medicines for neonatal care)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29.1 Medicines administered to the neonate</th>
<th>29.1 Medicines used to treat gout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.2 Medicines administered to the mother</td>
<td>29.2 Disease modifying agents used in rheumatoid disorders (DMARDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.3 Juvenile joint diseases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 30: DELETED (formerly Medicines for diseases of joints)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30.1 Medicines used to treat gout</th>
<th>30.1 Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.2 Disease-modifying agents used in rheumatoid disorders (DMARDs)</td>
<td>30.2 Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3 Juvenile joint diseases</td>
<td>30.3 Deleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 2: Applications and medicines not recommended for 2019 EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL MEDICINES</th>
<th>EML / EMLc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition of anti-PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitors for treatment of non-small cell lung cancer (atezolizumab, nivolumab, pembrolizumab)</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of newly registered antibiotics for treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (including AWaRe classification) (ceftolozane + tazobactam, delafloxacin, eravacycline, omadacycline)</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of medicines for treatment of multiple sclerosis (fingolimod, glatiramer acetate, ocrelizumab)</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of long-acting insulin analogues for treatment of type 1 diabetes (insulin detemir, insulin glargine, insulin degludec)</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of enzalutamide for treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of escitalopram for treatment of major depressive disorder</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of methylphenidate for treatment of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of pertuzumab for use in the treatment of breast cancer</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of sumatriptan for treatment of migraine</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of trastuzumab emtansine (TDM-1) for use in the treatment of breast cancer</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL FORMULATIONS / STRENGTHS</th>
<th>EML / EMLc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New injectable formulation of ethambutol for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New injectable formulation of isoniazid for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New strength of isoniazid oral liquid for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis</td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New injectable formulation of p-aminosalicylic acid for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New injectable formulation of rifampicin for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New subcutaneous formulation of rituximab for use in the treatment of lymphoma and leukaemia</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New subcutaneous formulation of trastuzumab for use in the treatment of breast cancer</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW INDICATIONS</th>
<th>EML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New indication for 5-fluorouracil for treatment of cervical cancer in the curative setting.</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELETIONS</th>
<th>EML / EMLc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of misoprostol for the indication for prevention of postpartum haemorrhage</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of antiretroviral formulations for treatment of HIV infection (raltegravir 100 mg tablets, ritonavir 400 mg/5 mL oral liquid)</td>
<td>EML &amp; EMLc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE RESTRICTIONS</th>
<th>EMLc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change to age restriction for use of delamanid in children with multi-drug resistant tuberculosis</td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

The 22nd meeting of the World Health Organization (WHO) Expert Committee on the Selection and Use of Essential Medicines was held from 1 to 5 April 2019, in Geneva, Switzerland.

The meeting agenda included 65 applications involving over 100 medicines for addition, deletion, amendment and review in order to update the Model List of Essential Medicines and Model List of Essential Medicines for Children. In addition, reports and recommendations made by two EML Working Groups were also submitted for consideration.

The meeting was opened by Mariângela Simão, Assistant Director General, Medicines, Vaccines and Pharmaceuticals, on behalf of WHO Director-General, Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus. Dr Simão welcomed committee members and temporary advisers, representatives from WHO regional offices, non-governmental organizations and other participants.

In her opening remarks Dr Simão described the importance of the Model Lists of Essential Medicines to Member States as a standard reference for medicines, and a valuable tool for policy makers to optimize selection and use of medicines at national level to ensure access in the context of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). She highlighted the roles of the Model List in priority setting and informing reimbursement policies, both as an intrinsically positive list, and also by looking at medicines that have been assessed and not recommended for listing on the basis of uncertain benefit or safety. Furthermore, she highlighted the functions of the Model List as a guide for better procurement and competition among similar treatments, as a guide for expanding the mandate of the WHO Prequalification Program and the Medicines Patent Pool, and as a tool for UHC and health financing.

With reference to the meeting agenda, Dr Simão highlighted some of the key topics to be considered by the Expert Committee including applications for new cancer medicines, the review of the AWaRe classification of antibiotics, medicines for multiple sclerosis, and policy-oriented discussions around biosimilars and medicines affordability and availability. In particular, the ongoing challenges and complexities of access to insulin were highlighted as important factors in the Committee’s consideration of the application for inclusion of insulin analogues.

Dr Simão acknowledged the work already undertaken by Committee Members and Temporary Advisors in reviewing applications and thanked them for their preparation. She reminded them of their obligations to provide advice to the Organization in their individual capacities as experts, and not as representatives of their governments, institutions or organizations. On behalf of the Director-General, she offered special thanks to the Committee for dedicating their time to this valuable work.
2. Open session

The open session of the meeting was chaired by Mariângela Simão, Assistant Director General, Access to Medicines, Vaccines and Pharmaceuticals, on behalf of the Director-General, and was attended by a variety of interested parties, representatives of non-governmental organizations and representatives of WHO member states.

Nicola Magrini, Secretary of the Expert Committee delivered an update on current activities of the EML Secretariat, methodology for the EML update, and the impact and implementation of recommendations made by the previous Expert Committee.

Manica Balasegaram, Executive Director of the Global Antibiotic Research and Development Partnership (GARDP) presented the work being undertaken by GARDP, in collaboration with WHO and the Drugs for Neglected Diseases initiative (DNDi), on antimicrobial resistance and antibiotic research and development.

Nav Persaud, Assistant Professor at the University of Toronto, presented details of a global database of national essential medicine lists from 137 countries, which allows comparison and benchmarking with the WHO Model List and comparison between countries.

Additional presentations and/or statements of relevance to the agenda of the Expert Committee were made by the following participants:

- Rosa Guilliani, European Society for Medical Oncology
- Hans Hogerzeil, Health Action International and the Lancet Commission on Essential Medicines
- Greg Perry, International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufactures & Associates
- Thiru Balasubramanian, Knowledge Ecology International
- Esteban Burrone, Medicines Patent Pool
- Myriam Henkens, Medicins Sans Frontières
- Patrick Durisch, Public Eye
- Tom Frieden, Resolve to Save Lives

Copies of the presentations and statements are available on the WHO website at https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/en/.
3. **Follow-up items and EML Working Groups**

**Follow-up items from the 2017 Expert Committee meeting**

**Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food**

The Expert Committee considered the comprehensive report prepared by the WHO Department of Nutrition in response to the request of the previous Expert Committee for the proposal to include Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF) on the Model List$^9$.

The Expert Committee acknowledged once again the efficacy of RUTF for the dietary management of uncomplicated severe acute malnutrition in children under 5 years of age, many in non-hospitalised settings. However, the report highlighted the divided opinions and ongoing uncertainty of the implications at country level of including RUTF as a medicine on the Model List. The Committee felt that the report did not fully address the concerns held by the 2017 Expert Committee. The Committee recognized that the report highlighted that adding RUTF to the EML could have unknown or unintended consequences such as more restricted access, increased costs and could potentially hamper local production. The Committee recommended that a comprehensive risk-mitigation plan for these potential consequences would be highly relevant for any future consideration of the inclusion of RUTF on the Model List. The Committee noted that there is work currently underway to establish standards and guidelines for RUTF under the Codex Alimentarius, regarding production, nutritional aspects and labelling in order to facilitate harmonization for the requirements of RUTF at an international level.

In the absence of such standards, and without a clear indication of the potential consequences and implications at country level of including RUTF on the Model List, and without the reassurance of a risk-mitigation plan to address any consequences, the Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of RUTF to the core list of the EMLc.

With regard to questions around the eligibility of RUTF to be added to the EML as a food/nutritional product rather than a medicine, the Committee noted that the Model Lists already include non-medicine products when they form part of a comprehensive WHO policy or strategy (e.g., condoms) and that RUTF would be eligible for future consideration for inclusion on the Model Lists, provided the concerns around the potential consequences of listing on access can be addressed.

**Oseltamivir**

The Expert Committee recalled the recommendation of the 2017 Expert Committee that oseltamivir be considered for deletion in 2019 unless new information supporting its use in seasonal and pandemic outbreaks is provided. The Committee noted the advice from the WHO Secretariat that the WHO Guidelines for clinical management of influenza are in the process of being updated and a meeting of the Guideline Development Group (GDG) was held in March 2019 but the recommendations of the GDG were not yet available. As part of the guideline development process, a systematic review of the effect of antiviral

---

treatments for influenza was conducted, but the results were not yet available. This review, yet to be published or presented to the GDG, updated previous systematic reviews and considered nonrandomized studies.

The Expert Committee accepted that the updated Guideline recommendations and systematic review would represent new information relevant to any decision regarding the inclusion or deletion of oseltamivir for treatment of influenza on the Model Lists. The Committee therefore decided that any decision regarding the potential deletion of oseltamivir from the Model List should take into consideration this new evidence, and that the current listing for oseltamivir should be maintained until such time that this evidence can be reviewed.

EML Cancer Medicines Working Group

Following the recommendation of the 2017 Expert Committee, the EML Cancer Medicines Working Group was established in March 2018 to support the work of the Committee by identifying cancer medicines for potential inclusion on the Model Lists and by establishing clear principles that can serve as a guide for selection of optimal treatments. The Working Group was mandated to propose clear principles that can serve as a guide for selection of optimal cancer medicines for EML inclusion through a review of the available tools for assessing the magnitude of clinical benefit, and meaningful thresholds for clinical and public health relevance of cancer medicines. A meeting of the Working Group was held in Geneva in March 2018. The report of the Working Group meeting10, together with two commissioned reports outlining 1) temporal trends in oncology trials11 and 2) how to prioritize the selection of essential cancer medicines12 were presented to the 2019 Expert Committee for consideration.

The Expert Committee endorsed the Working Group’s recommendations that WHO adopts in general, a threshold for benefit of at least 4-6 months survival gain for new cancer medicines to be considered as candidates for EML inclusion. A range was preferred over a specific threshold (e.g. 4 months) given the uncertainty associated with how clinical trial data relates to real-world benefits, and may differ between different cancers.

The Committee endorsed the role of the ESMO Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale13 (ESMO–MCBS) as a screening tool to identify cancer treatments that have potential therapeutic value that warrants full evaluation for EML listing. Potential new EML cancer medicines, in general, should have a score on the ESMO-MCBS of A or B in the curative setting and of 4 or 5 in the non-curative setting. These scores would support a medicine being evaluated by the Expert Committee for inclusion in the EML through a full application.

With regard to other attributes of new cancer medicines and clinical evidence requirements to support their inclusion on the EML, the Expert Committee recommended the following general principles:

• Clinical data from more than one trial is usually required;
• Data from high quality randomized trials is considered most important, and must be mature in order to assess the impact of the medicine on overall survival, and to show consistent results across different trials;

10 https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/CMWG_meeting_report.pdf?ua=1
12 https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/CMWG_Report_Fojo.pdf?ua=1
13 https://www.esmo.org/Guidelines/ESMO-MCBS
Randomized trials should compare efficacy of new regimens to current best standard of care (e.g. regimen, dose) rather than to available but sub-optimal comparators;

Additional information to inform the deployment of cancer regimens in countries with varying resources and capacity would be useful;

Trials that define the need for maintenance therapy and the length of maintenance. Shorter treatment durations that compromise efficacy only marginally or not at all might substantially reduce outlays and allow more patients access to treatment;

Trials that demonstrate superiority are preferred to non-inferiority trials for new drugs, rather than an absence of inferiority to the relevant comparator(s). However, non-inferiority trials can be informative in some circumstances, eg, comparison of different dosing regimens or treatment durations;

Consideration should be given to disease stage and line of therapy: efficacy of cancer medicines is usually less in more advanced stages of disease, and when used in advanced lines of treatment; therefore, medicines that are effective in the first-line treatment setting are more clinically meaningful and therefore highly desirable;

The inclusion of a cancer medicine on the EML for a given indication does not imply that the medicine should be considered essential for other indications.

The Expert Committee acknowledged the valuable work of the Working Group and recommended the continuation and further expansion of the Working Group’s activities. Activities over the next biennium should include the update of treatment regimens for cancers previously considered by the Expert Committee and the identification of new cancer medicines that meet the above criteria.

The Working Group should also review the issues being experienced at country level in relation to the implementation of EML cancer medicine recommendations and access to cancer medicines.

The Expert Committee also recommended the need for consolidation of cancer medicine recommendations and EML listings through a broader technical advisory group meeting in 2020, with country engagement to support implementation within a UHC perspective. This meeting should also be aimed at sharing these approaches with a larger group of cancer experts and important stakeholders and engage with countries in their implementation capacity.
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EML Antibiotics Working Group

Two meetings of the EML Antibiotics Working Group were held during the intervening period since the last Expert Committee meeting: in September 2017 and August 2018. The Working Group submitted three reports for consideration by the Expert Committee: 1) a review of the AWaRe classification of antibiotics and proposed amendments and expansion, 2) guidance on paediatric dosing regimens for EML Access antibiotics in children\textsuperscript{14}, and 3) optimal duration of antibiotic therapy\textsuperscript{15}.

Review of the AWaRe classification and EML listings of antibiotics

The Expert Committee noted the adoption and utilization of the Access, Watch and Reserve (AWaRe) classification of antibiotics on the EML by several Member States including the endorsement of AWaRe by the G20 Health Ministers in Argentina in October 2018\textsuperscript{16}. A new target indicator based on AWaRe was adopted by WHO under the 13th General Programme of Work\textsuperscript{17}. It specifies a country level target of at least 60\% of antibiotic consumption being from the Access group. This indicator is intended to monitor access to essential medicines and progress towards Universal Health Coverage. The Committee recognized the emerging role of the AWaRe groups for stewardship and quality improvement programs, complementary to the specific listing of antibiotics on the Model Lists as Essential Medicines.

The Expert Committee recommended that specific listing of antibiotics in the EML and the classification of antibiotics into the different AWaRe groups should be distinguished from each other, recognizing their distinct albeit complementary purposes. The Committee acknowledged that EML-listed antibiotics represent a parsimonious, evidence-based selection of essential narrow spectrum antibiotics for first- and second-choice empiric treatment of most common bacterial infections and a tool for stewardship. The Committee noted that the existing AWaRe groupings did not include a range of antibiotics used internationally and this impeded data collection and use. The Committee therefore recommended that the AWaRe classification should extend beyond the EML to all commonly used antibiotics globally, to better support antibiotic monitoring and stewardship activities. The Expert Committee recommended the development of an AWaRe classification database as a searchable tool for countries.

The Committee also recommended, based on the advice of the Working Group, that WHO consider creating an additional group in the AWaRe classification database for antibiotics whose use is not evidence-based, nor recommended in high quality international guidelines, particularly fixed-dose combinations of multiple broad-spectrum antibiotics. Antibiotics in this group are not included on the Model Lists.

The Committee considered the proposals by the Working Group for amendments to the AWaRe classification of antibiotics to expand the AWaRe classification to include antibiotics and antibiotic classes not included in the 2017 iteration. Furthermore, the Committee agreed that fourth-generation cephalosporins should be re-classified as Watch group as they did not meet the criteria for classification as Reserve. The Committee also recommended the re-classification of faropenem from Watch to Reserve due to its high

\textsuperscript{14} https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/ABWG_paediatric_dosing_AB.pdf

\textsuperscript{15} https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/ABWG_optimal_duration_AB.pdf

\textsuperscript{16} http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2018/2018-10-04-health.pdf

\textsuperscript{17} http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB144/B144_7-en.pdf
potential for inappropriate use. It is an orally available formulation with a broad spectrum activity whose
inappropriate use may further the spread of carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*.

With regard to the EML listing of antibiotics, the Committee endorsed revised criteria for the inclusion
of Reserve group antibiotics on the Model List. Namely, Reserve group antibiotics should be included
individually on the Model List when they have a favourable benefit-risk profile and proven activity against
“Critical Priority” or “High Priority” pathogens as identified by the WHO Priority Pathogens List, most notably
carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae*. Subsequently, the Committee recommended the removal of
aztreonam, fourth- and fifth-generation cephalosporins (as classes), tigecycline and daptomycin from the EML
and EMLc as these antibiotics did not meet the revised criteria for inclusion on the Model Lists as individual
Reserve group agents.

In summary, 19 Access group antibiotics and 11 Watch group antibiotics are now included individually
on the 2019 Model Lists as first or second choice empiric treatment options for infectious syndromes reviewed
by the Expert Committee. Seven Reserve group antibiotics are listed individually as last-resort treatment
options for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms. The Committee recommended the re-structuring
of Section 6.2 by AWaRe groups, such that antibiotics on the Model Lists are listed in revised sub-sections
accordingly, replacing the existing sub-sections based on chemical structure.

The revised EML AWaRe listing of antibiotics is summarized below (italic font indicates listing on the
complementary list).

**Table 1: Antibiotics included on the 2019 Model Lists of Essential Medicines by AWaRe groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2.1 Access group antibiotics</th>
<th>6.2.2 Watch group antibiotics</th>
<th>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>Ceftazidime + avibactam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>Cefixime</td>
<td>Colistin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
<td>Cefotxime</td>
<td>Fosfomycin (intravenous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>Ceftazidime</td>
<td>Linezolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzathine benzylpenicillin</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>Meropenem + vaborbactam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzylpenicillin</td>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
<td>Plazomicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefalexin</td>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>Polymyxin B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefazolin</td>
<td>Clarithromycin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloramphenicol</td>
<td>Meropenem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
<td>Piperacillin + tazobactam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloxacillin</td>
<td>Vancomycin (oral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxycycline</td>
<td>Vancomycin (intravenous)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamycin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrofurantoin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenoxyxymethylenicillin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procaine benzylpenicillin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectinomycin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfamethoxazole + trimethoprim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The antibiotics classified into AWaRe groups has been revised and expanded in 2019 to include 177 specific, commonly used antibiotics. A general summary of the antibiotics and antibiotic classes classified is presented in the table below. The full AWaRe classification database of antibiotics is available as an online appendix to this report.\textsuperscript{18}

**Table 2: General summary of AWaRe classification of antibiotics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Antibiotics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access group</strong></td>
<td>Aminoglycosides (unless included in Watch or Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphenicols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta-lactams with beta-lactamase inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-generation cephalosporins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penicillins (unless included in Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetracyclines (unless included in Watch or Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trimethoprim, alone or in combination with sulfonamides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrofurantoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectinomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watch group</strong></td>
<td>Aminoglycosides (unless included in Access or Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-pseudomonal penicillins with beta-lactamase inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbapenems (unless included in Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carboxypenicillins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluoroquinolones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glycopeptides (unless included in Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macrolides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penicillins (unless included in Access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetracyclines (unless included in Access or Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second generation cephalosporins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third generation cephalosporins (unless included in Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth generation cephalosporins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rifamycins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clofloxicol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fosfomycin (oral formulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fusidic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pristinomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserve group</strong></td>
<td>Aminoglycosides (unless included in Access or Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbapenems (unless included in Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monobactams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third generation cephalosporins (unless included in Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth generation cephalosporins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polymyxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glycopeptides (unless included in Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxazolidinones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetracyclines (unless included in Access or Watch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalfopristin-quinupristin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daptomycin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{18} https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/327957/WHO-EMP-IAU-2019.11-eng.xlsx
Dosing and duration reports

The Expert Committee noted the reports presented on paediatric dosing regimens for Access antibiotics and on optimal duration of antibiotic therapy. The Committee considered that these reports were valuable work that could be further expanded to inform the development of antibiotic guidance tools for countries.

To this end, the Committee recommended the development of clinical guidance summaries for each infectious syndrome for both adults and children as a useful tool for countries to implement EML recommendations and stewardship interventions using AWaRe. These summaries should include information on choice of antibiotic, recommended daily dose, optimal dosing frequency, and optimal duration of therapy. Guidance on when not to prescribe or use antibiotics should also be incorporated. Management and treatment algorithms for the infectious syndromes could also be included.

The Expert Committee acknowledged the valuable work of the Working Group and recommended the continuation and expansion of the Working Group’s activities. Activities over the next biennium should include:

- continued evaluation and review of the AWaRe classification of antibiotics, including potential inclusion on the Model Lists;
- review of new infectious syndromes for which antibiotics could be considered for inclusion on the Model Lists by the Expert Committee;
- development of clinical guidance on optimal antibiotic dosing and dosing frequency for adults and children to inform the clinical guidance summaries;
- development of clinical guidance on optimal antibiotic treatment duration for clinical infection syndromes reviewed by the Expert Committee to inform the clinical guidance summaries;
- development, in collaboration with key relevant stakeholders, of the abovementioned clinical guidance summaries and management and treatment algorithms as educational tools for optimal use;
- development of potential models of stewardship tools and processes using AWaRe, including metrics of optimal prescribing.

EML Working Group on Transparency and Access to Clinical Trial Data

The Expert Committee reiterated its recommendation from 2017 to establish a Working Group on transparency and timely public disclosure of all clinical trial results and available data. The Working Group should identify strategic actions to address factors known to impact the availability of reliable data informing applications for the inclusion or removal of medicines on the Model Lists. Such factors include selective outcome reporting, publication bias and open access to clinical trial results. This Working Group could also action the recommendation made by the Expert Committee for further independent analysis of data for pertuzumab in breast cancer.
4. Summary of changes

Changes to sections of the Model Lists

Refer to Table 1 of the Executive Summary for details of change to sections and sub-sections of the Model Lists.

Additions to Model Lists

Section 6.2.2: Cefuroxime was added to the core list of the EML and EMLc as a Watch group antibiotic for surgical prophylaxis.

Section 6.2.3: Ceftazidime + avibactam, meropenem + vaborbactam and plazomicin were added to the complementary list of the EML as Reserve group antibiotics for treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms. Ceftazidime + avibactam was added to the complementary list of the EMLc.

Section 6.2.4: Bedaquiline was added to the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis in children aged 6 years and older.

Section 6.4.2: For treatment of HIV infection, a fixed-dose combination of dolutegravir + lamivudine + tenofovir was added to the core list of the EML, and single-agent dolutegravir was added to the core list of the EMLc.

Section 6.4.4.2.1: Fixed-dose combination of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was added to the core list of the EML as a pan-genotypic treatment for adult patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection.

Section 6.5.5.1: Fexinidazole was added to the core list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of human African trypanosomiasis.

Section 8.1: Adalimumab with a square box, representative of the class of anti-tumour necrosis factor alpha (TNF-α) biologics, was added to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of chronic inflammatory autoimmune disorders (rheumatoid arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis and Crohn’s disease). Alternatives are limited to etanercept and infliximab on the EMLc and to etanercept, infliximab, certolizumab pegol and golimumab on the EML.

Section 8.2.1: Arsenic trioxide, pegaspargase, and realgar-Indigo naturalis formulation were added to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for treatment of leukaemias. Melphalan was added to the complementary list of the EML for treatment of multiple myeloma. Fluorouracil, irinotecan, oxaliplatin and procarbazine were added to the complementary list of the EMLc for selected indications for which they are already included on the EML.

Section 8.2.2: Bortezomib was added to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of multiple myeloma. Erlotinib with a square box (gefitinib and afatinib are alternatives) was added to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of EGFR mutation positive advanced non-small lung cancer. All-trans retinoid acid, dasatinib, imatinib, nilotinib and rituximab were added to the complementary list of the EMLc for selected indications for which they are already included on the EML.

Section 8.2.3: Lenalidomide and thalidomide were added to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of multiple myeloma. Nivolumab with a square box (pembrolizumab as an alternative) was added to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of metastatic melanoma.
Section 8.2.4: Abiraterone was added to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer.

Section 10.2: Dabigatran with a square box (apixaban, edoxaban and rivaroxaban are alternatives) was added to the core list of the EML for prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation, and for treatment of venous thromboembolism. Enoxaparin with a square box (nadroparin and dalteparin as alternatives) was added to the core list of the EMLc.

Section 12.3: Four fixed-dose combination formulations were added to the core list of the EML for treatment of hypertension: lisinopril + amlodipine, lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide, telmisartan + amlopidine and telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide. Each component is listed with a square box as representative of the relevant pharmacological classes.

Section 12.5.2: Alteplase was added to the complementary list of the EML for use as a thrombolytic in patients diagnosed with acute ischaemic stroke.

Section 17.2: Aprepitant was added to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for management of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in patients undergoing moderately- to highly-emetogenic chemotherapy.

Section 18.6: Diazoxide was added to the complementary list of the EMLc for the management of hypoglycaemia secondary to prolonged hyperinsulinism.

Section 18.7: Methimazole with a square box (carbimazole as an alternative) was added to the core list of the EML and the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of primary hyperthyroidism.

Section 19.3: Dengue vaccine was added to the EML and EMLc for use in some high-risk population in line with the recommendations in the dengue vaccine WHO position paper.

Section 22.3: A heat-stable formulation of carbetocin was added to the core list of the EML for the prevention of postpartum haemorrhage.

Section 25: Tiotropium with a square box, representative of long-acting muscarinic antabonists (LAMAs) was added to the core list of the EML for the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Section 27: Multiple micronutrient powders were added to the core list of the EMLc for the prevention of anaemia in infants and children.

Deletions from Model Lists

Section 6.2.3: Aztreonam, daptomycin, fourth- and fifth-generation cephalosporins, and tigecycline were deleted from the EML and EMLc.

Section 6.2.4: Capreomycin and kanamycin were deleted from the EML and EMLc. Ethambutol + isoniazid tablet 400 mg + 150 mg, isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin tablet 150 mg + 500 mg + 150 mg, and isoniazid + rifampicin tablets 60 mg + 60 mg and 150 mg + 150 mg were deleted from the EML.

Section 6.4.2: Abacavir + lamivudine dispersible tablet 60 mg + 30 mg, and zidovudine dispersible tablet 60 mg were deleted from the EML and EMLc.

Section 6.4.4.2: Simeprevir was deleted from the EML.
New indications

Section 6.2.1: The new indication of treatment for progressive apical dental abscess was added for amoxicillin and phenoxymethylpenicillin on the EML and EMLc. The new indication of surgical prophylaxis was added for amoxicillin + clavulanic acid, cefazolin, gentamicin and metronidazole on the EML and EMLc.

Section 6.2.2: The new indication of treatment for enteric fever was added for azithromycin, ceftriaxone and ciprofloxacin on the EML and EMLc.

Section 6.2.5: Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid and meropenem were included on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis.

Section 6.6: Ivermectin was included on the core list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment of scabies.

Section 6.5.3.2: New indications of intermittent preventive treatment in pregnancy (IPTp) and intermittent preventive treatment in infants (IPTi) were included for sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine in malaria.

Section 8.2: Additional indications for multiple cancer medicines were included on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc as follows:

- Cervical cancer (EML): carboplatin, cisplatin
- Multiple myeloma (EML): cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, dexamethasone, prednisolone
- Prostate cancer (EML): prednisolone
- Kaposi sarcoma (EMLc): bleomycin, doxorubicin, vincristine
- Nasopharyngeal cancer (EMLc): cisplatin
- Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (EMLc): cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, prednisolone
- Acute myeloid leukaemia (EMLc): cytarabine
- Acute promyelocytic leukaemia (EMLc): cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine, methotrexate
- Chronic myeloid leukaemia (EMLc): hydroxyurea

Section 22.5: tranexamic acid was included in the core list of the EML for the new indication of treatment of post-partum haemorrhage.

New formulation and/or strength

Section 6.2.5: Additional formulations and/or strengths of medicines for treatment of tuberculosis were included in the EMLc as follows:

- Cycloserine: solid oral dosage form 125 mg
- Ethambutol: dispersible tablet 100 mg
- Ethionamide: dispersible tablet 125 mg
- Isoniazid: dispersible tablet 100 mg
- Levofloxacin: dispersible tablet 100 mg
- Linezolid: dispersible tablet 150 mg
- Moxifloxacin: dispersible tablet 100 mg

Section 6.4.2: Additional formulations and/or strengths of medicines for HIV infection were included in the EML and EMLc as follows:

- Lopinavir + ritonavir (EMLc): granules 40 mg + 10 mg (listed as “solid oral dosage form”)
Section 6.3.2: Raltegravir (EML and EMLc): granules for oral suspension 100 mg
Section 6.3.2: Ritonavir (EMLc): oral powder 100 mg

Section 6.5.3.2: Co-packaged presentations of amodiaquine and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine dispersible tablets were included on the EMLc for seasonal malaria chemoprevention in children.

Section 8.2: Additional formulations and/or strengths of multiple cancer medicines were included in the complementary list of the EML and EMLc as follows:

- Calcium folinate (EML and EMLc): tablet 5 mg and 25 mg
- Cyclophosphamide (EML and EMLc): tablet 50 mg
- Etoposide (EML and EMLc): tablet 50 mg

Section 17.5: A co-packaged presentation of oral rehydration salts (ORS) and zinc sulfate tablets was included on the core list of the EMLc.

Section 22.3: A co-packaged presentation of mifepristone and misoprostol was included on the core list of the EML.

Other changes to listings

Sections 2.3 and 17.2: addition of a square box to the listing of ondansetron on the EML and EMLc.

Section 6.2.5: replaced “capsule” with “solid oral dosage form” in the listings for flocazimine and rifabutin.

Section 18.7: removal of the square box on the EML listing for propylthiouracil and addition of notes on the EML and EMLc regarding use when alternative first line treatment is not appropriate or available.

Section 22.3: transfer the listing of mifepristone-misoprostol from the complementary to the core list of the EML and removal of the note regarding the requirement for close medical supervision.

Section 24.2.2: addition of a square box to the listing of fluoxetine on the EML.

Section 27: amendment to the strength of iodine capsules from 200 mg to 190 mg on the EML and EMLc from 200 mg to 190 mg.

Applications not recommended

Section 6.2.3: addition of ceftolozane + tazobactam, delafloxacin, eravacycline and omadacycline for treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.

Section 6.2.4: addition of injectable formulations of ethambutol, isoniazid, p-aminosalicylic acid, and rifampicin; new strength formulation of isoniazid oral liquid; change to the age restriction associated with the listing of delamanid for the treatment of tuberculosis.

Section 6.4.2: deletion of raltegravir 100 mg tablets and ritonavir 400 mg/5 mL oral liquid formulations for treatment of HIV infection.

Section 7.1: addition of sumatriptan for treatment of acute migraine.

Section 8.1: addition of fingolimod, glatiramer acetate and ocrelizumab for the treatment of multiple sclerosis.

Section 8.2: addition of nivolumab, pembrolizumab and atezolizumab for the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer; pertuzumab and trastuzumab emtansine for treatment of HER-2 positive breast cancer; enzalutamide for treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer; subcutaneous formulations of rituximab and
trastuzumab; extension of indications for fluorouracil to include treatment of cervical cancer in the curative setting.

Section 18.5.1: addition of long-acting insulin analogues for treatment of type 1 diabetes.

Section 22.3: deletion of the indication of prevention of post-partum haemorrhage for misoprostol.

Section 24: addition of methylphenidate for treatment of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; addition of escitalopram for the treatment of depressive disorders.

Refer to the individual application summaries in this Report for full details of the Expert Committee’s recommendations.
5. Applications for the 21st Model List of Essential Medicines and the 7th Model List of Essential Medicines for Children

Section 6: ANTI-INFECTIVE MEDICINES

6.2 Antibacterials

Antibiotics for typhoid fever

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typhoid and paratyphoid (enteric) fever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence (from the application)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four trials (293 patients) compared ciprofloxacin to chloramphenicol, only one trial included children above 12 years, none of the trials reported the prevalence of MDR and NaR strains. For clinical failure, the results favoured ciprofloxacin (RR 0.24; 95% CI 0.07 to 0.82), confidence intervals were wide, due to the small sample size (low quality evidence). Fever clearance time (FCT) (2 trials; 147 patients) also favoured ciprofloxacin, the mean difference (MD) was -62.46 hours (95% CI, -75.52 to -49.39) (moderate quality evidence). Small numbers of events occurred for microbiological failure (two trials, 142 patients; RR 0.05; 0.00 to 0.81) (low quality evidence) and relapse (4 trials, RR 0.15; 0.02 to 1.15) (low quality evidence). The results for serious adverse events (2 trials) were indeterminate (RR 0.99; 0.18 to 5.52) (very low quality evidence) and for non-serious adverse events (4 trials), the results were comparable (RR 1.00; 0.61-1.64), but with wide confidence intervals (low quality evidence) (8).

**Ofloxacin versus chloramphenicol**

Four trials (247 patients) compared ofloxacin to chloramphenicol. The results for clinical failure were in favour of ofloxacin, but with wide confidence intervals (RR 0.15; 0.03 to 0.64) (low quality evidence). Fever clearance time (2 trials, 140 patients) followed the same trends as clinical failures, the MD was -75.85 hours (-88.52 to -63.17) (moderate quality evidence). Due to the small numbers of events, the results for microbiological failure (3 trials, RR 0.16; 0.02 to 1.07) (low quality evidence) and relapse (RR 0.14; 0.01 to 2.65) (low quality evidence) were indeterminate. For serious adverse events (1 trial), the RR was not estimable due to zero events. For non-serious adverse event (4 trials), the results were comparable with a RR of 1.06, with wide confidence intervals (0.60 to 1.87) (low quality).

The systematic review included one trial (252 patients), that compared gatifloxacin, (which was not proposed in the application for EML listing), versus chloramphenicol (RR for clinical failure was 0.79; 0.32 to 1.96) [10]. Non-serious adverse events favoured gatifloxacin (0.58; 0.44 to 0.78).

**Ciprofloxacin/ofloxacin versus cotrimoxazole and ampicillin/amoxicillin**

The application reported comparisons of ciprofloxacin versus cotrimoxazole (2 trials, 132 patients), ofloxacin versus cotrimoxazole (1 trial, 99 patients), ofloxacin versus ampicillin (1 trial, 40 patients), ofloxacin versus amoxicillin (1 trial, 50 patients), however, due to the small sample sizes the results were indeterminate and the individual outcomes were assessed as low or very low quality. Therefore, cotrimoxazole and ampicillin/amoxicillin were not proposed in the application for EML listing.

**Ciprofloxacin/ofloxacin versus cefixime**

The comparisons of ciprofloxacin versus cefixime and ofloxacin versus cefixime were each based on one trial. Due to the weakness and low/very low quality of the evidence, cefixime was not proposed in the application for EML listing.

A randomized controlled trial that compared gatifloxacin versus cefixime (158 patients), was stopped early by the Independent Data Safety and Monitoring Board due to the high number of failures (19/70) in the cefixime arm (RR 0.04; 0.01 to 0.31) (p<0.001) (10). This trial was included in the systematic review was not part of the comparisons evaluated in the application for inclusion in the EML.

**Ciprofloxacin versus ceftriaxone**

For this comparison, only one trial (42 adult participants) was available. Due to the very small number of patients, the result was indeterminate. There is no estimate for FCT and adverse events were not reported. The overall quality of the evidence was assessed as very low. More than 50% of strains were MDR.

**Ofloxacin versus ceftriaxone**

For this comparison, only one trial (47 adult participants) was available. More than 50% of strains were MDR, no NaR was reported. For clinical failure, a non-significant result in favour of ofloxacin was reported, (RR was 0.09, 0.01 to 1.46), the mean difference in FCT was -115 hours (-150.67 to -79.33).

**Ciprofloxacin versus azithromycin**

For this comparison, only one trial (64 participants) was available. Due to the small sample size (0 events in both arms), clinical failure, microbiological failure and relapse were not estimable. The MD for FCT was -12 hours (-24.39 to 0.39). The quality of the evidence was low/very low.
Ofloxacin versus azithromycin

Two trials were available (213 patients) for this comparison. Clinical failure favoured azithromycin with a RR of 2.2 (1.23 to 3.94) (high quality of evidence), the MD in FCT of 30.41 hours (-22.12 to 82.93) (moderate quality evidence) supported azithromycin. The higher failure rates in the ofloxacin arm in the more recent of the two trials, reflected the increasing prevalence of NaR S. Typhi isolates in this region.

The systematic review included one azithromycin trial (287 patients), that compared gatifloxacin to azithromycin (11). Gatifloxacin and azithromycin had similar high efficacy (RR for clinical failure 0.98 (0.32 to 2.96)) in this setting with high proportions of NaR S. Typhi strains.

A 2008 Cochrane systematic review of 7 trials involving 773 patients evaluated azithromycin for treatment of uncomplicated typhoid and paratyphoid fever (12).

The comparison azithromycin versus chloramphenicol (1 trial, 77 patients) showed a benefit for azithromycin, but due to the small sample size and wide confidence intervals no inferences can be made (OR for clinical failure, 0.16 (0.01 to 3.4) (low quality evidence). Four trials (564 patients) compared azithromycin to the fluoroquinolones (including gatifloxacin) and were discussed above.

Two trials (132 patients) compared azithromycin versus ceftriaxone. Clinical failure (OR 2.58; 0.48 to 13.87) and FCT (MD 9.12 h; -1.11 to 19.36) favoured ceftriaxone (moderate quality evidence). No data were available to assess adverse events.

The application described a systematic search for randomized controlled trials in enteric fever to supplement evidence obtained from the two systematic reviews. The majority of identified RCTs had small sample sizes, few events and lacked sufficient power to detect significant differences. Four trials with sample sizes greater than 30 patients in each arm were reviewed. Two trials had zero events for clinical failure. A trial of gatifloxacin versus ofloxacin (218 culture positive patients) showed similar numbers of treatment failures in both arms (Hazard Ratio, HR = 0.81, 95% CI 0.25 to 2.65), however the FCT was significantly shorter in the gatifloxacin arm (HR = 1.59, 95% CI 1.16 to 2.18) in this setting with high NaR (13). Similar proportions of patients experienced adverse events, most of which were mild (grade 1 or grade 2).

A trial of gatifloxacin versus ceftriaxone (116 culture positive patients) showed similar number of failures in the ITT patients, but in the culture confirmed patients, the comparison favoured ceftriaxone (HR 0·24; 95% CI 0·08 to 0·73) (14). Treatment failure was associated with the emergence of high level fluoroquinolone resistance in S. Typhi, requiring the trial to be stopped. A similar number of non-serious adverse events occurred in each treatment group, and no serious events were reported.

Guidelines (from the application)

The 2003 WHO guidelines on the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of typhoid fever (5) make the following recommendations for treatment of uncomplicated typhoid fever, based on susceptibility of infection:

- Fully sensitive: a fluoroquinolone (ofloxacin or ciprofloxacin) as optimal therapy. Chloramphenicol, amoxicillin or sulfamethoxazole + trimethoprim are alternatives.
- Multidrug resistance: a fluoroquinolone or cefixime as optimal therapy. Azithromycin or cefixime are alternatives.
- Quinolone resistance: azithromycin or ceftriaxone as optimal therapy. Cefixime is an alternative.

The 2012 WHO Pocket book recommendations for management of common childhood conditions (15) make the following recommendations for the treatment of typhoid fever in children:

- Children with typhoid fever should be treated with a fluoroquinolone (i.e. ciprofloxacin, gatifloxacin, ofloxacin and perfloxacin) as a first line treatment for 7-10 days (strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)
- If response to treatment is poor, consider drug-resistant typhoid and treat with a second-line antibiotic such as a third generation cephalosporin or azithromycin for 5-7 days (strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)
Where drug resistance to antibiotics among salmonella isolates is known, follow national guidelines according to local susceptibility data (strong recommendations, moderate quality evidence).

Rationale for antibiotic selection (from the application)

Although recommended in the 2003 WHO Guidelines, ampicillin/amoxicillin and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole were not proposed in the application for inclusion in the EML for typhoid fever due to the lack of data showing any benefit over comparators based on evidence from the systematic reviews identified.

Chloramphenicol is recommended in the 2003 WHO guidelines but not in the 2012 WHO pocket book. There has been conflicting evidence from smaller trials, however, a large trial showed similar efficacy to gatifloxacin, a fourth-generation fluoroquinolone, but higher numbers of grade 1 and 2 adverse events. Due to the need to monitor blood counts, the long treatment duration, and the availability of alternative drugs, chloramphenicol was not proposed in the application for inclusion on the EML.

The application proposed the inclusion of ofloxacin and ciprofloxacin on the EML and EMLc, supported by evidence from the systematic reviews and guidelines. More clinical trials evaluating ofloxacin have been performed, however, ofloxacin is not currently included in the EML. As ciprofloxacin is currently listed and has similar clinical performance, for parsimony, ciprofloxacin only could be considered.

Although included in the 2003 WHO guidelines, the evidence from the systematic reviews did not support listing of cefixime. In comparisons with fluoroquinolones, cefixime, showed higher number of failures and longer FCTs, however, in comparisons with chloramphenicol, it compared favourably.

The application also proposed listing ceftriaxone and azithromycin on the EML and EMLc for typhoid fever, supported from evidence from SR and CPG.

Committee considerations (additional evidence, dose/duration, costs, etc.)

The Expert Committee agreed that knowledge of the local resistance patterns for S. Typhi and S. Paratyphi strains was critical for making empiric treatment choices in the the treatment of enteric fever, noting that there are reports of high rates of fluoroquinolone resistance in some settings. This is the first time the Expert Committee has considered resistance patterns in making specific recommendations for empiric treatment.

The Expert Committee considered the various antibiotics proposed in the application under the guiding principle of parsimony and selected first- and second-choice antibiotics for this indication for inclusion on the EML and EMLc.

EML listings

Antibiotics proposed for both EML and EMLc unless specified

*Endorsement* indicates those antibiotics currently included on EML/EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsement</th>
<th>First choice</th>
<th>Second choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin (except where high prevalence of fluoroquinolone resistance exists)</td>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee recommendations

The Expert Committee endorsed listing of ciprofloxacin, ceftriaxone and azithromycin as first-choice treatments for typhoid and paratyphoid (enteric) fever on the core list of the EML and EMLc. Ciprofloxacin is recommended as first-choice in settings with low prevalence of fluoroquinolone resistance, while ceftriaxone and azithromycin are recommended first-choice treatments in settings where there is a high prevalence of fluoroquinolone resistance.

Ciprofloxacin, azithromycin and ceftriaxone are all classified as Watch group antibiotics (Section 6.2.2).

Following the principle of parsimony, the Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of ofloxacin for this indication, noting that ofloxacin and ciprofloxacin have demonstrated similar clinical performance for this indication in clinical trials.
References

## Surgical antibiotic prophylaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant(s)</th>
<th>WHO Department of Service Delivery and Safety (SDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Introduction

Surgical site infections (SSIs) are the most frequent health care-associated infection (HAI) in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) and the second most frequent HAI in Europe and the United States of America (1-4). In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), 11% of patients who undergo surgery are infected in the process. In Africa, infection is the most frequent complication in surgery and up to 20% of women who have a caesarean section develop a postoperative wound infection, compromising both their health and the ability to care for their infants (WHO, unpublished data, 2017; (5)). SSIs are mainly caused by bacteria that enter through incisions made during surgery. Some involve only skin and subcutaneous tissue, but others are more serious and involve muscle, fascia, organ spaces or implanted material (6).

SSIs are associated with longer postoperative hospital stays and may require additional surgical procedures and even intensive care, thus resulting in a higher attributable morbidity and mortality (7). They also add a financial burden to the health care system and patient out-of-pocket costs. In the USA, they contribute to patients spending more than 400 000 extra days in hospital at a cost of an additional US$ 10 billion per year (8).

Surgical antibiotic prophylaxis (SAP) is one of the pillars of SSI prevention and is defined as the prevention of infectious complications by administering an effective antimicrobial agent prior to exposure to contamination during surgery (9). It has also been defined as “the rational, safe and effective use of antimicrobial agents for the prevention of (initial) SSIs” (10) or as “the use of antibiotics to prevent postoperative infection” (11). WHO provides strong recommendations on the administration of SAP prior to surgical incision when indicated, depending on the type of operation and its timing and duration. However, SAP is often used inappropriately in many settings around the world and this misuse diminishes patient safety and increases acquisition and transmission of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in surgical services. Inappropriate SAP mainly consists of incorrect antibiotic choice, dose, timing and/or means of administration, and/or duration.

Results of a WHO global survey conducted in 2014 (https://www.who.int/gpsc/5may/global-surveys/en/) showed that inappropriate SAP duration is a major problem worldwide, with prolongation of antibiotic use beyond international standards (that is, one pre-operative dose and repetition during the intervention if necessary according to specific criteria) in 43.5% of procedures on average. The frequency of prolongation was higher than 60% in African, Eastern Mediterranean and Western Pacific countries. Inappropriate SAP is particularly frequent in LMICs (12-16).

Based on these and other findings and considering the central role of SAP in SSI prevention, there is need for standardized, evidence-based global guidance on appropriate SAP, which involves several key aspects based on high-quality evidence: correct antibiotic choice, dose, timing, route of administration and duration.

### Summary of evidence (from the application)

The application presented the results of a rapid systematic literature review of systematic reviews on SAP. Inclusion criteria were that the systematic review addressed the effect of intravenous SAP on SSIs and either (1) recommended SAP; (2) recommended a specific agent; and/or (3) provided a head-to-head comparison of antibiotics used for SAP. In addition, systematic reviews based on insufficient evidence (for example, one or two randomized controlled trials [RCTs] with small sample sizes) were excluded. (Refer to the application for full details of the search strategy and study selection).

Seventeen systematic reviews were included: 13 compared SAP regimens for specific procedure types including: neurosurgery (17, 18); neck surgery (19, 20); cardiac surgery (21, 22); upper gastrointestinal surgery (23); colorectal surgery (24, 25); caesarean section (26); gynaecological surgery (27); hernia surgery (28); and plastic surgery (29). Three compared specific SAP regimens for several procedure types combined (cardiac-, vascular-, orthopaedic-, and neurosurgery; cardiac-, vascular- and orthopaedic surgery; and cardiac- and orthopaedic surgery) (30-32). One specifically addressed SAP for MRSA SSI prevention (33). The included systematic reviews provided evidence that was generally in line with the recommendations for SAP from the evidence-based guideline issued jointly in 2013 by the American Society of Health System Pharmacists (ASHP), the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), the Surgical Infection Society (SIS) and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) (10) (see Guidelines section, below).
Guidelines (from the application) The application presented the results of systematic review and inventory of available relevant evidence-based SAP guidelines and protocols. Inclusion criteria were that the guideline was: (1) issued by a country, region or organization/society (that is, not adopted locally or by a single centre); (2) issued within the last 5 years; and (3) based on a systematic, evidence-based approach. (Refer to the application for full details of the search strategy and guideline selection).

Thirty records were included: 19 records met all three inclusion criteria (9-11, 34-49). Ten met the first two criteria, but did not rely on a systematic evidence-based approach (50-59) and one, which included recommendations on all relevant types of surgery, was systematically updated, but not issued in a national context or by a scientific society (60). The 11 records that did not meet all three inclusion criteria were deemed relevant as they were of high quality and/or addressed unique situations, such as LMICs or paediatric settings.

All identified guidelines covered at least one of the most common surgical procedures. The most frequently recommended first-line antibiotics (first-choice antibiotics and second-choice agents as alternatives to first-choice) for SAP across all procedures were cefazolin, by far, followed by cefuroxime, then metronidazole (in combination with another agent), gentamicin and ampicillin-sulbactam. The most frequently recommended second-line antibiotics to be used for SAP in cases of known immediate severe or delayed severe penicillin hypersensitivity were vancomycin, clindamycin, gentamicin and metronidazole across all procedures.

When considering wound classification (61-63), the most frequently recommended first-line antibiotics in clean surgical procedures with potential severe consequences of infection and/or procedures involving implantation of foreign material (for example, cardiac, breast and hernia surgery, central and peripheral vascular surgery, orthopaedic [excluding arthroscopy or neurosurgery] and non-cardiac thoracic surgery) were a first-generation cephalosporin (cefazolin), by far, followed by a second-generation cephalosporin (cefuroxime). The most frequently recommended second-line antibiotics to be used in cases of known immediate severe or delayed severe penicillin hypersensitivity were vancomycin and clindamycin, both as a single agent. For some procedures, some guidelines also mentioned a combination of vancomycin and gentamicin (cardiac and central vascular surgery) or a combination of clindamycin and gentamicin (breast surgery, hernia repair) or gentamicin and metronidazole (hernia repair) as possible second-line alternatives.

In clean-contaminated surgical procedures (for example, head and neck, abdominal, gynaecological, obstetric, urologic and vascular surgery), the most frequently recommended first-line antibiotic was cefazolin (usually combined with metronidazole), by far, followed by metronidazole (in combination with another agent), then cefuroxime, cefoxitin, ampicillin-sulbactam and gentamicin. The most frequently recommended second-line antibiotic to be used in cases of known immediate severe or delayed severe penicillin hypersensitivity was gentamicin, followed by clindamycin, then metronidazole and vancomycin. For most procedures, guidelines recommended a combination of gentamicin with either clindamycin or vancomycin or metronidazole as possible second-line alternatives.

Many guidelines recommended to consider the use of vancomycin across procedures in addition to the recommended agent(s) as a single pre-operative dose for patients known to be colonized with methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) or at high risk for MRSA colonization (for example, recently-hospitalized patients, nursing home residents, hemodialysis patients) or in the absence of screening data (10, 11, 53, 56, 59, 60).

Rationale for antibiotic selection (from the application) The application proposed the antibiotics of choice for SAP for inclusion on the EML by type of surgical procedures and provided alternative options when the first-line choices are unavailable or contraindicated due to severe allergy. The proposed antibiotics were selected by consensus at a meeting of technical experts after consideration of the abovementioned review findings. Among first-line antibiotics, the first choice recommended for most procedures was cefazolin or its second-generation equivalent, cefuroxime. It was noted that ceftriaxone and other antibiotics are often inappropriately used as first-line SAP options in many LMICs.
Experts stressed the importance of ensuring that cefazolin and/or cefuroxime are broadly available worldwide at a reasonable price and as good quality products with good manufacturing practice labelling.

For patients with confirmed immediate severe or delayed severe penicillin hypersensitivity, a non-beta-lactam antibiotic must be used instead. It was emphasized that the second-line antibiotics listed are suboptimal and should only be used in cases of known or highly suspected allergies. However, appropriate documentation of allergies prior to surgery is not common practice in all settings, particularly in LMICs.

It was agreed that there is no good reason to use ceftriaxone for SAP as it belongs to the EML Watch group (64). In addition, it is included in the WHO highest-priority, critically important antimicrobials (CIA) list (65) as it is a third-generation cephalosporin and thus has a high risk of selection of bacterial resistance (in particular, extended spectrum beta-lactamase-[ESBL] producing enterobacteriaceae). Therefore, ceftriaxone should be reserved for the limited number of infectious conditions where it is indicated for therapeutic purposes. Conversely, it is widely overused, including for SAP for which ceftriaxone has no indication and does not add any value as it does not offer additional coverage for ESBL. It is also inferior to other antibiotics (for example, cefazolin) for methicillin-sensitive S. aureus and creates an unnecessary risk of collateral damage to the gut flora given its high biliary penetration.

Considering the high resistance rates to quinolones in LMICs and the fact that they feature in the EML Watch category (64) and are among the highest-priority antimicrobials in the CIA list (65), participants agreed that the combination of an aminoglycoside (gentamicin or tobramycin) plus metronidazole is generally preferable as second-line antibiotics. However, for patients with renal insufficiency, quinolones may be more appropriate. Quinolones should be reserved for special circumstances where no other options are available. When they are used, ciprofloxacin should generally be favoured over levofloxacin.

It was noted that many hospitals in the US have begun administering azithromycin in addition to cefazolin for pregnant women undergoing caesarean sections, based on the results of a RCT published in 2016 showing a 50% reduction in SSIs compared to a control group (66). Experts agreed that this study represents valuable evidence, but it would be premature to consider this option in the EML based on the results of a single study conducted in a high-income country. Additional evidence emerges, it might be appropriate to add adjunctive azithromycin as a first-line option for caesarean section in future editions of the EML.
### Antibiotics proposed in the application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
<th>FIRST-LINE</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First choice</td>
<td>Second choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(when allergic to first-line choices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clean</td>
<td>No SAP</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime) plus metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clean-contaminated</td>
<td>No SAP</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clindamycin plus gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac surgery (in general)</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic surgery (non-cardiac)</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper gastrointestinal tract surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clindamycin plus gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepato-pancreato-biliary surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Cholecystectomy*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentamicin plus metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernia surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendectomy</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime) plus metronidazole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentamicin plus metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime) plus metronidazole</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentamicin plus metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysterectomy</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clindamycin plus gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarean section</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clindamycin plus gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central vascular surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral vascular surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedic surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding arthroscopy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone fracture surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urologic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prostate surgery</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- laparoscopic nephrectomy</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>No SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- laparotomy nephrectomy and partial</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nephrectomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosurgery – cranium/spine</td>
<td>Cefazolin (or cefuroxime)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biliary tract open surgery or endoscopic in high-risk patients: factors that indicate a high risk of infectious complications in laparoscopic cholecystectomy include emergency procedures; diabetes; long procedure duration; intraoperative gallbladder rupture; age >70 years; conversion from laparoscopic to open cholecystectomy; American Society of Anesthesiologists classification of 3 or greater; episode of colic within 30 days before the procedure; re-intervention of less than one month for a non-infectious complication; acute cholecystitis; bile spillage; jaundice; pregnancy; non-functioning gallbladder; immunosuppression; and insertion of a prosthetic device. As a number of these risk factors are not possible to determine before the surgical intervention, it may be reasonable to give a single dose of antimicrobial prophylaxis to all patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy (10).**


Committee considerations
(additional evidence, dose/duration, costs, etc.)

The Expert Committee agreed with the views of the technical expert group that key factors for appropriate SAP include selecting the right antibiotic, taking into account the surgical procedure (as well as probable causative microorganisms and their resistance patterns based on SSI surveillance), route of administration, dosing, patient allergies and cost/availability; administering the antibiotic at the right time; and avoiding prolongation of the antibiotic after completion of the operation. For SAP to be effective, the tissue concentration of the antibiotic must be above the minimal inhibitory concentration at the time of incision and throughout the procedure. This depends on the half-life of the antibiotic chosen and may require re-dosing accordingly during the procedure.

The Expert Committee agreed that administering SAP close to the time of incision is important for antibiotics with a short half-life and, in general, this could avoid the need for re-dosing during the procedure (depending again on the half-life of the particular antibiotic used). For example, administration closer to the incision time (<60 minutes) can be considered for antibiotics with a short half-life such as cefazolin.

The Expert Committee noted the key considerations for dosing and re-dosing identified by the technical expert group:

- observational data suggest that higher serum and tissue levels throughout the surgical procedure reduce the risk of SSIs;
- higher doses should be favoured, as long as there are no concerns about toxicity;
- re-dosing should generally be provided after twice the half-life of the antibiotic has passed since the initial preoperative dose;
- there is little evidence to support weight-based dosing, but higher doses of cephalosporins may be advisable in morbidly obese patients.

EML listings
Antibiotics proposed for both EML and EMLc unless specified

Endorsement indicates those antibiotics currently included on EML/EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsement</th>
<th>First choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cefazolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(alone or in combination with) Metronidazole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee recommendations

The Expert Committee considered the various antibiotics proposed in the application under the guiding principle of parsimony and selected first- and second-choice antibiotics for this indication for inclusion. In line with previous decisions for infectious syndromes, alternatives for use in case of allergy were not recommended.

The Expert Committee endorsed listing of cefazolin, alone or in combination with metronidazole as first-choice options, and of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid and gentamicin as second-choice options for surgical prophylaxis on the core list of the EML and EMLc, as Access group antibiotics (Section 6.2.1).

The Committee also recommended the addition of cefuroxime to the core list of the EML and EMLc as a second-choice option for surgical prophylaxis, as a Watch group antibiotic (Section 6.2.2), as an alternative to cefazolin.
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### Antibiotics for oral/dental infections

#### Oral and dental infections

| Applicant(s) | Antibiotics are the most widely prescribed category of medicines used by general dental practitioners, a group which was shown to be responsible for 7-11% of all antimicrobials prescribed, and for 45% of all prescriptions of metronidazole (1, 2). Studies have also shown a wide variation in the prescribing habits suggesting inappropriate use of antibiotics in this setting (3-8). Dentinal and periodontal infections are polymicrobial in nature, mostly strictly anaerobic gram-positive cocci and gram-negative rods mixed with facultative anaerobic flora (9-12). The types of infections where antibiotics may be used include periodontitis, pulpitis, pericoronitis, acute necrotizing ulcerative gingivitis, and periodontal abscesses. The choice of antibiotics is typically empirical in the treatment of these infections. Drainage and removal of the cause of the infection is key in infections such as abscesses, with antibiotics to be considered in certain patients such as those with systemic illness or immunocompromised individuals. |
| **Introduction** | **Mark Loeb, Dominik Mertz, Paul Alexander - McMaster University** |

#### Summary of evidence (from the application)

The application presented the results of a search undertaken for systematic reviews and meta-analyses of systemic antibiotic therapy for dental infections. A total of 20 systematic reviews were included covering chronic periodontitis, apical periodontitis and acute apical abcess, and irreversible pulpitis.

**Chronic periodontitis**

Although patient important outcomes such as pain or quality of life would have been optimal, the outcomes reported in the literature for periodontitis were surrogate markers of activity such as reduction in probing depth, improvement in clinical attachment level, and bleeding on probing. Microbiological outcomes were disregarded as they were not considered to be of high patient importance. The scope of the identified systematic reviews ranged from assessment of the overall effect of antibiotics, to assessment of specific antibiotics or specific subpopulations such as diabetics or smokers.

**SRs of any antibiotics for any patients**

A systematic review and network meta-analysis of 14 RCTs of systemic antibiotics for patients with periodontitis reported that using metronidazole or a combination of amoxicillin and metronidazole as an adjuvant to scaling and root planing (SRP) improved clinical attachment gain and reduction in probing depth compared to no antibiotics (13). A greater gain in clinical attachment level (MD 1.08 mm) and reduction in probing depth (1.05 mm) was noted with metronidazole, and clinical attachment level (0.45 mm) and probing depth (0.53 mm) with amoxicillin/metronidazole. These antibiotics showed a better effect than doxycycline.

A systematic review of 14 RCTs compared systemic antibiotics in combination with scaling and root planing compared to SRP alone (14). They found that systemic antibiotics significantly improved pocket depth reduction and clinical attachment gain. Results suggested that metronidazole with amoxicillin was the most potent combination.

A systematic review of systemic antibiotics for non-surgical periodontal therapy identified a single eligible RCT in which benefit was noted in probing depth reduction (0.9 mm) and clinical attachment gain (0.7 mm). However, the authors concluded that findings were insufficient at this time and larger RCT with longer follow up was needed (15).

**SRs of amoxicillin with metronidazole**

A systematic review of 20 RCTs comparing efficacy of amoxicillin and metronidazole adjunctive to SRP compared to SRP alone found a beneficial effect of adjunctive antibiotic therapy for probing depth reduction (0.86 mm, 95% CI 0.65 to 1.07 mm) and clinical attachment level gain 0.75 mm (95% CI 0.40 to 1.09) (16).

Another systematic review of six 6 RCTs evaluated the effectiveness of amoxicillin and metronidazole as an adjunct to full mouth SRP compared to full mouth SRP alone. Adjunctive
antibiotic treatment was associated with significant clinical attachment gain (0.42 mm; 0.23, 0.61) and probing depth reduction (0.58 mm; 0.39, 0.77) (17).

A systematic review of 6 RCTs that assessed the effect of adjunctive antibiotics for refractory periodontitis found greater reduction in probing depth and in loss of clinical attachment level with antibiotics compared to debridement alone across all studies, however a meta-analysis was not conducted. The authors concluded that no firm conclusions could be drawn due to the low quality of the evidence (18).

A systematic review of 18 RCTs found no clinically important difference between amoxicillin plus metronidazole compared to no antibiotics as an adjunct to non-surgical treatment of periodontitis.(19)

SRs of metronidazole alone
A systematic review of 3 RCTs that assessed metronidazole as an adjuvant to scaling and root planing found benefit of the antibiotic with respect to probing depth reduction (0.18 mm; 0.09-0.28) and clinical attachment (0.10mm; 0.08-0.12) (20). Another, older systematic review of 8 RCTs also found that metronidazole may offer a benefit for periodontitis in pockets of 4mm and greater, but only for short term outcomes (21).

SRs of azithromycin
Two systematic reviews (6 and 14 RCTs) comparing azithromycin as an adjuvant therapy for SRP to SRP alone both reported significant beneficial effects of azithromycin for outcomes of probing depth, clinical attachment level and bleeding on probing (22, 23).

SRs of doxycycline
A systematic review of 3 RCTs assessed the long-term efficacy of systemic of low-dose (subantimicrobial-dose) doxycycline (SSD, 20 mg twice daily) as an adjunctive treatment to SRP compared to SRP alone.(24). Significant reductions in probing depth reduction (0.9 mm; 0.43-1.37), clinical attachment gain (0.88 mm; 0.08-1.67), changes in plaque index, gingival index and gingival crevicular fluid at the 9 months mark were observed with adjunctive doxycycline. The authors concluded that the evidence supported a 3-month course of low-dose doxycycline. However, two of the studies were conducted by the same author, and all three studies were conducted in Turkey, potentially limiting the generalizability of the finding. The two studies driving the effect were both evaluated as being at high risk of bias.

SRs in smokers
Three systematic reviews of trials of antibiotic therapy in smokers with chronic periodontitis yielded variable findings of no benefit (25), inconsistent findings (26) and statistically significant benefit of questionable clinical relevance (27) associated with adjunctive antibiotic therapy.

SRs in diabetics
Two systematic reviews of trials of antibiotic therapy in diabetic patients both reported benefits associated with antibiotic therapy for the outcome of probing depth reduction, but not for other outcomes (28, 29).

Apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess
A Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis of 2 RCTs (62 participants) comparing penicillin to placebo (with surgical intervention and analgesics) found no significant differences for pain or swelling between groups. The authors concluded that there were insufficient data to determine the effects of systemic antibiotics (30). Another systematic review of 8 RCTs comparing antibiotics to placebo or no pharmacotherapy for acute apical abscesses and found no benefit of antibiotics as an adjuvant to surgical intervention. However, a single identified study showed a benefit of azithromycin over amoxicillin+clavulanic acid in terms of reduction of pain, with no benefit for the co-primary outcome “absence of infection” (31).

Irreversible pulpitis
A Cochrane systematic review of systemic antibiotics for pulpitis was based only on one small trial which included the use of penicillin for which there was a lack of significant differences in outcomes between groups (32).

Guidelines (from the application)

The application presented the results of a search undertaken of clinical practice guidelines for recommendations on the use of antibiotics for dental infections.

Chronic periodontitis

A 2015 clinical practice guideline developed by an expert panel convened by the American Dental Association on the prevention and treatment of periodontal diseases in primary care recommended use of systemic subantimicrobial-dose doxycycline (20mg twice daily for 3-9 months) as an adjunct to SRP. The recommendation was made based on moderate evidence of a small net benefit in clinical attachment level from 11 RCTs (813 participants). There was also a weak recommendation for other systemic antimicrobials as adjunct therapy to SRP which showed a similar effect size as SSD but more significant risk for harm based on 24 RCTs (33).

2014 Guidelines published by the Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Program recommended against the use of antimicrobials for chronic periodontitis or peri-implantitis due to a lack of convincing evidence (34).

Apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess

The European Society of Endodontology position statement recommended against the use of antibiotics in patients with acute apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess and emphasized the importance of surgical drainage. However, a recommendation for adjunctive antibiotics was made for the following patient groups: medically compromised patients (not defined in detail) and patients with systemic involvement (fluctuant swelling, temperature >38 degrees C, malaise, lymphadenopathy, trismus), and patients with progressive infections where referral to oral surgeons may be necessary (rapid <24h severe infection, cellulitis, spreading infections, osteomyelitis). They also recommended against antibiotic treatment in patients with chronic apical periodontitis with a sinus tract. In the subgroup of patients with an indication for antibiotics treatment, penicillin VK (phenoxymethylpenicillin) was the first choice, while amoxicillin, amoxicillin+clavulanic acid, and metronidazole were recommended after 48-72hours if penicillin VK fails. Further listings include clindamycin, clarithromycin, azithromycin for penicillin allergic patients. Duration should be re-assessed after 2-3 days, with a statement that 3-7 days if often sufficient (35).

The Canadian Collaboration on Clinical Practice Guidelines in Dentistry (CCCD) also recommend against the use of antibiotics for acute apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess as no benefit had been shown over drainage alone. They suggest that antibiotics may be helpful in the setting of systemic complications (fever, lymphadenopathy, cellulitis), diffuse swelling or in patients with medical indications. There is a statement that no antibiotic can be recommended over another, and that antibiotics may be used if drainage is not possible (36).

Irreversible pulpitis

The European Society of Endodontology position statement recommends against the use of antibiotics for the treatment of irreversible pulpitis (35).

Rationale for antibiotic selection (from the application)

Periodontitis

The application stated that the overall evidence on antibiotics as an adjunct to SRP for periodontitis was limited, conflicting, and in general at high risk of bias. Where benefits had been shown, the summary estimates tended to be small to modest and as such of questionable clinical benefit. Also, recommendations in the two clinical practice guidelines identified were conflicting. It seems reasonable to conclude that the majority of patients likely do not benefit significantly from adjunctive systemic antibiotics, and as such the potential negative effects are outweighing the potential benefits. There might be a subgroup of patients who may clinically benefit from adjunctive antibiotics, but the current evidence does not allow drawing firm conclusions what these subgroups might be. It does not seem that large treatment effects can be seen in smokers or diabetics, and as such these groups should not be treated any differently from others.
If, in a specific patient there is a perceived potential benefit with antibiotic treatment, low-dose long-term doxycycline which may have the least ecologic impact, or short-term courses with amoxicillin/metronidazole seem to be the most promising regimens.

### Apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess

The systematic reviews identified in the application provided no evidence supporting the routine use of antibiotics for apical periodontitis and acute apical abscess. The identified guidelines also recommend against the use of antibiotics for the majority of patients, emphasizing the importance of source control and drainage. However, the guidelines recommend antibiotic use for subgroups of patients at risk for complicated/severe infections that may not get under control with drainage alone. In the absence of convincing evidence preferring one antibiotic regimen over the other, we agree with the European guideline listing phenoxymethylpenicillin or amoxicillin, with the potential of adding metronidazole if first line treatment fails. For penicillin allergic patients, the use of clindamycin seems to be the best option given the microbiology of periodontal infections.

### Irreversible pulpitis

There is insufficient evidence to support the use of antibiotics for irreversible pulpitis. Guidelines do not support antibiotics for this indication.

### Committee considerations (additional evidence, dose/duration, costs, etc.)

The Expert Committee noted that the evidence supporting antibiotic use in the treatment of oral and dental infections is limited and did not recommend EML listing of antibiotics for most dental conditions, including acute or chronic periodontitis or irreversible pulpitis.

### EML listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotics proposed for both EML and EMLc unless specified</th>
<th>First choice</th>
<th>Second choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endorsement</strong></td>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>Phenoxymethylpenicillin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee recommendations

The Expert Committee endorsed listing of amoxicillin and phenoxymethylpenicillin on the core list of the EML and EMLc as first-choice treatment for progressive (systemically complicated) apical dental abscess. These antibiotics are also recommended as first-choice treatment of apical dental abscess in medically compromised patients.

Amoxicillin and phenoxymethylpenicillin are classified as Access group antibiotics (Section 6.2.1).

### References

### Ceftazidime + avibactam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested the inclusion on the EML of ceftazidime + avibactam as last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Essential Medicines and Health Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</td>
<td>Powder for injection: 2 g + 0.5 g in vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>This combination antibiotic had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. Ceftazidime is third generation cephalosporin listed on the EML complementary list and classified within the Watch group. Avibactam is a non-beta-lactam beta-lactamase inhibitor active against certain types of carbapenemases (e.g. KPC and OXA-48 but not active against metallo-beta-lactamases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance: (burden of disease)</td>
<td>Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (1-3). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33 000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (1). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (2). Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> (4). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (2). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (3). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (5). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant <em>Acinetobacter baumannii</em>, <em>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em> and <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em>; and third-generation cephalosporin resistant <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> (6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)</td>
<td>Several RCTs have been conducted comparing ceftazidime + avibactam to carbapenems or best available therapy for cIAIs and cUTIs (7-10). Of note, all but one of the RCTs (7) included patients based on clinical syndromes and not based on the presence of infections confirmed to be caused by multidrug-resistant organisms. In that “descriptive” trial of patients with cUTI (plus some patients with cIAI) caused by ceftazidime-resistant Gram negatives, ceftazidime + avibactam treatment resulted in similar clinical response compared to best available therapy. So far, few data on the “real life” clinical use of ceftazidime + avibactam have been published. A retrospective single centre study at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Centre in Pittsburgh, USA examined outcomes of 109 patients with bacteraemia caused by carbapenem-resistant <em>K. pneumoniae</em> bacteraemia (97% of which were KPC producers) over the time period from 2009 to 2017. The 30-day survival rate was 92% (12/13) in patients treated with ceftazidime + avibactam vs. 69% (66/96) for patients treated with other regimens, but this obviously has to be interpreted with caution given the many potential confounding factors (11). Published data about use of ceftazidime + avibactam in children is very scarce and limited to a phase I study and case reports (12-14). However, two phase 2 RCTs have been conducted in children with cUTIs and cIAI and are awaiting publication (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02475733 and NCT02497781). Of note ceftazidime + avibactam may have a role in combination with aztreonam to treat infections caused by <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> producing metallo-beta-lactamases at least until the combination of aztreonam with avibactam becomes available (15, 16).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

In the RCTs the incidence of adverse events in the groups treated with ceftazidime + avibactam was similar to the control groups (7-10). However, in a meta-analysis of eight RCTs including 4093 patients, serious adverse events (SAEs) were more common with ceftazidime + avibactam (RR 1.24, 95%CI 1.00-1.54, I^2=0%) but detailed data regarding the nature of these SAE were not available (17).

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

**United Kingdom:** Basic NHS price: 10 vial pack £857.00 = £257.1 (about 340 USD) per day (standard dosing)

Few data are available regarding the cost-effectiveness of ceftazidime-avibactam. A decision analytic model presented at ID week in October 2018 aimed to estimate the cost-effectiveness of treatment with ceftazidime + avibactam compared with colistin for a hypothetical cohort of patients with pneumonia and bacteraemia caused by carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* over a 12 months period. The researchers assumed a 41% mortality with colistin treatment, a 23% (and hence very large) absolute reduction in mortality with ceftazidime-avibactam, daily costs of ceftazidime-avibactam of 1080 USD, a 42% incidence of nephrotoxicity with colistin treatment, a 56% probability of transfer to long-term care and a 1.8 fold improved odds of discharge home with ceftazidime-avibactam treatment (18). The authors estimated an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio for ceftazidime + avibactam compared with colistin of 110, 300 USD per quality adjusted life-year.

### Availability:

Ceftazidime-avibactam has FDA & EMA approval for cUTI & cIAI (for cIAI in combination with metronidazole) (11). EMA lists “HAP and other infections due to Gram-negative bacteria with limited treatment options” as further indication.

### Other considerations:

The Committee noted that there was very limited clinical trial evidence of the efficacy of recently approved antibiotics for infections caused by carbapenem-resistant bacteria, with activity against this type of infection based on studies with small sample sizes, methodological limitations and including heterogenous populations. The Committee was concerned that the current regulatory approval process for novel agents effective against “critical priority” pathogens (according to the WHO Priority Pathogens List (5)) does not adequately inform the urgent public health need for clear evidence-based guidance on the optimal management of these infections, which are associated with important morbidity and mortality.

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of ceftazidime + avibactam on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of infections caused by carbapenem-resistant organisms which are pathogens classified as “critical priority” in the WHO Priority Pathogens List.

The Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that this antibiotic should be classified in the AWARe Reserve group.

The Committee recommended further collaboration between relevant stakeholders to design and implement strategic public health orientated studies that will help to inform the choice of optimal single or combination treatment of both novel and older antibiotics for adults and children in different settings, with the goal of improving clinical outcomes, minimizing toxicity and reducing selection of resistance.

### References:


### Ceftolozane + tazobactam – addition – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ceftolozane + tazobactam</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> J01DI54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion on the EML of ceftolozane + tazobactam as a last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Essential Medicines and Health Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Powder for injection: 1 g + 0.5 g in vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Ceftolozane + tazobactam is the combination of a new cephalosporin with a structure similar to ceftazidime with a beta-lactam inhibitor that has been in clinical use for decades (tazobactam). Ceftolozane + tazobactam retains in vitro activity against some strains of multidrug-resistant <em>P. aeruginosa</em> and against <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> producing ESBL. It only has limited activity against Gram positive pathogens and anaerobes (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong> (burden of disease)</td>
<td>Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (2-4). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33 000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (2). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (3). Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> (5). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (3). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (4). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (6). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant <em>Acinetobacter baumannii, Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em> and <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em>; and third-generation cephalosporin resistant <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> (7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>Ceftolozane + tazobactam has been assessed in two non-inferiority RCTs, one for cUTI and one for cIAI (8, 9). Of note, in the cUTI trial levofloxacin was used as comparator agent, a highly debatable choice given that resistance to levofloxacin in Gram negatives isolated in urine cultures at baseline was nearly 10 times more prevalent at baseline (2.7% for C/T versus 26.7% for levofloxacin) (9). An RCT in ventilator-associated pneumonia is currently being conducted (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01853982). A retrospective cohort study in of 101 patients treated with ceftolozane + tazobactam in 22 Italian centres for a variety of infections causes by <em>P. aeruginosa</em>, including 51% of XDR strains, showed overall clinical success of 83.2% and a good safety profile (10). A secondary analysis of the 150 of 1346 (11.1%) patients with ESBL producing organisms in the original 2 RCTs reported high clinical cure rates with ceftolozane + tazobactam (overall 97.4%), better than the comparators (82.6% for levofloxacin [cUTI only] and 88.5% for meropenem [cIAI only]) (11). The major methodologic limitations of these studies mean, however, that the data have to be interpreted with caution. Data for children are scarce and no specific recommendations regarding use in the paediatric population can be made (12, 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>In the two non-inferiority phase III RCTs published so far adverse events (AE) occurred with similar frequency in the ceftolozane + tazobactam and comparator groups with headache and gastrointestinal symptoms being the most frequent AE (8, 9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### References:


### Delafloxacin – addition – EML

**Proposal:** The application requested the inclusion of delafloxacin on the complementary list of the EML as last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).

**Applicant:** EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group

**WHO Technical Department:** Essential Medicines and Health Products

**EML / EMLc:** EML

**Section:** 6.2.2 Watch group antibiotics

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):** Tablet: 450 mg Lyophilized powder for injection: 300 mg

**Core / Complementary:** Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:** Individual

**Background:** Delafloxacin had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. It is a new fluoroquinolone which, compared to the older molecules of this class, has activity against methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) (1, 2). It has been approved for treatment of skin and soft tissue infections based on two phase 3 multicentre, double blind non-inferiority trials (3, 4).

**Public health relevance:** Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (5-7). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33 000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (5). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (6).

Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing *Enterobacteriaceae* (8). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in *Enterobacteriaceae* and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (6). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (7). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (9). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Enterobacteriaceae*, and third-generation cephalosporin resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* (10).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

In the two phase III trials in adult patients with acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections, delafloxacin fulfilled criteria for non-inferiority compared to linezolid and vancomycin/aztreonam respectively (3, 4). In these trials about one third and one fourth of patients had infections due to MRSA.

A trial comparing delafloxacin to moxifloxacin (or linezolid in the case of confirmed MRSA) in patients with community-acquired pneumonia (NCT02679573) has been completed in 2018 but results have not yet been published.

**Summary of evidence: harms**

A review of the safety data of the two phase III non-inferiority RCTs and additional phase I and II trials showed few discontinuations (<1%) due to treatment-related adverse events. (3, 4, 11). The proportion of patients with AEs was similar to the proportion observed in the comparator arms. No fluoroquinolone specific AE such as tendinitis or neuropathy were observed in the delafloxacin arm. Gastrointestinal events (notably diarrhoea), headache, and infusion site pain were the most frequently reported AE. Adverse events associated with fluoroquinolones (tendinitis, myopathy, dysglycaemia, neuropathy, neurotoxicity) were not more frequent when compared with vancomycin/aztreonam with the caveat that the combined phase 3 trials only included 1492 patients and rare, potentially severe events were unlikely to be detected.

There are no data for use of delafloxacin and children similar to other fluoroquinolones it is not recommended for use in patients younger than 18 years.
### Additional evidence: (not in the application)
Delafloxacin has been suggested as treatment option for gonorrhoea with good in vitro activity even against strains with reduced susceptibility to ciprofloxacin (12). The results of an open-label, multicentre study with 460 participants with uncomplicated gonorrhoea has been recently published (13). Patients were randomized (2:1) to either a single oral dose of 900 mg of delafloxacin or 250 mg of intramuscular ceftriaxone. Delafloxacin did not fulfil the predefined criteria for noninferiority for the primary outcome urogenital cure (85.1% (194/228) vs 91.0% (91/100); 95% CI -13.18% to 1.36%; the lower bound of the CI thus exceeding the pre-specified -10% non-inferiority margin).

### WHO Guidelines:
There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms. Delafloxacin is not mentioned in the 2016 “WHO guidelines for the treatment of Neisseria gonorrhoeae” (issued before the availability of delafloxacin) (14).

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:
Approximately 260 USD per day

### Availability:
Delafloxacin is approved in the US and Europe for the treatment of acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections.

### Other considerations:
N/A

### Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of delafloxacin to EML. The Committee noted that although delafloxacin has demonstrated activity against some MRSA strains ranked as “high priority” on the WHO Priority Pathogens List, effective alternatives are currently available on the EML. In addition, delafloxacin was not associated with greater activity against “critical priority” pathogens compared to other, older fluoroquinolones currently available on the Model List.

The Expert Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that this antibiotic should be classified in the AWaRe Watch group.

### References:

Eravacycline – addition – EML

Eravacycline

Proposal: The application requested the inclusion of eravacycline on the complementary list of the EML as last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).

Applicant: EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group

WHO Technical Department: Essential Medicines and Health Products

EML / EMLc: EML

Section: 6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics

Dose form(s) & strength(s): Lyophilized powder for injection: 50 mg

Core / Complementary: Complementary

Individual / Square box listing: Individual

Background: Eravacycline had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. Eravacycline is a fully synthetic tetracycline antibiotic that has a spectrum of activity similar to tigecycline and maintains its activity in the presence of two common resistance mechanisms: ribosomal protection and active drug efflux. It retains activity against most ESBL producing Enterobacteriaceae and some strains of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae and Acinetobacter baumannii but has limited activity against Pseudomonas aeruginosa (1-4).

Public health relevance: Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (5-7). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33 000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (5). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (6).

Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing Enterobacteriaceae (8). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (6). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (7). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (9). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant Acinetobacter baumannii, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Enterobacteriaceae; and third-generation cephalosporin resistant Enterobacteriaceae (10).

Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application) Eravacycline achieved the predefined criteria for non-inferiority compared with ertapenem in one trial and meropenem in another trial in the treatment of complicated intrabdominal infections in hospitalized adults (11, 12). A further trial has been conducted in adult patients with cUTI using levofloxacin as comparator, but the results have so far only been published on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT01978938) and eravacycline “did not achieve its primary endpoint of statistical non-inferiority compared to levofloxacin” (13).

Like for other tetracyclines, eravacycline use is not recommended in children younger than 8 years and pregnant or breastfeeding women due to the risk of tooth discoloration and enamel hypoplasia. A phase 1 multicentre study to assess the pharmacokinetics and safety of IV eravacycline in children aged 8 to 18 years is currently recruiting patients (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT03696550).

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) In the trials comparing eravacycline to a carbapenem (ertapenem and meropenem respectively) more treatment-emergent adverse events were observed in the eravacycline treatment groups (11, 12). The difference was mostly attributable to nausea and phlebitis.

Additional evidence: (not in the application) No additional evidence.
Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of eravacycline to the EML. The Committee considered that although eravacycline demonstrates activity against some strains of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae, there are some concerns with regard to efficacy, as eravacycline failed to demonstrate non-inferiority compared to levofloxacin in one RCT for complicated UTI. In addition, the Committee considered that there could be safety concerns, with no long-term safety data currently available. The Committee noted pharmacological similarities between eravacycline and tigecycline, and the reported increased mortality associated with tigecycline in some meta-analyses. The Expert Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that eravacycline be classified in the AWaRe Reserve group.

WHO Guidelines: There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.

Costs / cost-effectiveness: US: wholesale acquisition cost of 175 USD per day of treatment (14). No cost-effectiveness data are available.

Availability: Eravacycline has been approved in the United States and the European Union for the treatment of complicated intra-abdominal infections in adults.

Other considerations: Safety concerns exist for tigecycline, a pharmacologically similar agent with a similar spectrum of activity to eravacycline, with an increased risk of mortality compared with other antimicrobials being reported (15-17). The FDA issued a boxed warning about this risk in 2013 (18). In a separate recommendation made during the meeting, the Expert Committee recommended the removal of tigecycline from the EML and EMLc.

References:


## Meropenem + vaborbactam – addition – EML

### Proposal:
The application requested the inclusion on the EML of meropenem + vaborbactam as a last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).

### Applicant:
EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group

### WHO Technical Department:
Essential Medicines and Health Products

### EML / EMLc:
EML

### Section:
6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics

### Dose form(s) & strength(s):
Powder for injection: 1 g + 1 g

### Core / Complementary:
Complementary

### Individual / Square box listing:
Individual

### Background:
Meropenem + vaborbactam is a combination of the carbapenem meropenem with the non-suicidal cyclic boronic acid–based β-lactamase inhibitor vaborbactam (1, 2). Vaborbactam inhibits Ambler class A and C β-lactamases of which KPC-carbapenemases and some extended spectrum beta-lactamases are currently the clinically most relevant examples. Metallo-β-lactamases (e.g. NDM, VIM) and class D β-lactamases are not inhibited by vaborbactam.

### Public health relevance:
Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (3-6). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33,000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (3). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (4). Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing *Enterobacteriaceae* (6). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in *Enterobacteriaceae* and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (4). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (5). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (7). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Enterobacteriaceae*, and third-generation cephalosporin resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* (8).

### Summary of evidence: benefits
As of December 2018, meropenem + vaborbactam was assessed in two phase 3 randomized controlled trials (9, 10). The TANGO I trial showed non-inferiority of meropenem + vaborbactam versus piperacillin + tazobactam for the treatment of complicated urinary tract infections (infection with a pathogen resistant to standard antibiotics was not an inclusion criterion) (9). The TANGO II trial, a phase 3, multicentre, multinational, open-label randomized clinical trial, compared meropenem + vaborbactam to the best available therapy (BAT; often a combination of antibiotics) in patients with a variety of infections caused by carbapenem resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* and showed decreased 28-day all-cause mortality (15.6% (5/32) vs. BAT 33.3% (5/15)) with meropenem + vaborbactam compared to BAT with a wide confidence interval given the small sample size (95% CI of difference, - 44.7% to 9.3%) (10).

### Summary of evidence: harms
In the TANGO I and TANGO II trials adverse events were similar in the meropenem + vaborbactam group and in the comparator group.

### Additional evidence:
N/A

### WHO Guidelines:
There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:
**US:** about 200 USD for 1g/1 g, equivalent to 1200 USD for an average daily dose of 2 g + 2 g every 8 hours.
No data about cost-effectiveness are available.

### Availability:
Meropenem + vaborbactam is approved by the FDA for patients 18 years of age and older with complicated urinary tract infections (cUTI), including pyelonephritis.
EMA approved its use in the European Union for
- Complicated urinary tract infection, including pyelonephritis, a sudden and severe infection causing the kidneys to swell and which may permanently damage them;
- Complicated intra-abdominal infection;
- Hospital-acquired pneumonia, including ventilator associated pneumonia;
- Bacteria in the blood associated with any of the infections listed above;
- Infections due to aerobic Gram-negative organisms in adults with limited treatment options.

### Other considerations:

The Committee noted that there was very limited clinical trial evidence of the efficacy of recently approved antibiotics against carbapenem-resistant infections, with activity based on small sample size studies including heterogeneous populations. The Committee was concerned that the current regulatory approval process for novel agents effective against the WHO Priority Pathogen List “critical priority” pathogens does not adequately inform the urgent public health need for clear evidence-based guidance on the optimal management of these infections, which are associated with high mortality.

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of meropenem + vaborbactam on the complementary list of the EML of meropenem + vaborbactam for the treatment of infections caused by carbapenem-resistant organisms which are pathogens classified as “critical priority” in the WHO Priority Pathogen List. The Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that this antibiotic should be classified in the AWaRe Reserve group (Section 6.2.3). The Committee recommended further collaboration between relevant stakeholders to design and implement strategic public health orientated studies that will help to inform the choice of optimal single or combinations of both novel and older antibiotics for adults and children in different settings, with the goal of improving clinical outcomes, minimizing toxicity and reducing selection of resistance.

### References:

**Omadacycline – addition – EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested the inclusion of omadacycline on the complementary list of the EML as last-resort treatment options for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Essential Medicines and Health Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</td>
<td>Lyophilized powder for injection: 100 mg Tablet: 300 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Omadacycline had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. Omadacycline, a recently approved tetracycline antibiotic, has a broad spectrum of activity against many Gram-positive and Gram-negative pathogens, including methicillin-resistant <em>Staphylococcus aureus</em> (MRSA) (1). MRSA is ranked as a “high priority” pathogen on the WHO Priority Pathogens List (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance: (burden of disease)</td>
<td>Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (3-5). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33,000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (3). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (4). Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> (6). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (4). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (5). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (2). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant <em>Acinetobacter baumannii</em>, <em>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em> and Enterobacteriaceae; and third-generation cephalosporin resistant Enterobacteriaceae (7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)</td>
<td>Several randomized controlled trials of omadacycline had been conducted or were currently ongoing, but at the time of writing the application the results had not yet been published in the peer-reviewed literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omadacycline versus moxifloxacin for the treatment of community-acquired bacterial pneumonia (CAP) (NCT02531438), Phase 3, double-blind, multicenter non-inferiority RCT (2015-2017) in 774 adult patients with CAP. Primary outcome: Number of participants with early clinical response 81.1% vs 82.7% (-1.6, 95% CI -7.1 to 3.8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral omadacycline versus oral linezolid for the treatment of ABSSSI (NCT02877927), Phase 3, double-blind, multicentre non-inferiority RCT (2016-2017) in 735 adult patients with ABSSSI, Primary outcome: Early clinical response (87.5% vs. 82.5%, +5.0%, 95% CI -02 to 10.3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Recommendations:

- Oral omadacycline versus oral nitrofurantoin for the treatment of cystitis (NCT03425396): trial still recruiting

The results of NCT02531438 and NCT02378480 have since been published (see additional evidence).

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

See additional evidence.

Additional evidence: (not in the application)

Two noninferiority RCTs of omadacycline in adults with community-acquired bacterial pneumonia and acute bacterial skin and skin-structure infections were published in February 2019.

A double-blind, noninferiority (10 % point margin) RCT allocated adults with community-acquired bacterial pneumonia to either omadacycline or moxifloxacin with possible transition to the oral equivalent after 3 days for a total treatment duration between 7 and 14 days. The primary outcome was early clinical response (according to predefined criteria) at 72 to 120 hours. Omadacycline fulfilled criteria for noninferiority for early clinical response (81.1% versus 82.7%; difference, -1.6 percentage points; 95%CI -7.1 to 3.8) (8). The frequency of adverse events (AE) was similar in both groups, with gastrointestinal side effects being the most commonly observed AE (10.2% vs. 18.0%). There was a slight imbalance in mortality with eight deaths occurring in the omadacycline group versus four in the moxifloxacin group, disproportionately affecting patients with more severe pneumonia. A second double-blind, noninferiority (10 % point margin) trial, randomly assigned adults with acute bacterial skin and skin-structure infections to treatment with omadacycline or linezolid with possible transition to the oral equivalent after 3 days for a total treatment duration between 7 and 14 days. The primary outcome was early clinical response (48-72 hours), defined as survival, absence of rescue antibiotic therapy and a ≥ 20% reduction in lesion size. Omadacycline fulfilled criteria for noninferiority for early clinical response (84.8% vs 85.5%, r; difference -0.7 percentage points; 95%CI -6.3 to 4.9) (9). The frequency of adverse events was similar in both groups, with gastrointestinal side effects being the most commonly observed AE (18.0% vs 15.8%).

WHO Guidelines:

There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.

Costs / cost-effectiveness:

No information regarding costs available. Few data are available regarding the cost-effectiveness of omadacycline. A modelling study estimated potential cost savings with omadacycline treatment compared with inpatient IV vancomycin treatment in patients with acute bacterial skin and skin-structure infections by shifting care to the outpatient setting due to the availability of an oral formulation of omadacycline (10). The study assumed that a large proportion (50%) of patients would continue with IV vancomycin (rather than a switch to an oral agent), limiting applicability to “real-world” scenarios. It was noted that the first author of this study was an employee of the pharmaceutical company producing omadacycline.

Availability:

The drug has been approved for the treatment of community acquired bacterial pneumonia and acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections in the United States (11).

Other considerations:

N/A

Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of omadacycline to the EML. The Committee considered that although omadacycline demonstrates activity against both Gram-positive and Gram-negative pathogens, including MRSA, available data for its effectiveness and safety are currently limited. The Committee noted the finding of potentially increased mortality associated with omadacycline in one RCT of patients with community acquired pneumonia. The Expert Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that omadacycline be classified in the AWaRe Reserve group.

References:


### Plazomicin—addition—EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of plazomicin on the complementary list of the EML as a last-resort treatment option for infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms (MRDO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>EML Secretariat on behalf of the EML Antibiotics Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Essential Medicines and Health Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.2.3 Reserve group antibiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Injection: 50 mg/mL in 10 mL vial (500mg/10ml concentrate for solution for infusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Plazomicin had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. Plazomicin is a next-generation aminoglycoside which is not affected by many aminoglycoside-modifying enzymes of Enterobacteriaceae that inactivate other types of aminoglycosides (1, 2). This makes it a potentially useful drug for the treatment of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae since aminoglycosides are not affected by carbapenemase production (metallo-betalactamases may be an exception since they often are associated with genes for methylases affecting and inactivating all types of aminoglycosides, including plazomicin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are a significant threat to public health, both in high-income as well as low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (3-5). A recent study estimated that infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria were responsible for approximately 33,000 attributable deaths in Europe in 2015 (3). Fewer data are available for LMIC, but a retrospective study in ten hospitals in India found that resistant pathogens were associated with 2-3 times higher mortality than infections with susceptible strains after adjusting for several confounders (4). Over the last decade there has been increasing spread of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens such as carbapenemase producing Enterobacteriaceae (6). The Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (GLASS) Report published in 2018 found high levels of carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae and non-fermenters in many of the LMICs providing data for the report (4). The 2015 WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance calls for the development of new antimicrobial medicines (5). To provide a framework for this endeavour, in 2017 WHO published a priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria – the WHO Priority Pathogens List (7). “Priority 1: critical” category includes four types of pathogens, all of which are Gram-negative: carbapenem resistant Acinetobacter baumannii, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Enterobacteriaceae; and third-generation cephalosporin resistant Enterobacteriaceae (8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>See additional evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong></td>
<td>Like all aminoglycosides plazomicin is potentially nephrotoxic. Increases in serum creatinine levels of 0.5 mg or more per deciliter (≥40 μmol per litre) above baseline occurred in 7.0% of patients in the plazomicin group and in 4.0% in the meropenem group in the non-inferiority trial comparing plazomicin to meropenem for patients with complicated urinary tract infections (see additional evidence) (9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional evidence: (not in the application)</td>
<td>Results of a non-inferiority trial comparing plazomicin to meropenem for patients with complicated urinary tract infections (UTIs) were published in January 2019 (9). 609 patients with a diagnosis of complicated UTI were randomly allocated 1:1 to IV plazomicin or meropenem with the option for oral step-down treatment after at least 4 days of IV treatment with a total treatment duration of 7 to 10 days of therapy. The primary outcome was “composite cure” (clinical cure and microbiologic eradication) at day 5, and 15 to 19 days after treatment start in the microbiologic modified intention-to-treat population. Plazomicin fulfilled the non-inferiority criteria for both endpoints (with a 15% prespecified non-inferiority margin): 88.0% (168/191) vs 91.4% (180/197) (difference, −3.4 percentage points; 95% CI, −10.0 to 3.1) and 81.7% (156/191) versus 70.1% (138/197) (difference, 11.6 percentage points; 95% CI, 2.7 to 20.3) respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Guidelines:</td>
<td>There are no available WHO guidelines for the treatment of infections due to multi-drug resistant organisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</td>
<td>US: Dosing is weight-based but a dose of 1000mg for a 70 kg person with good renal function is reported to be approximately 750 USD. No data regarding the cost-effectiveness of plazomicin compared to other treatment options are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability:</td>
<td>Plazomicin is approved by the FDA for patients 18 years of age or older for the treatment of complicated urinary tract infections (cUTIs), including pyelonephritis caused by the following susceptible microorganism(s): <em>Escherichia coli</em>, <em>Klebsiella pneumoniae</em>, <em>Proteus mirabilis</em>, and <em>Enterobacter cloacae</em>. An application has been filed in Europe by the producing company but is currently pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other considerations:</td>
<td>The Committee noted that there was very limited clinical trial evidence of the efficacy of recently approved antibiotics against carbapenem-resistant infections, with activity based on small sample size studies including heterogeneous populations. The Committee was concerned that the current regulatory approval process for novel agents effective against the WHO Priority Pathogen List “critical priority” pathogens does not adequately inform the urgent public health need for clear evidence-based guidance on the optimal management of these infections, which are associated with high mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Recommendations:</td>
<td>The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of plazomicin on the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of infections caused by carbapenem-resistant organisms which are pathogens classified as “critical priority” in the WHO Priority Pathogen List. The Committee agreed with the EML Antibiotic Working Group’s recommendation that this antibiotic should be classified in the AWaRe Reserve group (Section 6.2.3). The Committee recommended further collaboration between relevant stakeholders to design and implement strategic public health orientated studies that will help to inform the choice of optimal single or combinations of both novel and older antibiotics for adults and children in different settings, with the goal of improving clinical outcomes, minimizing toxicity and reducing selection of resistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antituberculosis medicines – new formulations for addition – EML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycloserine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethambutol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethionamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levofloxacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linezolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moxifloxacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clofazimine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifabutin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: The application requested:
- the addition of various new formulations of currently listed medicines for tuberculosis for use in children;
- amendments to the dosage form terminology used to describe clofazimine and rifabutin.

Applicant: Stop TB Partnership / Global Drug Facility

WHO Technical Department: Comments on the application were received from the WHO Global TB Programme. The technical unit advised that it supported the application, which was developed in consultation with the Global TB Programme, and was fully in line with the latest WHO recommendations on the management of multidrug resistant (MDR-TB) and rifampicin resistant (RR-TB) tuberculosis, and isoniazid-resistant TB. The technical unit stated that the addition of child-friendly formulations of second-line antituberculosis medicines will greatly benefit children with drug-resistant tuberculosis.

EML / EMLc: EML and EMLc

Section: 6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

Dose form(s) & strengths(s):
- Cycloserine: solid oral dose form 125 mg (ADD)
- Ethambutol: dispersible tablet 100 mg (ADD)
- Ethionamide: dispersible tablet 125 mg (ADD)
- Isoniazid: dispersible tablet 100 mg (ADD)
- Levofloxacin: dispersible tablet 100 mg (ADD)
- Linezolid: dispersible tablet 150 mg (ADD)
- Moxifloxacin: dispersible tablet 100 mg (ADD)
- Clofazimine: capsule to solid oral dosage form 50 mg, 100 mg (AMEND)
- Rifabutin: capsule to solid oral dosage form 150 mg (AMEND)

Core / Complementary: 
- Core – ethambutol, isoniazid, rifabutin
- Complementary – clofazimine, cycloserine, ethionamide, levofloxacin, linezolid, moxifloxacin

Individual / Square box listing: Individual

Background: All of the medicines for which additional formulations are requested for listing are currently included on the Model Lists in various formulations and strengths.

In 2007, the World Health Assembly called for WHO to promote the development of child-friendly medicines with a particular focus on treatment for HIV, tuberculosis, malaria and chronic disease (1).

In 2017, the Expert Committee recommended the addition to the EMLc of two fixed dose combination, child-friendly dispersible tablet formulations of isoniazid + rifampicin +/- pyrazinamide for use in children with drug sensitive tuberculosis infection. The Committee considered the availability of these age-appropriate formulations would offer benefits including appropriate dosing, ease of administration and reduced pill burden (2).
| **Public health relevance:** (burden of disease) | It is estimated that of the 10 million people who developed TB in 2017, 1 million of them were children. Children aged < 15 years accounted for 7.1% of the 6.4 million new or relapsed cases of TB notified to National TB programmes and reported to WHO. Children aged < 15 years accounted for 15% and 10% of total TB deaths among HIV-negative and HIV-positive people, respectively - higher than their share of estimated cases, suggesting poorer access to diagnosis and treatment (3). |
| **Summary of evidence:** benefits (from the application) | Evidence for the clinical effectiveness of the medicines was evaluated at the time of their individual listings.  
**Paediatric-friendly formulations**  
The proposed new formulations are mostly dispersible formulations, meaning they can be mixed in liquid, making it easier to get the correct doses and for children to swallow. They are flavoured to overcome the bitterness associated with breaking, crushing and otherwise manipulating adult formulations.  
The proposed formulations are at lower strengths, aligned with the dosing needs of children according to the WHO treatment guidelines for multidrug- and rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis 2018 update (4). With the exception of linezolid 150 mg dispersible tablet (which is still in development), the proposed formulations are all quality-assured, either through the World Health Organization’s Prequalification for Medicines Programme, or by the Global Fund’s Expert Review Panel Programme.  
**Amended dosage form terminology**  
Until recently there has been a single supplier of clofazimine in a capsule formulation. This creates a risk to the global supply security of this key medicine, especially as it is increasing in importance and will likely have greater use in national programmes. Many organizations have worked to improve the supply security and have new suppliers develop clofazimine; in 2018 a new tablet formulation of clofazimine was quality-assured and is now eligible for procurement by programmes. The current listing on the Model List refers only to clofazimine capsules. The specificity of having the dosage form limited to only capsules could create a barrier to accessing the new tablet formulations. This situation also applies to other products, such as rifabutin capsules, where it is possible that different manufacturing approaches could mean that products may be produced in tablet and/or capsule formulations. Having robust quality assurance approaches, such as the WHO’s Prequalification Programme, ensures that the efficacy of the medicines remains regardless of the formulation. |
| **Summary of evidence:** harms (from the application) | Evidence for the safety of the medicines was evaluated at the time of their individual listings. |
| **Additional evidence:** (not in the application) | N/A |
| **Costs / cost-effectiveness:** | No information was provided in the application. |
| **Availability:** | The proposed new formulations are in the StopTB Partnership’s Global Drug Facility Product Catalogue and are reportedly being procured by programmes. |
| **Other considerations:** | N/A |
| **Committee Recommendations:** | The Expert Committee recommended the addition of the proposed dispersible tablet formulations of ethambutol and isoniazid to the core list of the EMLc, and of cycloserine, ethionamide, levofloxacin, linezolid and moxifloxacin to the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of children with drug-sensitive and drug-resistant tuberculosis.  
The Committee considered that the availability of quality-assured, age-appropriate formulations will help improve access to effective treatment for children with tuberculosis.  
The Committee also recommended the requested amendments to the dosage form terminology for clofazimine and rifabutin. |
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### Antituberculosis medicines – formulations for deletion – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Combination</th>
<th>ATC Code: J04AM03</th>
<th>ATC Code: J04AM05</th>
<th>ATC Code: J04AM02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethambutol + isoniazid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid + rifampicin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**
The application requested the removal from the EML of specific fixed-dose combination formulations/strengths of ethambutol + isoniazid, isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin, and isoniazid + rifampicin based on updated recommendations in WHO guidelines.

**Applicant:** WHO Global TB Programme

**WHO Technical Department:** Global TB Programme

**EML / EMLc:** EML

**Section:** 6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Ethambutol + isoniazid: Tablet 400 mg + 150 mg
- Isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin: Tablet: 150 mg + 500 mg + 150 mg (For intermittent use three times weekly)
- Isoniazid + rifampicin: Tablet 60 mg + 60 mg and 150 mg + 150 mg (For intermittent use three times weekly)

**Core / Complementary:** Core

**Individual / Square box listing:** Individual

**Background:**
Abbreviations used for tuberculosis medicines:
- H = isoniazid, R = rifampicin, Z = pyrazinamide, E = ethambutol

**Public health relevance:**
(burden of disease) N/A

**Summary of evidence: benefits**
(from the application) N/A

**Summary of evidence: harms**
(from the application) N/A

**Additional evidence:**
(not in the application) N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**
The proposed deletions are in alignment with recommendations made in current WHO guidelines for treatment of tuberculosis.

- **Ethambutol + isoniazid (= HE)**
  - The 2010 WHO guidelines for the treatment of tuberculosis (1) recommended that the two-month rifampicin regimen, 2HRZE/6HE, should be phased out, based on evidence that showed it to be associated with more relapses and deaths than the six-month rifampicin regimen, 2HRZE/4HR.
  - Isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin / isoniazid + rifampicin

- **Isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin**
  - The 2017 WHO guidelines for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis and patient care (2) reviewed the effectiveness of intermittent (three times weekly) dosing schedules of TB medicines in both the intensive and continuation phases of treatment. Evidence showed that patients who received three times weekly dosing had a higher risk of treatment failure, disease relapse and acquired drug resistance than patients who received daily dosing.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:** N/A

**Availability:** N/A

**Other considerations:** Alternative strength fixed-dose formulations of isoniazid + pyrazinamide + rifampicin and isoniazid + rifampicin remain available on the EML for use in daily dosing regimens.

**Committee Recommendations:**
The Expert Committee recommended the deletion of the proposed formulations from the core list of the EML, noting the advice of the WHO Global TB Programme department that their use is no longer recommended in current WHO guidelines based on evidence that treatment regimens involving these formulations have been associated with greater rates of treatment failure, relapse, mortality and acquired drug resistance.
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## Antituberculosis medicines - intravenous formulations for addition – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethambutol</td>
<td>J04AK02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoniazid</td>
<td>J04AC01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-aminosalicylic acid</td>
<td>J04AA01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifampicin</td>
<td>J04AB02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:
Four separate applications requested addition of injectable formulations of ethambutol, isoniazid, p-aminosalicylic acid (PAS) and rifampicin to the EML and EMLc for treatment of drug susceptible tuberculosis in combination with other first line medicines.

### Applicant:
INCURE CU

### WHO Technical Department:
Comments on the applications were received from the WHO Global TB Programme. The technical unit advised that it did not support inclusion of the proposed IV formulations of TB medicines emphasizing the following:
- WHO recommends oral treatment regimens, ideally administered in fixed-dose combinations (where such formulations exist) for the treatment of drug-sensitive TB;
- WHO has recently updated treatment guidelines for MDR/RR TB, recommending that injectable agents are no longer among the priority medicines when designing longer MDR-TB regimens;
- In view of these WHO policy recommendations, in the large majority of TB patients, IV administration for first- or second-line medicines is not indicated;
- For the majority of indications listed in the applications for IV formulations, patients can be treated with oral formulations, if necessary using alternative forms of oral administration;
- For adult patients with drug-sensitive TB, a four-drug regimen is recommended; therefore, with only three of the four medicines available as intravenous formulations, patients would still be required to take pyrazinamide orally.

### EML / EMLc
EML and EMLc

### Section:
6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

### Dose form(s) & strengths(s):
- Ethambutol: injection 1000 mg and 2000 mg
- Isoniazid: injection 300 mg, 500 mg and 900 mg
- p-aminosalicylic acid: injection 3 g, 9 g and 12 g
- Rifampicin: injection 450 mg and 600 mg

### Core / Complementary:
Core

### Individual / Square box listing:
Individual

### Background:
Ethambutol, isoniazid, PAS and rifampicin are all currently included on the EML and EMLc in oral dose forms.

### Public health relevance:
Worldwide, tuberculosis is one of the top 10 causes of death, and the leading cause from a single infectious agent. In 2017, TB caused an estimated 1.3 million deaths among HIV-negative people, and there were additional 300 000 deaths from the disease among HIV-positive people. There were an estimated 10.0 million new cases of TB, equivalent to 133 cases per 100 000 population (1).

The IV formulations are proposed in the applications for use in cases of severe forms of disease, such as central nervous system (CNS) TB or TB sepsis, patients with gastrointestinal diseases and reduced oral absorption rates, and other patient groups unwilling or unable to take oral dose forms.

There is evidence that there is a decrease in the functional absorptive area of the intestine in TB patients, resulting in reduced serum concentrations of orally administered anti-tuberculosis drugs. Patients with malabsorption syndromes can require higher doses to achieve minimum therapeutic levels (2, 3). Malabsorption of anti-mycobacterial drugs has been reported HIV-coinfected patients (4, 5).
A retrospective cohort study in Brazil found that among TB patients admitted to intensive care units, over 90% have acute respiratory failure (ARF) and require mechanical ventilation. The in-hospital mortality rate for ICU-admitted patients was around 65% (6). CNS TB has been reported to account for 5-10% of extrapulmonary TB cases and approximately 1% of all TB cases (7). It is associated with high morbidity and mortality (8). No information was provided in the applications regarding the proportion of total TB cases that would require IV treatment.

### Summary of evidence: benefits

from the application

The clinical benefits and place in therapy of these medicines (per se) are well established and have been evaluated previously by the Expert Committee. Limited pharmacokinetic data were presented in the applications indicating higher achievable concentrations with IV versus oral formulations, which is to be expected from IV administration where 100% bioavailability is achieved.

### Summary of evidence: harms

from the application

The adverse events associated with the medicines per se, rather than of the proposed IV formulations, were described in the applications. The safety profiles of these medicines are well established and have been evaluated previously by the Expert Committee. It is reasonable to assume that the known safety profiles would be applicable to the IV formulations.

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

A randomized controlled trial investigating the efficacy and safety of IV chemotherapy during the intensive treatment phase in patients newly diagnosed with pulmonary tuberculosis was identified during the review process (9). 92 patients were randomized to receive oral treatment with isoniazid, rifampicin, pyrazinamide and ethambutol or IV isoniazid, IV rifampicin, IV ethambutol and oral pyrazinamide. Alleviation of chest symptoms (cough, dyspnoea, chest pain) and intoxication symptoms (weakness, loss of appetite, fatigue, night sweats, increased body temperature) was more rapid in the IV therapy group. No serious adverse events associated with IV therapy were observed.

### WHO Guidelines:

WHO guidelines recommend ethambutol, isoniazid, rifampicin and PAS in treatment regimens for drug-susceptible TB and MDR/RR-TB (10, 11). The guidelines recommend the use of oral, preferably fixed-dose combination therapy for tuberculosis treatment. In WHO’s Target Regimen Profiles for TB Treatment, it is recommended that IV formulations be reserved for cases of severe forms of disease such as CNS TB or TB sepsis (12).

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

Due to the limited availability of the proposed IV formulations on world markets, no information on the comparative cost and cost-effectiveness of these products are available. The applications suggest that the IV formulations will be more expensive than the currently available oral formulations.

### Availability:

The proposed formulations have limited market approval and global availability:
- IV ethambutol: Germany, Switzerland, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan
- IV isoniazid: USA, UK, Italy, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan
- IV PAS: Germany, Belarus, Ukraine
- IV rifampicin: USA

### Other considerations:

N/A

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of injectable formulations of ethambutol, isoniazid, p-aminosalicylic acid (PAS) and rifampicin to the EML and EMLc for treatment of drug susceptible tuberculosis in combination with other first line medicines.

The Committee noted that WHO guidelines recommend use of oral, preferably fixed-dose combination therapy for tuberculosis, but acknowledged that parenteral administration of TB medicines may be useful in a small number of critically unwell patients unable to tolerate oral therapy or patients with TB meningitis. The Committee considered that the inclusion of these parenteral TB formulations on the EML could result in inappropriate use of parenteral therapy in patients otherwise able to take oral therapy.

The Committee also noted that the global market availability of these products was limited, and the comparative cost unknown.

### References:
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# Bedaquiline – addition – EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposal:</strong></th>
<th>The application requested the addition of bedaquiline to the complementary list of the EMLc as a reserve second-line medicine for the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis in children aged 6 years and older.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO Global TB Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Global TB Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Tablet 100 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>In 2015, bedaquiline was included on the complementary list of the EML as a reserve second-line medicine for treatment of MDR-TB in adults (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>It is estimated that of the 10 million people who developed TB in 2017, 1 million of them were children. Children aged &lt; 15 years accounted for 7.1% of the 6.4 million new or relapsed cases of TB notified to National TB programmes and reported to WHO. Children aged &lt; 15 years accounted for 15% and 10% of total TB deaths among HIV-negative and HIV-positive people, respectively - higher than their share of estimated cases, suggesting poorer access to diagnosis and treatment. In 2017, it was estimated that about 558,000 new MDR/RR-TB cases emerged and about 230,000 MDR/RR-TB patients died (2). The contribution of bedaquiline to MDR-TB regimens is crucial to compose regimens, particularly in frequent situations in which other effective and safe medicines are not available. In a substantial proportion of MDR/RR-TB patients the susceptibility to fluoroquinolones is lost and other TB medicines cannot be given because of safety concerns. Reports of sporadic cases and outbreaks of MDR-TB and XDR-TB among patients not previously treated for TB treatment attests to the transmissibility of such strains, an additional public health concern, making the provision of effective treatment for all M/XDR-TB patients very important. The likelihood of treatment success in MDR-TB patients diminishes with the acquisition of additional drug resistance. Bedaquiline can increase the prospects of lasting cure in these patients. The WHO Global TB Programme considers that bedaquiline should also be viewed as an essential medicine in children aged 6 years and older following the update by WHO of its treatment recommendations for adults and children with multidrug- or rifampicin-resistant (MDR/RR-TB) in December 2018 (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>As part of the WHO guideline development process, a meta-analysis of individual patient data with 13,104 records from 53 studies in 40 countries was used to evaluate treatment success of bedaquiline. This dataset was largely composed of adult patients, with only 181 of the 13,104 (1.4%) cases being under 15 years of age. Paediatric data for bedaquiline were reviewed to explore the extent to which adult data could be extrapolated to children. The focus of this review was on safety and pharmacologic exposure data available from 2 ongoing paediatric studies of bedaquiline: TMC207-C211 and IMPAACT P1108 (4). Assuming that bedaquiline exposure-response (efficacy) profiles could be extrapolated from adults to children, the Guideline Development Group concluded that the bedaquiline doses evaluated in the trials did not appear to produce bedaquiline exposures that would put children aged 6 to 17 years at greater risk of therapeutic failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong></td>
<td>With regard to harms, the Guideline Development Group concluded that the safety risk of bedaquiline in children aged 6 years and older did not appear to exceed that observed in adults. However, it was noted that children included in the trials were all HIV negative and had limited exposure to other QT-interval prolonging medicines (4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional evidence:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO Guidelines: The 2018 WHO treatment guidelines for multidrug- and rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis (3) make the following recommendation with regard to bedaquiline:

“Bedaquiline should be included in longer MDR-TB regimens for patients aged 18 years or more (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the estimates of effect). Bedaquiline may also be included in longer MDR-TB regimens for patients aged 6-17 years (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the estimates of effect)”

The updated guidelines include a weight-based dosage regimen for children 6-17 years:

15-29kg: 2 x 100 mg tablets once daily for two weeks, then 1 x 100 mg tablet once daily on Monday, Wednesday and Friday for 22 weeks;

>29 kg: 4 x 100 mg tablets once daily for 2 weeks then 1 x 100 mg tablets once daily on Monday, Wednesday and Friday for 22 weeks (equivalent to the adult dose).

Costs / cost-effectiveness: Bedaquiline is available via the Global Drug Facility (GDF), at a price of US$ 400 for a 6-month course of adult treatment (5). There is a marked differential in the price of bedaquiline between high income countries and countries eligible for concessional pricing through the GDF. Prices for a 6-month course of adult treatment have been reported as EUR 26,481 in Italy (6), GB pounds 18,880 in the UK (7) and US$ 26,500 in the Republic of Korea (8).

Availability: Bedaquiline is manufactured by Janssen Pharmaceuticals. It is available to eligible countries through the GDF.

Other considerations: The Committee recalled that bedaquiline is associated with an increased risk of QT interval prolongation, which may be further increased when bedaquiline is administered with other medicines that prolong the QT interval. The Committee also noted the potential for drug-drug interactions between bedaquiline and other commonly co-prescribed medicines. These factors should be taken into consideration when bedaquiline is prescribed.

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended the addition of bedaquiline to the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis in children aged 6 years and older, in line with updated WHO treatment guidelines. The Committee noted that the extrapolation of evidence from adult data to children suggested therapeutic bedaquiline exposure in children and no increased safety risk.
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**Capreomycin and kanamycin – deletion – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capreomycin</th>
<th>ATC Code: J04AB30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanamycin</td>
<td>ATC Code: J01GB04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**
The application requested the removal from the EML and EMLc of capreomycin and kanamycin for use in treatment regimens for multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB).

**Applicant:** WHO Global TB Programme

**WHO Technical Department:** Global TB Programme

**EML / EMLc:** EML and EMLc

**Section:** 6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Capreomycin: Powder for injection 1 g (as sulfate) in vial
- Kanamycin: Powder for injection 1 g (as sulfate) in vial

**Core / Complementary:** Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:** Individual

**Background:** N/A

**Public health relevance:** N/A

**Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application):** N/A

**Summary of evidence: harms (from the application):** N/A

**Additional evidence:** (not in the application) N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**
The proposed deletions are in alignment with recommendations in current WHO guidelines for the treatment of multidrug- and rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis (MDR/RR-TB). WHO guidelines for the treatment of drug-resistant tuberculosis were updated in 2018 (1). One of the key outcomes of the revision was a reclassification of medicines recommended for inclusion in regimens for MDR/RR-TB.

Capreomycin and kanamycin had previously been recommended as Group B, second-line injectable agents along with amikacin and streptomycin (2). The updated 2018 guidelines no longer recommend the use of capreomycin and kanamycin as treatment options. Use of capreomycin and kanamycin was associated with poorer outcomes when compared with regimens not containing these medicines in the latest data analysis.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:** N/A

**Availability:** N/A

**Other considerations:** Amikacin and streptomycin remain available on the Model List for use in treatment regimens for drug-resistant tuberculosis.

**Committee Recommendations:** The Expert Committee recommended the deletion of capreomycin and kanamycin from the complementary list of the EML and EMLc, noting the advice of the WHO Global TB Programme department that their use is no longer recommended in WHO guidelines due to evidence that regimens involving these agents were associated with worse outcomes compared with regimens that did not include them, and that fully oral regimens should be preferred for most patients.

**References:**
### Delamanid – change age restriction – EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested a change to the age restriction that applies to the listing of delamanid on the Model Lists.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>WHO Global TB Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Global TB Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</td>
<td>Tablet 50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>In 2017, delamanid was added to the EMLc as a reserve second-line drug for MDR-TB in children aged 6-17 years. The current Model Lists include an age limit for delamanid of &gt; 6 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance: (burden of disease)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)</td>
<td>As part of the MDR-TB guideline development process, paediatric data for delamanid were reviewed to examine whether the recommendations for delamanid use in children could be lowered to children under 6 years of age. Safety and pharmacologic exposure data were available from ongoing paediatric studies (1). The Guideline Development group concluded that based on the pharmacokinetic data, exposure profiles in children aged 3-5 years were comparable to adults and no higher than in children aged 6 and older. From the available data, there were no safety signals distinct from those reported in adults observed in children aged 3-5 years. The GDG concluded that extrapolations of efficacy and safety should be restricted to children 3 years of age and older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional evidence: (not in the application)</td>
<td>Children aged 3-5 years in the trials were administered delamanid at a dose of 25 mg twice daily, using a scored, dispersible paediatric formulation that is not currently available. The only source of delamanid is the 50 mg adult formulation which poses potential problems when considered for children requiring &lt; 6 years of age. The adult and paediatric formulations of delamanid are not bioequivalent or interchangeable. Equal doses of each formulation achieve different concentrations in the body. Substituting the adult formulation for the paediatric formulation will result in higher delamanid exposures than would be expected from the paediatric formulation. In addition, splitting or crushing of the adult tablet for administration to children will affect the stability of the medicine and result in pill fragments that are exceedingly bitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Guidelines:</td>
<td>The 2018 WHO treatment guidelines for multidrug- and rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis (2) make the following recommendation with regard to delamanid: “Delamanid may be included in the treatment of MDR/RR-TB patients aged 3 years or more on longer regimens (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the estimates of effect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</td>
<td>No information provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability:</td>
<td>Delamanid 50 mg tablets are manufactured by Otsuka Pharmaceutical, Japan. They are available to eligible countries through the Global Drug Facility. The 25 mg paediatric dispersible tablet formulation is not currently commercially available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other considerations:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Recommendations:</td>
<td>The Expert Committee did not recommend the requested change to the age restriction that applies to the listing of delamanid on the Model Lists. The Committee noted that pharmacokinetic data used to inform the guideline development process used a different formulation of delamanid to that which is currently included on the Model Lists, which is not commercially available at this time, nor has it been demonstrated to be bioequivalent to the available, listed formulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Group C antibiotics for MDR-TB — new indication — EML and EMLc

### Proposal:
The application requested listing on the complementary list for the new indication of treatment of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) of:
- amoxicillin + clavulanic acid (EML and EMLc)
- imipenem + cilastatin; (EML only) and
- meropenem (EML and EMLc)

### Applicant:
WHO Global TB Programme

### WHO Technical Department:
Global TB Programme

### EML / EMLc
- EML and EMLc
  (EML only for imipenem + cilastatin)

### Section:
6.2.5 Antituberculosis medicines

### Dose form(s) & strength(s):
- **Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid:**
  - tablet: 500 mg (as trihydrate) + 125 mg (as potassium salt);
  - powder for oral liquid: 125 mg + 31.25 mg per 5 mL; 250 mg + 62.5 mg per 5 mL
- **Imipenem + cilastatin:**
  - powder for injection: 250 mg (as monohydrate) + 250 mg (as sodium salt); 500 mg (as monohydrate) + 500 mg (as sodium salt) in vial
- **Meropenem:**
  - powder for injection 500 mg; 1 g (anhydrous) in vial

### Core / Complementary:
Complementary

### Individual / Square box listing:
Individual

### Background (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration):
These medicines have not previously been considered for use in MDR-TB. Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid and meropenem are currently included in the EML and EMLc for use as first- and second-choice treatment of specified infectious syndromes. Imipenem + cilastatin is noted as an acceptable alternative to meropenem for most clinical situations. Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid is classified as an AWaRe Access group antibiotic, while meropenem (and other carbapenems) are categorized as AWaRe Watch group antibiotics.

### Public health relevance (burden of disease):
It is estimated that 558,000 new MDR/RR-TB cases emerged in the world in 2017 and 230,000 patients died of this form of tuberculosis (1). Between 25,000 and 32,000 children are estimated to develop MDR-TB each year (2). Many of these cases go undetected and are not placed on appropriate treatment, increasing the risk that they die and continue to transmit drug-resistant strains to others in the community. In 2017, countries reported that about 139,000 patients started MDR-TB treatment worldwide. The effectiveness of these efforts varies considerably, and data reported for patient outcomes in recent years show that only about half the MDR/RR-TB patients complete their treatment successfully. Among patients with XDR-TB the likelihood of successful outcomes is even lower. Patients who are not cured - often because their treatment fails or is interrupted - risk persistent disease or death. Given these low levels of treatment success, all efforts must be made to ensure that effective medications to treat drug-resistant TB become more widely available to the patients who need them, particularly in low resource settings which carry the largest burden of MDR/RR-TB (1).

The most recent data analysis conducted for the 2018 WHO MDR-TB treatment guidelines revision attests to the effectiveness of the carbapenems – imipenem + cilastatin and meropenem - in patients in whom other agents cannot be used to compose an adequate regimen, such as those with strains resistant to fluoroquinolones or who develop drug intolerance (3).
Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

A typical MDR-TB longer regimen starts with a combination of at least four TB medicine drugs considered to be effective, primarily from Groups A and B (Table 1). The three proposed medications have a particular role in the composition of longer treatment regimens for patients with MDR/RR-TB, particularly those who have additional resistance or intolerance to one or more of the agents in Groups A and B. In such a case the regimen is strengthened by Group C agents. Both carbapenems in this application belong to Group C and must be administered with clavulanic acid, which is only available in formulations combined with amoxicillin. Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid is not considered an additional effective TB agent, and should not be used without imipenem + cilastatin or meropenem.

Table 1: Grouping of medicines recommended for use in longer MDR-TB regimens (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Levofloxacin or moxifloxacin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bedaquiline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linezolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Clofazimine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycloserine or terizidone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>Ethambutol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delamanid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrazinamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imipenem+cilastatin or meropenem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amikacin (or streptomycin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethionamide or prothionamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-aminosalicylic acid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Every dose of imipenem + cilastatin and meropenem is administered with clavulanic acid, which is only available in formulations combined with amoxicillin. Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid is not counted as an additional effective TB agent and should not be used without imipenem + cilastatin or meropenem.

*Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (MTB) is resistant to most β-lactam antibiotics because it contains the gene blaC, which encodes an extended spectrum β lactamase (4). BlaC β lactamase is only transiently inhibited by most β lactamase inhibitors (i.e. sulbactam and tazobactam) except for clavulanic acid, which irreversibly inhibits it (4, 5). The use of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid against MTB has had mixed results. Of note, clavulanic acid is not available commercially without amoxicillin. An early bactericidal activity (EBA) study from South Africa showed no benefit of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid over the control (6). A study from Pakistan examining the MIC of drug resistant clinical isolates of MTB found that 98% of the isolates were resistant to amoxicillin + clavulanic acid (7). Another EBA study showed that over 7 days, amoxicillin + clavulanic acid reduced the sputum colony-forming units (CFU) by an average of 0.1 log10 cfu/ml per day (in comparison, isoniazid reduced CFU by 0.27 log10 cfu/ml per day) (8).

However, the mild efficacy of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid may not be shared by all the β lactam antibiotics. Meropenem is hydrolyzed 5 times slower than amoxicillin + clavulanic acid by blaC (4, 5) and there have been several studies evaluating its activity (combined with clavulanic acid) against MTB (9). In vitro studies have shown that the combination of clavulanic acid improves the MIC of meropenem from 8 to 1 μg/ml (10), that this combination sterilizes aerobic and anaerobic MTB cultures and was active against drug susceptible and XDR-TB strains (5). Results have been mixed with respect to the effect of meropenem + clavulanic acid on mouse mortality and on MTB CFUs in the lung and spleen (10-13). The combination of imipenem + cilastatin with clavulanic acid also has activity against MTB, although in some studies meropenem + clavulanic acid seems to be superior (5).

Human data are sparse (case-control studies, case reports) (11, 14), but meropenem with clavulanic acid as part of regimens (usually also containing linezolid) for patients with MDR-TB and XDR-TB has shown improved culture conversion and survival (15-17).

The updated WHO guidelines reported the relative and absolute effects for treatment failure or relapse and death (versus treatment success) for medicines used in longer regimens from the main IPD-MA dataset of 13,104 records from 53 studies in 40 countries (3, 18).

For imipenem + cilastatin or meropenem, the adjusted odds ratio for treatment failure/relapse versus treatment success was 0.4 (95% CI 0.2 = 0.7) (n=206). In absolute terms, 11 fewer (95% CI 19 to 3 fewer) treatment failures/relapses per 100 patients treated (very low certainty
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**Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)**

Evidence for the safety of these medicines has been considered previously. The common and uncommon adverse effects associated with these medicines are well known.

**Additional evidence: (not in the application)**

N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**

The 2018 update of the WHO treatment guidelines for multidrug- and rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis (3) include the following recommendations regarding longer treatment regimens for MDR/RR-TB:

- In MDR/RR-TB patients on longer regimens, all three Group A agents and at least one Group B agent should be included to ensure that treatment starts with at least four TB agents likely to be effective and that at least three agents are included for the rest of treatment after bedaquiline is stopped. If only one or two Group A agents are used, both Group B agents are to be included. If the regimen cannot be composed with agents from Groups A and B alone, Group C agents are added to complete it (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the estimates of effect).
- Imipenem + cilastatin or meropenem may be included in the treatment of MDR/RR-TB patients on longer regimens (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the estimates of effect).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

Reported costs from the Global Drug Facility product catalogue (19) are:

- Imipenem + cilastatin 500 mg + 500 mg powder for injection: US$ 31.36/10 vials
- Meropenem 1 g powder for injection: US$ 3.70/vial
- Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid 500 mg + 125 mg tablets: US$ 10.21-13.28/100 tablets
- Amoxicillin + clavulanic acid 125 mg/31.25 mg oral suspension: US$ 1.21/bottle

**Availability:**

The proposed medicines are widely available globally and already included for other indication on the EML and EMLc.

**Other considerations:**

N/A

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of meropenem and of amoxicillin + clavulanic acid on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of use in the treatment of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB). The Committee recommended that imipenem could be considered as an alternative to meropenem for use in adults, and that the EML should note this accordingly.

The Committee noted the limited clinical evidence base, and the very low certainty in the estimates of effect associated with the carbapenems in MDR-TB treatment regimens. However, the Committee accepted the public health need for effective treatments for MDR-TB and considered that the updated WHO guideline recommendations would be supported by the inclusion of these medicines on the EML.

The Committee expressed some concern in relation to increased use of carbapenem antibiotics in the empiric treatment of MDR-TB and the development of carbapenem resistance, and recommended that ongoing monitoring for the development of resistance be undertaken.

**References:**


**Isoniazid – new formulation (oral liquid) - EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Isoniazid</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> J04AC01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested addition of a new strength formulation of isoniazid oral liquid to the core list of the EMLc for treatment and preventive therapy of tuberculosis in infants and children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>INCURE CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Global TB Programme. The technical unit highlighted the current WHO recommendations and available alternative treatment options for latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI) and advised that the addition to the EMLc of the proposed new strength oral liquid formulation of isoniazid may not add value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc:</td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>6.2.4 Antituberculosis medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</td>
<td>Oral liquid 100 mg/5 mL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background:</td>
<td>Isoniazid oral liquid 50 mg/5mL has been included on the EMLc since 2007. Solid oral dose forms of isoniazid have been include on the EML since 1977. The recommended dose for isoniazid in children for treatment of tuberculosis or IPT is 10 mg/kg per day (range 7-15 mg/kg); maximum dose 300 mg/day. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance:</td>
<td>About 1.7 billion people globally are estimated to have a latent TB infection, and are thus at risk of developing active TB disease during their lifetime (2). Isoniazid preventive therapy (IPT) for latent TB infection is indicated for an asymptomatic contact or a contact in whom TB disease has been excluded if the contact is less than 5 years of age or who is living with HIV (regardless of age). Preventive therapy for young children with latent TB infection who have not yet developed TB disease will greatly reduce the likelihood of TB disease developing during childhood (3). Six months’ daily monotherapy with isoniazid is the standard treatment for both adults and children living in countries with either high or low TB incidence (4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits</td>
<td>Several systematic reviews have demonstrated the preventive efficacy of isoniazid monotherapy. A systematic review of RCTs involving people living with HIV showed that isoniazid monotherapy reduces the overall risk for TB by 33% (RR 0.67; 95% CI 0.51;0.87), and the preventive efficacy reached 64% for people with a positive TST (RR 0.36; 95% CI 0.22;0.61). Furthermore, the efficacy of the 6-month regimen was not significantly different from that of 12 months’ daily isoniazid monotherapy (RR 0.58; 95% CI 0.3;1.12) (5). A recent systematic review of RCTs also showed a significantly greater reduction in TB incidence among participants given the 6-month regimen than in those given a placebo (odds ratio, 0.65; 95% CI 0.50;0.83) (6). This application requested only the addition of a new strength formulation of isoniazid oral liquid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: harms</td>
<td>The safety profile of isoniazid is well known. Evidence for the safety of isoniazid was evaluated at the time of original listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional evidence:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Guidelines:</td>
<td>The 2018 WHO guidelines for programmatic management of latent tuberculosis (4) make the following recommendations regarding TB preventive therapy in children: – Infants aged &lt; 12 months living with HIV who are in contact with a case of TB and are investigated for TB should receive 6 months of isoniazid preventive treatment (IPT) if the investigation shows no TB disease. (Strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence. Updated recommendation) – Children aged ≥ 12 months living with HIV who are considered unlikely to have TB disease on the basis of screening for symptoms and who have no contact with a case of TB should be...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
offered 6 months of IPT as part of a comprehensive package of HIV prevention and care if they live in a setting with a high prevalence of TB. *(Strong recommendation, low-quality evidence. Existing recommendation)*.

- All children living with HIV who have successfully completed treatment for TB disease may receive isoniazid for an additional 6 months. *(Conditional recommendation, low-quality evidence. Existing recommendation)*

- HIV-negative children aged < 5 years who are household contacts of people with bacteriologically confirmed pulmonary TB and who are found not to have active TB on an appropriate clinical evaluation or according to national guidelines should be given TB preventive treatment. *(Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence. Updated recommendation)*

- In countries with a low TB incidence, adults, adolescents and children who are household contacts of people with bacteriologically confirmed pulmonary TB should be systematically tested and treated for LTBI. *(Strong recommendation, high–moderate-quality evidence. Existing recommendation)*

- In countries with a high TB incidence, children aged ≥ 5 years, adolescents and adults who are household contacts of people with bacteriologically confirmed pulmonary TB who are found not to have active TB by an appropriate clinical evaluation or according to national guidelines may be given TB preventive treatment. *(Conditional recommendation, low-quality evidence. New recommendation)*.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:** No information was provided in the application regarding the cost of this product.

**Availability:** The application stated that the product is available in Ukraine, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Namibia and Kenya. No information was provided on the regulatory status of this product. It does not appear to have current regulatory approval from a stringent regulatory authority (US FDA, EMA, Health Canada, TGA Australia).

Isoniazid oral liquid (any strength) is not currently included in the Stop TB Partnership / Global Drug Facility medicine catalogue.

**Other considerations:** The application stated that the currently available 50 mg/mL oral liquid formulation is not available in many countries, and is less convenient than the proposed strength formulation, requiring a greater volume to deliver the prescribed dose. The application stated that dispersible tablet formulations have limitations insofar as they cannot always meet weight-based dosing requirements as they cannot be divided. A separate application from the Stop TB Partnership/Global Drug Facility requested listing of isoniazid 100 mg dispersible tablets. Unlike isoniazid oral liquid, quality-assured isoniazid dispersible tablet products are available through the GDF.

**Committee Recommendations:** The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of a new strength formulation of isoniazid oral liquid to the core list of the EMLc for treatment and preventive therapy of tuberculosis in infants and children. The Committee considered that quality-assured dispersible tablet formulations of TB medicines represent a preferred treatment option to oral liquid formulations. The Committee considered that an additional strength oral liquid formulation of isoniazid would be unlikely to add value to patients or TB treatment programmes.

In addition, with the separate recommendation made at this meeting to add isoniazid 100 mg dispersible tablets to the EMLc, the Committee recommended that the existing isoniazid oral liquid formulation (50 mg/mL) could be considered for removal from the EMLc in 2021.

**References:**


### 6.4 Antiviral medicines

#### 6.4.2 Antiretrovirals

**Antiretrovirals - formulation for deletion – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARV formulations for deletion</th>
<th>ATC Code: various</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the deletion of various antiretroviral formulations from the core list of the EML and EMLc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.4.2 Antiretrovirals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Dose form(s) & strengths(s):** | Zidovudine: tablet (dispersible, scored) 60 mg  
Abacavir + lamivudine: tablet (dispersible, scored) 60 mg (as sulfate) + 30 mg  
Ritonavir: oral liquid 400 mg / 5 mL  
Raltegravir: tablet (chewable) 100 mg |
| **Core / Complementary:** | Core |
| **Individual / Square box listing:** | Individual |
| **Background:** (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration) | Separate applications to the 2019 Expert Committee requested the inclusion of new formulations of ritonavir (oral powder 100 mg) and raltegravir (oral granules 100 mg). |
| **Public health relevance:** (burden of disease) | N/A |
| **Summary of evidence: benefits** (from the application) | Recommendations were made by the WHO Department of HIV/AIDS to delete the antiretroviral formulations from the EML and EMLc in order to achieve alignment between the 2018 WHO Interim Guidelines for antiretroviral regimens (1), and the updated Optimal Pediatric ARV Formulary and Limited-Use List (2).  
Zidovudine (AZT) 60 mg dispersible scored tablet was removed from the Optimal Formulary and Limited-use List. Zidovudine 60 mg is available in dual fixed-dose combination formulations with lamivudine that can be combined with as abacavir 60 mg dispersible scored tablet to deliver a triple nucleoside regimen during TB treatment.  
Abacavir + lamivudine (ABC/3TC) 60 mg + 30 mg dispersible scored tablet was removed from the Optimal Formulary. It has been replaced with ABC/3TC 120 mg + 60 mg dispersible scored tablet to minimize market fragmentation while decreasing pill burden for older children. The double strength formulation was included on the EML and EMLc in 2017.  
Ritonavir oral liquid 400 mg / 5 mL was removed from the Optimal Formulary and Limited-use List. Cold chain requirements, poor palatability and short shelf life has limited use of this product. Alternative formulations of ritonavir are preferred.  
Raltegravir 100 mg scored chewable tablets were replaced by the 25 mg strength on the Optimal Formulary to optimize dosing flexibility to provide raltegravir-based regimens across all weight bands for first- and second-line treatment. |
| **Summary of evidence: harms** (from the application) | N/A |
| **Additional evidence:** (not in the application) | N/A |
| **WHO Guidelines:** | The proposed deletions are in alignment with recommendations in the 2018 WHO guidelines and paediatric ARV formulary. |
| **Costs / cost-effectiveness:** | N/A |
| **Availability:** | N/A |
| **Other considerations:** | – Zidovudine oral solution 50 mg/5mL remains included on the Model Lists for postnatal prophylaxis or neonatal use; |
- Zidovudine in fixed dose combination with nevirapine and/or lamivudine remains included on the Model Lists;
- Abacavir + lamivudine 120 mg + 60 mg scored dispersible tablets remain included on the Model Lists;
- Ritonavir heat-stable tablets 25 mg and 100 mg remain included on the Model Lists; A separate recommendation was made at this meeting to add ritonavir 100 mg oral powder;
- Raltegravir tablets 400 mg and chewable tablets 25 mg remain included on the Model Lists; A separate recommendation was made at this meeting to add raltegravir 100 mg oral granules.

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Committee recommended deletion of zidovudine 60 mg dispersible scored tablet and of abacavir + lamivudine 60 mg + 30 mg dispersible scored tablet from the EML and EMLc, noting they are no longer included in the current WHO Guidelines for paediatric HIV treatment, and that suitable alternatives are already included on the Model Lists and available for use.

The Committee recommended that ritonavir oral liquid and raltegravir 100 mg chewable tablets be retained on the Model Lists at this time. The Committee considered that until the availability is well established of the alternative formulations of these medicines recommended in separate applications to this meeting, (ritonavir 100 mg oral powder and raltegravir 100 mg oral granules), deletion of the existing formulations could be premature. The existing formulations could be flagged for deletion without further discussion in 2021 unless an application is received in support of their retention.

**References:**

### 6.4.2.3 Protease inhibitors

**Ritonavir – new formulation – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ritonavir</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> J05AE03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of a new formulation of ritonavir (RTV) to the core list of the EML and EMc for the treatment of HIV infection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.4.2.3 Protease inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Oral powder 100 mg in sachet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Single-agent ritonavir has been included on the EMLc since 2007. Currently listed formulations are oral liquid 400 mg/5mL and heat-stable tablets 25 mg and 100 mg. In a separate application to the 2019 Expert Committee, ritonavir oral liquid was proposed for deletion from the EML and EMLc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Despite an impressive reduction in mother to child transmission of HIV in recent years, 180,000 new pediatric infections occurred in 2017. There are now 1.8 million children living with HIV, the vast majority in sub-Saharan Africa. Evidence shows that in the absence of ART, over 50% of HIV-infected infants progress to AIDS and death by the age of 2 years, but the introduction of pediatric ART has changed HIV infection in children from a life-threatening illness to a chronic but manageable infection. Despite recognition of the advantages of early treatment, pediatric treatment coverage still only reaches 52% of children eligible for treatment (1) and in 2017 an estimated 110,000 HIV/AIDS related deaths occurred in children &lt;15 years of age (3). Children are at particular risk of acquiring tuberculosis, although good epidemiologic data has been difficult to collect. A 2016 systematic review and meta-analysis of opportunistic and other infections among HIV-infected children in LMIC confirmed a high incidence rate (12.3% in ART naïve and 8.8% in ART exposed) of tuberculosis co-infection in this population (4). Among children with TB, the WHO estimates that HIV prevalence, in countries with moderate to high prevalence, ranges from 10 to 60% with the variation in rates depending on the background rates of HIV infection (5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>RTV is used only for pharmacologic boosting of other protease inhibitors (PI). The amount of RTV used depends on the PI used as the active ARV but most PIs currently recommended as second- or third-line antiretroviral therapy (ART) require 100mg of RTV combined with the adult dose of the PI. Pediatric patients may use differing amounts of RTV in boosted PI regimens based on their weight. Evidence supporting the use of RTV as a pharmacologic booster for second- and third-line protease inhibitors has previously been accepted by the EML which notes, “Ritonavir is recommended for use in combination as a pharmacological booster, and not as an antiretroviral in its own right.” Since 2010, WHO has recommended the approach of “super-boosting” LPV/r with additional ritonavir (RTV) (1:1 instead of 4:1 LPV/r ratio, i.e. equal doses of LPV and RTV) to manage rifampicin-based TB co-treatment in children on an LPV/r-based regimen (6). Although HIV therapy is life-long, the use of the RTV super-boosted LPV/r regimen is only used for the duration of TB treatment with rifampicin. A retrospective review of ART regimens and outcomes in HIV/TB coinfected children younger than 2 years in South Africa suggested that super-boosted LPV/r led to better outcomes and less toxicity than earlier PI regimens (7). The adequacy of the super-boosted regimen was confirmed in a PK study conducted in South Africa which demonstrated that LPV trough concentrations in children receiving super-boosted LPV/r and rifampicin were noninferior to LPV concentrations in children off TB therapy (8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)**

Evidence for the safety of ritonavir has been considered previously. The adverse event profile of ritonavir observed during paediatric clinical trials has been reported as similar to that for adults patients. Vomiting, diarrhoea, and skin rash/allergy were the only drug-related clinical adverse events of moderate to severe intensity observed in greater than or equal to 2% of paediatric patients enrolled in clinical trials. Grade 3-4 laboratory abnormalities occurring in greater than 3% of paediatric patients who received treatment with ritonavir either alone or in combination with reverse transcriptase inhibitors were neutropenia (9%), hyperamylasemia (7%), thrombocytopenia (5%), anemia (4%), and elevated AST (3%) (9).

The South African retrospective study evaluating PI-based ART in children younger than 2 years also receiving TB treatment concluded there were only few treatment interruptions due to toxicity. This suggests that the use of boosted LPV/r and TB treatment in this group was generally well tolerated. The authors also noted there were no significant differences in the proportions of children with grade 3/4 ALT elevations in the TB co-treatment groups while receiving TB treatment compared to children on LPV/r alone (7).

**Additional evidence: (not in the application)**

N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**

WHO guidelines for pediatric HIV treatment recommend the approach of “super-boosting” LPV/r with additional RTV (1:1 instead of 4:1 LPV/r ratio, i.e. equal doses of LPV and RTV) to manage rifampicin-based TB co-treatment in children on an LPV/r-based regimen (6).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

No cost or cost-effectiveness information is currently publicly available for ritonavir oral powder. The manufacturer has made a general commitment to employ market-specific pricing strategies as part of their commitment to access to medicines (11).

**Availability:**

Ritonavir oral powder is available internationally from Abbvie Inc. Generic brands are not currently available.

**Other considerations:**

N/A

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of the new formulation of ritonavir oral powder 100 mg to the core list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of HIV infection, in line with recommendations in current WHO guidelines, noting the importance of the availability of quality, age-appropriate paediatric dosage forms of antiretroviral medicines.

---

**References:**


### Lopinavir + ritonavir – new formulation – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposal:</strong></th>
<th>The application requested addition of a new formulation of lopinavir + ritonavir (LPV/r) fixed-dose combination to the core list of the EMLc for the treatment of children with HIV infection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.4.2.3 Protease inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</strong></td>
<td>Oral granules: 40 mg + 10 mg in sachet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Fixed-dose combinations of LPV/r have been included on the EMLc since 2007. Currently listed formulations are oral liquid 400 mg +100 mg/5 mL, heat-stable tablets 100 mg + 25 mg and capsules containing oral pellets 40 mg + 10 mg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Despite an impressive reduction in mother to child transmission of HIV in recent years, 180,000 new pediatric infections occurred in 2017. There are now 1.8 million children living with HIV, the vast majority in sub-Saharan Africa. Evidence shows that in the absence of ART, over 50% of HIV-infected infants progress to AIDS and death by the age of 2 years, but the introduction of pediatric ART has changed HIV infection in children from a life-threatening illness to a chronic but manageable infection. Despite recognition of the advantages of early treatment, pediatric treatment coverage still only reaches 52% of children eligible for treatment and in 2017 an estimated 110,000 HIV/AIDS related deaths occurred in children &lt;15 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits:</strong></td>
<td>The effectiveness of LPV/r in HIV-infected adult and pediatric patients has been demonstrated in a variety of clinical settings and populations and has been previously reviewed. The data supporting use of the oral pellets (also LPV/r 40mg/10mg) was considered by the Expert Committee in 2017. LPV/r oral granules are expected to be used in the same settings and for the same patient population as the LPV/r pellets. Since the previous EML application for LPV/r pellets was submitted, additional data on this dosage form have been reported. The LIVING Study conducted in Kenya and Uganda evaluated use and acceptability of LPV/r pellets in 723 infants and young children from 3kg to &lt;25kg. As of the July 2018 report, 303 patients had reached week 48 of treatment; 266 had HIV RNA data available for the week 48 visit. At 48 weeks, 49-60% of patients across 4 age groups had HIV RNA &lt; 50 copies/mL. These data suggest that the oral granules will also be an acceptable formulation in young infants. LPV/r oral pellets and oral granules are currently listed as optimal formulations and are listed collectively as a “solid oral dosage form 40mg/10mg” on the Optimal Pediatric ARV Formulary and Limited-Use List (5). These two formulations are listed to be used with 2 NRTIs for alternative first-line or second-line treatment for infants and children below 10 kg or unable to swallow 100mg/25mg tablets whole. The Optimal Pediatric ARV Formulary and Limited-use List was first developed in 2011 to address this challenge and now provides guidance to streamline the selection of pediatric ARV dosage forms to those that conform to a list of criteria, including dosing flexibility, user-friendliness, optimization of supply chain management, and availability of quality assured products in resource limited settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms:</strong></td>
<td>Evidence for the safety of LPV/r in paediatric patients has been previously evaluated. The LPV/r oral granules formulation is expected to have the same safety and tolerability as other LPV/r formulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional evidence:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **WHO Guidelines:** | Based on evidence from randomized controlled trials showing the superiority of LPV/r-based regimens over NVP-based regimens for treating young children, the WHO 2013 guidelines first
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| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | The application reported a price per patient per year (PPPY) for LPV/r oral granules of US$ 281 based on WHO dosing guidelines for the 3 to 9.9kg weight band. This is similar to the PPPY for LPV/r oral pellets, but more expensive than LPV/r oral liquid. It has previously been proposed that cost-savings associated with freight and storage are associated with LPV/r oral pellets compared to oral liquid. |
| Availability: | The FDA granted tentative approval to Mylan's LPV/r 40 mg/10 mg oral granules in August 2018. |
| Other considerations: | N/A |
| Committee Recommendations: | The Expert Committee recommended the addition of a new formulation of lopinavir + ritonavir (LPV/r) oral granules 40 mg + 10 mg fixed-dose combination to the core list of the EMLc for the treatment of children with HIV infection, in line with recommendations in current WHO guidelines, noting the importance of the availability of quality, age-appropriate paediatric dosage forms of antiretroviral medicines. The Committee recommended the new LPV/r oral granules and the existing LPV/r capsules containing oral pellets should be listed collectively as “solid oral dosage form”, for consistency with the the 2018 Optimal Pediatric ARV Formulary and Limited-Use List. |

**References:**

8. Updated recommendations on first-line and second-line antiretroviral regimens and post-exposure prophylaxis and recommendations on early infant diagnosis of HIV: interim guidelines, supplement to the 2016 consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection. World Health Organization,
### 6.4.2.4 Integrase inhibitors

**Dolutegravir – addition – EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dolutegravir</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> J05AX12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of dolutegravir to the core list of the EMLc for treatment of HIV infection in paediatric patients weighing 25kg or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>HIV Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.4.2.4 Integrase inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</strong></td>
<td>Tablet 50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Dolutegravir was added to the core list of the EML in 2017 for treatment of adult patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>There are now 1.8 million children living with HIV, the vast majority in sub-Saharan Africa. Evidence shows that in the absence of ART, over 50% of HIV-infected infants progress to AIDS or death by the age of 2 years (1), but the introduction of pediatric ART has changed HIV infection in children from a life-threatening illness to a chronic-but-manageable infection. Despite recognition of the advantages of early treatment, pediatric treatment coverage still only reaches 52% of children eligible for treatment (estimated 940,000) and in 2017 an estimated 110,000 HIV/AIDS related deaths occurred in children &lt;15 years of age (2). Although there is limited clinical experience globally with use of DTG in children, it is recommended in this population based on extrapolation of efficacy from the larger, more diverse adult studies (3). Regulatory and normative bodies including the WHO (and its pediatric working groups) and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have accepted the concept of extrapolation of efficacy of ARVs in pediatric patients based on bridging pharmacokinetic (PK) data and supporting safety information. Thus, the most recent WHO treatment guidelines for pediatric use of dolutegravir are based primarily on aligning PK data collected in children receiving dolutegravir in clinical trials to adult PK targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Summary of evidence: benefits** | Dolutegravir has been shown to be effective in diverse adult patient populations enrolled in multiple clinical trials conducted internationally. The results of these adult clinical trials were reviewed in the dossier submitted to support inclusion of dolutegravir 50mg as first-line ART in the EML in 2017 and are not reproduced here. The pediatric data published to date is comprised of two ongoing clinical trials and several observational cohort reports. The trials on which WHO treatment and dosing recommendations are based include the IMPAACT P1093 study, sponsored by the U.S. National Institutes of Health, and the ODYSSEY study, sponsored by the Paediatric European Network for Treatment of AIDS-ID. PK and safety data from these trials have been reported and reviewed as new weight band cohorts have been completed. Both trials are evaluating pediatric patients as young as 4 weeks of age using a dispersible tablet, but data for the younger/smaller patients are not available at this time. IMPAACT P1093 is an ongoing single-arm, open-label trial of dolutegravir in children with HIV. FDA approval of dolutegravir for use in children weighing as low as 40 kg was based on data from 23 treatment-experienced, INSTI-naive adolescents (4). Intensive PK evaluations were performed on the first 10 participants, nine of whom weighed ≥40 kg and received |
dolutegravir 50 mg and one of whom weighed 37 kg and received dolutegravir 35 mg. These doses resulted in exposures comparable to those seen in adults receiving 50 mg once daily. At 48 weeks, 61% of participants had achieved HIV RNA concentration <50 copies/mL. By week 144, 39% and 30% of participants had achieved HIV RNA concentrations <400 copies/mL and <50 copies/mL, respectively. All who experienced virologic failure were reported to be nonadherent. A younger cohort of children aged ≥6 to <12 years were also enrolled in IMPAACT P1093, with those weighing ≥30 kg to <40 kg receiving the 35 mg dose and those weighing ≥40 kg receiving the 50 mg dose. At 48 weeks, data from 23 participants demonstrated a favorable safety profile, adequate PK, and virologic efficacy, with HIV RNA concentrations of <50 copies/mL achieved in 74% of participants. These data led to FDA approval of the lower-strength film-coated tablets (10mg plus 25mg) for children with HIV weighing at least 30 kg.

Using similar data, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) approved the lower-strength film-coated tablets for children aged ≥6 years and weighing ≥15 kg based on population PK modelling and simulation analyses (5). The EMA approved doses of 20 mg for children weighing 15 kg to <20 kg and 25 mg doses for those weighing 20 kg to <30 kg. Because the available PK data in these weight bands were very limited and the observed $C_{\text{trough}}$ concentrations were lower than expected, the FDA did not approve dosing for children weighing <30 kg.

The ODYSSEY trial is enrolling both treatment naïve and treatment experienced pediatric patients in the EU, Thailand, and several African countries, and initially evaluated the EMA-approved doses for children weight >15kg. A total of 674 children < 18 years of age were enrolled; 282 starting dolutegravir as first line therapy and 392 starting second line therapy (6). Nested pharmacokinetic sub-studies within ODYSSEY are evaluating simplified pediatric dosing aligned with WHO-recommended weight bands. PK data have been reported from a cohort of children >25 kg switching to the 50mg adult tablet (n=27). These children receiving the 50mg film-coated tablet achieved exposures similar to those of adults. When given to children 14 to <25 kg, the DTG 25mg film-coated tablet resulted in lower exposure than the adult target exposure, particularly $C_{\text{trough}}$. The lower $C_{\text{trough}}$ was more marked in the 20 to <25 kg group. Higher doses are currently under study in these weight bands and doses have been adjusted for lower weight bands (7, 8).

After careful review and discussion, the WHO-convened Paediatric Antiretroviral Working Group endorsed the simplified dosing using the dolutegravir 50mg tablet in children weighing >25kg.

In the adult clinical studies to date, dolutegravir-based regimens were either non-inferior or superior in efficacy to comparator regimens containing other integrase inhibitors, boosted protease inhibitors, and NNRTIs regardless of patient population. In patients initiating first line treatment, successful virologic suppression occurred in more patients receiving DTG than the comparators. There are no comparative pediatric trials available but both the WHO working groups and multiple regulatory agencies (including the U.S. FDA and the EMA) endorse the concept of extrapolating efficacy from well-designed, adequately-powered adult trials on the basis of similar pharmacokinetic profile and supplemental safety data.

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

A French, retrospective, multicenter cohort study evaluated 50 adolescents who initiated dolutegravir-based ART. In this cohort, only one patient discontinued dolutegravir-based treatment because of a significant adverse (dizziness and sleep disturbance) (9). Another cohort of adolescents reported from Barcelona received the fixed dose combination product Triumeq (abacavir 600mg/dolutegravir 50mg/lamivudine 300mg). No serious safety concerns were reported, however, patients complained about the size of the tablet and six reported having to crush or split the tablet in order to swallow it, potentially contributing to adherence issues (10).

In the original clinical trials, patients on dolutegravir experienced significantly fewer incidences of nervous system disorders and psychiatric disorders than those receiving efavirenz, however, there have been post-marketing reports of neuropsychiatric events (such as insomnia or depression) among adults receiving dolutegravir-based treatment since
its approval. Causality for these events has been difficult to determine as many patients are reported to have a previous history of psychiatric symptoms.

In a surveillance study of birth outcomes among pregnant women on antiretroviral therapy in Botswana, an increased rate of neural tube defects was observed among infants born to women who were receiving dolutegravir at the time of conception (11). As children and young adolescents mature, and before they become sexually active, pediatric and adolescent providers should discuss this potential risk with patients who are receiving or initiating dolutegravir and their caregivers. The WHO 2018 interim guidelines (3) note the following in their guidance on this topic:

- dolutegravir appears to be safe when started later in pregnancy: after the period of risk of neural tube defects and after the first trimester.
- Adolescent girls and women of childbearing potential who do not currently want to become pregnant can receive dolutegravir together with consistent and reliable contraception; hormonal contraception and dolutegravir have no reported or expected drug–drug interactions although data are limited.

### Additional evidence:
(not in the application)  N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

- The WHO-recommended dose of dolutegravir in integrase inhibitor treatment naive adults and pediatric patients weighing greater than 25kg is one tablet (50mg) once daily (3). Dolutegravir should be given together with two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) appropriate for pediatric patients (abacavir plus lamivudine or zidovudine plus lamivudine). In addition, the WHO 2018 interim guidelines also recommend that dolutegravir in combination with an optimized NRTI backbone is the preferred second-line regimen for children with approved dolutegravir dosing for whom non-DTG-based regimens are failing.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

- The indicative average price per patient per year (PPPY) for dolutegravir 50 mg tablets is approximately US$ 50 for children weighing between 25 and 35 kg. This price is lower than PPPY for other ARVs suitable for children.

In November 2015, CHAI, UNAIDS, and Unitaid announced a pricing agreement for dolutegravir 50 mg single tablets that had been brokered with Aurobindo Pharma (12). Under the agreement, Aurobindo agreed to make generic dolutegravir 50 mg tablets available at a price of US$44.00 PPPY (or US$3.67 per pack).

### Availability:

- Dolutegravir 50 mg tablets are manufactured by multiple pharmaceutical companies, including generic and WHO prequalified manufacturers.

### Other considerations:

- N/A

### Committee Recommendations:

- The Expert Committee recommended the addition of dolutegravir 50 mg tablets to the core list of the EMLc for treatment of HIV infection in paediatric patients weighing 25kg or more, in combination with an optimized NRTI backbone regimen, in line with recommendations in current WHO Guidelines.

The Committee acknowledged the important need to expand HIV treatment options for children. The Committee noted the available evidence for use of dolutegravir in children was largely limited to pharmacokinetic and safety data from two ongoing pediatric trials, but considered that extrapolation of efficacy from adult trials was acceptable.

### References:


### Raltegravir – new formulation – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raltegravir</th>
<th>ATC Code: J05AX08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application requested the addition of a new formulation of raltegravir to the core list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of HIV infection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO HIV Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.2.4 Integrase inhibitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granules for oral suspension 100 mg in sachet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raltegravir was added to the Model Lists in 2017 for use in pregnant women and as a second-line treatment option for children in accordance with WHO guidelines. Currently listed formulations include 400 mg tablets and 25 mg and 100 mg chewable tablets. In a separate application to the 2019 Expert Committee, raltegravir 100 mg chewable tablet formulation was proposed for deletion from the EML and EMLc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(burden of disease)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite an impressive reduction in mother to child transmission of HIV in recent years, 180,000 new pediatric infections occurred in 2017. There are now 1.8 million children living with HIV, the vast majority in sub-Saharan Africa (1). Evidence shows that in the absence of ART, over 50% of HIV-infected infants progress to AIDS and death by the age of 2 years (2), but the introduction of pediatric ART has changed HIV infection in children from a life-threatening illness to a chronic but manageable infection. Despite recognition of the advantages of early treatment, pediatric treatment coverage still only reaches 52% of children eligible for treatment (1) and in 2017 an estimated 110,000 HIV/AIDS related deaths occurred in children &lt;15 years of age (3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from the application)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Data supporting general effectiveness of raltegravir in adults has been considered previously. The application only presented evidence relevant to the use of raltegravir granules for oral suspension. Data from IMPAACT P1066, a Phase I/II open label multicenter trial to evaluate the pharmacokinetic profile, safety, tolerability, and efficacy of RAL in HIV infected children (4) have been considered previously, and are not reproduced here. The safety and pharmacokinetics of raltegravir granules for oral suspension were evaluated in 42 full-term HIV-1-exposed neonates at high risk of acquiring HIV-1 infection in a Phase 1, open-label, multicenter clinical study (IMPAACT P1110) (5). Cohort 1 neonates received 2 single doses of RAL powder for oral suspension: the first within 48 hours of birth and the second at 7 to 10 days of age. Cohort 2 neonates received daily dosing of RAL powder for oral suspension for 6 weeks: 1.5 mg/kg once daily starting within 48 hours of birth through Day 7 (week 1); 3 mg/kg twice daily on Days 8 to 28 of age (weeks 2 to 4); and 6 mg/kg twice daily on Days 29 to 42 of age (weeks 5 and 6). Sixteen neonates were enrolled in Cohort 1 and 26 in Cohort 2; all infants received a standard of care antiretroviral drug regimen for prevention of mother to child transmission. All enrolled neonates were followed for safety for a duration of 24 weeks. HIV-1 status was assessed by nucleic acid test at birth, week 6 and week 24 and all remained HIV-1 negative. IMPAACT P1066 also enrolled HIV-infected infants and toddlers 4 weeks to less than 2 years of age who had received prior antiretroviral therapy either as prophylaxis for prevention of mother-to-child transmission and/or as combination antiretroviral therapy for treatment of HIV infection. Raltegravir granules for oral suspension was administered without regard to food in combination with an optimized background regimen. None of the enrolled subjects were completely treatment naïve (all had prenatal/in utero ARV exposure or post-natal prophylaxis or treatment). Of the 26 treated subjects, 24 subjects were included in the Week 48 efficacy analyses. All 26 treated subjects were included for safety analyses. At Week 48, 45% achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL and 67% achieved HIV RNA <400 copies/mL. The mean CD4 count (percent) increase from baseline to Week 48 was 527 cells/mm3 (7.3%). (6). A recent follow-up publication reports the outcomes of those patients receiving RAL at the final
selected doses through 240 weeks of treatment. In this analysis, 13 of 15 infants receiving RAL oral granules for 240 weeks achieved virologic success (>1 log decrease in HIV RNA from baseline or HIV RNA <400 copies/mL) (7). RAL granules for oral suspension is currently listed as a limited use formulation on the Optimal Pediatric ARV Formulary and Limited-Use List for neonatal treatment only.

**Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)**

Evidence of the safety and tolerability of raltegravir has been previously considered. The overall safety of raltegravir in paediatric patients, including neonates, was similar to that observed in adults. Overall, the safety profile in pediatric patients, including neonates, is similar to that observed in adults. Raltegravir is metabolized primarily by UGT1A1 (the same metabolic pathway as bilirubin) and UGT1A1 activity is greatly reduced in neonates. Concerns regarding potential competition with bilirubin for albumin binding sites and resulting jaundice in infants have not been borne out. The dose recommended in neonates takes into consideration the rapidly increasing UGT1A1 activity and drug clearance in this age group (5).

**Additional evidence: (not in the application)**

N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**

WHO’s 2018 updated recommendations on first-line and second-line antiretroviral regimens make the following recommendations in relation to raltegravir-based regimens in children:

- A raltegravir based regimen may be recommended as an alternative first-line regimen for infants and children for whom approved dolutegravir dosing is not available (condition recommendation, low-certainty evidence).
- A raltegravir-based regimen is recommended as the preferred first-line regimen for neonates (conditional recommendations, very-low-certainty evidence)

Raltegravir-based regimens for neonates are recommended for use for no longer than three months, when transition to LPV/r solid formulations is possible (8).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

The reported price per patient per year for raltegravir oral granules is US$ 260. No cost-effectiveness information for this formulation is currently available.

**Availability:**

Raltegravir granules for oral suspension are manufactured by Merck Sharp & Dohme Ltd.

**Other considerations:**

RAL granules for oral suspension is not recommended in pre-term neonates or in pediatric patients weighing less than 2 kg.

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of a new formulation of raltegravir granules for oral suspension 100 mg to the core list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of HIV infection in line with recommendations in current WHO guidelines. The Committee considered that this formulation of raltegravir could facilitate treatment of neonates and paediatric patients, and would be a suitable alternative for adult and paediatric patients for whom dolutegravir is not available or is not tolerated.

---

**References:**

## Dolutegravir + lamivudine + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

### ATC Code: to be assigned

### Proposal:
The application requested the addition of a fixed-dose combination formulation of dolutegravir, lamivudine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TLD) to the core list of the EML for treatment of HIV infection in adults and adolescents.

### Applicant:
WHO HIV Department

### WHO Technical Department:
HIV Department

### EML / EMLc:
EML

### Section:
6.4.2 Antiretrovirals – fixed-dose combinations

### Dose form(s) & strength(s):
Tablet 50 mg + 300 mg + 300 mg (disoproxil fumarate equivalent to 245 mg tenofovir disoproxil)

### Core / Complementary:
Core

### Individual / Square box listing:
Individual

### Background:
This fixed-dose combination (FDC) had been previously considered by the Expert Committee for addition to the EML. The component medicines are all included individually on the EML.

### Public health relevance:
In 2017, UNAIDS reported there were 36.9 million people living with HIV/AIDS globally, 1.8 million new HIV-1 infections, and 940,000 thousand HIV-related deaths (1). Over 95% of infected people live in low and middle income countries (LMIC) with inadequate resources to effectively combat the epidemic. While some countries have achieved declines in new HIV infections among adults of 50% or more, global data show that many others have not made measurable progress and others have experienced worrying increases in new HIV infections. Overall, approximately 21.7 million people were receiving antiretroviral therapy (ART) in 2017, but this is estimated to represent only 59% of HIV infected people. Early and effective ART not only significantly improves the health of those living with HIV, but also reduces transmission of the disease as shown in the recently reported START study (2). For this reason, the WHO released guidelines in 2015 calling for treatment for all people with HIV. Easy to administer, highly effective, safe treatment options remain desperately needed in many areas of the world to meet the UNAIDS 90-90-90 targets, which call for 90 percent of people living with HIV to know their status, 90 percent of those with known infection to be on ART, and 90 percent of those on ART to be virally suppressed (i.e., on successful therapy) by the year 2020 (3).

### Summary of evidence: benefits
The efficacy of dolutegravir (DTG) has been demonstrated in ART-naïve subjects in three randomized, controlled, multinational, phase III studies: SPRING-2 (4), SINGLE (5) and FLAMINGO (6). The findings of these studies were evaluated in the 2017 consideration of dolutegravir by the Expert Committee and are not reproduced here.

The safety, tolerability, and efficacy of a dolutegravir-based regimen was evaluated in a prospectively-enrolled, open-label cohort of 564 Indian adults receiving dolutegravir in combination with other ARVs (primarily tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) and lamivudine (3TC) or emtricitabine (FTC)) as either first- or second-line therapy. Among the treatment naive patients initiating DTG plus TDF/3TC or TDF/FTC, all had viral suppression at the 6 month follow-up, and overall, viral suppression occurred in 82.9% at 6 months (7).

The NAMSAL ANRS study randomized HIV-infected adults in Cameroon to receive either a dolutegravir-based regimen (TLD) (n=310) or an efavirenz-containing regimen (TLE-400) (n=303) for first-line treatment. Preliminary efficacy results at 48 weeks on treatment indicate the proportion of patients with HIV RNA <50 copies/mL was 74.5% in the TLD arm and 69% in the TLE-400 arm. Fewer patients with initial HIV RNA levels >100,000 copies/mL had virologic suppression to <50 copies/mL: 66.2% in the TLD arm and 61.5% in the TLE-400 arm. In this study, viral suppression with TLD was numerically higher but not statistically superior to TLE-400; NNRTI resistance was an important determinant of TLE-400 failure (8).
In the clinical studies to date, dolutegravir-based regimens were either non-inferior or superior in efficacy to comparator regimens containing other integrase inhibitors, boosted protease inhibitors, and NNRTIs regardless of patient population. In patients initiating first line treatment, successful virologic suppression occurred in more patients receiving dolutegravir than the comparators. A systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by the WHO in 2016 concluded that among treatment-naive patients, treatment with an integrase inhibitor (particularly DTG) plus two NRTIs, had superior efficacy and tolerance to the current standard of care regimens of efavirenz plus two NRTIs (9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The overall safety profile of dolutegravir in adults compared favourably to other ARVs included in the clinical trials reported previously. There have been multiple reports of neuropsychiatric events among patients receiving dolutegravir-based treatment since its approval. Although dolutegravir appears to result in fewer of these events compared to efavirenz in comparative clinical trials (5), some patients receiving dolutegravir experience episodes of insomnia or depression. Causality for these events has been difficult to determine as many patients are reported to have a previous history of psychiatric symptoms.

In the South Indian cohort of first-line and second-line patients, dolutegravir-based regimens were well tolerated. Mean ALT and AST decreased slightly in the cohort during the 6-month evaluation period, mean hemoglobin increased slightly, and kidney function remained stable. In this cohort, sleep disturbances and neuropsychiatric symptoms were not reported. The frequency of opportunistic infections decreased from 7.4% prior to starting DTG to 3.3% after 6 months follow up. None of the patients in this cohort discontinued DTG during the evaluation period. Four deaths were reported (2 sepsis and 2 CMV encephalitis, considered unrelated to ARVs) (7).

A nationwide birth outcomes surveillance program conducted in Botswana began collecting data in women initiating dolutegravir in 2014. An initial report of pregnant women who began taking either a dolutegravir- (n=1729) or efavirenz-based (n=4593) treatment regimen identified no difference in risk for adverse birth outcomes, even among those beginning treatment during the first trimester (i.e., post-conception ART) (10). However, an interim analysis of a second surveillance study of women becoming pregnant while already receiving ART (i.e., pre-conception ART) identified an excess number of neural tube defects among infants of women receiving a dolutegravir-based regimen. Neural tube defects were observed in 4 of 426 (0.94%) infants born to women receiving dolutegravir compared to 14 of 11,300 (0.12%) infants born to women receiving any other ART regimen and 61 of 66,057 (0.09%) infants born to HIV-uninfected women. Although none of the affected women were receiving folic acid supplements, no other risk factors for neural tube defects have been identified (11). This study is ongoing and expects to have a final analysis in 2019. While awaiting the final study results and data from other sources, the WHO recommends counseling for women of child bearing potential and access to effective contraception in those receiving dolutegravir. However, they also suggest that an efavirenz-based regimen remains a safe and effective regimen in women who plan to become pregnant (12).

The NRTI backbone of TDF/3TC has an extensive history of use in ART globally and has accumulated a favorable safety and tolerability profile. Initial concerns regarding potentially serious renal and bone toxicity due to the TDF component have not been borne out over years of clinical experience although it requires dose adjustment in patients with significant renal impairment and so is not generally used in this subgroup.

In addition, the potential risks and benefits of wide implementation of TLD were evaluated in a 2018 modeling exercise conducted by a group of independent researchers. The group used existing data to estimate HIV transmission and disease progression (taking into account drug resistance, drug potency, differential viral suppression and clinical outcomes) to compare outcomes of different ART regimens in different scenarios. In their model, the greatest number of disability-adjusted life-years was averted in the scenario providing TLD to all adult patients without restrictions over 20 years compared to adults based on intent to have children and/or dependent on documentation of viral suppression (13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional evidence: (not in the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO Guidelines: The 2016 WHO Consolidated Guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection recommended TDF plus 3TC as a preferred nucleoside/tide backbone in first-line therapy and dolutegravir 50 mg in combination with TDF and 3TC as an alternative first-line regimen (14). In addition, these guidelines reiterate WHO’s conclusion that FDCs and once-daily regimens are most preferred. At that time, TLD was not available as an FDC. In the most recent WHO treatment guidelines update (July 2018), a DTG-based regimen is recommended as a preferred first-line regimen for adults and adolescents living with HIV who are initiating antiretroviral therapy (12).

Costs / cost-effectiveness: Various sources indicate an average price per patient per year (PPPY) for the FDC of US$74.00. This price is comparable to other first-line regimens. A pricing agreement was announced in July 2017 by the governments of South Africa and Kenya, together with UNAIDS, CHAI, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Unitaid, the UK Department for International Development, PEPFAR, USAID, and the Global Fund, with Aurobindo and Mylan. Under the agreement, Aurobindo and Mylan agreed to offer TLD at ~$75 PPPY. This lower price is accessible to public sector purchasers in over 92 LMICs worldwide.

Availability: This product is currently available for procurement from multiple suppliers (including WHO prequalified manufacturers).

Other considerations: N/A

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended the addition of the fixed-dose combination formulation of dolutegravir + lamivudine + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate to the core list of the EML for treatment of HIV infection in adults and adolescents. The Committee noted the demonstrated efficacy and safety of DTG-based regimens in treatment-naive patients, and that DTG-based regimens are now recommended as preferred first-line therapy in WHO Guidelines for adults and adolescents initiating antiretroviral treatment.

The Committee also considered that the availability of fixed-dose combinations of antiretroviral therapies provides benefits to patients in terms of ease of administration and reduced pill burden, which can contribute to improved therapeutic adherence.

References:


6.4.4 Antihepatitis medicines

6.4.4.2 Medicines for hepatitis C

Glecaprevir + pibrentasvir – addition – EML

| Proposal: | The application requested addition of the fixed-dose combination of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir to the core list of the EML for the treatment of adult patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection, genotypes 1 to 6. |
| Applicant: | AbbVie Inc. |
| WHO Technical Department: | WHO Global Hepatitis Programme |
| EML / EMLc | EML |
| Section: | 6.4.4.2.1 Pangenotypic direct-acting antiviral combinations |
| Dose form(s) & strengths(s): | Tablet 100 mg + 40 mg |
| Core / Complementary: | Core |
| Individual / Square box listing: | Individual |
| Background: | Neither this fixed-dose combination (FDC) nor its individual components have been previously considered by the Expert Committee for addition to the EML. |
| Public health relevance: (burden of disease) | Globally in 2015, it was estimated that 71 million persons were living with chronic HCV infection and nearly 400,000 died from cirrhosis or hepatocellular cancer. The Global Health Sector Strategy on viral hepatitis was endorsed by the World Health Assembly in 2016 and proposes the elimination of viral hepatitis as a public health threat by 2030 by achieving a 90% reduction in incidence and a 65% reduction in mortality. This requires 90% of infection persons to be diagnosed, and 80% of diagnosed persons to be treated (1). |
| Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application) | In Phase 2 and Phase 3 registrational studies, glecaprevir + pibrentasvir has shown high sustained viral response rates at 12 weeks (SVR12) across all hepatitis C genotypes and in key patient sub-populations (patients with chronic kidney disease, organ transplant recipients, patients co-infected with HIV and patients with compensated cirrhosis). The application described SVR12 rates greater than 95% for all treated genotypes: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Proportion SVR12 (n/N)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GT1</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>99.7% (331/332)</td>
<td>99.1, 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT2</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>98.5% (135/137)</td>
<td>96.5, 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT2</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>99.5% (195/196)</td>
<td>98.5, 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT3</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>95.3% (222/233)</td>
<td>94.2, 98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT4</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>99.0% (95/96)</td>
<td>94.3, 99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT5</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>100% (21/21)</td>
<td>84.5, 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT6</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>100% (30/30)</td>
<td>88.6, 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all GT1-6 infected subjects who received the recommended duration of treatment with glecaprevir + pibrentasvir, regardless of renal function, cirrhosis status, presence of HIV co-infection, treatment naive or treatment experienced, 97.4% (1,252/1,287) achieved SVR12 (2). High SVR12 rates were also reported for GT1-6 infected subjects in key patient sub-populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-population</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Proportion SVR12 (n/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKD (+/- haemodialysis)</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>98.1% (102/104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post liver/renal transplant</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>98.0% (98/100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV/HIV-1 co-infection (with or without cirrhosis)</td>
<td>12 or 8 weeks</td>
<td>98.2% (165/168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated cirrhosis</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>95.3% (222/233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSA inhibitor (only) experienced</td>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td>94.4% (17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI (only) experienced</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>100% (27/27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The application described the findings of two randomized, Phase 3, open-label studies that evaluated the safety and effectiveness of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir compared to sofosbuvir + ribavirin in Japanese patients with HCV GT2 (CERTAIN-2, Study M15-828) (3), and compared to sofosbuvir + daclatasvir in treatment-naive, non-cirrhotic HCV GT3 patients (ENDURANCE-3, Study M13-594) (4). In each study, glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was found to be non-inferior to the comparator treatments for the percentage of patients achieving SVR12. Real-world data for glecaprevir + pibrentasvir also support the effectiveness demonstrated in the Phase 2 and 3 trials (5-9).

**Summary of evidence: harms**
(from the application)

The application stated the safety assessment for glecaprevir + pibrentasvir in subjects with compensated liver disease (with or without cirrhosis) were derived from Phase 2 and 3 studies which evaluated 2,369 subjects infected with GT 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 HCV who received treatment for 8, 12 or 16 weeks. The overall proportion of subjects who permanently discontinued treatment due to adverse reactions was 0.1%. The most common adverse reactions were reported as headache (13.2%), fatigue (11.4%) and nausea (7.6%). These adverse reactions occurred at a similar frequency in patients receiving placebo or sofosbuvir + daclatasvir. Seven deaths were reported in the Phase 2 and 3 analysis set, none of which were considered to be related to the study drug. No apparent differences were observed in adverse event profiles by sex, race, ethnicity, or baseline BMI. The incidence of serious adverse events and adverse events of Grade 3 or higher was higher in patients aged 65 years or older compared to patients under 65 years. No other differences by age in the proportion of subjects reporting any adverse event, discontinuations or deaths were observed. Real-world data for glecaprevir + pibrentasvir also support the safety demonstrated in clinical trials (5-9).

**Additional evidence:**
(not in the application)

A systematic review of treatment options for chronic hepatitis C virus infection, genotypes 1-6 was conducted to inform the 2018 WHO Guidelines for the care and treatment of persons diagnosed with chronic hepatitis C virus infection (10, 11). The review found that the proportion of patients treated with glecaprevir + pibrentasvir who achieved SVR12 ranged from 83% to 98%. GRADE assessments of the quality of evidence were high for GT1-3 and very low for GT4-6. For safety outcomes, the review assessed discontinuations due to adverse events (DAEs), serious adverse events (SAEs) and mortality. The pooled proportions for DAEs, SAEs and mortality for glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was 1%, 2% and 1%, respectively. GRADE assessments of the quality of evidence were moderate for DAEs and high for SAEs and mortality.

**WHO Guidelines:**

The 2018 WHO Guidelines for the care and treatment of persons diagnosed with chronic hepatitis C virus infection (1) recommend:

- the use of pangenotypic DAA regimens for the treatment of chronic HCV infection in persons aged 18 years and older (conditional recommendation, moderate quality evidence);
- glecaprevir + pibrentasvir as a pangenotypic treatment option for adults with or without compensated cirrhosis.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

In a 2017 cost-effectiveness analysis set in the United States, glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was shown to be a dominant pan-genotypic treatment option compared to current standard practices providing most favorable health outcomes at lowest cost (2). Health outcomes included quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) and number needed to treat (NNT) to achieve a QALY, SVR or avoid an adverse liver event. In this analysis, glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was compared to two treatment strategies: (i) sofosbuvir + ledipasvir for GTs 1 and 4, and sofosbuvir + velpatasvir for GTs 2, 3, 5 and 6; and (ii) grazoprevir + elbasvir for GTs 1 and 4, and sofosbuvir + velpatasvir for GTs 2, 3, 5 and 6. A 12-week regimen course of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir was assumed to cost $27,929 USD per 2017 wholesale acquisition drug costs. Cost-effectiveness results in other countries may vary based on the different pricing of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir and other DAAAs.

**Availability:**

Glecaprevir + pibrentasvir has marketing approval and is commercially available in 58 countries globally. AbbVie and the Medicines Patent Pool have entered into a royalty-free licensing agreement.
agreement to accelerate access in 99 low- and middle-income countries. Through this agreement, AbbVie will allow WHO prequalified generic manufacturers to license, manufacture and supply generic versions. AbbVie is also considering the inclusion of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir on the WHO List of Prequalified Medicinal Products.

Other considerations: N/A

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended the addition of the fixed-dose combination of glecaprevir + pibrentasvir to the core list of the EML for the treatment of adult patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection, based on evidence of pan-genotypic effectiveness and an acceptable safety profile. The Committee noted that this combination is one of three pan-genotypic combinations recommended in the current WHO guidelines for treatment of hepatitis C and is suitable for use in patients with or without compensated cirrhosis.

The Committee noted that the manufacturer and the Medicines Patent Pool have entered into licensing agreement for this product to accelerate access in 99 low and middle income countries. However, the Committee noted with concern that some LMICs with a high burden of hepatitis C are not included in this agreement and encouraged the manufacturer and the MPP to address this issue to ensure patients in these high-burden countries have equitable access.

The Committee recommended that the hepatitis C medicines section of the Model List be amended to differentiate between pangenotypic (glecaprevir + pibrentasvir, sofosbuvir + daclatasvir and sofosbuvir + velpatasvir), non-pangenotypic direct acting antivirals, and other antivirals for hepatitis C. The pangenotypic regimens should be considered as therapeutically equivalent to facilitate selection and procurement by countries at national level.

The Committee recommended that the hepatitis C medicines section of the Model List be amended to differentiate between pangenotypic (glecaprevir + pibrentasvir, sofosbuvir + daclatasvir and sofosbuvir + velpatasvir), non-pangenotypic direct acting antivirals, and other antivirals for hepatitis C. The pangenotypic regimens should be considered as therapeutically equivalent to facilitate selection and procurement by countries at national level.

The Expert Committee then considered whether it was appropriate to delete non-pangenotypic treatments for hepatitis C, and recommended the deletion of simprevir, whose place in therapy was now superseded by the pan-genotypic options. The Committee recommended that other non-pangenotypic treatments could be considered for deletion from the EML in the future.
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### 6.5 Antiprotozoal medicines

#### 6.5.3 Antimalarial medicines

#### 6.5.3.2 For chemoprevention

**Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine – new indication IPTi – EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine</th>
<th>ATC Code: P01BD51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested listing of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine fixed-dose combination tablet on the core list of the EMLc for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment (of malaria) in infancy (IPTi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO Global Malaria Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Global Malaria Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.5.3.2 Antimalarial medicines – For chemoprevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Tablet 250 mg + 12.5 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500 mg + 25 mg tablets are currently included on the EML and EMLc for use in combination with artesunate 50 mg for the curative treatment of malaria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong> (burden of disease)</td>
<td>Malaria is one of the leading causes of illness, death and lost economic productivity globally. In 2017, there were an estimated 219 million malaria cases worldwide, the majority of which occurred in the African region (92%, 200 million cases) (1). Of the 435,000 deaths due to malaria globally in 2017, 266,000 (61%) were in children under 5 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>The application presented the findings of a pooled analysis of six randomized, placebo controlled trials in 7,930 infants that investigated the efficacy and safety of IPTi with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine (IPTi-SP) in four African countries with moderate to high transmission of malaria, when administered to infants at the time of routine vaccination according to the WHO Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) (2). From the pooled analysis, the combined estimate of protective efficacy of IPTi-SP against clinical malaria in infants aged up to 1 year of age was 30.3% (95% CI 19.8%-39.4%, p&lt;0.0001). IPTi-SP was also associated with protective efficacy in infants up to 1 year of age for anaemia (21.3% (95% CI: 8.3%–32.5%, p=0.002)), all-cause hospital admissions (22.9% (95% CI: 10.0%–34.0%, p=0.001)), and hospital admissions associated with malaria parasitaemia (38.1% (95% CI 12.5%–56.2%, p=0.007)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>SP for intermittent preventive treatment in infancy is generally well tolerated. Studies showed no evidence of any adverse effects of SP-IPTi on infants’ serological responses to vaccines (DTP, polio, hepatitis B, Haemophilus influenzae B, yellow fever or measles). A rebound effect in terms of greater susceptibility to malaria after termination of SP-IPTi, although reported in some studies, was not found in the pooled analysis, where the pooled estimate of protective efficacy of IPTi-SP against clinical malaria for the potential rebound period was 9.5% (95% CI 0.3%-17.8%, p=0.044) (2). Surveillance of molecular markers of SP resistance should accompany SP-IPTi, in particular the distribution and prevalence of Pfdrhs 540 mutations, which is a surrogate measure of SP efficacy. Use of IPTi-SP is contraindicated in individuals with known hypersensitivity to pyrimethamine, sulfonamides and related compounds and infants receiving a sulfa-based medication for treatment or prophylaxis, including co-trimoxazole (trimethoprim–sulfamethoxazole), which is widely used as prophylaxis against opportunistic infections in HIV-infected infants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 2011 systematic review of the cost and the cost-effectiveness of malaria interventions found that the median financial cost of IPTi-SP for protecting one person for one year was US$0.60 (range $0.48-$1.08) (3). A study by Conteh et al of the cost-effectiveness of IPTi in sub-Saharan Africa found the cost per malaria episode averted for IPTi-SP was very low, US$ 1.36–4.03 based on trial specific data (US$ 0.68–2.27 on pooled analysis). The authors concluded that IPTi delivered with the EPI was a highly cost effective intervention against clinical malaria (4).

WHO Guidelines:
A 2010 WHO Policy recommendation on IPTi-SP recommends the co-administration of SP-IPTi with DTP2, DTP3 and measles immunization to infants, through routine EPI in countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in areas with moderate-to-high malaria transmission (Annual Entomological Inoculation Rates ≥10), and where parasite resistance to SP is not high – defined as a prevalence of the pfdhps 540 mutation of ≤ 50% (5).

This recommendation was not re-evaluated during the guideline development process for the 2015 WHO Guidelines for the treatment of malaria. The same recommendation is included in the 2015 Guidelines, however the quality of evidence was not formally assessed (6).

Costs / cost-effectiveness:
No information was provided in the application.

Availability:
A paediatric formulation of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 250 mg + 12.5 mg is currently under assessment by the WHO Prequalification Program.
The administered dose of IPTi-SP depends on the weight of the child.
- Children weighing less than 5 kg should be given 125mg sulfadoxine and 6.25mg pyrimethamine.
- Children weighing 5 kg or more should be given 250mg sulfadoxine and 12.5mg pyrimethamine.

Other considerations:
The successful implementation of SP-IPTi requires that national malaria control and EPI programmes work together. WHO, working with UNICEF developed an implementation guide which provides the necessary technical and operational information and tools for country-level policy-makers and programme managers to decide on how to include SP-IPTi with immunization services (7). In areas where SP-IPTi is implemented each child will be given SP three times in their first year of life when they receive routine vaccinations as follows:
- First SP-IPTi dose (SP-IPTi1) when DTP2/Penta2 (or combo) vaccination is given (i.e. 8-10 weeks of age)
- Second SP-IPTi dose (SP-IPTi2) when DTP3/Penta3 (or combo) vaccination is given (12-14 weeks of age)
- Third SP-IPTi dose (SP-IPTi3) at the time of measles vaccination (9 months)
The exact timing of the doses may vary according to the national immunization schedule for DTP and measles vaccination.

Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee recommended listing of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 250 mg + 12.5 mg fixed-dose combination tablet on the core list of the EMLC for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment (of malaria) in infancy (IPTi) on the basis of demonstrated efficacy and acceptable safety, and in alignment with WHO malaria guideline recommendations.

The Expert Committee noted the lack of evidence of the impact of the use of SP-IPTi on antimicrobial resistance, and encouraged further assessment and monitoring in this regard within programme delivery.
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### Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine – new indication IPTp – EML

**Proposal:**  
The application requested listing of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine (SP) fixed-dose combination tablet on the core list of the EML for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment (of malaria) in pregnancy (IPTp).

**Applicant:**  
WHO Global Malaria Programme

**WHO Technical Department:**  
Global Malaria Programme

**EML / EMLc:**  
EML

**Section:**  
6.5.3.2 Antimalarial medicines - For chemoprevention

**Dose form(s) & strengths(s):**  
Tablet 500 mg + 25 mg

**Core / Complementary:**  
Core

**Individual / Square box listing:**  
Individual

**Background:**  
Sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500 mg + 25 mg tablets are currently included on the EML and EMLc for use in combination with artesunate 50 mg for the curative treatment of malaria.

**Public health relevance:**  
Malaria is one of the leading causes of illness, death, and lost economic productivity globally. While there has been successful scale-up and use of critical commodities, malaria still resulted in over 219 million cases and more than 435,000 deaths in 2017; most of the deaths occurred in children under five years of age and pregnant women (1). In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), over 30 million pregnant women are annually exposed to infection from malaria (2). Of these, an estimated 10,000 pregnant women and up to 200,000 newborns die from malaria in pregnancy (MiP), primarily due to the infection from Plasmodium falciparum (3). Furthermore, recent data indicate that up to 20% of stillbirths in SSA are attributable to MiP (4).

WHO recommends that IPTp-SP be given to all pregnant women at each antenatal care visit, starting as early as possible in the second trimester (i.e. not during the first trimester) (5). Each IPTp-SP dose should be given at least 1 month apart, with at least three doses during each pregnancy. The expected benefits of IPTp-SP include:

- Prevention of the adverse consequences of malaria on maternal and fetal outcomes, such as placental infection, clinical malaria, maternal anaemia, fetal anaemia, low birth weight and neonatal mortality (6);
- A cost-effective intervention for both prevention of maternal malaria and reduction of neonatal mortality in areas with moderate or high malaria transmission (7);
- Protection against both neonatal mortality (protective efficacy 18%) and low birth weight (21% reduction) under routine programme conditions (8).

To date, 39 African countries have adopted this policy. However, there is an unacceptably low proportion of eligible pregnant women receiving IPTp with quality-assured sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine (SP): only an estimated 22% of pregnant women received three doses of IPTp-SP in 2017 (1). It has been estimated that if all women with at least 3 antenatal care visits in Africa received IPTp-SP, that an additional 215,000 (128,000± 318,000 95% crl) LBW deliveries could be prevented (9).
The application presented the findings of a systematic review of seven trials (6,281 pregnancies) in which a direct comparison of two doses of IPTp-SP with three or more doses monthly was evaluated (10). The trials were conducted in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi, Mali and Zambia between 1996 and 2008. In comparison with two doses of SP, three or more doses was associated with:
- increased mean birth weight by an average of 56 g (95% CI, 29–83; seven trials, 2,190 participants, high-quality evidence);
- fewer low-birth-weight infants by about 20% (relative risk (RR) 0.80; 95% CI, 0.69–0.94; absolute risk reduction, 33 per 1000 (95% CI, 10–52); NNT = 31; seven trials, 2,190 participants, high-quality evidence);
- reduced placental parasitaemia by about 50% (RR, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.38–0.68; absolute risk reduction, 31 per 1000 (95% CI, 20–39); six trials, 1436 participants, high-quality evidence); and
- reduced maternal parasitaemia by about 33% (RR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.52–0.89; seven trials, 2096 participants, moderate-quality evidence).

The reduction in risk for low birth weight was consistent for a wide range of levels of resistance to SP.

There were no differences in rates of serious adverse events between treatment groups in the abovementioned systematic review (10).

IPTp-SP is generally very well tolerated. Mild and transient side effects including nausea, vomiting, weakness and dizziness have been reported by some women, particularly with the first dose. Studies have demonstrated that side effects tend to decrease with the administration of further doses (11, 12). The adverse effects reported are mainly those associated with sulfonamides, including gastrointestinal disturbances, headache, dizziness and skin reactions such as photosensitivity, rash, pruritus, urticaria and slight hair loss (13–16). Potentially fatal skin reactions, namely erythema multiforme, Stevens–Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis, have also been reported.

Demonstrated drug–drug interactions have been observed between SP and high doses (>5 mg) folic acid resulting in reduced efficacy of SP (17). Concurrent use with trimethoprim, alone or in combination with sulfamethoxazole should be avoided due to increased risk of severe cutaneous reactions (18).

There is limited evidence of potential teratogenicity when SP is used during the first trimester of pregnancy (13, 19). Use of SP during the first trimester is not recommended.

The 2015 WHO guidelines for the treatment of malaria (5) make the following recommendation regarding IPTp-SP:

In malaria-endemic areas in Africa, provide IPTp-SP to all women in their first or second pregnancy as part of antenatal care. Dosing should start in the second trimester and doses should be given at least 1 month apart, with the objective of ensuring that at least three doses are received. (Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence).

SP is an inexpensive medicine, and most countries already have a delivery system for IPTp-SP in place, which is often integrated into a comprehensive Focused Antenatal Care (FANC) package.

In comparison to placebo, in Mozambique, delivery of two doses of IPTp-SP has been estimated to cost $41.46 USD (CI 95% 20.50, 96.70) per maternal outpatient visit averted. This same study estimated an incremental cost effectiveness ratio (ICER) of $1.08 USD (CI 95% 0.43, 3.48) per DALY averted (7). Additionally, using data from seven countries, the incremental cost-effectiveness of 3 or more doses of IPTp-SP compared to two doses has been estimated at US$ 7.28 (20).

The WHO recommendations on intermittent screening and treatment in pregnancy and the safety of ACTs in the first trimester (21) state that IPTp-SP remains highly cost-effective in preventing the adverse consequences of malaria on maternal and fetal outcomes, and should therefore be actively scaled up in line with the current WHO recommendations. The threshold level of malaria transmission below which IPTp-SP is no longer cost-effective has not been

---

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

(From the application)

The application presented the findings of a systematic review of seven trials (6,281 pregnancies) in which a direct comparison of two doses of IPTp-SP with three or more doses monthly was evaluated (10). The trials were conducted in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi, Mali and Zambia between 1996 and 2008. In comparison with two doses of SP, three or more doses was associated with:

- increased mean birth weight by an average of 56 g (95% CI, 29–83; seven trials, 2,190 participants, high-quality evidence);
- fewer low-birth-weight infants by about 20% (relative risk (RR) 0.80; 95% CI, 0.69–0.94; absolute risk reduction, 33 per 1000 (95% CI, 10–52); NNT = 31; seven trials, 2,190 participants, high-quality evidence);
- reduced placental parasitaemia by about 50% (RR, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.38–0.68; absolute risk reduction, 31 per 1000 (95% CI, 20–39); six trials, 1436 participants, high-quality evidence); and
- reduced maternal parasitaemia by about 33% (RR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.52–0.89; seven trials, 2096 participants, moderate-quality evidence).

The reduction in risk for low birth weight was consistent for a wide range of levels of resistance to SP.

---

**Summary of evidence: harms**

(From the application)

There were no differences in rates of serious adverse events between treatment groups in the abovementioned systematic review (10). IPTp-SP is generally very well tolerated. Mild and transient side effects including nausea, vomiting, weakness and dizziness have been reported by some women, particularly with the first dose. Studies have demonstrated that side effects tend to decrease with the administration of further doses (11, 12).

The adverse effects reported are mainly those associated with sulfonamides, including gastrointestinal disturbances, headache, dizziness and skin reactions such as photosensitivity, rash, pruritus, urticaria and slight hair loss (13–16). Potentially fatal skin reactions, namely erythema multiforme, Stevens–Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis, have also been reported.

Demonstrated drug–drug interactions have been observed between SP and high doses (>5 mg) folic acid resulting in reduced efficacy of SP (17). Concurrent use with trimethoprim, alone or in combination with sulfamethoxazole should be avoided due to increased risk of severe cutaneous reactions (18).

There is limited evidence of potential teratogenicity when SP is used during the first trimester of pregnancy (13, 19). Use of SP during the first trimester is not recommended.

---

**Additional evidence:**

(Not in the application)

N/A

---

**WHO Guidelines:**

The 2015 WHO guidelines for the treatment of malaria (5) make the following recommendation regarding IPTp-SP:

In malaria-endemic areas in Africa, provide IPTp-SP to all women in their first or second pregnancy as part of antenatal care. Dosing should start in the second trimester and doses should be given at least 1 month apart, with the objective of ensuring that at least three doses are received. (Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence).

---

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

SP is an inexpensive medicine, and most countries already have a delivery system for IPTp-SP in place, which is often integrated into a comprehensive Focused Antenatal Care (FANC) package.

In comparison to placebo, in Mozambique, delivery of two doses of IPTp-SP has been estimated to cost $41.46 USD (CI 95% 20.50, 96.70) per maternal outpatient visit averted. This same study estimated an incremental cost effectiveness ratio (ICER) of $1.08 USD (CI 95% 0.43, 3.48) per DALY averted (7). Additionally, using data from seven countries, the incremental cost-effectiveness of 3 or more doses of IPTp-SP compared to two doses has been estimated at US$ 7.28 (20).

The WHO recommendations on intermittent screening and treatment in pregnancy and the safety of ACTs in the first trimester (21) state that IPTp-SP remains highly cost-effective in preventing the adverse consequences of malaria on maternal and fetal outcomes, and should therefore be actively scaled up in line with the current WHO recommendations. The threshold level of malaria transmission below which IPTp-SP is no longer cost-effective has not been
identifying. Therefore, in areas where IPTp is implemented and transmission has been reduced to low levels as a result of successful control strategies, WHO recommends continued IPTp-SP implementation until the area approaches interruption of transmission.

Availability: Quality assured sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500 mg + 25 mg tablets are available from Guilin Pharmaceuticals (China) with WHO prequalification status. Quality assured sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500mg/25 mg tablets are also available from Remedic Pharmaceuticals (Cyprus).

Other considerations: Starting as early as possible in the second trimester, IPTp-SP is recommended for all pregnant women at each scheduled antenatal care visit until the time of delivery, provided that the doses are given at least one month apart. IPTp-SP should ideally be administered as directly observed therapy (DOT) of three tablets sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500 mg + 25 mg giving the total required dosage of 1500 mg/75 mg SP.

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended the listing of sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine 500 mg + 25 mg fixed-dose combination tablet on the core list of the EML for the new indication of intermittent preventive treatment of malaria in pregnancy (IPTp) on the basis of demonstrated efficacy in terms of improved outcomes for mothers and newborns, and acceptable safety, and in alignment with WHO malaria guideline recommendations.

The Expert Committee noted the lack of evidence of the impact of the use of SP-IPTp on antimicrobial resistance, and encouraged further assessment and monitoring in this regard within programme delivery.

References:
### Amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine – addition – EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Codes:</strong></th>
<th>P01BA06, P01BD51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of co-packaged amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine to the core list of the EMLc for seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) in children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO Global Malaria Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Global Malaria Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>6.5.3.2 Antimalarial medicines - For chemoprevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Dose form(s) & strengths(s):** | Co-packaged amodiaquine dispersible tablet 76.5 mg (as hydrochloride) [3] and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine dispersible tablet 250 mg + 12.5 mg [1]  
Co-packaged amodiaquine dispersible tablet 153 mg (as hydrochloride) [3] and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine dispersible tablet 500 mg + 25 mg [1] |
| **Core / Complementary:** | Core |
| **Individual / Square box listing:** | Individual |
| **Background:** | Amodiaquine and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine are both listed on the EMLc for use in combination with artesunate for the curative treatment of malaria. These medicines have not previously been considered for use in malaria prophylaxis/prevention. |
| **Public health relevance:** | Malaria is one of the leading causes of illness, death and lost economic productivity globally. In 2017, there were an estimated 219 million malaria cases worldwide, the majority of which occurred in the African region (92%, 200 million cases) [1]. Of the 435,000 deaths due to malaria globally in 2017, 266,000 (61%) were in children under 5 years of age.  
Across the Sahel sub-region in Africa, most childhood mortality and morbidity from malaria occurs during the rainy season, which is generally short. Giving effective antimalarial medicines at full treatment doses at appropriate intervals during this period has been shown to prevent illness and death from malaria in children.  
The interventions currently recommended by WHO for the control of malaria are use of long-lasting insecticidal mosquito nets and/or indoor residual spraying for vector control, prompt access to diagnostic testing of suspected cases and treatment of confirmed cases with effective artemisinin-based combination therapy. In addition to these, other interventions recommended for specific high-risk groups in areas of high transmission include intermittent preventive treatment in pregnancy and infancy. With the changing epidemiology of malaria, there has been a progressive shift from a ‘one size fits all’ approach to targeting malaria control strategies to specific populations and/or locations for maximal effectiveness. In line with this approach and on the basis of new evidence, WHO recommends an additional intervention against Plasmodium falciparum malaria: seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC). The objective of preventive treatment is to prevent malarial illness by maintaining therapeutic drug levels in the blood throughout the period of greatest risk (2). |
| **Summary of evidence: benefits** | A 2012 Cochrane systematic review of seven trials (12,589 participants) evaluated the effects of seasonal malaria chemoprophylaxis compared with no prophylaxis in children aged six years or less living in areas of West Africa with seasonal malaria transmission (3). In three studies, amodiaquine (AQ) and sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine (SP) was administered monthly at full treatment doses, two studies used SP every two months, and one study used SP and artesunate monthly, during the malaria transmission season.  
In comparison with no chemoprophylaxis, SMC was associated with markedly reduced clinical malaria episodes (rate ratio (RR) 0.26, 95% CI 0.17-0.38) and serious malaria episodes (RR 0.17, 95% CI 0.1-0.76). SMC may also be associated with a reduction in mortality (RR 0.66, 95% CI 0.31-1.39) and a reduction in moderately severe anaemia (RR 0.71, 95% CI 0.52-0.98). The findings were consistent in trials in which there was high (>90%) use of insecticide treated bednets (3). |
**Summary of evidence: harms**
(from the application)

AQ + SP are safe and well tolerated when used at the recommended doses and regimens. Both drugs have been used for decades for malaria treatment, and SP is currently used for intermittent preventive treatment of malaria in pregnancy and in infancy. Both AQ and SP are also used in combination with artemisinine as artemisinin-based combination therapy, which is used for the treatment of uncomplicated malaria in many endemic countries. In Senegal, where nearly 800,000 treatment courses of SP + AQ within SMC have been given to children, no serious adverse events attributable to these drugs were observed during intensive pharmacovigilance based on spontaneous reporting (4). AQ + SP is generally well tolerated in children. Mild side effects may occur, of which the most common is vomiting associated with intake of AQ. No serious adverse events attributable to AQ + SP have been reported in trials involving children (5-7). SMC with AQ + SP is contraindicated in children receiving sulfa-based medication for treatment or prophylaxis, including sulfamethoxazole + trimethoprim, which is widely used as prophylaxis against opportunistic infections in HIV-infected infants.

**Additional evidence:**
(not in the application)

N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**
The 2015 WHO guidelines for the treatment of malaria recommend SMC with monthly AQ + SP for all children aged less than 6 years during each transmission season in areas with highly seasonal malaria transmission in the sub-Saharan region of Africa (strong recommendation, high-quality evidence) (8). The guideline recommendation was informed by the aforementioned Cochrane systematic review (3).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**
Evaluation of the cost of delivering SMC in large field trials shows that the greatest costs are for delivering the drugs and the incentives paid to health workers. In The Gambia, the cost of SMC delivery by village health workers was estimated to be US$ 1.63 per child per year (9). In Senegal, where SMC was delivered by community health workers paid a daily rate and supervised by the health post nurse, the overall cost at 46 health posts was estimated to be US$ 0.5 per child per month, or approximately US$ 1.50 per child per year (10). The cost of SMC is similar to those of other malaria control interventions (11).

**Availability:**
Co-packaged sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine and amodiaquine tablets are currently available on the market from three manufacturers and have been prequalified by the WHO prequalification Programme.

**Other considerations:**
N/A

**Committee Recommendations:**
The Expert Committee recommends the addition of co-packaged amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine to the core list of the EMLc for seasonal malaria chemoprevention in children on the basis of acceptable safety and demonstrated benefits for reducing clinical malaria episodes and serious malaria episodes and reduced rates of mortality and anaemia, and in alignment with WHO malaria guideline recommendations.

The Expert Committee noted the lack of evidence of the impact of the use of amodiaquine with sulfadoxine + pyrimethamine for SMC on antimicrobial resistance, and encouraged further assessment and monitoring in this regard within programme delivery.

**References:**


6.5.5 Antitrypanosomal medicines

6.5.5.1 African trypanosomiasis

Fexinidazole – addition – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fexinidazole</th>
<th>ATC Code: P01CA03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested listing of fexinidazole on the core list of the EML and EMLc for treatment of human African trypanosomiasis due to Trypanosoma brucei gambiense infection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Sanofi-aventis groupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Neglected Tropical Diseases. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of fexinidazole on the Model Lists and considered that its introduction could result in important advantages in the management of human African trypanosomiasis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>6.5.5.1 African trypanosomiasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</td>
<td>Tablet 600 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background:</td>
<td>Fexinidazole had not previously been considered for inclusion on the Model Lists. The Model Lists currently include pentamidine and suramin sodium for treatment of 1st stage African trypanosomiasis and eflornithine, melarsporol and nifurtimox for treatment of 2nd stage African trypanosomiasis (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance:</td>
<td>Human African trypanosomiasis (HAT), or sleeping sickness, is one of the most neglected tropical diseases. Without diagnosis and treatment, HAT is usually fatal as the parasites multiply in the body, cross the blood–brain barrier and invade the central nervous system at the late stage of the disease. Human African trypanosomiasis takes two forms, depending on the parasite involved: Trypanosoma brucei gambiense HAT and Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense HAT. T. b. rhodesiense causes an acute, rapidly progressive and fatal disease and is present in 3% of HAT cases. T. b. gambiense is responsible for 97% of HAT cases (2) and evolves to a fatal outcome between 2 and 3 years after infection (3). As of October 2012, 7,106 annual cases of T. b. gambiense HAT had been reported worldwide. With the increased efforts of control programmes and availability of combination therapy with eflornithine and nifurtimox (NECT) therapy, only 1,420 gambiense HAT cases worldwide were reported to the WHO in 2017, the lowest level since the start of the systematic global data collection 75 years ago (4). However, the incidence is suspected to be under reported due to different elements. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) bears the majority of disease burden (83-84% of the reported cases in 2012, 2015 and 2016 (4). In view of the success in control of the disease, T. b. gambiense was included in WHO’s &quot;roadmap for elimination and control of neglected tropical diseases&quot;. A target date was set for global elimination of HAT as a public health problem (&lt;1 case/10 000 inhabitants in at least 90% of endemic areas) by 2020 with complete interruption of transmission in Africa targeted for 2030 (5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence of efficacy is based on data from 3 (yet to be published) clinical efficacy and safety studies (DNDiFEX004, DNDiFEX005, and DNDiFEX006), using data from 749 patients with HAT (from study sites in DRC and Central African Republic), 619 of which were treated with fexinidazole. FEX006 included 125 paediatric patients aged between 6 and 15 years weighing 20kg or more.

FEX004 compared fexinidazole and NECT in 394 adult patients (aged ≥15 years) with late stage 2 HAT. The success rate was 91.2% for fexinidazole and 97.6% for the NECT combination. The primary objective of the study was met. Fexinidazole was considered an acceptable treatment as the difference in response compared to NECT was <13% in favour of NECT at 18 months after the End of Treatment (EOT). In the primary analysis, the difference in success rate between groups remained within the margin of acceptable difference (-6.4%, 97.06% CI [-11.2%; -1.6%]). However, in the subpopulation of patients with cerebrospinal fluid white blood count (CSF-WBC) > 100 /µl the efficacy was 86.9% in the fexinidazole arm versus 98.7% in the NECT arm, and therefore the risk of failure was higher in this subgroup with fexinidazole. The follow-up analysis of the success rate at 24 months on the complete population (n=389) yielded similar findings to those with partial data for 24 months at the primary analysis timepoint (n=345) with only 2 new failures (1 in each group).

FEX005 was an open-label single arm cohort study of efficacy and safety of fexinidazole in 230 adult patients with stage 1 or early stage 2 HAT. The success rate with fexinidazole at 12 months after the EOT (98.7%; 95% CI 96.2%-99.7%), was greater than an unacceptable rate of 80%. No difference was seen in efficacy at 12 months according to the stage of the disease. The success rate at 18 months improved slightly between the initial and follow-up analysis due to the inclusion of the additional 69 patients in the follow-up analysis (all successes): 97.8% (95% CI [95.0; 99.3]) versus 96.9% (95% CI [92.9; 99.0]) in the initial analysis.

FEX006 was an open-label single arm prospective study of efficacy and safety of fexinidazole in 125 children aged ≥ 6 years and < 15 years weighing over 20 kg with any stage HAT. The success rate with fexinidazole at 12 months after the EOT (97.6%; 95% CI 93.1%-99.5%) was greater than an unacceptable rate of 80% and compatible with a target rate of 92%. The success rate at 18 months improved slightly between the initial and follow-up analysis due to the inclusion of the additional 40 patients in the follow-up analysis (all successes): 98.4% (95% CI [94.3; 99.8]), versus 97.6% (95% CI [91.8%; 99.7%]) in the initial 12 month analysis.

Pooled analyses of data from FEX004, FEX005 and FEX006, revealed findings consistent with observations from the individual study analyses, with regard to the incidence of Treatment Emergent Adverse Events (TEAEs), TEAEs that occurred between baseline and End Of Hospitalization (EOH), TEAEs that occurred after EOH, and TEAEs that were considered by the Investigator as possibly related to treatment. A total of 577 of 619 (93%) patients experienced TEAEs. Overall, 506 of 619 (82%) patients reported a total of 2026 possibly related TEAEs between initiation of treatment and End Of Treatment (EOT), with most being mild or moderate. In study FEX004 in patients with late stage 2 disease, the overall incidence of TEAEs was comparable between treatment groups (93.6% with fexinidazole versus 92.3% with NECT). The most commonly reported TEAEs across all fexinidazole treated patients (≥10% of patients) were vomiting (42%), headache (37%), nausea (35%), asthenia (27%), insomnia (23%), tremor (22%), decreased appetite (20%), dizziness (19%), dyspepsia (14%) and feeling hot (10%). Comparing overall TEAEs between fexinidazole and NECT in late stage 2 patients, there were notable differences between treatment groups; including higher rates in the NECT arm of pyrexia, chills, hyperkalaemia, convulsions and procedural pain; and higher rates in the fexinidazole arm of insomnia, tremor, headache, asthenia, nausea, dizziness, hypocalcaemia, feeling hot, hypoalbuminaemia, abdominal pain upper, chest pain and dyspepsia. Vomiting was reported in a similar percentage of patients. All other TEAEs occurred with similar frequency with NECT and fexinidazole in late stage 2 HAT patients, suggesting that the AEs were related to the underlying disease or that both treatments were associated with increased risk of the events to similar extents.

With regard to risk of QT prolongation, fexinidazole has been associated with QTcF interval increases and its use is contraindicated in patients at risk of QT prolongation, uncorrected electrolyte abnormalities, symptomatic cardiac arrhythmia, clinically relevant bradycardia, severe congestive cardiac failure or family history of sudden death. Central nervous system/psychiatric events as well as emesis/vomiting were observed with fexinidazole treatment. Asymptomatic reversible neutropenia and elevated liver enzymes that
were found at different dose regimens in Chagas disease patients were not reported in HAT patients with the treatment regimen used in the HAT studies.

| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | Fexinidazole received a positive opinion by EMA under Article 58 on 15 November 2018. It is not yet included in the WHO guidelines or any other national guidelines. However, sleeping sickness treatment WHO guidelines will be under revision in order to consider integration of fexinidazole as part of the therapeutic options to treat gambiense HAT. |
| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | Drugs for HAT are provided free of charge to the WHO via a public/private partnership between WHO/Sanofi (pentamidine, melarsoprol and eflornithine) and WHO/Bayer AG (suramin, nifurtimox). Under a signed agreement between Sanofi and WHO, drugs are donated to WHO, to be used exclusively for the treatment of HAT. Requests for supplies are made to WHO by governments of disease-endemic countries and organization working in association with these governments. Stock control and shipment of the drugs are undertaken by Médecins sans Frontières-Logistique according to the agreement. Transport costs to countries are paid by Sanofi through its partnership with WHO. In the same way as what is currently done for NECT or other HAT drugs, fexinidazole will be distributed free of charge through the World Health Organization (WHO) neglected tropical diseases (NTD) department to National Sleeping Sickness Control Programs (NSSCPs) and from there to the treatment centres. The product will not be available through wide logistic of pharmacies or out of the predefined distribution system. No return on investment is expected. With NECT, indirect costs including transport to hospital, food and hospitalisation costs are born by the patients. They should be significantly reduced with fexinidazole when patients are not hospitalised and treated close to their home. |
| Availability: | Fexinidazole is a new oral treatment for sleeping sickness disease and is not yet distributed. An application for fexinidazole was submitted to European Medicines Agency (EMA) through Article 58 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004. Article 58 is a mechanism whereby the EMA may give a scientific opinion, in cooperation with the WHO, for the evaluation of medicinal products intended to prevent or treat diseases of major public interest and exclusively intended for markets outside the European Community. A positive opinion from EMA was given on 15 November 2018 for the following indication: “Fexinidazole Winthrop is indicated for the treatment of both first-stage (haemo-lymphatic) and second-stage (meningo-encephalitic) of human African trypanosomiasis (HAT) due to Trypanosoma brucei gambiense in adults and children ≥ 6 years old and weighing ≥ 20 kg. Fexinidazole should be used in line with official recommendations” However, lower efficacy of fexinidazole as compared to NECT has been seen in a subgroup of patients. Patients with cerebrospinal fluid white blood count (CSF-WBC) > 100 / µL should only be treated with fexinidazole if no other adequate treatment (e.g. NECT) is available or tolerated. Registrations in DRC and Uganda are also scheduled. Further registrations in other endemic African countries are not planned due to the specific registration regulatory picture for Human African Trypanosomiasis products and ways of distribution. |
| Other considerations: | Since 2009, NECT has become the first-line therapy for stage 2 HAT due to *T. b. gambiense* and has improved the prognosis of treated patients (6), replacing monotherapy with eflornithine. NECT treatment requires a minimum health infrastructure and personnel to administer 2 slow infusions every day for 7 days, on top of an oral treatment every 8 hours for 10 days, requiring systematic hospitalisation as well as being resource consuming for skilled health staff in the environment in which HAT patients live (remote, poor areas with little health infrastructure). NECT is not recommended for early stage disease, instead, patients treated with pentamidine administered via intramuscular injections. Second line-therapy for stage 2 HAT due to *T. b. gambiense* includes melarsoprol, an organoarsenic compound, which is highly toxic and to which resistance has developed (7). Intravenous injections of melarsoprol are painful and can cause phlebitis. The drug has been administered by use of lengthy and complicated dosing schedules, however, an abbreviated 10 day regimen of melarsoprol has been developed. |
The limitations associated with current HAT therapy include mandatory hospitalisation and need for equipment and skilled and trained health staff to administer IV infusions and/or injections. The repeated infusions needed with current HAT therapy are not only painful but increase the risk of infection for the patient. The distribution of treatment to remote health facilities due to heavy components (38 kg per box which includes 4 treatments consisting of drugs, solvents and equipment), is also a costly logistical challenge (8).

Fexinidazole is orally administered once daily with food for 10 days. Recommended dosage regimens are according to body weight.

Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended the listing of fexinidazole on the core list of the EML and EMLc for treatment of human African trypanosomiasis due to *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* infection.

The Committee noted that fexinidazole was demonstrated in clinical trials to have success rates within acceptable margins compared to NECT, and acceptable safety. The Committee acknowledged that as an orally administered treatment, use of fexinidazole may offer both patient and health-system advantages compared to parental administration of other medicines for this disease.

The Committee noted that fexinidazole would be provided free of charge through the WHO NTD department to National Sleeping Sickness Control Programmes and treatment centres and could contribute to the goal of disease eradication, particularly in areas where access to health facilities is limited.

References:

### 6.6 Medicines for ectoparasitic infections

**Ivermectin – new indication scabies – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ivermectin</th>
<th>ATC Code: P02CF01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested listing of ivermectin on the core list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment of scabies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Applicant: | International League of Dermatological Societies  
International Alliance for the Control of Scabies  
WHO Department of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases |
| WHO Technical Department: | Department of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases |
| EML / EMLc | EML and EMLc |
| Section: | 6.6 Medicines for ectoparasitic infections |
| Dose form(s) & strengths(s): | Tablet (scored) 3 mg |
| Core / Complementary: | Core |
| Individual / Square box listing: | Individual |

**Background:**

Ivermectin is currently included on the EML and EMLc as an intestinal anthelminthic and antifilarial treatment. Only topical therapies for scabies (benzyl benzoate and permethrin) are currently included on the Model Lists.

**Public health relevance:**

Scabies is seen in all countries. In many resource-poor settings, prevalence rates of infestation can exceed 20% of the population and the most vulnerable members of society, children (1) and the elderly, are at highest risk. In 2015, the global prevalence of scabies was over 200 million (2). Globally, scabies was responsible for 0.21% of disability adjusted life years (DALYs) from all conditions studied by the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015 (2). A major complication of scabies, with lasting consequences for health, seen most in resource-poor settings, is symptomatic acute glomerulonephritis (AGN) which was reported in 10% of children in a survey in northern Australia, while 24% had microscopic haematuria (3). AGN was closely linked to skin sores due to streptococcal infection, and scabies was identified as the principal cause. Scabies infestation is also an epidemiological risk factor for rheumatic fever and there is a strong association with scabies-associated streptococcal infections (4). One study has identified a possible link between scabies and bacterial sepsis caused by Staphylococcus aureus in infants in the Gambia (5). Household economic loss due to scabies is also a major problem in resource-poor communities. A study in rural Mexico indicated that families were spending a significant part of their household income on ineffective topical treatment of scabies (US$24) over each 3-month period, impacting the ability to purchase other commodities, including food (6). Scabies in resource poor environments is therefore both a potential cause of serious morbidity and a source of financial burden. Its high prevalence places a huge burden on stretched health care resources.
### Summary of evidence: benefits
(from the application)

The application presented the results of a 2018 Cochrane systematic review of 15 studies (1,896 participants) comparing topical permethrin, systemic ivermectin or topical ivermectin for treatment of scabies (7).

The response to oral ivermectin was found to be equivalent to the response to topical permethrin, 2 and 4 weeks after treatment. 200 μg/kg oral ivermectin (was associated with slightly lower rates of complete clearance after one week compared to permethrin 5% cream. Using the average clearance rate of 65% in the trials with permethrin, the illustrative clearance with ivermectin was 43% (RR 0.65, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.78; 613 participants, 6 studies; low-certainty evidence).

After two weeks, there was no significant difference (illustrative clearance of permethrin 74% compared to ivermectin 68%; RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.76 to 1.08; 459 participants, 5 studies; low-certainty evidence). In this review, there did not appear to be any advantage in repeated treatments in conventional cases of scabies. Hence treatment with one to three doses of ivermectin or one to three applications of permethrin led to little or no difference in rates of complete clearance after four weeks’ follow-up (illustrative cures with 1 to 3 applications of permethrin 93% and with 1 to 3 doses of ivermectin 86%; RR 0.92, 95% CI 0.82 to 1.03; 581 participants, 5 studies; low-certainty evidence).

Seven days after treatment with oral ivermectin 200 μg/kg or one application of permethrin 5% lotion, there was little or no difference in complete clearance rates (illustrative cure rates: permethrin 73%, ivermectin 68%; RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.74 to 1.17; 120 participants, 1 study; moderate-certainty evidence). After two weeks, one initial dose of systemic ivermectin compared to one application of permethrin lotion produced similar complete clearance rates (extrapolated cure rates: 67% in both groups; RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.78 to 1.29; 120 participants, 1 study; low-certainty evidence).

The application also presented the findings of numerous individual studies of ivermectin versus various topical agents for scabies which supported the comparative effectiveness of oral ivermectin (8-18).

The application presented evidence of the effectiveness of ivermectin for treating scabies when delivered through mass drug administration programmes. Studies in the Solomon Islands (19, 20), Australia (21), Brazil (22) and Fiji (23) all showed mass drug administration of ivermectin to be an effective public health intervention.

There is some evidence from case reports and case series that oral ivermectin (with or without topical scabicides) is effective in the treatment of crusted scabies (24-28). Crusted scabies is a hyper transmissible form of scabies where patients are infected with very large populations of scabies mites. It is mainly seen in those who are immunocompromised including HIV infected individuals, transplant recipients and those on high doses immunomodulating drugs or biologic agents; it may also occur in endemic settings in apparently healthy individuals. It is rare but can cause a major problem with transmission to susceptible populations.

### Summary of evidence: harms
(from the application)

Evidence for the safety of ivermectin has been evaluated when it was considered for listing on the EML for other indications.

In terms of safety of oral ivermectin for treatment of scabies, the Cochrane systematic review reported moderate certainty evidence of no withdrawals due to adverse events in either the oral ivermectin or topical permethrin treatment groups. There was moderate certainty evidence of little or no difference between treatment groups for the proportion of participants who experienced at least one adverse event two weeks after initiation of treatment. After four weeks, ivermectin was associated with a larger proportion of participants with at least one adverse event (RR 1.30, 95% CI 0.35 to 4.83; 502 participants, 4 studies; low-certainty evidence).

Most side effects reported in other studies were transient and mild. Loose stool, fatigue and headache were most frequently reported, and the incidence among the randomised control trials of all side effects was highest in the studies involving children.

When ivermectin is administered to subjects with high Loa loa microfilariaemia, severe adverse reactions such as neurological signs, encephalopathy and coma have been reported (29). In Loa loa endemic countries potential co-infection with this parasite has to be considered prior to using ivermectin.

There were a total of 1656 reports for ivermectin in VigiBase (out of a total of over 14 million reports in the database). Reports in males and females were of similar proportions. The
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Majority of reports were in adults aged 18 years and older. The most commonly reported ADRs for ivermectin alone and ivermectin co-administered with albendazole included pruritus, headache, dizziness, vomiting, rash, urticaria and diarrhoea. Most reported ADRs were considered to be minor and transient. Safety of ivermectin in pregnant women or children under 15 kg body weight has not been established.

Additional evidence: (not in the application) N/A

WHO Guidelines: WHO guidelines on the treatment of skin and oral HIV-associated conditions in children and adults (30) recommend treatment with oral ivermectin (200 μg/kg) for mild/moderate scabies in HIV-infected children and adults if topical permethrin treatment is not feasible or there is a poor response (Strong recommendation, low quality evidence). The guidelines also recommend two doses of oral ivermectin for treatment of HIV-infected children ≥ 15 kg and adults with severe or crusted scabies.

Costs / cost-effectiveness: The application stated that no cost-benefit analyses on the use of ivermectin in scabies have been undertaken, but proposes that effective interventions with ivermectin may reduce personal, institutional and governmental expenditure.

Availability: Ivermectin has wide market availability. Generic brands are available.

Other considerations: N/A

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended listing of ivermectin on the core list of the EML and EMLc for the new indication of treatment of scabies. The Committee noted that oral ivermectin treatment is associated with comparable effectiveness to topical therapies and has acceptable safety. The Committee also noted the effectiveness of ivermectin as a public health intervention when delivered via mass drug administration programmes. The Committee considered that the ease of oral administration compared to topical administration may also represent an advantage for patients in terms of compliance.

References:


Section 7: ANTIMIGRAINE MEDICINES

7.1 For treatment of acute attack

**Sumatriptan – addition - EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumatriptan</th>
<th>ATC Code: N02CC01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of sumatriptan to the core list of the EML for the treatment of adult patients with acute migraine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Medicines and Medical Devices Area, Health Care and Welfare Directorate, Community Care Service, Emilia-Romagna Region WHO Collaborating Centre in Evidence-Based Research Synthesis and Guideline Development, Emilia Romagna Health Care and Welfare Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>7.1 Antimigraine medicines – For treatment of acute attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Tablet 50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**

An application requesting addition of sumatriptan to the EML was considered by the Expert Committee in 2007. The Committee considered that the application was generally of poor quality and provided only a limited review of the evidence. Overall the evidence provided in the application did not support the public health need or comparative effectiveness, safety and cost-effectiveness of sumatriptan. The Committee therefore recommended that sumatriptan not be added to the Model List (1). The EML currently lists acetylsalicylic acid tablets and paracetamol tablets for treatment of acute migraine attacks.

**Public health relevance:**

Headache disorders are a public health concern given the associated disability and financial costs to society. As headache disorders are most troublesome in the productive years (late teens to 50s), estimates of their financial cost to society – mainly from lost working hours and reduced productivity – are massive. In the United Kingdom, for example, some 25 million working- or school-days are lost every year because of migraine alone (2). The main source of data about the burden of migraine worldwide is the GBD study, although its estimates refer mainly to a selected population of high income countries, while data from important and populous low- and middle income countries, such Indonesia, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Egypt, South Africa, Democratic Republic of Congo and several countries in sub-Saharan Africa, are lacking.

According to the GBD study, 1.04 billion (95% uncertainty interval [UI] 1·00–1·09) people were estimated to have a migraine in 2016 (3). Migraine has a profound effect on wellbeing and general functioning, not only during the acute attack, but also in terms of work performance, family and social relationships, and school achievement. Migraine carries substantial individual, societal and economic burden, ranking as the second cause of disability (4). According to the GBD study, in 2016 migraine was estimated to have caused 45.1 million (95% UI 29.0-62.8) years of life lived with disability (YLDs), and in 2017 overall 5.54% (95% CI 3.91-7.5) of total YLDs were attributed to migraine (5). Even though the burden of migraine worldwide is considerable, accurate diagnosis, quality of care and rates of drug utilization are still insufficient across countries and settings. Worldwide, only 40% of people with migraine are professionally diagnosed (6).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

The application identified clinical evidence on efficacy of sumatriptan in adults and children and adolescents with acute migraine attack from systematic reviews (SR) and randomized controlled trials (RCT) and ongoing studies. Clinical practice guideline recommendations were also presented. Children and adolescents...
A 2016 Cochrane systematic review of 27 trials involving 7,630 participants compared any pharmacological intervention by any route of administration for symptomatic acute treatment of a migraine attack in children (under 12 years of age) and adolescents (12 to 17 years of age). Acceptable comparators included placebo to other active drug treatments. The primary outcome was the percentage of pain-free participants at two hours (7). Most data on triptans in children and adolescents came from treatment with sumatriptan. Only intranasal sumatriptan has been studied in clinical trials in children.

A pooled estimate of six studies oral sumatriptan in adolescents with acute migraine showed no difference between oral sumatriptan and placebo in reaching pain freedom at 2 hours. In absolute terms, the proportion of patients pain-free at 2 hours with sumatriptan was 21.7% vs 20% with placebo (RD: 1.7%, 95%CI: -4.3, 7.1).

For studies involving sumatriptan via any route of administration, for the primary outcome of pain-free at 2 hours, clinical trials in adolescents show superiority of sumatriptan vs placebo, while in children the estimate does not reach statistical significance. Absolute estimates show that 49.3% of children on (intranasal) sumatriptan vs and 23.6% with placebo were pain-free at two hours (RD 25.7%, 95%CI 10.0, 39.6), while 34.8% of adolescents on sumatriptan vs 25.1% on placebo (RD 9.7% (95%CI: 4.8; 14.4)).

Triptans considered as a class (regardless of the formulation) showed superiority vs placebo in reaching the primary outcome both among children (RD:16.3 (95%CI: 6.2-25.9)) and adolescents (RD 7.6% (95%CI:5.4;9.7)).

Adults

Two systematic reviews provided evidence for the efficacy and safety of sumatriptan in adults. An analysis of pooled data from 18 studies showed 50 mg oral sumatriptan to be more effective than placebo for the outcome of pain-free at two hours for any pain intensity at baseline. Similarly, pooled data from 21 studies of 100 mg oral sumatriptan showed slightly higher estimates. Numbers needed to treat (NNT) ranged from 3 to 6.1. The certainty in the estimates was rated as high, according to GRADE. Results for outcomes of sustained pain freedom at 24 hours and use of rescue medicine also showed clinically meaningful differences and NNTs in favour of sumatriptan (8).

Compared to active comparators, efficacy of sumatriptan was comparable to that of other triptans except for eletriptan 40 mg an 80 mg, which showed significantly greater efficacy. Four studies compared sumatriptan 50 mg and 100 mg with effervescent acetylsalicylic acid (ASA) 1000 mg (2 studies, 726 participants) and ASA 900 mg + metoclopramide 10 mg (2 studies, 575 participants), respectively. The pooled analysis of the former comparison showed no statistically significant differences relative to the outcome pain-free at 2 hours", while in the latter a significant difference in favour of sumatriptan 100 mg was observed. In absolute terms, 32.3% of patients treated with sumatriptan 50 mg and 26.4% of those on ASA 1000 mg were pain-free at 2 hours (RD 15% in favour of sumatriptan). Sumatriptan 100 mg was compared to paracetamol 1000 mg + metoclopramide 10 mg relative to the outcome headache relief at 2 hours (2 studies, 1035 participants), showing no difference (8).

A network meta-analysis (NMA) by the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) compared the relative efficacy, effectiveness and safety of triptans alone or in combination with other drugs, all administration routes, any dose, compared with other triptans, NSAIDs, acetylsalicylic acid, paracetamol, ergots, opioids in the treatment of acute migraine attacks in adults (> 18 years of age) (9). Overall, considering all administration routes, freedom from pain at 2 hours was achieved in 18% to 50% of patients with acute migraine taking standard dose triptans. Sumatriptan 50 mg provided pain freedom at 2 hours in 27.7% (95%CI 24.6, 31%) of patients, compared with 10.60% (95%CI 10.0, 11.3%) for placebo. Triptans showed to be effective in the largest proportion of patients on the outcome “headache relief at 2 hours”: 42% to 76% of patients, compared to 26.70 (95%CI 25.7, 27.7) for placebo. Fifty percent of patients taking sumatriptan 50 mg (95%CI 46.3, 53.1) vs 27% (95%CI 25.7, 27.7) with placebo had a headache relief at 2 hours (9).

Two additional RCTs not included in the systematic reviews provided data that did not change the conclusions of the SRs (10, 11).
Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

The application identified safety data of sumatriptan in adults and children and adolescents from systematic reviews and randomized controlled trials and one observational study.

**Children and adolescents**

No safety data were available on oral sumatriptan in children. Overall, triptans in children did not show a higher frequency of adverse events (AE) compared to placebo. For intranasal sumatriptan, the risk difference for any adverse events was statistically higher than placebo. The overall frequency of any adverse event in adolescents taking triptans was higher than placebo although most AEs were considered mild (7).

**Adults**

Among 20,049 patients treated with oral sumatriptan (25 mg to 300 mg), only two treatment-related serious adverse events were reported: one after treating with sumatriptan 85 mg (heart palpitations), one after treating with sumatriptan 300 mg (chest tightness and pressure). Withdrawals due to AEs were uncommon; in placebo-controlled studies, excluding those using high doses of sumatriptan (>100mg), the rate of adverse event withdrawal among patients treated with sumatriptan was equivalent to that of placebo (0.71% (45/6349) and 0.65% (19/2926), respectively). Any AEs were more common in patients treated with sumatriptan (particularly at the 100 mg dose) than placebo (8).

Pooled estimates of comparisons of sumatriptan versus other triptans did not show significant differences for any AEs. Sumatriptan 100 mg was associated with a higher frequency of AEs compared to ASA and paracetamol in combination with metoclopramide (8).

An industry-funded SR and NMA assessed the tolerability of treatments administered by oral route in adults (> 18 years of age) with acute migraine. The SR included 141 RCTs evaluating triptans, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAIDs) or barbiturates in any combination, without any other limitation regarding sample size or treatment concealing (12). The quality of the included studies was not formally assessed and the results should be interpreted with caution.

Data from direct comparisons were available for sumatriptan vs. placebo (39 studies), naproxen (6 studies), naproxen + sumatriptan (4 studies), selective cox-inhibitors (1 study), ergotamine (1 study), paracetamol (1 study), eletriptan (3 studies), rizatriptan (8 studies), naratriptan (2 studies), zolmitriptan (4 studies) and almotriptan (2 studies).

Sumatriptan showed a significantly higher incidence of any AEs than placebo (OR 1.80, 95%CI 1.57, 2.05), as well as sumatriptan + naproxen, zolmitriptan and rizatriptan. Sumatriptan, sumatriptan + naproxen zolmitriptan, rizatriptan, eletriptan and paracetamol showed a higher frequency of treatment-related AEs vs placebo (sumatriptan OR 2.23, 95%CI 1.86, 2.70).

Serious adverse events show estimates with wide CIs (SAEs are uncommon, many trials reported zero events in at least one arm, and the definition of SAE varied among trials).

A metaanalysis of 6 observational studies assessed the risk of pregnancy outcomes (major congenital malformations (MCM), prematurity and spontaneous abortion) of women with migraine prenatally exposed to triptans, comparing them with those of women with migraine not taking triptans and with healthy women (13). Pooled analysis showed that the rate of MCM and prematurity was not increased among women with migraine taking triptans during pregnancy when compared with women with migraine not taking triptans. Women exposed to triptans during pregnancy showed a higher rate of spontaneous abortion. Women with migraine not taking triptans compared to healthy controls showed a higher risk of MCM, however this difference was observed on a relatively small sample of triptan-exposed women (n=178). The estimates should be interpreted with caution as they were not adjusted for potential confounders and the overall certainty was rated as very low.

A systematic review by the UK National Clinical Guideline Centre found conflicting evidence of very low quality regarding pregnancy outcomes from a pooled analysis of three observational studies which compared women with migraine who took triptans during pregnancy and women with migraine who did not (14). The guideline panel concluded that the evidence reviewed, although inconclusive, did not indicate an increased risk of triptan use during pregnancy.

The Sumatriptan, Naratriptan and Treximet® Pregnancy Registry is a prospective, observational, uncontrolled, international study sponsored by GlaxoSmithKline. The registry collected pregnancy data of women exposed at any time during their pregnancy to sumatriptan, naratriptan or the combination of sumatriptan and naproxen sodium from health care providers enrolled on a voluntary basis in 18 countries. Data were gathered during 16 years of observation, including a total of 904 exposed pregnant women, with 689 pregnancy outcomes. Six-hundred-and-ten women (67%) with 626 pregnancy outcomes (91%) had been exposed to sumatriptan. The
frequency of major birth defects following any trimester of exposure to sumatriptan was 4.2% (24/576; 95%CI 2.7, 6.2). The same frequency was observed considering 528 pregnancy outcomes after exposure during the first trimester (4.2% 95%CI 2.6%, 6.5%). The authors compared these data with those from other observational studies, showing birth defect frequencies of 4-5% among migraineurs, concluding that there is no signal of teratogenicity associated with major birth defects for sumatriptan (15). These results should be interpreted with caution, due to numerous limitations. Certainty in the estimates was rated very low using GRADE.

Triptans can induce vasoconstriction that may potentially increase the risk of cardiovascular events. A metaanalysis of 4 observational studies assessed the risk of severe cardiovascular events among persons with migraine taking triptans or ergotamine. The authors distinguished the risk of cardiovascular events and stroke associated with the intensity (number of prescribed/dispensed doses) and with the recency of migraine-specific use. Pooled analysis showed no significant differences in the overall risk of cardiovascular events of patients with migraine treated with triptans (intensity of treatment) as compared with controls (OR 0.86; 95% CI 0.52, 1.43, I squared 24.5%). Due to the high heterogeneity of results of the included studies, pooled analysis of the risk of CV events and stroke in relation to recency was not performed (16). Certainty in the estimates was rated as low using GRADE.

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2007, the WHO in collaboration with Lifting the Burden and with the European Headache Federation published guidance on the management of common headache disorders in primary care (17). This guidance recommended stepped management of acute migraine attacks, treating three attacks at each step before proceeding to the next, starting from common analgesics (such as acetylsalicylic acid, ibuprofen, diclofenac, ketoprofen, naproxen or - where these are contraindicated – paracetamol) followed, if needed, by antiemetics (such as domperidone or metoclopramide). Triptans were recommended at the second step, among specific drugs, to be offered to all patients failing step one. The starting recommended formulation was oral, subcutaneous sumatriptan was suggested when all other triptans are ineffective. Analgesics only were recommended for children.

Sumatriptan (50mg or 100 mg) is recommended as the first line monotherapy treatment in adults by the SIGN guideline, with the suggestion of trying other triptans in case of failure (18).

The NICE guideline recommends an oral triptan in monotherapy or combined with NSAID or paracetamol in adults and children. In young subjects (12-17 years of age) nasal triptan is preferred (19).

The Canadian Headache Society guideline recommends sumatriptan, or another triptan, for moderate-severe migraine attacks in adults. If the triptan in monotherapy is insufficient, it is recommended the association with naproxen sodium 500 mg (20).

According to SIGN and NICE guidelines, triptans can be used for treatment of acute migraine during pregnancy and in women in child bearing age.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

Cost-effectiveness modelling suggested that common analgesics (acetylsalicylic acid in particular) are the most cost-effective strategy for managing acute episodic migraine (21). A triptan in combination with acetylsalicylic acid or paracetamol are potentially cost-effective interventions, although with a higher absolute cost, that however would be largely offset by savings in terms of gained health (14).

All triptans are available as generic drugs, but sumatriptan has the lowest price in most countries, including low- and middle-income countries. Oral eletriptan shows superiority to oral sumatriptan relative to all relevant outcomes. However, eletriptan is, on average, substantially more expensive than sumatriptan even considering the non-proprietary name preparations.

### Availability:

Sumatriptan is available globally in branded and generic forms.

### Other considerations:

Sumatriptan was not proposed for inclusion in the EMLc by the applicant because:
- oral sumatriptan is not licensed in children and has not been studied in randomized controlled trials;
- oral sumatriptan has been studied in adolescents 12 to 17 years of age with episodic migraine showing no superiority versus placebo in reaching pain freedom at 2 hours;
- intranasal sumatriptan has been studied in adolescents 12 to 17 years of age showing to be more effective than placebo and is licensed in such patients by some regulatory agencies in western high-income countries. However, since the intranasal inhalation of the drug needs
patient training, the effectiveness of this preparation observed in clinical trials may not be directly applicable in settings where training is impractical or not possible. Moreover, the cost-effectiveness of intranasal sumatriptan is substantially lower than oral sumatriptan.

Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of sumatriptan to the core list of the EML for the treatment of adult patients with acute migraine.

The Committee noted that the available evidence supported the superior effectiveness of sumatriptan compared to placebo, but that evidence comparing sumatriptan with currently listed analgesics (aspirin and paracetamol) showed varying results, including no difference in effect.

However, the Committee also noted that sumatriptan is recommended as first-line therapy for migraine in many international guidelines, and would welcome a future review of additional data of the role of sumatriptan in the context of other migraine therapies.

References:

### Section 8: IMMUNOMODULATORS AND ANTINEOPLASTICS

#### 8.1 Immunomodulators for non-malignant disease

**Medicines for multiple sclerosis – addition – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glatiramer acetate</td>
<td>L03AX13</td>
<td>The application requested the addition of glatiramer acetate, fingolimod and ocrelizumab to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of multiple sclerosis (MS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingolimod</td>
<td>L04AA27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocrelizumab</td>
<td>L04AA36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant:** Multiple Sclerosis International Federation (MSIF)

**WHO Technical Department:** Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse

**EML / EMLc:** EML and EMLc

**Section:** 8.1 Immunomodulators for non-malignant disease

**Dose form(s) & strengths(s):**
- Glatiramer acetate: injection 20 mg/mL, 40 mg/mL
- Fingolimod: capsule 0.25 mg, 0.5 mg
- Ocrelizumab: injection 300 mg/10 mL in 10 mL vial

**Core / Complementary:** Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:** Individual

**Background:**
In 2015, the Expert Committee reviewed an application requesting addition of azathioprine to the EML for the treatment of MS. The Committee acknowledged the significant public health burden of MS but noted the availability of a number of well-established and more recent immunomodulating medicines for this condition. The Committee therefore recommended that a comprehensive review be undertaken of all medicines used for the management of relapsing–remitting and other forms of multiple sclerosis for future consideration (1). MSIF is a non-state actor in official relations with WHO. They convened a taskforce of global experts in MS research and care to submit an application for Disease-Modifying Therapies (DMTs) for the treatment of MS to be included on the EML. All approved DMTs used for the treatment of MS were summarized by comparative effectiveness in a variety of clinical settings based on the recently published ECTRIMS/EAN (European Committee for Treatment and Research for Multiple Sclerosis/European Association of Neurology) Guidelines on the pharmacological treatment of people with MS (2). A comparison was also made with the American Academy of Neurology guidelines on disease modifying therapies in MS (3). Of the multiple therapies are used for treating MS, the application prioritized three medications to be included on the EML. Prioritization was based on their efficacy/safety profiles, tolerability/liveability, monitoring needs, route of administration, licensed use in paediatric-onset and primary progressive MS, safety profile in pregnancy, and availability of generic and/or biosimilar substitutes.

**Public health relevance:** Multiple sclerosis is an immune-mediated disorder of the central nervous system (gray and white matter) characterized by inflammation, demyelination, and degenerative changes including neuroaxonal loss and progressive brain and spinal cord atrophy. Approximately 85% of those with MS initially experience relapses and remissions of neurological symptoms, (relapsing-remitting MS), with relapses often associated with new areas of central nervous system inflammation. Gradual worsening in this population, with or without additional inflammatory events, is known as secondary progressive MS. Progressive changes can occur at any time in the disease course, but usually become more prominent over time. Approximately 15% of people diagnosed with MS have a progressive course from disease onset (primary progressive MS). Some with primary progressive MS may have typical relapses later in their disease course, after a progressive course has been established (4, 5).
In 2013, there were more than 2.3 million people with MS worldwide (6, 7). The incidence and prevalence of MS are rising, with studies showing significantly larger numbers than was previously estimated (8-15). Women are disproportionately affected, with prevalence in females 2-3 times that in males (7, 16). Although the cause is not fully understood, MS is considered to have complex causality blending genetic risk and environmental factors. People can be diagnosed throughout the age range, though MS is most often diagnosed between the ages of 20-50. Onset may also occur in childhood, and it is estimated that 3%-10% of all individuals with MS experience their first attack prior to age 18 years (17). The incidence of paediatric-onset MS in North American and European studies has been reported to be between 0.13 to 0.6 cases per 100,000 children (18).

Symptoms of MS negatively impact functional abilities and quality of life, and often include overwhelming fatigue, mood and cognitive changes, mobility impairment, sensory impairment, visual disturbances, sexual dysfunction, and impaired bowel and bladder control. People with MS report lower health-related quality of life compared to other populations – including those with other chronic illnesses. The prevalence of depression is estimated to be 70% in patients with MS (19).

The goal of treatment is to reduce the long-term burden of the disease, i.e. to delay disability progression and to prevent secondary progressive MS (20). Quality of life and the socioeconomic burden of MS are closely linked to disability, therefore, delaying and preventing disability worsening will have a major impact for individuals with the disease and for society (21).

### Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glatiramer acetate</strong></td>
<td>Three trials (3,217 patients), compared glatiramer acetate with placebo in patients with RRMS with follow up ranging from 52 to 104 weeks (22-24). Compared to placebo, glatiramer acetate lowered annualized relapse rates for follow ups of 52-96 weeks (MD=0.14, 95% CI: -0.21 to 0.06, moderate quality evidence, n=2,117, 2 studies) and resulted in more patients free from relapse at 1-2 years follow up (RR=1.17, 95% CI: 1.10-1.24, moderate quality evidence, n=2,360, 3 studies). Glatiramer acetate was also shown to result in a lower number of cumulative gadolinium enhancing (GAD) lesions (MD=0.73, 95% CI: -1.15 to -0.31, high quality evidence, n=1,325, 1 study) and new or newly enlarging T2 lesions at 6 and 12 months follow up (MD=1.94, 95% CI: -3.03 to -0.85, high quality evidence, n=1,325, 1 study). Low quality evidence showed a non-statistically significant effect on disability at 2 years follow up (RR=0.86, 95% CI: 0.66 to 1.11, n=964, 2 studies). Four trials compared glatiramer acetate to interferon in patients with RRMS (25-28). At two years' follow up, the number of participants free from relapse did not significantly differ (RR=0.98, 95% CI: 0.90-1.06, moderate quality evidence, n=2,175, 3 studies), nor did extent of disability worsening (RR=1.07, 95% CI: 0.83-1.31, 1 study). One trial (970 patients) compared glatiramer acetate to placebo for patients with primary-progressive MS (29). There was a non-significant effect on the number of disability worsening (RR=0.87, 95% CI: 0.75-1.02) and longer time to disability worsening (HR=0.87, 95% CI: 0.71-1.07) in the glatiramer acetate group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fingolimod</strong></td>
<td>Two trials compared fingolimod with placebo in patients with RRMS, with two years follow up (30, 31). A larger proportion of patients were free from relapse at two years in the fingolimod arm (RR=1.44, 95% CI: 1.28-1.63, moderate quality evidence, n=2,355). The annualized relapse rate was also lower in the fingolimod arm (MD=-0.21, 95% CI: -0.25 to -0.16, moderate quality evidence). Fingolimod-treated patients had a lower risk of disability worsening compared to placebo (RR=0.71, 95% CI: 0.56-0.90, moderate quality evidence, n=2,355). Patients also had fewer new or newly enlarged T2 lesions (RR=2.16, 95% CI: 1.77-2.63, moderate quality evidence, n=1,192) and fewer GAD lesions (MD=0.87, 95% CI: -1.10 to -0.64, moderate quality evidence, n=1,216, 2 studies) at two years follow up. According to one study, fingolimod reduced percent change in brain volume at 1-2 years follow up (MD=0.3, 95% CI: 0.16-0.44, moderate quality evidence, n=685). One trial compared fingolimod with interferon in patients with RRMS (32). Moderate quality evidence showed that participants in the fingolimod arm had lower annualized relapse rates (MD=0.17, 95% CI: -0.26 to -0.08, n=860), and more participants were free from relapse at 1 year (RR=1.19, 95% CI: 1.11-1.29, n=860) than the interferon group. Fingolimod was also associated with fewer new or newly enlarged T2 lesions (MD=-0.90, 95% CI: -1.62 to -0.18, 1 study).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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n=733) and GAD lesions (MD=-0.28, 95% CI: -0.50 to -0.06, n=728). There was no significant difference in extent of disability progression between fingolimod and interferon in the trial. A phase III trial investigated the safety and efficacy of fingolimod versus interferon beta-1a, in 215 children and adolescents (ages 10 to 17) with MS. Fingolimod significantly reduced annualized relapse rates by 82% (absolute difference, 0.55; 95% CI 0.36 to 0.74; relapses RR 0.18, 95% CI 0.11 to 0.30) over a period of up to two years compared to interferon beta-1a; reduced the number of new or newly enlarged T2 lesions up to 24 months by 53% (RR 0.47, 95% CI 0.36 to 0.62) and reduced the average number of gadolinium-enhancing T1 (Gd+) lesions per scan at 24 months by 66.0% (RR 0.34, 95% CI 0.22 to 0.54). Fingolimod was associated with a higher rate of serious adverse events (16.8% versus 6.5%) (33).

One trial (970 participants) compared fingolimod with placebo in patients with primary-progressive MS (34). There was no difference in disability progression at 156 weeks follow up between fingolimod or placebo (RR=0.93, 95% CI: 0.80-1.08, moderate quality evidence). The adjusted annualized relapse rate was 0.12 with fingolimod and 0.67 with interferon beta-1a (absolute difference, 0.55 relapses; relative difference, 82%; P<0.001). The key secondary end point of the annualized rate of new or newly enlarged lesions on T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was 4.39 with fingolimod and 9.27 with interferon beta-1a (absolute difference, 4.88 lesions; relative difference, 53%; P<0.001). Adverse events, excluding relapses of multiple sclerosis, occurred in 88.8% of patients who received fingolimod and 95.3% of those who received interferon beta-1a. Serious adverse events occurred in 18 patients (16.8%) in the fingolimod group and included infection (in 4 patients) and leukopenia (in 2 patients). Six patients had convulsions. Serious adverse events occurred in 7 patients (6.5%) in the interferon beta-1a group and included infection (in 2 patients) and supraventricular tachycardia (in 1 patient).

Ocrelizumab

A phase II trial compared ocrelizumab (low and high dose) and placebo in patients with RRMS. At the end of the 24 weeks participants in both ocrelizumab groups had lower numbers of active brain lesions compared to the placebo group (89%, 95% CI 68 to 97, lower in low dose ocrelizumab group and 96%, 95% CI 89 to 99, lower in high dose ocrelizumab group). Annualized relapse rates over the 24 weeks were 0.13 (95% CI 0.03 to 0.29) in the low dose ocrelizumab group and 0.17 (95% CI 0.05 to 0.35) in the high dose ocrelizumab group compared to the 0.64 rate (95% CI 0.43 to 0.94) of the placebo group. Findings also showed that both doses of ocrelizumab were effective in reducing MRI and clinical disease activity (35).

Two phase III clinical trials, OPERA I and OPERA II, compared the effects of ocrelizumab (600mg every 24 weeks) with interferon beta-1b (44 µg three times a week) for 96 weeks. Clinical outcomes from 1,656 participants show significantly reduced annualized relapse rates with ocrelizumab compared to interferon beta-1a at 2 years (MD=-0.13, 95% CI: -0.18 to -0.08) thus meeting its primary endpoint. Secondary outcomes showed ocrelizumab had lower rate of disability progression. For the total trial period of 96 weeks, the rate of disability progression at 24 weeks was 6.9% vs 10.5% in the ocrelizumab and interferon beta-1a groups, respectively (hazard ratio, 0.60; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.84). Patients in the ocrelizumab group also had fewer gadolinium-enhancing lesions (36).

One trial compared ocrelizumab to placebo in patients with primary progressive MS. The ocrelizumab group had a greater time to disability progression at 120 weeks follow up when confirmed at both 12 weeks (HR=0.76, 95% CI:0.59-0.98, high quality evidence, n=732) and 24 weeks (HR=0.75, 95% CI: 0.58-0.97, high quality evidence, n=732) (37).

Rituximab

A 2013 Cochrane systematic review found one trial comparing rituximab to placebo in 104 adult patients with RRMS (38). The mean number of total gadolinium-enhancing lesions, the primary endpoint of this double-blind phase 2 trial, was significantly decreased in patients receiving rituximab after 12, 16, 20 and 24 weeks (-5.0, 95% CI: -9.99 to -0.01). The proportion of patients with relapses was significantly reduced in the rituximab group, both after 24 weeks (14.5% vs. 34.3% in the placebo group; P=0.02) and 48 weeks (20.3% vs. 40.0%, P=0.04) (39). A phase II open label study of 26 patients with RRMS receiving rituximab at baseline and 6 months found that mean annualised relapse rate reduced from 1.27 to 0.23, and mean number of GAD lesions reduced from 1.31 to 0.05 at week 48 and 0.0 at week 72. Mean number of new or newly enhancing T2 lesions also decreased from 0.92 at week 4 to 0.0 at week 72 (40).
A randomized controlled trial (439 participants) compared rituximab versus placebo in patients with primary progressive MS (41). Patients were randomized (2:1) to receive two intravenous doses (2 weeks apart) of rituximab (n=292) or placebo (n=147) infusions every 24 weeks, for 96 weeks. Results showed that fewer in the rituximab group (30.2%) experienced 12 weeks confirmed disease progression during 96 weeks compared to 38.5% in the placebo group, but the difference did not reach statistical significance (p= 0.14). However, in a predefined sub-analysis, rituximab showed a significant effect in patients with active MRI lesions or aged less than 51 years. This effect was comparable with the effect seen in the ocrelizumab trial, which only included patients below the age of 55.

Real-world data on treatment with rituximab in MS was available from a study which examined the disease course of 822 MS-patients, 557 with RRMS, 198 with secondary progressive MS and 67 with primary progressive MS, who were followed for a mean duration of 22 months (42). RRMS patients treated with rituximab had a yearly relapse rate of 0.044 during the study period. In total, 5.2 % of the patients stopped treatment because of side effects or disease activity. The ratio of gadolinium-enhancing lesions per MRI dropped significantly from approximately 3 months after treatment initiation, and was in total 0.054, present in 2.2% of MRIs. Moreover, the registry data suggest that the treatment efficacy of rituximab in RRMS could exceed the effect of fingolimod, dimethyl fumarate and beta-interferons. In addition, adherence was higher and side effects were comparable to all other drugs (43, 44).

### Summary of evidence: harms

The application presented a summary description of adverse events associated with glatiramer acetate, fingolimod and ocrelizumab, and their associated frequencies, as reported in the respective approved prescribing information documents.

Common and very common adverse events associated with glatiramer acetate include injection site reactions, lipoatrophy, vasodilatation, rash, dyspnoea, chest pain and lymphadenopathy. Common and very common adverse events associated with fingolimod include headache, influenza, diarrhoea, back pain, elevated liver enzymes, cough, first-dose bradycardia, macular oedema, lymphopenia and bronchitis. Common and very common adverse events associated with ocrelizumab include infusion reactions, infections. Ocrelizumab has also been associated with a possible increased risk of malignancies.

### Additional evidence: Glatiramer acetate

A 2016 Cochrane systematic review of 6 trials (2 904 participants) compared the safety and efficacy of glatiramer acetate and beta-interferons (45). Both medicines showed similar clinical efficacy at 24 months (three studies) for number of participants with relapse (RR 1.04, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.24) or confirmed progression (RR 1.11, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.35). At 36 months, results from a single study suggested that relapse rates were higher in the IFN group than in the GA group (RR 1.40, 95% CI 1.13 to 1.74). However, greater and faster reduction in MRI lesion load accrual was observed in IFN-treated compared with GA-treated participants with MS (MD for T2 weighted lesion volume −0.58, 95% CI −0.99 to −0.18). Reviewers interpretation of overall evidence quality was cautious: the number of studies and participants was limited, the heterogeneity among studies was high and the clinical relevance of scales to measure disease progression was considered doubtful. The number of participants who withdrew from or dropped out of the study because of adverse events was available for four studies (2685 participants; 93%). No differences were found between the two treatment groups (RR 0.95, 95% CI 0.64 to 1.40). Results were similar for severe adverse events (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.63 to 1.56).

A 2018 network meta-analysis including direct and indirect evidence, including 24 trials published between 1987 and 2015, yielded a more precise estimate of effectiveness for both interferon beta-1a once a week versus placebo (HR = 0.73, 95% CI 0.53 to 1.00) and glatiramer acetate (0.76, 95% CI 0.60 to 0.97) at three months (46). There was little evidence of superiority of one drug over another but ranking of the medicines suggested that interferon beta-1a thrice weekly had the highest cumulative probability of superiority. Interpretation of these findings should take into consideration the short length of follow up, the high risk of bias across studies, and the potential differences among trials which may act as effect modifiers and introduce bias in the network meta-analysis. This review also considered discontinuation due to adverse events, at different follow up times. Evidence that one medicine was more likely to lead to discontinuation than another was limited, as the confidence intervals were wide: more
### WHO Guidelines:

None available.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The cost-effectiveness of disease modifying treatments for MS have been assessed in multiple systematic reviews involving studies conducted in high-income countries in Europe and North America (48-51). The studies reported that DMTs (including glatiramer acetate, fingolimod, ocrelizumab and rituximab) were potentially cost-effective but several studies reported costs which were likely to be above particular countries’ willingness to pay thresholds. Limitations of these studies noted in these reviews included the lack of head-to-head comparisons between different DMTs, variation in time-horizons, and variation in end-points. There were no cost-effectiveness studies identified from low or middle-income countries.

Though there is significant variance globally, a North American study suggested that approximately 60% of people with MS are unemployed (52), accounting for about one third of the total economic burden of MS (53). In addition to a loss in productivity, people with MS will have additional care needs with advancing age and disease severity. The economic burden of MS per patient and year ranges from approximately $24,666 to $51,678 USD (54). These amounts represent direct costs, which include in and out patient care, medications, medical procedures and social services as well as indirect costs related to loss of employment, disability benefits, early pension plans, and loss of productivity for spouses or family members providing informal care and death. Given the most frequent age of presentation (young adults), it is important to note that MS has both physical and cognitive impact, and also impacts the family development of the patients, as well as, determines a socio-economic impact on society as a whole.

### Availability:

Glatiramer acetate has marketing approval in many high and middle-low income countries. Generic versions of glatiramer acetate are available in some countries – for example, in the US, Russian Federation and India. Secondary patents concerning glatiramer acetate are active in some jurisdictions.

Fingolimod has marketing approval in many high and middle-low income countries. Price and availability of fingolimod vary globally. Generic versions are available. The main product patent on fingolimod appears not to have been filed in the low and middle income country (LMIC).
jurisdictions surveyed and expires between 2016 and 2018 in some European countries and 2019 in the USA.

Ocrelizumab has marketing approval in 68 high and middle-income countries. Ocrelizumab is protected by a product patent expiring in 2023 in many jurisdictions. It is likely that biosimilar ocrelizumab cannot enter the market where this patent has been granted before 2023. Rituximab has marketing approval for indications other than multiple sclerosis in high- and low and middle-income countries. Biosimilar versions of rituximab have been approved in numerous countries, including, the European Union, South Korea, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, India, and Australia.

**Other considerations:**

Use in pregnancy

A pregnancy registry maintained by the marketing company of branded glatiramer acetate captured over 7,000 pregnancies exposed to glatiramer acetate did not find an increase in spontaneous abortions, premature births, neonatal complications, or birth defects (55). No significant differences were observed in birth weight of babies born to mothers exposed to glatiramer during pregnancy compared with mothers not exposed to glatiramer acetate during pregnancy. Evidence supports the use of branded glatiramer acetate in pregnant women who are recommended to remain on treatment to manage disease activity.

Fingolimod is a teratogen class C agent and should be considered an absolute contraindication in pregnancy and breastfeeding based on its known teratogenicity in animal studies and post-marketing data.

Ocrelizumab is known to cross the placental barrier and is recommended to be avoided during pregnancy unless the potential benefit to the mother outweighs the potential risk to the fetus. There are no adequate data on the developmental risk associated with use of ocrelizumab in pregnant women.

For rituximab, a large cohort study found that out of 153 pregnancies, 90 resulted in live births (56). Twenty-two infants were born prematurely; with one neonatal death at 6 weeks. Eleven neonates had hematologic abnormalities; none had corresponding infections. Two congenital malformations were identified.

The European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) task considered on use of rituximab before pregnancy and during pregnancy (57). Based on a systematic literature and consensus among experts, the recommendation considered that rituximab should be replaced before conception by other medication. It should be used during pregnancy only when no other pregnancy-compatible drug can effectively control maternal disease.

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee acknowledged the important public health burden of MS and the need for effective and affordable treatments and noted the large number of supporting letters that were received in relation to the application.

The Committee appreciated the approach taken in the application to propose a limited number of essential medicines for MS, but noted that the superiority of the presented medicines over other therapeutic options in terms of benefits, harms and affordability did not clearly emerge. The Committee noted that some commonly used treatments were not included (eg. azathioprine, natalizumab, dimethyl fumarate, cladribine) or were not given full consideration (rituximab) and the reasons for their exclusion were not clear. The Committee also noted ongoing development in international MS guidelines and would welcome a revised application for EML inclusion in the future which considers the relative roles of all available medicines for MS.

In particular, the Committee noted the evidence presented in the application in relation to rituximab. The Committee agreed that rituximab could have a relevant clinical role in treatment of MS, and recommended that any future application should include evidence for rituximab versus active comparators, not just placebo.

The Committee, therefore did not recommend the addition of glatiramer acetate, fingolimod and ocrelizumab to the Model Lists at this time, and would welcome a revised application which comprehensively reviews the relative roles of relevant available medicines for MS.
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**TNF-alfa inhibitors for chronic inflammatory diseases – addition – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etanercept</td>
<td>L04AB01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infliximab</td>
<td>L04AB02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalimumab</td>
<td>L04AB04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certolizumab pegol</td>
<td>L04AB05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golimumab</td>
<td>L04AB06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**
The application requested the addition of anti Tumour Necrosis Factor (TNF) biologic medicines etanercept, infliximab and adalimumab (and biosimilars) to the EML and EMLc and of certolizumab pegol and golimumab to the EML for the treatment of severe chronic inflammatory autoimmune disorders: rheumatoid arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis and Crohn disease.

**Applicant:** Centre for Global Health - University of Ottawa

**WHO Technical Department:** Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention

**EML / EMLc:** EML and EMLc

**Section:** 8.1 Immunomodulators for non-malignant disease

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Etanercept (ETN): injection 25 mg/mL, 50 mg/mL
- Infliximab (IFX): powder for injection 100 mg
- Adalimumab (ADA): injection 40 mg/0.8 mL, 40 mg/0.4 mL
- Certolizumab pegol (CZP): injection 200 mg/mL
- Golimumab (GOL): injection 50 mg/0.5 mL, 100 mg/mL

**Core / Complementary:** Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:** Square box

**Background:** Anti-TNF biologic medicines had not previously been considered for inclusion on the Model Lists.

**Public health relevance:**

- **Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA):** RA is a chronic autoimmune disease that can affect multiple joints, connective tissues, muscles, tendons and fibrous tissues. It is a chronic disabling condition causing severe pain and deformity. The global prevalence of RA in 2017 was 0.27%. Countries from all income levels are affected (1).

- **Ankylosing Spondylitis (AS):** AS is a type of chronic inflammatory arthritis that primarily affects the spine and sacroiliac joints and ligaments. Individuals with AS have increased risk for developing articular and extra-articular manifestations which further compound the negative health outcomes and prognosis (2). The pooled global prevalence of AS has been estimated at 0.18%, with the highest prevalence seen in Europe, North America (3) and in individuals who are HLA-B27 positive with a family member with the disease (4).

- **Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis (JIA):** JIA is the most common rheumatic disease affecting children under the age of 16 years. There are limited epidemiological data for JIA, likely due to lack of standard diagnostic criteria (5, 6). However, recent estimates indicate that the prevalence varies from 3.8 to 400/100,000 and after directly standardizing for age and gender, the pooled prevalence is 70.2 [62.9–78.1]/100,000 (6).

- **Crohn’s Disease:** Crohn’s disease is a chronic autoimmune disorder characterized by severe inflammation of any part of the gastrointestinal tract, but most commonly occurs in the lower part of the small intestine and the colon. Crohn’s disease is a lifelong systemic condition with deliberating symptoms that negatively affect an individual’s quality-of-life. Most people will need surgery and/or drug treatment. As such, it is associated with high morbidity, mortality, and substantial costs to the health-care system. Although the incidence is the highest in westernized nations, it is greatly accelerating in Asia, South America and Africa (7). The overall burden of Crohn’s disease remains high with prevalence exceeding 0.3% in North America, Oceania, and many countries in Europe (7). The prevalence has especially risen in the pediatric population in the last 15 years (8).
Summary of evidence: benefits
(from the application)

Early RA
A systematic review of 16 RCTs (6,908 participants) compared anti-TNF biologics to conventional synthetic disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (csDMARD) as monotherapy (n=13) or combination therapy (n=3). One RCT compared TNF and non-TNF biologic therapies. The majority of the included studies were rated as medium risk of bias (ROB) (9).
Overall, the results of a network meta-analysis revealed that when anti-TNF biologics were combined with methotrexate (MTX), patients achieved higher response rates (as measured by ACR50 (50% change in RA activity measures)) compared to MTX alone: ETN + MTX relative risk (RR) 1.49; 95% CI, 1.27 to 1.74; moderate strength of evidence; ADA + MTX RR 1.35; 95% CI, 1.15 to 1.59; low strength of evidence; CZP + MTX RR 1.20; 95% CI, 1.04 to 1.38; low strength of evidence; IFX + MTX RR 1.57; 95% CI, 1.30 to 1.88; insufficient strength of evidence (9). Results also indicated that the combination of anti-TNF biologics plus MTX were favoured in comparison to biologic monotherapy. The ACR50 response rate was significantly higher for ADA+MTX than ADA monotherapy (RR, 1.52; 95% CI, 1.28 to 1.80; moderate evidence) and ETN+MTX than ETN monotherapy (RR, 1.57; 95% CI, 1.23 to 2.02) (9). Anti-TNF combinations were also associated with benefits compared to MTX monotherapy for the outcome measures of remission, radiographic changes or functional capacity (9).
Advanced RA
A systematic review of 98 RCTs evaluated the comparative efficacy of different treatment options for advanced RA. Of these, 61 studies were included to determine the efficacy of anti-TNF biologics. Of the 88 studies assessed for risk of bias, half were judged to have a high ROB and only 10 were considered to have a low ROB overall; the rest (39%) had an unclear ROB overall (10).
ETN + MTX (odds ratio (OR) 3.95, 95% CI 2.29 to 7.51), IFX + MTX (OR 3.00, 95% CI 1.78 to 5.08), ADA + MTX (OR 3.99, 95% CI 2.84 to 5.62), CZP + MTX (OR 5.35, 95% CI 3.42 to 8.67) and GOL + MTX (OR intravenous 2.90, 95% CI 1.21 to 7.12; OR subcutaneous 6.00, 95% CI 3.27 to 11.35) all produced greater ACR 50 responses when compared to MTX monotherapy. Anti-TNF biologics in combination with MTX were also associated with greater odds of achieving ACR 50 response compared to MTX in combination with another csDMARD. With the exception of Infliximab, all the anti-TNF biologics in combination with MTX produced a comparable ACR 50 response to csDMARD triple therapy (10). There were no significant differences in radiographic progression for any anti-TNFs in combination with MTX compared to csDMARD double or triple therapy. There were statistically significant higher odds of achieving remission among those who were treated with anti-TNF biologics in combination with MTX compared to MTX. Anti-TNF biologics in combination with MTX also produced more favourable odds of remission compared to a csDMARD plus MTX (10). CZP+MTX, achieved a statistically significant improvement in the DAS28 (Disease Activity Score 28) compared to MTX monotherapy. IFX, ADA, CZP and GOL (IV and SC) all in combination with MTX produced a significantly lower disability score and higher physical health-related quality of life scores compared to MTX monotherapy. Intravenous GOL and CZP both in combination with MTX produced higher mental health-related quality of life than MTX. Patients treated with ETN, ADA or CZP all in combination with MTX had lower pain scores than MTX monotherapy.
CZP+MTX produced a significantly lower fatigue score than MTX monotherapy (10).
Ankylosing Spondylitis
A systematic review of 21 short-term RCTs involving 3,308 participants assessed assess the benefits and harms of anti-TNF biologics in comparison to placebo, other drugs or usual care in the treatment of AS. Most included studies had low or unclear risk of bias (4). Patients receiving anti-TNF biologics were found to be three to four times more likely to achieve an Assessment in SpondyloArthritis International Society (ASAS) 40 response by six months compared to placebo (ETN RR 3.31, 95% CI 2.38 to 4.53; IFX RR 4.07, 95% CI 2.80 to 5.74; ADA RR 3.53, 95% CI 2.49 to 4.91; GOL RR 2.90, 95% CI 1.90 to 4.23) (high strength of evidence). The number needed-to-treat (NNT) to receive this response ranged from 3 to 5. No significant difference were found for ASAS 40 response between the anti-TNF biologics (4). Moderate strength evidence found that patients receiving anti-TNF biologics were also significantly more likely than placebo to achieve ASAS partial remission. The NNT to detect a minimally clinically important difference of 0.7 points for physical functioning ranged from 2 to 4. There was high strength evidence that ETN, IFX, ADA and GOL all had significantly BASFI (Bath Ankylosing Spondylitis Functional Index) scores compared to placebo. Low to moderate strength evidence
suggested that anti-TNF biologics have a small impact on reducing spinal inflammation, however the clinical relevance of this was not clear (4).

Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis

A systematic review of 100 full-text articles and conference abstracts (67 RCTs) evaluating the efficacy and safety of interventions for JIA included 8 RCTs comparing anti-TNF biologics (11). This review found that patients receiving ETN 0.4mg/kg were more likely to maintain a disease response measured by the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) Pediatric (PEDI) 30 compared to patients receiving placebo (RR 1.91 (95% CrI, 1.28 to 2.59). No other anti-TNF biologics showed statistically significant differences compared to placebo for this outcome. There were no significant differences between anti-TNF biologics and methotrexate in combination with placebo. Indirect estimates of the head-to-head comparisons of anti-TNF biologics did not demonstrate statistically significant differences (11). The number of active joints decreased for 0.2 mg/kg and 0.4 mg/kg ETN (MD -11.23, 95% CrI -18.16 to -4.59 and MD -11.01, 95% CrI -14.59 to -7.52, respectively) and the number of joints with limited range of motion decreased for 0.4 mg/kg ETN only (MD -5.15, CrI -9.5 to -0.8) (11).

Crohn Disease

A systematic review comparing the efficacy of therapies for induction and maintenance of remission in adult patients with Crohn’s disease included 15 trials involving anti-TNF therapies (IFX: 1 for induction and 2 for maintenance; ADA: 4 for induction and 3 for maintenance; CZP: 4 for induction and 1 for maintenance) and 5 additional studies evaluating combination therapies with IFX (12). All but one study assessed remission using the Crohn’s disease Activity Index (CDAI) less than 150. Most of the included studies were assessed to have unclear risk of bias. Other limitations of this study have been identified in the literature that may limit the applicability of the results (13). However, additional network meta-analyses have found similar effectiveness of anti-TNFs against placebo in the induction and maintenance of remission for Crohn’s disease even after accounting for these differences (14-16).

Compared to placebo, IFX (OR, 2.8 95% CrI 1.4–7.2), IFX plus azathioprine (OR 4.3 95% CrI 2.0–9.8) and ADA (OR, 2.9 95% CrI 1.6–5.5) all had over 99% probability of being superior at inducing remission in Crohn’s patients. These same drugs also proved to be superior to azathioprine/6-mercaptopurine (OR, 2.3 95% CrI 1.3–5.0, OR 3.4 95% CrI 1.9–6.3, and OR 3.4 95% CrI 1.9–6.3). IFX plus azathioprine was 2.7 times more likely to induce remission compared to methotrexate (95% CrI 1.9 – 6.3). IFX + azathioprine (OR 3.1 95% CrI 1.4–7.7) and ADA (OR 2.1 95% CrI 1.0–4.6) were found to be superior to CZP for inducing remission (12).

For maintenance of remission, IFX (OR 2.8, 95% CrI 1.84.5), IFX plus azathioprine (OR 5.2, 95% CrI 2.8 - 11), ADA (OR 5.1, 95% CrI 3.3–8.1) and CZP (OR 2.0, 95% CrI 1.4–3.0) all had over 99% probability of being superior to placebo. ADA (OR, 2.9, 95% CrI 1.6–5.1), IFX (1.6, 95% CrI 1.0–2.5) and IFX plus azathioprine (OR 3.0, 95% CrI 1.7–5.5) all had greater odds at achieving maintenance of remission compared to azathioprine/6-mercaptopurine. IFX + azathioprine (OR 2.6, 95% CrI 1.3–6.0) and ADA (OR 2.5 95% CrI 1.4–4.6) were found to be superior to CZP for maintenance of remission. IFX plus azathioprine was superior to IFX monotherapy for maintenance of remission (OR 1.8, 95% CrI 1.0-3.8) (12).

A systematic review comparing efficacy of pharmacologic interventions for preventing relapse of Crohn's disease after surgery found that anti-TNF monotherapy was the most effective therapy for post-operative prophylaxis, with large effect sizes relative to all other strategies including antibiotics, immunomodulator monotherapy, immunomodulators with antibiotics, budesonide (clinical relapse: RR, 0.02–0.20; endoscopic relapse: RR, 0.005–0.04) (17).
Uncommon yet serious adverse events for anti-TNF biologics include serious infection, malignancy and lymphoma, neurologic effects and cardiac failure. A 2011 Cochrane Systematic Review assessed the potential adverse effects of anti-TNF biologics: etanercept (39 RCTs), infliximab (40 RCTs), adalimumab (22 RCTs), certolizumab pegol (6 RCTs) and golimumab (8 RCTs) alone or in combination with other therapies. This review found that compared to control, CZP was associated with a higher odds of serious adverse effects (OR 1.57, 95% CI 1.06-2.32) and serious infections (OR 4.75, 95% CI 1.52-18.45) and IFX was associated with higher odds of total adverse events (OR 1.55, 95% CI 1.01-2.35) and withdrawals due to adverse events (OR 2.34, 95% CI 1.40-1.14) (18).

Early RA
The network meta-analysis for early RA found no significant differences in serious adverse events or discontinuations attributable to adverse events between MTX monotherapy and any of the anti-TNF biologics (low strength of evidence). IFX + MTX also did not differ from csDMARD combination therapies (low strength of evidence). Anti-TNF therapy with a csDMARD did not differ significantly in serious adverse events or discontinuations attributable to adverse events compared to TNF biologic monotherapy (moderate strength of evidence) (9).

Advanced RA
The systematic review for advanced RA found that there were no significant differences in serious adverse events or withdrawals attributable to adverse events between the anti-TNF biologics in combination with MTX and MTX monotherapy. ETN + MTX had lower odds of withdrawals attributable to adverse events compared to a csDMARD in combination with MTX (OR 0.33, CrI 0.11 to 0.89). There was insufficient evidence to detect any differences in anti-TNF treatment comparisons for mortality, serious infections, tuberculosis, cancer, leukemia, lymphoma, congestive heart failure, major adverse cardiac events, and herpes zoster. A pairwise meta-analysis found no statistically significant difference in mortality for IFX + MTX and MTX monotherapy. Additional pairwise meta-analyses found that there were no differences in serious infections for patients treated with the ETN, IFX or GOL (plus MTX) versus MTX alone. There was insufficient evidence for this outcome for ADA + MTX. A pooled estimate from two trials comparing ETN monotherapy and MTX combination therapy, found that there were no significant differences in cancer and a pairwise meta-analysis found no significant differences between IFX + MTX and MTX groups (10).

Ankylosing Spondylitis
Pooled results for all anti-TNF biologics demonstrated a moderate level of evidence that there is an increased risk of withdrawals due to adverse events compared to placebo (Peto OR 2.44, 95% CI 1.26 to 4.72), with an absolute increase of 1% (95% CI 0% to 2%). There was no difference in risk for serious adverse events (Peto OR 1.45, 95% CI 0.85 to 2.48). ETN (25 and 50 mg) was the only anti-TNF biologic that had an individual increase in withdrawals due to adverse events versus placebo (RR 3.65, 95% CI 1.27 to 11.79) with an absolute increased harm of 2% (95% CI 0.2% to 8%). The effect of Etanercept compared to placebo for serious adverse events was uncertain. There was no certainty reported for adverse effects or withdrawals due to effect between either ADA, GOL or IFX and placebo. The strength of evidence was moderate for all safety outcomes (4).

Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis
The systematic review for JIA found that biologics were safe in short-term use among both polyarticular course and active systemic patients. For polyarticular course, one RCT found that no serious adverse effects or withdrawals due to adverse effects occurred for high or low doses of ETN. Another RCT found no withdrawals due to adverse events occurred for ADA with or without methotrexate and few withdrawals due to adverse events (11).

Crohn’s Disease
IFX + azathioprine (OR 0.27, 95% CrI 0.08-0.72) and ADA monotherapy (OR 0.43, 95% CrI 0.26 - 0.69) were associated with significantly lower odds of total withdrawals compared to placebo. Similarly, IFX + azathioprine was associated with significantly lower odds of total withdrawals compared to Azathioprine/6-mercaptopurine (OR 0.39, 95% CrI 0.14–0.98) and methotrexate (OR 0.29, 95% CrI 0.07–0.93) (12).

For withdrawals due to adverse events, IFX (OR 2.7, 95% CrI 1.6–4.7) and IFX + azathioprine (OR 3.2, 95% CrI 1.6–6.1) had significantly greater odds of withdrawals due to adverse events compared to placebo. Adalimumab had over a 99% probability of having less withdrawals due to adverse events than placebo (OR, 0.48, 95% CrI 0.31–0.74). CZP (OR 0.23, 95% CrI 0.13–0.40)
and ADA (OR 0.12, 95% CrI 0.06–0.24) had significantly less odds of withdrawals due to adverse events compared to azathioprine/6-mercaptopurine and methotrexate (CZP: OR 0.07, 95% CrI 0.01–0.28 and ADA: 0.04, 95% CrI 0.00–0.16). Infliximab monotherapy had significantly lower odds of withdrawals due to adverse events compared to methotrexate (OR 0.21, 95% CrI 0.02–0.93) (12).

Anti-TNF comparisons indicated that ADA (OR 0.0, 95% CrI 0.24–0.96) and IFX + azathioprine (OR 0.32, 95% CrI 0.09–0.94) have significantly lower odds of total withdrawals than CZP. ADA had lower odds of withdrawals due to adverse events than CZP (OR 0.55, 95% CrI 0.32–0.94) and IFX (OR 0.18, 95% CrI 0.09–0.34), IFX + azathioprine (OR 3.6, 95% CrI 1.7–7.5) and IFX monotherapy (OR 3.1, 95% CrI 1.7–5.8) had significantly greater odds of withdrawals due to adverse events than CZP. IFX + azathioprine also had greater odds than ADA of withdrawals due to adverse events (OR 6.5, 95% CrI 3.0–14) (12).

### Additional evidence:

**Additional evidence:**

*(not in the application)*

N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

None available

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The application presented details of available information on drug costs for the anti-TNF biologics from Australia, Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. These medicines are associated with a significant budget impact to health systems due to both price and volume of use.

In addition, the application identified and summarized the findings numerous economic evaluations conducted primarily in Canada, USA and UK involving anti-TNF biologics for the indications proposed for EML listing (19-35).

### Availability:

These medicines have wide marketing approval globally. Biosimilars are available for ETN, IFX and ADA.

### Other considerations:

The Committee noted that the most of the evidence presented in the application comes from countries with low levels of tuberculosis and/or hepatitis B infection. Reactivation of latent tuberculosis infection and hepatitis B in patients receiving anti-TNF biologics has been reported (36, 37), and this risk should be taken into consideration when anti-TNF biologics are considered for in settings where there is a higher burden of TB and hepatitis B.

### Committee Recommendations:

The Committee recognized that these auto-immune disorders are highly debilitating and that there is a public health need for effective treatments for patients who do not respond adequately to first-line treatments (eg. methotrexate).

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of adalimumab with a square box to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the second-line treatment of severe chronic inflammatory autoimmune disorders (rheumatoid arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis and Crohn disease) on the basis of the positive benefit to harm profile of these medicines.

For adult patients, therapeutically equivalent alternatives to adalimumab are limited to etanercept, infliximab, certolizumab pegol and golimumab. For children, therapeutically equivalent alternatives should be limited to etanercept and infliximab.

The Committee also recognized that these medicines are associated with a significant budget impact to health systems. However, the availability of several therapeutically equivalent alternatives and the increasing availability of biosimilar products could lead to more market competition. The Committee recognized a potential expansion of the role of MPP to biological medicines such as these as an opportunity to facilitate affordable access. Quality assured available biosimilars of these medicines should also be considered as therapeutically equivalent for procurement purposes.

The Expert Committee recommended that WHO take action to facilitate access to these medicines through the WHO pre-qualification programme, and through collaboration with partners such as the Medicines Patent Pool.
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## 8.2 Antineoplastics and supportive medicines

*Cancer medicines for children – addition / new indication – EMLc*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application proposed an extension of adult cancer indications to paediatrics and corresponding inclusion on the EMLc. The proposal involves both the inclusion of new indications for some cancer medicines currently on the EMLc and the addition of selected new cancer and supportive care medicines to the EMLc. The proposed listing extensions are presented in the following table:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New medicines to be added to the EMLc – extending adult indications to children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paediatric indication(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-trans retinoid acid (ATRA)</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasatinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoxaparin</td>
<td>For use as anticoagulant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxyurea</td>
<td>Chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imatinib</td>
<td>Chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gastrointestinal stromal tumour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irinotecan</td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilotinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxaliplatin</td>
<td>Early stage colon cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procarbazine</td>
<td>Hodgkin lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rituximab</td>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoledronic acid</td>
<td>Malignancy-related bone disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New indications for existing medicines on the EMLc</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medicine(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposi sarcoma</td>
<td>Bleomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doxorubicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vincristine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasopharyngeal cancer</td>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
<td>Cyclophosphamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doxorubicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prednisolone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vincristine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancers</td>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
<td>Cytarabine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daunorubicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercaptopurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute myeloid leukaemia</td>
<td>Cytarabine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Catherine Lam, Scott C. Howard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supports the proposal to extend the listing of specified cancer medicines and indications on the EML to the EMLc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>8.2 Antineoplastic and supportive medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background:
(if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)

The proposed medicines for the proposed indications had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EMLc. The application applied the following rationale in proposing the medicines and indications for inclusion on the EMLc:

- The medicine must already be listed on the EML or EMLc;
- The indications listed for adults are also diagnosed in children aged 12 years and under;
- The medicines have been reported for treatment in children aged 12 years and under for the same indication as listed on the EML for treatment in adults;
- Published literature supports the extension of the indication to children, including clinical studies, peer-reviewed consensus documents and/or clinical guidelines support the medicine’s role as standard of care.

Public health relevance:
(burden of disease)

Cancer is a leading cause of death for children globally with the most common cancer types occurring in children being leukaemias, lymphomas, and central nervous system tumours (1). Childhood cancers generally cannot be prevented nor screened for, so improving outcomes for children with cancer relies on early and accurate diagnosis and access to effective treatment.

In 2018, WHO launched the Global Initiative for Childhood Cancer, to provide leadership and technical assistance to Member States to build and sustain high-quality childhood cancer programmes. The goal of this initiative is to achieve at least 60% survival for all children with cancer globally by 2030 (2).

Summary of evidence: benefits
(from the application)

**Acute promyelocytic leukaemia (APML)**
New medicine: all-trans retinoid acid (ATRA)
New indication: cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine, methotrexate

The median age of children with APML has been reported as 10 years old (3). Standard regimens used for children with APML include ATRA (3, 4), with prior randomized trial data demonstrating significant disease-free survival improvement for children randomized to receive ATRA vs. not (48% at 5-years, vs. 0%, p < 0.0001), with overall survival rates sustained at 10 years (5). The use of ATRA is acknowledged in standard guidelines for the treatment of APL, and is considered to be a paradigm for a targeted approach to the treatment of leukaemia (6-10). The treatment of APML is typically provided in the context of poly-chemotherapy, involving cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine and methotrexate (3-5).

**Acute myeloid leukaemia (AML)**
New indication: cytarabine

The safety and effectiveness of cytarabine for the treatment of childhood AML have been evaluated in controlled clinical trials (11-13). It is considered the standard of care, used internationally for children with AML as in adults (14, 15).

**Chronic myeloid leukaemia (CML)**
New medicine: imatinib, dasatinib, nilotinib, hydroxycarbamide

CML is a very rare disease in children, estimated to be responsible for 2% of all leukaemias in children less than 15 years of age with an annual incidence of 1 case per million (16). The tyrosine kinase inhibitors introduced a chance of cure for CML, with long lasting disease control and significantly improved outcomes (17).

Imatinib has shown clinical benefit in children with CML, with results comparable to those seen in adults (18). In particular, a clinical study of the use of imatinib in patients aged less than 18 years with CML in the chronic phase demonstrated the efficacy, safety and long-term benefit of imatinib in children (19).

Dasatinib and nilotinib have been used in children with CML including (but not limited to) children with imatinib-resistant. A phase 2 trial of dasatinib in 113 paediatric patients with CML demonstrated a complete cytogenetic response was achieved in 76% of imatinib-resistant patients, with an acceptable safety profile that did not include pleural or pericardial effusion, commonly seen in dasatinib-treated adults (20). The effectiveness and safety of nilotinib in children with CML has also been reported (21). Nilotinib has been approved by the FDA for treatment of paediatric patients newly diagnosed or resistant CML on the basis of the results from two open-label, single-arm trials involving 69 patients (22,
23. For imatinib-resistant patients, the major molecular response rate was 40.9%. No new safety concerns were reported, noting transient and manageable laboratory abnormalities: hyperbilirubinemia and moderate to severe transaminits. Hydroxycarbamide has a recognized debulking/cytoreductive role for myeloid malignancies and for palliative purpose in all settings. In addition, hydroxycarbamide can have an important role in settings where resource limitations affect access to imatinib or other tyrosine kinase inhibitors, to allow commencement of antineoplastic therapy (24). A general expert consensus recommendation for childhood CML includes hydroxycarbamide as standard initial therapy in all settings, while awaiting confirmatory diagnostic testing results as well as initial clinical response (25).

**Gastrointestinal stromal tumour (GIST)**

New medicine: imatinib

Imatinib is the preferred treatment for molecularly-selected GIST in adults and children, where c-KIT sensitive mutations are demonstrated. Paediatric GISTS represent a distinct entity, and may be associated with genetic syndromes (such as Carney Triad, Carney-Stratakis syndrome or Neurofibromatosis NF1/ Von Recklinghausen disease). It is also less common for paediatric patients with GIST to have the activating mutations in KIT and PDGFRA seen in adults. Data on the effectiveness and activity of imatinib in paediatric GIST is scarce, as it is a very rare entity (1-2% of all the cases). Children less than 18 years typically have more indolent disease with more favourable prognosis than in adults (approximating 100% five-year overall survival), as reported in a long-term retrospective analysis of a large observational study, that included a subgroup of 28 patients in this age group (26).

**Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL)**

New medicine: rituximab

New indication: cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, prednisolone, vincristine

Different studies of DLBCL have established a role for rituximab in paediatric populations, with studies often spanning all age groups including adults and children starting at age 9 years (27), and confirming efficacy and safety in children (28). Rituximab is administered in the context of a combination regimen with CHOP (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, prednisolone) (27, 28). CHOP alone may be administered in settings where rituximab is not available.

**Kaposi sarcoma**

New indication: bleomycin, doxorubicin, vincristine

Kaposi sarcoma in children primarily occurs as either endemic (HIV-unrelated) or epidemic (HIV-related) disease. According to the data known from registries and literature, Kaposi sarcoma primarily occurs in the elderly population of the Mediterranean region, while the occurrence in children is restricted to smaller series (29). Data from paediatric cohorts and clinical trials showed a median age of diagnosis at 8 years old. Chemotherapy indicated for Kaposi sarcoma includes bleomycin, vincristine and doxorubicin (ABV), has reported 80% remission for stage I HIV positive patients treated in South Africa (32). Bleomycin, vincristine, and doxorubicin have also been included as standard treatment agents in international expert consensus recommendations (35).

**Nasopharyngeal cancer**

New indication: cisplatin, fluorouracil

Nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) is the most commonly diagnosed head & neck malignant neoplasm in China and Southeast Asian countries, but is considered relatively rare among children. Treatment schemes are typically adapted for children from adult-based regimens. Cisplatin-based regimens are the standard of care for children with NPC. Together with cisplatin, fluorouracil (5-FU) is included in standard regimens for children with NPC, with standard administration of 2 courses 21 days apart (36-39). The use of cisplatin including as a radiosensitizer (with concomitant cisplatin and radiation therapy) following cisplatin/5-FU
in the systemic treatment of NPC in children is recognized as standard across different institutions and countries, extrapolating from the adult treatment experience (40-43).

**Colon and rectal cancers**
New medicine: irinotecan, oxaliplatin
New indication: cisplatin, fluorouracil

While very rare, colorectal cancers can occur in children (reported in as young as 9 months old) and typically utilize the same chemotherapy agents as in adults, including 5-FU for the neoadjuvant treatment of rectal cancer, 5-FU and oxaliplatin for the adjuvant treatment of colon and rectal tumours, and 5-FU, oxaliplatin and irinotecan for advanced or metastatic colorectal cancer (44-47).

**Hodgkin lymphoma**
New medicine: procarbazine

Procarbazine is commonly included as a drug of choice in children for the treatment of Hodgkin lymphoma. According to clinical guidelines and literature, procarbazine is a standard inclusion in multi-agent chemotherapy regimens for Hodgkin lymphoma in children (48, 49). For the paediatric population, multiple regimen containing procarbazine are used, in particular BEACOPP that contains bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone. It is often used in more resource-limited settings. Local selection and use should consider known gonadotoxicity and effects on male fertility (50).

**Malignancy-related bone disease**
New medicine: zoledronic acid

Although certain malignancy-related bone diseases, such as osteonecrosis, occur more often in older children, patients as young as age 4 to 6 years have been affected and required treatment (51-53). The administration of zoledronic acid in paediatric oncology appears safe, and may result in improved bone strength and pain control. In a retrospective chart review of inpatients and outpatients less than 21 years old who received zoledronic acid at the Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia, safety of the bisphosphonate was assessed. The safety profile was consistent with the known experience in adults, including preventable alterations in calcium levels, with no major side effects reported (51).

**Anti-coagulation**
New medicines: enoxaparin

The use of low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) as an anticoagulant is considered standard of care for prophylaxis and treatment in children, including but not limited to children with cancer. Malignancy as well as treatment-related factors such as immobilization and central venous access can increase risk for thrombosis (54). Enoxaparin as standard antithrombotic therapy is used as a first option in routine practice in many settings (55-57).

**Summary of evidence: harms**
(from the application)
Not reported separately in the application.

**Additional evidence:**
(not in the application)
A randomized, multicentre, open-label, phase 3 trial (OS2006), compared standard chemotherapy with or without zoledronic acid in 318 patients aged between 5 years and 50 years (median 15.5 years) with newly diagnosed high-grade osteosarcoma (58). The trial results indicated that zoledronic acid did not improve event-free survival, percentage of good histological response or overall survival. No significant differences in toxicity or orthopaedic complications were observed between treatment groups. The trial was stopped after the second interim analysis for futility and the authors concluded that the use of zoledronic acid in osteosarcoma patients was not recommended.
A retrospective analysis of the use of zoledronic acid for treatment of chemotherapy related osteonecrosis in 20 children and adolescents found that zoledronic acid was well tolerated and improved joint pain in the majority of patients (53). However, among patients with osteonecrosis of the hip, the majority had progressive joint destruction requiring arthroplasty, despite treatment with zoledronic acid.

**WHO Guidelines:** None available

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:** Not reported in the application.

**Availability:** The proposed medicines are already included on the EML and/or EMLc.

**Other considerations:** The Expert Committee recognized the public health need for access to cancer therapies for children. The Committee acknowledged that there is limited clinical trial evidence available for the use of many cancer medicines in children, and that it is often necessary to rely on extrapolated data from trials in adults, clinical consensus and/or clinical practice guidelines, that lend support to a medicine’s role as the standard of care in paediatric patients.

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition to the complementary list of the EMLc of ATRA, dasatinib, fluorouracil, imatinib, irinotecan, nilotinib, oxaliplatin, procarbazine and rituximab for the paediatric cancer indications outlined in the table below.

The Committee also recommended the extension of the current listings on the EMLc of bleomycin, doxorubicin, vincristine, cisplatin, cyclophosphamide, prednisolone, cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine, methotrexate, cytarabine and hydroxycarbamide to include the indications outlined in the table below.

The Committee also recommended the addition to the core list of the EMLc of enoxaparin with a square box for use as an anticoagulant in children.

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of zoledronic acid to the complementary list of the EMLc for the treatment of malignancy-related bone disease. The Committee noted that data for its use in children are scant and fragmented. The Committee was also concerned that the effects of zoledronic acid in some paediatric cancers (e.g. osteosarcoma) were largely negative, and that there are insufficient long-term safety data of bisphosphonate use in paediatric cancer patients to be reassured of an acceptable benefit to harm ratio. Furthermore, the Committee noted that although use of bisphosphonates in paediatric patients has been reported to be well tolerated, the impact of use in the context of patients with actively growing skeleton is not yet fully known.

**New Medicines for EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-trans retinoid acid</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasatinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
<td>Nasopharyngeal carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early-stage colon cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early-stage rectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imatinib</td>
<td>Chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gastrointestinal stromal tumour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irinotecan</td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilotinib</td>
<td>Imatinib-resistant chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxaliplatin</td>
<td>Early stage colon cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metastatic colorectal cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procarbazine</td>
<td>Hodgkin lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rituximab</td>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enoxaparin</td>
<td>Anticoagulant (core list)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extension of indications for currently listed medicines**
The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bleomycin</td>
<td>Kaposi sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxorubicin</td>
<td>Kaposi sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincristine</td>
<td>Kaposi sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
<td>Nasopharyngeal carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclophosphamide</td>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prednisolone</td>
<td>Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytarabine</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daunorubicin</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercaptopurine</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>Acute promyelocytic leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytarabine</td>
<td>Acute myelogenous leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxycarbamide</td>
<td>Chronic myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Medicines for children with cancer – text clarifications**

**Proposal:** The application requested amendments to the text of the listings for a number of medicines and cancer indications on the EMLc:

1. Include alternate common names for some currently listed cancer medicines;
2. Include alternate common names for some listed indications;
3. Revised diagnosis terminology for germ cell tumours;
4. Alignment and addition of formulations;
5. Inclusion of variant formulations of listed medicines;
6. Addition of usage and supportive indications.

**Applicant:** Catherine Lam, Scott C. Howard.

**WHO Technical Department:** Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it generally supported the text clarifications proposed in the application.

**EML / EMLc:** EML and EMLc

**Section:** 8.2 Antineoplastic and supportive medicines

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):** Various

**Core / Complementary:** Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:** Individual

**Background:** (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration) N/A

**Public health relevance:** (burden of disease) N/A

**Summary of request:** (from the application)

1. The application proposed inclusion of the following alternate, commonly used names for medicines currently listed on the EML and EMLc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current medicine name</th>
<th>Proposed alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcium folinate</td>
<td>Leucovorin; Folinic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dactinomycin</td>
<td>Actinomycin; Actinomycin-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etoposide</td>
<td>VP-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
<td>5-Fluorouracil (5-FU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxycarbamide</td>
<td>Hydroxyurea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercaptopurine</td>
<td>6-mercaptopurine (6-MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tioguanine</td>
<td>6-thioguanine (6-TG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidocaine</td>
<td>Lignocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciclosporin</td>
<td>Cyclosporine; Cyclosporin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aciclovir</td>
<td>Acyclovir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The application proposed inclusion of the following alternate, commonly used names for diagnoses/indications currently included on the EML and EMLc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indication</th>
<th>Proposed alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute myelogenous leukaemia</td>
<td>Acute myeloid leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilms tumour</td>
<td>Nephroblastoma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The application proposed replacing the indications of ovarian and testicular germ cell tumours with the broader term “malignant germ cell tumour” to include other common locations where children develop malignant germ cell tumours (e.g., sacrococcygeal, mediastinal), as they are treated with the same chemotherapy agents.

4. The application proposed the following formulation amendments and additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Proposed formulation(s) for EML and EMLc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Proposed indication(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allopurinol</td>
<td>“for patients at risk of tumour lysis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium folinate</td>
<td>“in combination as supportive care agent, in regimens with higher dose methotrexate to decrease side effects of methotrexate, or in some regimens with fluorouracil to increase anticancer effects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesna</td>
<td>“in combination as supportive care agent, in regimens with higher doses of ifosfamide or cyclophosphamide to mitigate toxicity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>“for high-dose and intrathecal administration, must ensure ONLY preservative-free methotrexate is used”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincristine</td>
<td>“must ensure NEVER delivered via intrathecal administration as fatal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>“codeine should not be used as a substitute for pain management in children”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The application proposed the addition of variant formulations of the following medicines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current medicine</th>
<th>Proposed variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prednisolone</td>
<td>Prednisone (multiple strength tablets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etoposide</td>
<td>Etoposide phosphate 100 mg/mL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidocaine</td>
<td>Lidocaine 2.5% + prilocaine 2.5% topical formulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The application proposed inclusion of usage and supportive-care indications for the following listed medicines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Proposed indication(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allopurinol</td>
<td>“for patients at risk of tumour lysis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium folinate</td>
<td>“in combination as supportive care agent, in regimens with higher dose methotrexate to decrease side effects of methotrexate, or in some regimens with fluorouracil to increase anticancer effects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesna</td>
<td>“in combination as supportive care agent, in regimens with higher doses of ifosfamide or cyclophosphamide to mitigate toxicity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>“for high-dose and intrathecal administration, must ensure ONLY preservative-free methotrexate is used”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincristine</td>
<td>“must ensure NEVER delivered via intrathecal administration as fatal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>“codeine should not be used as a substitute for pain management in children”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) N/A

Additional evidence: (not in the application) N/A

WHO Guidelines: None available

Costs / cost-effectiveness: N/A

Availability: N/A

Other considerations: N/A

Committee Recommendations: Following consideration of the proposals in the application, the Expert Committee made the following recommendations:

1. The additional alternate common names for medicines should not be added to the Model Lists. The current listings refer to the international non-proprietary names (INN) of the medicines. INN is the preferred nomenclature for medicines on the Model Lists.

2. The indication terminology for acute myelogenous leukaemia and Wilms tumour should be amended as proposed, as this would be consistent with ICD-11 terminology for these indications.
3. The indication of “malignant germ cell tumour” should not replace the indications of ovarian and testicular germ cell tumour as the Committee has not reviewed evidence for use of the relevant medicines in the treatment of germ cell tumours other than ovarian and testicular. Extending the indication to all germ cell tumours would require a full application.

4. With regard to formulation amendments, the Committee recommended that formulations of dexamethasone should be consistently listed across different sections of the list. The Committee also recommended that proposed new strengths of existing dose forms of calcium folinate, cyclophosphamide, etoposide should be added. However the Committee did not recommend listing of the new dose forms for these medicines, and for mercaptopurine and methotrexate.

5. The Committee did not recommend the separate listing of prednisone with prednisolone, noting that the square box listing of prednisolone should be interpreted as including prednisone as an alternative. The Committee did not recommend the listing of etoposide phosphate as a variant of etoposide, as it considered that a full application would be appropriate to consider the clinical place of this medicine as an alternative to etoposide. The Committee also did not recommend listing for topical lidocaine + prilocaine, again considering that a full application would be required for this new combination product.

6. The Committee recommended including the indication “tumour lysis syndrome” with the listing for allopurinol. The Committee did not recommend including the other proposed supportive care indications with the listings of calcium folinate and mesna. Nor did the Committee recommend the proposed cautionary text for methotrexate and vincristine. The Committee acknowledged the critical importance of these messages, but considered that this text was better suited for clinical practice guidelines, medication safety information and product packaging, than on the Model Lists. The Committee did not recommend the proposed cautionary text about codeine with the listing for morphine. The Committee noted that codeine is not listed on the EMLC, and that alternatives to morphine are specified in the current listing as being limited to hydromorphone and oxycodone.
### Arsenic therapies – addition – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arsenic trioxide Realgar-Indigo naturalis formula (RIF)</th>
<th>ATC Code: L01XX27 ATC Code: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal: The application proposed the inclusion of arsenic therapies on the EML for the treatment of acute promyelocytic leukaemia (APML).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Scott C. Howard Professor, University of Tennessee Health Science Center Secretary General, International Pediatric Oncology Society (SIOP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department: Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of arsenic therapies for acute promyelocytic leukaemia on the EML. The technical unit stated that arsenic, used in combination with ATRA and chemotherapy, is curative in its use and is generally accepted as the standard of care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc EML and EMLc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section: 8.2.1 Cytotoxic medicines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s): Arsenic trioxide: Injection 1 mg/mL Realgar-Indigo naturalis formula (RIF): tablet 270 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary: Complementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing: Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: Arsenic trioxide was previously considered by the Expert Committee in 2015 for treatment of APL as part of a comprehensive review of cancer medicines (1). The Committee noted that addition of arsenic trioxide as consolidation therapy for APML did not produce a clinically relevant increase in overall survival in naïve patients. The Committee also noted the extremely high price and low availability of arsenic trioxide and considered that this would be unaffordable in many low- and middle-income countries. This new application focuses on clinical trial results that have been published in the past few years and examines the oral arsenic preparation realgar-Indigo naturalis formula (RIF), which has not been previously submitted. RIF represents a feasible and inexpensive alternative to intravenous arsenic trioxide that could benefit patients in low- and middle-income countries. Currently listed medicines for treatment of APML on the EML are all-trans retinoic acid (ATRA), cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine and methotrexate. These medicines are not currently included on the EMLc for this indication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance: GLOBOCAN estimates the worldwide total leukaemia new cases incidence for 2018 to be 437 033, with an age-standardized rate (ASR) of 5.2 per 100 000 per year (2). Mortality was 309 006 worldwide, with an ASR of 3.5 per 100 000 per year. The ASR was higher (3.6 per 100 000) in countries with “high human development” than in countries of “low human development” (2.7 per 100 000). However, over time, differences are becoming less evident. Unfortunately, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) does not subclassify leukaemias into acute and chronic, and myeloid or lymphoid, in its GLOBOCAN analysis. APML accounts for 10% of AML cases and its incidence is estimated to be 1/1,000,000 people in Europe (3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits A 2009 systematic review of the effectiveness of arsenic in APML patients included five RCTs with 328 cases (4). All the RCTs focused on the comparison of ATRA plus arsenic regimen with ATRA monotherapy. Meta-analysis showed that the effect sizes for time to complete remission, two-year disease-free survival rate and relapse rate were -1.20 [-1.68, -0.72], 8.64 [1.66,45.00], and 0.21 [0.09,0.47], respectively. The authors concluded that arsenic added to ATRA-based regimens improved remission rates and event-free survival. A 2019 review conducted for the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) led the NICE Appraisal Committee to recommend approval of arsenic trioxide for newly diagnosed and relapsed APL (5). The review presented three RCTs, in newly diagnosed APML patients and in patients with relapsed APML. In newly diagnosed results showed that more patients having ATRA plus arsenic regimen were alive at 50 months compared with patients having ATRA in combination with idarubicin (99% vs. 93%; p = 0.007). Number of cumulative relapse at 50 months were also lower in the arsenic regimen when compared to the...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee
Costs / cost-effectiveness: Arsenic trioxide was found to be highly cost-effective for relapsed APML in Canada using prices prevalent prior to the availability of generic formulations (39). Cost-effectiveness in the frontline setting would be expected to be even higher, with very high remission rates and long-term survival, and decreased need for hospitalization, blood products, and supportive care. Use of an oral arsenic available at a low price point would improve cost-effectiveness even more by removing the need for daily infusions with cardiac monitoring. Costs associated with oral arsenic are about an half of those associated with intravenous arsenic. In a RCT the median total medical costs were $13,183.49 in the RIF group compared with $24,136.98 in the ATO group (40). The large difference in costs was mostly caused by the

| Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) | Arsenic-based regimens for APML are less toxic than chemotherapy-based regimens. Grade 3 or 4 neutropenia and thrombocytopenia, including episodes lasting more than 15 days, were significantly more frequent both during induction therapy and after each consolidation course in the ATRA and chemotherapy group than in the ATRA and arsenic trioxide group (11, 22, 35). However, it is associated with QTc prolongation which can lead to cardiac dysrhythmias in patients who receive other drugs that prolong the QTc interval (36). Cardiac toxicity is rare in APML patients who receive arsenic therapy and can largely be prevented by avoiding drug-drug interactions and careful monitoring. Arsenic-based regimens have lower rates of second cancers than anthracycline-based regimens (though not statistically significant in the small studies conducted to date) (37). Finally, oral arsenic (RIF) has similar safety profile when compared to arsenic trioxide in patients with APML (38). |
| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | None available |
different costs of maintenance treatment. During induction therapy the length of hospitalization for the RIF group was significantly lower than that for the ATO group (24 vs. 31 days). During maintenance treatment, in the RIF group the estimated medical costs to treat a patient at home were $2047.14 compared with $11273.81 to treat a patient in the ATO group in an outpatient setting.

### Availability:

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved arsenic trioxide in 2002 for relapsed APML and in 2017 for newly diagnosed patients. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) has granted marketing authorisation for arsenic trioxide for newly diagnosed in relapsed APL in 2002 (provisional approval) and 2010 (full approval). Several generics are available in India and the patent for originator (Trisenox). Main patents have expired (2019) but secondary patents might remain active in some jurisdictions. Realgar-Indigo naturalis formula (RIF) is available as 270 mg tablets and it is produced by the Yifan Pharmaceutical Co (Tianchang, China). RIF contains Realgar (tetrArsenic tetrasulfide As₄S₄, 30 mg per tablet), Indigo naturalis (125 mg per tablet), Radix salvia miltiorrhiza (50 mg per tablet), Radix pseudostellariae (45 mg per tablet), and garment film (a cover to contain the drug components; 20 mg per tablet) (29, 38). The dose for frontline and relapsed acute promyelocytic leukaemia is 60 mg/kg/day divided into 3 daily doses (20 mg/kg/dose). It is the only oral arsenic formulation commercially available and, as such, warrants special consideration, especially for use in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) where the high cost of intravenous arsenic trioxide and the need for daily intravenous arsenic trioxide infusions over many months may pose important access and safety concerns.

### Other considerations:

ATO-based regimens require daily intravenous infusions during the arsenic-containing component of therapy. This means that patients must stay near the treatment centre to receive daily infusions for 6 weeks during remission induction therapy followed by four 4-week blocks. Infusions are given over 1-2 hours and ideally administration should occur in an infusion centre or hospital setting with availability of cardiac monitoring and resuscitation capabilities. Oral arsenic makes delivery of therapy more feasible in countries, and is of particular relevance in LMIC, where logistical and financial barriers are numerous. Diagnosis of acute promyelocytic leukaemia depends on clinical findings (haemorrhage and coagulopathy), laboratory findings (leukocytosis, anaemia, thrombocytopenia), morphology (presence of myeloid blasts containing Auer rods), and documentation of the t(15;17) in the leukaemia blasts by cytogenetics, FISH, or molecular biology (PCR). Risk stratification of patients allows each to receive the appropriate intensity of therapy to achieve cure, and includes a low-risk group, defined as patients whose presenting white blood cell count is less than 10,000 and a high-risk group (all other patients).

### Committee Recommendations:

The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration arsenic-containing regimens for APML. The Expert Committee recommended the addition of arsenic therapies (intravenous arsenic trioxide and oral realgar-Indigo naturalis formulation) to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for use in combination with all-trans-retinoic acid (ATRA) for treatment of patients with acute promyelocytic leukaemia, both newly diagnosed and relapsed. In consideration of a separate application of cancer medicines for children, the Committee also recommended the addition of ATRA to the EMLc, and extending the listings on the EMLc of cytarabine, daunorubicin, mercaptopurine, and methotrexate to include APML.

The Committee noted that treatment with ATRA plus arsenic was associated with high response rates and significant improvements in event-free and overall survival compared to ATRA plus chemotherapy, and has a more favourable toxicity profile.

### References:

---
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## Medicines for cervical cancer – new indication – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
<td>L01XA01</td>
<td>L01XA02</td>
<td>L01CD01</td>
<td>L01BC02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboplatin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paclitaxel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorouracil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:
The application requested listing for cisplatin, carboplatin, paclitaxel and fluorouracil for the additional indication of treatment of invasive cervical cancer.

### Applicant:
WHO Department for Management of Noncommunicable Diseases

### WHO Technical Department:
Management of Noncommunicable Diseases, Disability, Violence and Injury Prevention

### EML / EMLc:
EML

### Section:
8.2.1 Cytotoxic medicines

### Dose form(s) & strength(s):
As currently listed

### Core / Complementary:
Complementary

### Individual / Square box listing:
Core

### Background:
(If relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)
As part of the comprehensive review of cancer medicines on the EML undertaken in 2015, the Expert Committee recommended the addition of single-agent cisplatin to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of early-stage cervical cancer for use concurrently with radiotherapy in women at high risk of recurrence following surgery (1). All of the medicines proposed in this application for cervical cancer are included on the EML. However, carboplatin, paclitaxel and fluorouracil lack a specific endorsement for the indication of cervical cancer, and the listing for cisplatin is specific for use as a radio sensitizer.

### Public health relevance:
(burden of disease)
Cervical cancer is the fourth most common cancer among women globally, with an estimated 570,000 new cases and 311,000 deaths annually in 2018 (2). The burden of cervical cancer is estimated to increase by almost 50%, reaching 460,000 related deaths by 2040, of which the large majority will occur in low- and middle-income countries. Currently, the majority of cases in low- and middle-income countries are being diagnosed at late stage, as a result of delayed clinical presentation and untimely referral of symptomatic patients to the appropriate pathway of care for diagnosis and treatment (3).

In response to a rising public health problem, the United Nations Joint Global Programme on Cervical Cancer Prevention and Control was established in 2016, as an inter-Agency program to engage partners and key stakeholders, providing technical expertise to orient an evidence-based policy for cervical cancer planning and provide pragmatic solutions (4).

The elimination of cervical cancer is a priority in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Agenda, contributing to the reduction of premature mortality due to noncommunicable diseases by one-third by 2030 and the realization of universal health coverage, in terms of access to essential healthcare interventions and financial risk protection (5, 6). The final aim is to reduce drastically the incident cases of cervical cancer per year, through prevention (HPV vaccination) and early detection (cervical cancer early detection and screening, and treatment of pre-invasive cancer) along with treatment of more advanced forms through diagnosis, cancer surgery and radiotherapy, systemic therapy and palliative care services (7).

### Summary of evidence: benefits
(from the application)
Cisplatin
Cisplatin is a critical cytotoxic agent for the treatment of cervical cancer for radiotherapy is appropriate (8-12). It is also a key agent (alone or in combination with other agents) for the management of advanced disease, that is not amenable to locoregional control alone (i.e. surgery, radiotherapy, chemoradiotherapy (13-15).

Clinical trials of cisplatin 50mg/m² every 3 weeks as monotherapy for cervical cancer provided disappointing results for disease control (objective response rate (ORR, 20%; progression-free survival (PFS), approximately 3 months) and poor survival (overall survival (OS), approximately 8 months) (16, 17).

When combined to other cytotoxic agents, improved outcomes have been reported. A phase 3 clinical trial tested the combination of cisplatin and paclitaxel against cisplatin monotherapy, for FIGO IV B (metastatic), recurrent (after locoregional treatments) or persistent (not
responding to locoregional treatments) cervical cancer (n=280) (18). The addition of paclitaxel increased the ORR (19% to 36%) and the median PFS (2.8 to 4.8 months), with no relevant difference in overall survival. However, 92% of patients had prior exposure to cisplatin, the majority pre-treated with a cisplatin-paclitaxel combination regimen. Different cisplatin combinations have been compared with cisplatin monotherapy in another trial enrolling patients with stage IV B recurrent or persistent cervix uteri carcinoma (19). Patients in the experimental arm received either cisplatin 50mg/m2 plus topotecan (Cto) 0.75mg/m2 every three weeks or MVAC (cisplatin, vinblastine, doxorubicin and cisplatin); the standard arm consisted of single-agent cisplatin 50mg/m2 every three weeks (n=364). The escalated polychemotherapy (Cto or MVAC) showed a longer PFS (median PFS 2.9 versus 4.6 months; RR = 0.76, 95% CI, 0.58 to 0.94) and OS (median OS 6.5 versus 9.4 months, RR=0.76, 95% CI, 0.60 to 0.99) when compared to monotherapy. The greatest effect size on survival was observed in cisplatin-naïve patients, where the gain of OS was 6.6 months versus 1.9 months in pre-exposed patients.

The open-label, randomized, Phase III JCOG0505 trial compared cisplatin or carboplatin in combination with paclitaxel, in a non-inferiority (NI) design, with a NI-margin of 1.29 for Hazard Ratio of OS. The schedules used were: paclitaxel 135 mg/m2 plus cisplatin 50 mg/m2 every three weeks and paclitaxel 135 mg/m2 plus carboplatin 5mg/ml/min (area-under-the curve) each three weeks (n=253) (20). 98% of patients had a good performance status (WHO-ECOG scale 0-1), 83% presenting with squamous histology, 79% previously irradiated and 48% pre-exposed to cisplatin. The trial met the primary endpoint and confirmed carboplatin-based to be non-inferior to cisplatin-based chemotherapy, reporting HR=0.99 (90% CI, 0.79 to 1.25), and median OS of 18.3 and 17.5 months, respectively. Median PFS was 6.9 and 6.2 months. An exploratory subgroup analysis showed cisplatin to provide a greater effect size in platinum-naive patients, with a median OS of 23 months and 13 months for cisplatin and carboplatin, respectively. The subgroup analysis also favoured carboplatin and paclitaxel over cisplatin combination for platinum-resistant and platinum-intermediate sensitive disease (platinum free interval inferior to 6 months or between 6-12 months), suggesting that carboplatin can still provide a benefit after cisplatin failure and, otherwise, that cisplatin provides the greatest effect in the naive and eligible patients (HR for platinum-resistant in cisplatin-pretreated patients: 0.57; HR for platinum-intermediate: 0.71). However, all platinum-pretreated patients were exposed to cisplatin and none to carboplatin, suggesting that the re-challenge with the same platinum compound would be less effective and an inter-class switch preferred, where possible.

The 2009 GOG-204 Phase III clinical trial compared four different cisplatin-containing doublet combinations for stage IVB, recurrent or persistent cervical carcinoma patients (21). Patients were enrolled to receive vinorelbine, gemcitabine, topotecan or paclitaxel in combination as doublets with cisplatin 50mg/m2 each three weeks (n=513). Patients presented predominantly with squamous cell (80-88%) persistent (74-80%) cervical cancer, mostly pre-treated with cisplatin and radiotherapy (70-81%). The trial was interrupted after 513 patients enrolled, as the futility analysis proved the different combinations to be non-superior to cisplatin plus paclitaxel. ORR ranged between 22% and 29%; media PFS between 4 – 5.8 months and OS 10 - 12.9 months. Nevertheless, paclitaxel–cisplatin showed the highest response rate (29%), median PFS (5.8 months) and median OS (12.8 months).

The use of cisplatin requires the fulfillment of specific criteria for treatment initiation, particularly a conserved glomerular kidney function. Patients are considered to be cisplatin-unfit if presenting one of more of the following characteristics: PS ECOG performance status of 2 or more; creatinine clearance of less than 60 mL/minute; treatment-related hearing loss of grade 2 or more according to CTCAE and treatment-related neuropathy of grade 2 or more (22).

**Carboplatin**

Guidelines include carboplatin in the treatment of advanced disease for cisplatin-unfit patients, as a category 1 treatment (NCCN) (15). The role of carboplatin is highlighted in the present submission as an alternative in cisplatin-unfit patients, both as radiosensitizer and systemic agent for combination treatment in the locally advanced, refractory, relapsed and metastatic settings. The acknowledgment of carboplatin as an agent for cervical cancer is relevant for the specific anatomic topography and local invasiveness of the disease. Different
series have described hydronephrosis in 20-35% of cervical cancer patients, with possible retrograde kidney parenchyma impairment, due to the close anatomical proximity of the ureter with genitourinary organs. A Nigerian analysis of the renal status of patients with cervical cancer prior to commencement of treatment, reported one-third of patients having a clinically significant urethral involvement or obstruction and nearly 10% having a kidney dysfunction for related parenchyma disease (23).

Carboplatin has been shown in a subgroup analysis of the JCOG0505 trial to provide a greater benefit in cisplatin pre-treated patients compared to cisplatin (20). These findings were confirmed in a retrospective analysis of a cohort of Asian patients treated with paclitaxel combined either with cisplatin or carboplatin (n=116) (24). In the curative setting, the role of carboplatin must be restricted to the patients unfit for cisplatin but still eligible to receive a curative treatment, in the context of a concomitant chemoradiotherapy, as a radiosensitizer. Data on the efficacy of concurrent weekly carboplatin with radiotherapy in the treatment of cervical cancer have been evaluated in a recent meta-analysis, exploring whether differences between cisplatin and carboplatin exist when used as radiosensitizers (25). Twelve studies (1,698 patients) were eligible for meta-analysis. Complete response (CR), PFS and OS were assessed. The use of carboplatin provided a lower rate of CR (OR: 0.53, 95% CI 0.34 – 0.82); lower PFS and OS were assessed at 3 years, with HR of 0.71 and 0.70, indicative of a potential difference. However, the authors concluded that carboplatin should still be a priority for cisplatin ineligible patients, as it is the preferable alternative choice of treatment.

**Paclitaxel**
As previously described, paclitaxel represents the optimal partner of chemotherapy platinum-based doublets for the treatment of advanced disease. The doublet cisplatin plus paclitaxel (or carboplatin plus paclitaxel, in cisplatin ineligible patients) is the recommended regimen for advanced cervical cancer, as reported by the principal guidelines (13-15). In a large randomized phase 3 clinical trial (GOG-204), paclitaxel showed a greater effect size and a manageable safety profile, when compared with the combinations with topotecan, gemcitabine and vinorelbine (21).

**Fluorouracil**
Fluorouracil (5-FU) has a role as a radiosensitizer and is extensively used across different cancer indications. For cervical cancer, women with high-risk disease are eligible to receive concomitant adjuvant chemoradiotherapy. The features of high risk are defined as: positive pelvic lymph nodes, positive surgical margins, and positive parametrium. The use of adjuvant chemotherapy in combination with radiotherapy has been tested in a clinical trial, enrolling 268 patients with clinical stage FIGO IA2 and IIA carcinoma of the cervix, treated with radical hysterectomy and pelvic lymph node dissection, and found to have lymph node involvement, invaded parametrium and positive margins (11). Patients received cisplatin as a bolus of 70mg/m2 followed by 5-FU as continuous IV infusion over 96 hours at 1000 mg/m2 every three weeks, for four cycles concomitantly with radiotherapy for the first and second cycle. The pelvic radiotherapy consisted of 1.7 Gy per day on days 1 to 5 of each week, for a total of 29 fractions (49.3 Gy). Around one-third of patients presented with involvement of parametria, and 85% presented with metastatic pelvic lymph nodes after surgery. The addition of chemotherapy to radiotherapy showed a gain in overall survival, with 10% more patients alive at 4 years (OS 81% versus 71% at 4 years; HR=1.96, CI not reported, p=0.007). The projected progression-free survival at 4 years was 80% versus 63% (HR = 2.01, p=0.003), favouring the chemotherapy + radiotherapy arm.

The role of 5-FU as a radiosensitizer agent has been investigated in three clinical trials for stage IB2 to IVA cervical cancer patients (8, 26, 27). The three trials reported similar results, supporting the use of cisplatin-based chemotherapy, including the combination of cisplatin and 5-FU, as radiosensitizer in as an adjunct to radiotherapy for locally advanced cervical cancer: HRs for OS ranged between 0.52 (stage IB2- IVA) and 0.72 (stage IIB-IVA).
### Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

**Cisplatin and carboplatin**

In the JCOG0505 trial, cisplatin or carboplatin in combination with paclitaxel were associated with similar proportions of patients who terminated treatment because of intolerable adverse events were similar, 9.5% in the carboplatin group and 11.8% in the cisplatin group (20). Most patients experience haematological toxicity from the medication combination including neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, and anaemia, all of which are typically rapidly reversible upon discontinuation of agents (28, 29).

Cisplatin is highly emetogenic, prophylactic antiemetics are necessary to reduce nausea and vomiting in all patients (30). Mild peripheral neuropathy is common. Patients should be followed carefully, and dose reduction or discontinuation may be required for moderate or severe symptoms. Ototoxicity is observed with cisplatin and is more common with increasing dose and number of cycles. Audiometry should be considered to monitor patients with toxicity; vestibular defects are less common. Serious renal toxicity caused by cisplatin can be significant and may result in electrolyte abnormalities. Hypomagnesemia, hypocalcaemia and hypokalaemia should be followed and deficits replete. Intravenous hydration both before and after administering cisplatin is necessary to reduce the incidence of renal toxicity (31).

**Paclitaxel**

Paclitaxel is associated with infusion reactions in about 30% of patients; most reactions are mild and easily managed (32, 33). Paclitaxel frequently causes alopecia and peripheral neuropathy, which is often mild and reversible (32, 34).

**Fluorouracil**

The use of adjuvant chemotherapy (cisplatin followed by S-FU) in combination with radiotherapy is associated with an increase in grade 4 adverse events, mostly haematological toxicity (grade 4 adverse events: 17% versus 4%; grade 3 and 4 granulocytopenia: 29% versus 2%) compared to radiotherapy alone (11).

### Additional evidence: harms (not in the application)

N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

None available.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

An economic analysis of cisplatin alone versus cisplatin doublets in women with advanced or recurrent cervical cancer evaluated the impact of: (i) extending the use of cytotoxic agents to the advanced disease, with a highlight on systemic therapy, and (ii) the use of S-FU and carboplatin as alternative radiosensitizers (35). The cost analysis showed that chemotherapy medicine costs for six cycles of cisplatin was 89 USD while for cisplatin plus paclitaxel it was 489 USD. The highest chemotherapy cost was for gemcitabine plus cisplatin at 18,306 USD. According to the major effect size and manageable safety profile, the combination of cisplatin and paclitaxel resulted to be the most cost-effective option for the treatment of advanced cervical cancer, and, to a large extent, more cost-effective of cisplatin monotherapy. Sensitivity analyses confirmed that cisplatin plus paclitaxel would be the regimen of choice. For the same setting, another model showed that the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio for combination cisplatin plus paclitaxel compared to cisplatin alone was $13,654 per QALY gained (36).

### Availability:

Originator and generic brands of the proposed medicines are available.

### Other considerations:

N/A

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended extending the indications for cisplatin, carboplatin and paclitaxel on the complementary list of the EML to include treatment of invasive cervical cancer. The Committee considered that the evidence presented demonstrated these medicines to be associated with relevant survival benefits for patients. The Committee noted that regimens including these medicines are considered standard care in the curative and non-curative settings for cervical cancer.

Cisplatin is currently listed for use in the curative setting as a radiosensitizer and its listing is recommended to be extended to include the non-curative setting. Carboplatin is recommended for listing both in the curative and non-curative settings, and paclitaxel is recommended for listing in the non-curative setting.

The Expert Committee did not recommend extending the indications for fluorouracil to include treatment of cervical cancer in the curative setting. The Committee noted that when combined...
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Pegaspargase – addition – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested the addition of pegaspargase (PEGylated E coli asparaginase) to the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Applicant: | Scott C. Howard  
Professor, University of Tennessee Health Science Center  
Secretary General, International Paediatric Oncology Society (SIOP) |
| WHO Technical Department: | Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of pegaspargase and related approved biotherapeutics to the EML and EMLc, considering that the application requested inclusion of a related formation to an existing listed medicine within the same class (asparaginase). |
| EML / EMLc | EML and EMLc |
| Section: | 8.2.1 Cytotoxic medicines |
| Dose form(s) & strength(s): | Solution for injection 3,750 units/5 mL in vial |
| Core / Complementary: | Complementary |
| Individual / Square box listing: | Individual listing, including approved, quality-assured biosimilars. |
| Background: (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration) | Pegaspargase had not previously been considered by the Expert Committee for addition to the EML. Native E coli asparaginase is currently included on the EML and EMLc for treatment of ALL. Asparaginases represent a therapeutic group including native E coli asparaginase, PEGylated E coli asparaginase, Erwinia asparaginase, and biosimilars. When asparaginases are used at the recommended dose and schedule and when use is not limited by hypersensitivity or neutralizing antibodies, any of these 3 asparaginases effectively treat ALL. |
| Public health relevance: (burden of disease) | Acute lymphoblastic is a rare haematological malignancy. Globally, from 2003 to 2007, the age-standardized incidence rate of ALL ranged from 1.08 to 2.12 per 100,000 person-years. ALL accounts for approximately 25% of all cancers (80% of leukaemias) in children. The disease is far less common in adults (<1% of all cancers) where it is associated with much lower cure rate that that achievable for children [1].  
Allergic reactions to native E. coli asparaginase occur in 20% to 42% of patients with ALL, and silent (asymptomatic) neutralizing antibody formation in another 30-40%, such that around two thirds of patients do not complete all their required asparaginase unless they have access to a second asparaginase product, usually Erwinia asparaginase (2-10).  
Hypersensitivity or silent antibody formation necessitate a change to another form of asparaginase. The supply of Erwinia asparaginase has been limited to high-income countries, and supply is often insufficient to meet the needs of patients who react to frontline native E. coli asparaginase.  
When no second product is available (or an allergy occurs to the alternate asparaginase), the inability to complete asparaginase treatment increases the risk of relapse, which is associated with poor prognosis, with survival after relapse ranging from 20% to 50% (11). Furthermore, relapse therapy entails intense salvage chemotherapy followed by allogeneic stem cell transplantation, which greatly increases treatment costs (9). Minimization of allergic reactions to the initial form of asparaginase improves outcomes and reduces costs. |

**ATC Code:** L01XX24
PEGylation of E. coli asparaginase to create pegaspargase increases the half-life of asparaginase and decreases immunogenicity and allergic reactions/antibody formation from 20-42% to 2-11% (12).

The UKALL 2003 trial used pegaspargase in a schedule that included several days of glucocorticoids prior to each dose of pegaspargase in low- and intermediate-risk patients. Glucocorticoid pre-treated patients had a 1% rate of allergic reaction and 5-year event-free survival of around 95% (13).

Patients in the high-risk arm received several doses of pegaspargase without preceding glucocorticoids and had a reaction rate of 6%, such that in the whole study the reaction rate was 2% (13, 14). These findings led to a change in clinical practice, and modification of existing ALL treatment protocols to include glucocorticoid pretreatment before each pegaspargase dose, to reduce the incidence of allergic reactions, thus allowing patients to complete asparaginase therapy and reducing the need for a second-line asparaginase (e.g. Erwinia).

Asparaginase products have different molecular structures, different half-lives, and different clinical activities per unit. Pegasparagase is 6 to 9 times more potent than native E coli asparaginase and each dose lasts 2-3 weeks instead of 2-3 days. Modern ALL protocols require lower doses and fewer doses of pegaspargase to provide the asparaginase needed for patients.

Treatment strategies using pegaspargase as initial therapy are more effective because they reduce the rates of hypersensitivity and neutralizing antibodies from a total of 50-65% (including both) to 10-15% (including both) and thus allow more patients to continue frontline asparaginase and complete all doses of the treatment protocol. Completion of all doses of frontline asparaginase reduces the risk of relapse and thus reduces costs associated with salvage therapy (15). It also reduces the need for second-line Erwinia asparaginase, which is not available in many countries (especially LMIC) and which has suffered from recurrent shortages and stock-outs even in high-income countries (HIC).

No data were presented in the application in relation to the comparative safety of pegaspargase.

A randomized, open-label phase III trial compared the relative toxicity and efficacy of intravenous pegaspargase and intramuscular native E coli asparaginase in 463 children with newly diagnosed ALL who had achieved complete remission following induction therapy (16). Five-year disease-free survival was similar between treatment groups: 90% vs 89% for IV pegaspargase and IM native E coli asparaginase treated patients, respectively (p=0.58). There was no significant difference in the frequency of asparaginase-related toxicities (allergy, pancreatitis or thrombotic or bleeding adverse events ) between the treatment groups: 28% vs 26% in the pegaspargase and native E. coli asparaginase groups, respectively (p=0.60). Pegaspargase was associated with less anxiety than native E. coli asparaginase. The most common adverse events of grade 3 or higher were infections (bacterial or fungal) and occurred at a similar rate in both treatment groups.

A retrospective study compared the efficacy and safety of pegaspargase and native E coli asparaginase in 122 adolescents and adults with newly diagnosed ALL (17). Both treatments demonstrated comparable complete remission rates (95.65 vs. 90.79%), median overall survival (14.07 vs. 16.29 months) and median relapse-free survival (10.00 vs. 8.57 months). Pegasparagase treated patients aged less than 35 years had a higher median In addition, patients <35 years old receiving PEG asparaginase obtained a higher median relapse-free survival time compared with E. coli asparaginase treated patients (10.93 vs. 8.97 months; P=0.037). Both treatments were found to be acceptably tolerable and demonstrated similar incidences of allergy, hepatic toxicity, pancreatic lesions and bleeding and coagulation effects.

In patients with relapsed ALL, and with hypersensitivity to native E. coli asparaginase, pegaspargase treatment was associated with similar tolerability as in newly diagnosed patients (18).
The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
<th>None available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</td>
<td>The application estimated that, on average, the ratio of the number of vials of E. coli asparaginase needed versus vials of pegaspargase was 10.3 (assuming no obesity and no vial sharing between patients) meaning that a per-vial price of pegaspargase that is 10.3 times greater than that of a vial of native E. coli asparaginase would be cost-neutral, without considering differences in efficacy. Costs for native E. coli asparaginase were reported as between USD 150-177 per vial, compared to USD 1300-1400 per vial for pegaspargase in Europe and Latin America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability:</td>
<td>Pegaspargase is marketed by Servier Pharmaceuticals. Biosimilars of pegaspargase are in development in some jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other considerations:</td>
<td>The risk of allergic hypersensitivity reactions to asparaginase therapy increases with the number of doses and up to one third of patients experience a reaction by the fourth dose. This is one of the highest reported sensitivity reactions reported from chemotherapy drugs. Approximately 10% of reactions are life-threatening. Reactions involving the formation of silent neutralizing antibodies result in inactivation of asparaginase and reduced serum asparaginase activity levels. This results in a low therapeutic threshold of the drug. For these patients, therapeutic drug monitoring is essential, but not generally available in LMICS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Recommendations:</td>
<td>The Expert Committee recommended the addition of pegaspargase to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. The listing should indicate that quality-assured biosimilars of pegaspargase should also be considered as essential. The Committee noted pegaspargase was associated with less immunogenicity and development of neutralizing antibodies than native asparaginase, which may offer advantages in terms of improved patient adherence enabling completion of treatment, thereby reducing the risk of relapse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:


**Pertuzumab – addition – EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pertuzumab</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> L01XC13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of pertuzumab to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of early stage and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support inclusion of pertuzumab on the EML at this time, though noting with interest ongoing studies of pertuzumab in the neoadjuvant and metastatic settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>8.2.2 Targeted therapies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Concentrated solution for IV infusion 420mg/14 mL in 14 mL vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Background:** | Pertuzumab, in combination with trastuzumab and docetaxel, is indicated for treatment of patients with HER2-positive metastatic or locally recurrent, unresectable breast cancer who have not received prior anti-HER2 therapy or chemotherapy for metastatic disease. Pertuzumab, in combination with trastuzumab and chemotherapy, is indicated for:  
  - neoadjuvant treatment of patients with HER2-positive, locally advanced, inflammatory, or early stage breast cancer;  
  - adjuvant treatment of patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer at high risk of recurrence.  
  Pertuzumab has not previously been considered for EML inclusion. Trastuzumab, another anti-HER2 treatment, is currently included on the EML for treatment of early-stage and metastatic HER2 positive breast cancer. Multiple cytotoxic medicines, including docetaxel, are included on the EML for early-stage and metastatic breast cancer. |
| **Public health relevance:** | Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death among women globally, responsible for 15% of all cancer deaths. In 2018, the global cancer burden increased to 18.1 million cases, causing 9.6 million deaths (1). Changes in lifestyle, life expectancy and reproductive factors are responsible in many developing countries for a sharp increase in the incidence of breast cancer, and the number of deaths as a percentage of incident cases is greater than that seen in high income countries. For example, in 2008, this figure was 24% in high income countries, 38% in high-middle-income countries, 40% in low-middle-income and 48% in low income (2). The HER2 receptor has emerged as one of the most important targets for the treatment of breast cancer. HER2 is involved in regulating cell growth, survival, and differentiation (3). Amplification and/or overexpression of HER2 occurs in approximately 18%–22% of breast cancers (4, 5). HER2 amplification/overexpression (HER2-positivity) is associated with increased tumour aggressiveness, higher rates of recurrence, and increased mortality (5-10). The median age of patients presenting with HER2-positive breast cancer is in the mid-50s, approximately 5 years younger than the general breast cancer population (11). In the early breast cancer setting, surgery is the main modality of local treatment. Surgery and/or radiotherapy can control loco-regional disease in the majority of patients. Neoadjuvant therapy is given prior to surgery and has become commonly used in patients with newly diagnosed breast cancer. Neoadjuvant therapy is the primary modality of therapy for patients with inflammatory breast cancer, regardless of tumour size (12). If standard neoadjuvant chemotherapy has been completed, usually there is no need for additional postoperative chemotherapy. Data from four Phase III trials has shown that the use of trastuzumab, for the adjuvant treatment of HER2-positive breast cancer reduces the relative risk of relapse by about 50% and the risk of death by about 30% (13-15). In these studies, trastuzumab was administered either sequentially or concurrently with standard chemotherapy regimens consisting of anthracyclines and/or taxanes. However, despite the marked improvements conferred by... |
adjuvant trastuzumab in these studies, a significant percentage of HER2-positive breast cancer patients still relapsed and ultimately died from metastatic disease (16).

### Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

#### Metastatic or Locally Recurrent Unresectable Breast Cancer

The phase III CLEOPATRA study was a randomized, multi-centre, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial which evaluated the efficacy of pertuzumab in 808 patients with HER2-positive metastatic or locally recurrent unresectable breast cancer who had not received previous anti-HER2 therapy or chemotherapy for metastatic disease (17-19). The primary efficacy endpoint was progression free survival (PFS) assessed by an independent review facility (IRF). Key secondary efficacy endpoints included overall survival (OS) and quality of life (QoL) assessed through the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Breast quality-of-life questionnaire. Patients were randomized to receive pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (Ptz + T + D) or placebo plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (Pla + T + D).

The CLEOPATRA study found a statistically significant and clinically relevant improvement in IRF-assessed PFS in the pertuzumab arm compared with the placebo arm (HR: 0.62; 95% CI: 0.51, 0.75; p < 0.001), with an increase of 6.1 months in median PFS (12.4 months in the placebo arm vs. 18.5 months in the pertuzumab arm). The advantage in PFS appeared soon after the treatment is started (9 weeks), and was maintained from this point onwards. Benefit was observed in all pre-specified subgroups tested.

At the data cut-off date for final OS analysis (February 2014) the results demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in survival with Ptz + T + D compared with Pla + T + D. Median OS was prolonged in the Ptz + T + D arm compared with the Pla + T + D arm (56.5 months versus 40.8 months; HR = 0.68; 95% CI: 0.56, 0.84, p<0.001) (19). Sensitivity analyses defined to explore the impact of crossover on the OS result confirmed the robustness of the results in the ITT population. Subgroup analyses of final OS were consistent with the analysis in the whole ITT population and confirmed results from previous analyses.

At the time of data cut-off, 78.8% of patients in the Pla + T + D arm and 70.6% of patients in the Ptz + T + D arm had experienced a PFS event according to the investigator (19). The treatment benefit of Ptz + T + D compared with Pla + T + D was maintained in the updated analysis of investigator-assessed PFS (HR = 0.68; 95% CI: 0.58, 0.80). The median PFS durations of 12.4 months in the placebo arm and 18.7 months in the pertuzumab arm were consistent with results from the previous analyses. Exploratory subgroup analyses of investigator-assessed PFS indicated treatment benefit with Ptz + T + D over Pla + T + D in all subgroups analysed and were consistent with the result in the whole ITT population, and with results from previous analyses.

In patients treated with pertuzumab–trastuzumab-based combinations, 239 of 402 (59.5%) patients in the pertuzumab arm and 229 of 404 (56.7%) patients in the placebo arm experienced a decrease from baseline of ≥5 points in a subset of the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Breast (FACT-B) questionnaire. Kaplan–Meier analysis showed a similar time decline of HRQoL between the two treatment arms (HR = 0.97; 95% CI, 0.81 to 1.16), showing that the combination of pertuzumab and trastuzumab with docetaxel had no major adverse impact on HRQoL (20).

#### Neoadjuvant Treatment of Locally Advanced, Inflammatory, or Early-Stage Breast Cancer

The phase II NeoSphere study was a multicentre, randomised, open-label study which evaluated the efficacy of pertuzumab as neoadjuvant treatment in 417 patients with HER2-positive locally advanced, inflammatory, or early-stage breast cancer (21, 22). Patients were randomized to receive trastuzumab plus docetaxel (T + D), pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (Ptz + T + D), pertuzumab plus trastuzumab (Ptz + T), or pertuzumab plus docetaxel (Ptz + D).

The primary efficacy endpoint was rate of breast pathologic complete response (bpCR), defined as the proportion of patients with an absence of invasive neoplastic cells in the breast following primary systemic therapy (in situ disease might remain; nodal status not considered), also known as ypT0/is. Secondary efficacy endpoints included clinical PFS.
Efficacy results for the primary endpoint (9 March 2012 clinical cut-off date) showed a statistically significant and clinically meaningful improvement in bpCR rate in patients receiving Ptz + T + D compared with patients receiving T + D as neoadjuvant therapy (45.8% vs. 29.0%). A consistent pattern of results was observed regardless of pathological complete response (pCR) definition, with a higher tpCR (ypT0/is N0) rate also reported in patients receiving Ptz + T + D compared with T + D (39.3% vs. 21.5%). bpCR rates were lower in the subgroup of patients with hormone receptor-positive disease (ranging from 5.9% to 26.0% among the four arms) than in the subgroup with hormone receptor-negative disease (ranging from 27.3% to 63.2%), but the difference in pCR still favoured Ptz + T + D compared with T + D (21).

Point estimates of PFS (defined as the time from the date of randomization to the first documentation of progressive disease or death) and DFS from the 5-year analysis were consistent with the benefit shown from the addition of pertuzumab to trastuzumab plus docetaxel in the primary analysis of pCR (regardless of the definition of pCR used) but confidence intervals were wide and included the null value. Hazard ratios for PFS and DFS were 0.69 (95% CI 0.34, 1.40) and 0.60 (95% CI 0.28, 1.27), respectively, indicating a lower risk of PFS and DFS events in the Ptz + T + D arm compared with the T + D arm (22).

The efficacy of pertuzumab as neoadjuvant treatment was also assessed in the TRYPHAENA study, a multicentre, randomised, open-label, phase II study conducted in 225 patients with HER2-positive locally advanced, inflammatory, or early-stage breast cancer (23, 24). The primary endpoint was cardiac safety during the neoadjuvant treatment period. The key efficacy endpoint was pCR rate (ypT0/is). Additional efficacy endpoints included DFS, PFS, and OS. Patients were randomised to receive one of three neoadjuvant regimens:

- Three cycles of pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus 5-fluorouracil, epirubicin and cyclophosphamide (FEC) followed by three cycles of pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (Ptz + T + FEC/Ptz + T + D)
- Three cycles of FEC followed by three cycles of pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (FEC/Ptz + T + D)
- Six cycles of carboplatin plus pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus docetaxel (C + Ptz + T + D). Randomisation was stratified by breast cancer type (operable, locally advanced, or inflammatory) and hormone receptor status.

High pCR rates were observed in all three treatment arms. A consistent pattern of results was observed regardless of pCR definition. pCR rates were lower in the subgroup of patients with hormone receptor-positive disease (ranging from 46.2% to 50.0% in the three arms) than in patients with hormone receptor-negative disease (ranging from 65.0% to 83.8%).

Long-term analyses of DFS and OS were conducted when median follow-up exceeded 60 months in all trial arms. DFS at 3 years was 87% (95% CI 79–95) in patients treated with Ptz + T + FEC/Ptz + T + D, 88% (80–96) in patients treated with FEC/Ptz + T + D, and 90% (82–97) in patients treated with C + Ptz + T + D (3-year DFS was 89% (81–96) in the first group, 89% (81–96) in the second group and 87% (80–95) in the third group). 3-year OS followed a similar pattern: 94% (89–100) in the first group, 94% (89–100) in the second group and 93% (87–99) in the third group.

Adjuvant Treatment of early breast cancer with a high risk of recurrence

The Phase III APHINITY study was a randomized multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial that evaluated the safety and efficacy of pertuzumab plus trastuzumab plus chemotherapy compared with placebo plus trastuzumab plus chemotherapy in 4805 patients with operable HER2-positive primary breast cancer (25).

The primary efficacy endpoint was invasive disease-free survival (IDFS), defined as time from randomization to ipsilateral invasive breast cancer recurrence, contralateral invasive breast cancer, distant recurrence, or death due to any cause. Other efficacy endpoints were DFS and OS.

At the clinical cut-off date, IDFS events had occurred in 171 patients (7.1%) in the pertuzumab-containing arm compared with 210 patients (8.7%) in the comparator arm. Treatment with
pertuzumab-containing therapy resulted in a borderline significant improvement in IDFS, corresponding to a 19\% relative reduction in the risk of relapse or death (HR = 0.81, 95\% CI [0.66, 1.00]). Estimates of IDFS event-free rates were 94.1\% vs. 93.2\% at 3 years and 92.3\% vs. 90.6\% at 4 years in the pertuzumab and comparator arms, respectively. The addition of pertuzumab to trastuzumab and chemotherapy reduced the rate of distant recurrences as first site of recurrence (4.7\% versus 5.8\%) and at any time in the study 5.0\% versus 6.0\%).

Interim OS results numerically favoured patients in the pertuzumab arm, but with only 26\% of the events required for the final planned OS analysis, the data were immature at the primary data cut-off. There was no significant treatment effect with regard to mortality between treatment arms at this first interim overall survival analysis (HR 0.89; 95\% CI, 0.66 to 1.21).

Subgroup analysis across multiple, pre-specified, clinically relevant subgroups showed that the IDFS improvements were seen for patients in the pertuzumab arm in the subgroup with node-positive disease. Improved IDFS was observed irrespective of the hormone receptor status, but the benefit of adding pertuzumab to trastuzumab and chemotherapy was more marked in patients with hormone receptor-negative disease (HR = 0.76, 95\% CI [0.56, 1.04]) than for patients with hormone receptor-positive disease (HR = 0.86, 95\% CI [0.66, 1.13]), indicating a 24\% and 14\% reduction in the risk of recurrence or death, respectively.

Overall, data indicate that pertuzumab is well tolerated as monotherapy and that it can be given in combination with trastuzumab and a range of other therapeutic agents with manageable additional toxicity. No unexpected toxicities were encountered other than those that are known for agents that target the HER family of receptors. Serious or severe infusion-related symptoms have been rarely observed in patients receiving pertuzumab. A low level of cardiac toxicities, predominantly asymptomatic declines in left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), has been reported. In the pivotal Phase III CLEOPATRA trial, the rates of symptomatic and asymptomatic left ventricular systolic dysfunction were not higher in patients receiving Ptz + T + D than in those receiving Pla + T + D (17). However, patients who have received prior anthracyclines or radiotherapy to the chest area may be at higher risk of decreased LVEF.

There is a limited amount of data from the use of pertuzumab in pregnant women. Studies in animals have shown reproductive toxicity and pertuzumab is not recommended during pregnancy and in women of childbearing potential not using contraception (26).

**Metastatic breast cancer**

In the Phase III CLEOPATRA trial in patients with HER2-positive MBC (N = 808), the safety profile of Ptz + T + D at the time of the latest clinical cut-off (11 February 2014) was generally similar to that of Pla + T + D (17, 19). The most common adverse event (AE) in both arms combined was alopecia (an AE associated with docetaxel), followed by diarrhoea, neutropenia, nausea, fatigue and rash. The safety profile of pertuzumab plus trastuzumab and docetaxel in patients who crossed over (after initially being treated with placebo plus trastuzumab and docetaxel) was consistent with the safety profile observed in patients treated with pertuzumab plus trastuzumab and docetaxel from the beginning of the study. The majority of AEs following crossover from placebo to pertuzumab were Grade 1–2.

The ongoing Phase II PERTAIN study investigated the efficacy and safety of first-line trastuzumab plus an aromatase inhibitor (AI), with or without pertuzumab in patients with HER2 positive and hormone receptor positive metastatic or locally advanced breast cancer (27). All-grade AEs occurred in 96.1\% of patients taking pertuzumab + trastuzumab + AI and in 98.4\% of patients taking trastuzumab + AI. The incidence of Grade ≥ 3 AEs was higher in the pertuzumab treatment arm (50.4\% versus 38.7\%). The most common Grade ≥ 3 events reported (occurring in ≥ 5\% of patients in either treatment arm) were hypertension, diarrhoea and neutropenia.

The Phase III PHEREXA study assessed the efficacy and safety of trastuzumab plus capecitabine, with or without pertuzumab in patients with HER2 positive metastatic breast cancer with disease progression despite trastuzumab-based therapy and prior taxane (28). The safety profile of the pertuzumab-containing regimen was consistent with previous pertuzumab studies and no new safety signals were observed. Almost all patients experienced an AE. The most common AEs were diarrhoea, palmar-planter erythrodysthesia (PPE) syndrome and
nausea. The incidence of diarrhoea was higher in those patients that received pertuzumab. The incidence of Grade ≥ 3 AEs was lower in those patients that received pertuzumab. The incidence of SAEs was similar in the two treatment arms. The incidence of cardiac disorders, particularly LVD, was higher in patients that received pertuzumab (3.2% vs. 7.5%). There were a total of 213 deaths, the majority of which were due to disease progression. Of these 213 deaths, 98 occurred in the pertuzumab arm.

Early Breast Cancer

In the Phase II NeoSphere study (21), the most frequently occurring AEs during neoadjuvant treatment were alopecia, neutropenia, diarrhoea, nausea, fatigue, rash and mucosal inflammation. The overall safety profile of Ptz + T + D (Arm B) was comparable to that of T + D (Arm A). The tolerability of pertuzumab plus docetaxel (Arm D) was also broadly comparable to that of Arm B. Patients receiving trastuzumab and pertuzumab only (Arm C) reported fewer AEs across most body systems compared to patients who also received chemotherapy. At the final clinical cut-off date, the safety profile observed was consistent with what has been previously reported for the neoadjuvant, adjuvant and post-treatment follow-up periods, indicating that the combination of trastuzumab, pertuzumab and docetaxel was generally well tolerated. In addition, no late safety concerns (including delayed cardiac toxicity) have emerged.

In the Phase II TRYPHAENA study (23), the most common AEs were diarrhoea, alopecia, nausea, neutropenia, vomiting, fatigue, anaemia, dyspepsia and thrombocytopenia. The safety profile observed was consistent with what has been previously reported for the neoadjuvant, adjuvant and post-treatment follow-up periods, indicating that these combinations, whether given sequentially after or concomitantly with anthracycline-based or concomitantly with carboplatin-based treatment were generally well tolerated. In addition, there were no unexpected findings regarding cardiac safety.

In the ongoing Phase III APHINITY study (25), the most common AEs (≥ 30% in either treatment arm) were diarrhoea, nausea, alopecia, fatigue, vomiting, arthralgia, and constipation. The incidence of most of the common AEs was similar between treatment arms except for diarrhoea, nausea and fatigue, which were higher in the Ptz + T + chemotherapy arm, and arthralgia, which was higher in the Pla + T + chemotherapy arm. The incidence of Grade ≥3 AEs during the overall study treatment period was higher in the Ptz + T + chemotherapy arm than in the Pla + T + chemotherapy arm (64.2% patients in the Ptz + T + chemotherapy arm and 57.3% patients in the Pla + T + chemotherapy arm). The proportion of patients who experienced at least one AE that led to the withdrawal of pertuzumab or placebo was similar in the two treatment arms. The cardiac event rates were low in both treatment arms.

Additional evidence: (not in the application)

The phase 3 MARIANNE randomized controlled trial studied untreated HER2+ metastatic breast cancer patients receiving T-DM1 plus pertuzumab, T-DM1 plus placebo, or a combination of trastuzumab with a taxane (paclitaxel or docetaxel) (29, 30). Approximately 30% of trial participants had been treated with trastuzumab in the adjuvant/neoadjuvant setting. The final MARIANNE results showed similar overall survival in the three treatment arms, with all regimens resulting in median OS greater than 50 months. Notably, in MARIANNE, the median overall survival of patients treated with trastuzumab and a taxane (50.9 months) was longer than that reported in the CLEOPATRA trial for trastuzumab plus docetaxel (40.8 months) and closer to the median OS of 56.5 months reported in CLEOPATRA for trastuzumab, docetaxel, and pertuzumab. Results from MARIANNE demonstrate the central role of trastuzumab, an anti-HER 2 medicine included into the WHO Model List, in the management of HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer, where median survival times longer than 4 years can be achieved.

Technology appraisal guidance documents released by National Institute for Health and Care Excellence on pertuzumab in early and metastatic breast cancer noted considerable uncertainty on incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for pertuzumab as compared to control, given uncertainty on long treatment benefit associated with the medicine (31, 32). In UK pertuzumab is priced at £2,395 per 420-mg vial (excluding VAT: price referring to 2018).
The company has a commercial arrangement that makes pertuzumab available to the National Health Service with a discount. The size of the discount is commercial in confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
<th>None available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | **Metastatic Breast Cancer**<br>The application did not provide data in the context of metastatic breast cancer.  
**Early Breast Cancer**<br>The application reported on a budget impact model developed by F. Hoffmann-La Roche assessing the cost impact of pertuzumab on further lines of treatment based on the reduction of metastatic events compared to trastuzumab + docetaxel. Long-term cost savings associated with event-free survival were estimated on a 5-year time horizon. Cost and epidemiological data were derived from the Italian context but were not provided in the application. 1,300 HER2-positive early breast cancer patients were considered eligible for neoadjuvant treatment with pertuzumab in the first year after launch. Average cost savings per year per patient for further line treatments in Italy could go up to €2,800 three years after launch. In the third year after launch, the costs savings in later lines of treatment are estimated to be €3.6 million resulting in accumulated costs of €6.2 million within the first three years (33). Cost-effectiveness analyses based on Canadian setting and NeoSphere and TRYPHAENA trials suggested that the addition of pertuzumab resulted in increased life-years and quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs). The incremental cost per QALY ranged from $25,388 (CAD; NeoSphere analysis) to $46,196 (TRYPHAENA analysis). Sensitivity analyses resulted in cost-effectiveness ratios ranging from $9230 to $64,421. (34) The application reported on the results of an additional cost-effectiveness analysis based on costs derived from the Italian context. Few details were provided. The study concluded that the addition of pertuzumab in adjuvant therapy induces a cost increase ranging between 23,000 and 28,000 Euros per patient per a gain of 0.45-1 QALY (35). |
| Availability: | As of 7 June 2018, pertuzumab has been approved in more than 100 countries worldwide. |
| Other considerations: | Based on results of the CLEOPATRA study (17, 19, 20), pertuzumab received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for use in the first-line metastatic treatment setting (36). Based on results of the NeoSphere study (21, 22), pertuzumab received a score of C on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for use in the neoadjuvant setting in early breast cancer (36). Based on results of the APHINITY study (25), pertuzumab received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for use in the adjuvant setting in early breast cancer (36). |
| Committee Recommendations: | The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EML Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration of pertuzumab. The Committee acknowledged that pertuzumab was associated with a relevant survival benefit, well beyond the established threshold, as first-line treatment of metastatic breast cancer, based on the results reported in the CLEOPATRA trial. However, the Committee expressed reservations about the generalizability of CLEOPATRA results in metastatic breast cancer and consistency of the clinical effectiveness of pertuzumab among studies both in early and metastatic breast cancer. These reservations are expanded below. - The Committee noted that only approximately 10% of patients in CLEOPATRA had received trastuzumab in the adjuvant or neoadjuvant setting. The Committee was concerned that the observed survival gains may not therefore be generalizable to patients with metastatic disease who have received prior adjuvant or neoadjuvant trastuzumab, making the magnitude of benefit in this population sub-group uncertain. The Committee also noted the results reported in the MARIANNE trial, where pertuzumab in combination with T-DM1 was not shown to have greater clinical benefit compared to trastuzumab plus chemotherapy or T-DM1 alone. The |
Committee was unable to reconcile the differences in the outcomes reported in the MARIANNE and CLEOPATRA trials.

The Committee also noted that the relevant survival gains observed in CLEOPATRA for metastatic breast cancer were not replicated in trials of pertuzumab in early stage breast cancer. The Committee accepted that trial results suggest pertuzumab offers a small incremental overall and disease-free survival benefit compared to placebo, based on an analysis at around 3 years median follow-up. The Committee considered that continued follow-up was important to assess long-term overall survival, but thought it unlikely that the magnitude of benefit would be greater with longer follow-up, given that anti-HER2 treatments are typically associated with a reduction in early recurrences, followed by a plateau effect.

The Expert Committee therefore did not recommend the addition of pertuzumab to the complementary list of the Model List for the treatment of early stage and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer. The Committee considered that the available evidence did not demonstrate a clinically meaningful survival benefit in early stage disease, and that there was important uncertainty surrounding the estimated magnitude of survival benefit in metastatic disease, with results seen in CLEOPATRA not replicated in other trials.

It was Committee's view that questions associated with differences in results from the CLEOPATRA and MARIANNE trials should be resolved by integration of the raw, individual patient trial data and independent re-analysis following a set of pre-planned hypotheses. The Committee recommended that WHO considers requesting access to the raw clinical trial data from CLEOPATRA and MARIANNE from the applicant, for an independent re-analysis arranged by WHO, and present the report of any such independent re-analysis, to the 2021 Expert Committee for consideration.
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### Rituximab – new formulation – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rituximab</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> L01XC02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of new sub-cutaneous injection formulations of rituximab to the complementary list of the EML for use in the treatment of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, chronic lymphocytic leukaemia and follicular lymphoma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support the inclusion of SC rituximab at this time, suggesting that the addition of this formulation could be considered as evidence emerges regarding real-world evidence of SC formulations providing reduced costs of care for the health workforce and/or facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>8.2.2 Targeted therapies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Dose form(s) & strength(s):** | Injection (sub-cutaneous) 1400mg/11.7 mL in 15 mL vial (NHL)
- Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma
- Follicular lymphoma
Injection (sub-cutaneous) 1600 mg/13.4 mL in 20 mL vial (CLL)
- Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia |
| **Core / Complementary:** | Complementary |
| **Individual / Square box listing:** | Individual |
| **Background:** | Rituximab intravenous injection was added to the complementary list of the EML in 2015 for treatment of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, follicular lymphoma and chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (1). |
| **Public health relevance:** | Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma is the most common type of non-Hodgkin lymphoma, accounting for more than 30% of lymphoma incidence (Tilly 2016). The crude incidence of DLBCL in Europe has been reported as 3.8 /100,000/year, increasing with age (2). Follicular lymphoma is the second most frequent subtype, accounting for approximately 20% of the overall NHL incidence (3, 4). FL occurs most commonly in middle-aged patients and the elderly, with a median age at diagnosis of approximately 60 years (5, 6). Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia is the most common form of adult leukaemia in Western Europe, accounting for 25%–40% of all leukaemias (7-9) with approximately 2–6 new cases in every 100,000 individuals per year (8, 10). CLL is more prevalent in the elderly, with an estimated median age at first diagnosis of approximately 70 years (11) with a male to female ratio of approximately 2:1 (9). |
| **Summary of evidence: benefits** | Evidence for the clinical effectiveness of rituximab was evaluated at the time of listing in 2015. The SABRINA trial investigated non-inferiority of the pharmacokinetic profile, efficacy and safety of SC rituximab (in combination with chemotherapy) with IV rituximab (in combination with chemotherapy) in patients with previously untreated follicular lymphoma (12). Results showed that rituximab SC 1400 mg provides non-inferior PK (C\text{trough}/AUC), as well as comparable efficacy and safety to rituximab IV. The point estimate for complete response (CR or CRu) was numerically higher in the IV arm compared with the SC 1400 mg arm (34.8% [95% CI: 26.9, 43.2] versus 28.2% [95% CI: 20.9, 36.3]). A higher proportion of patients in the IV arm (85.1%; 95% CI: 78.1, 90.5) achieved an overall response (CR, CRu, and PR) compared with patients in the SC 1400 mg arm (80.3%; 95% CI: 72.8, 86.5), whereas the rate of partial response was similar between the two arms (50.4% [95% CI: 41.8, 58.9] versus 52.1% [95% CI: 43.6, 60.6]) (13, 14). The SAWYER trial investigated non-inferiority of the pharmacokinetic profile, efficacy and safety of 1600 mg SC rituximab (in combination with chemotherapy) with IV rituximab (in combination with chemotherapy) in patients with previously untreated chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (15). Response rates were similar for the IV and SC arms, with an overall response |
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| Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) | Evidence for the safety of rituximab was evaluated at the time of listing in 2015. The safety profile of rituximab SC formulation was reported to be comparable to that of the intravenous formulation, with the exception of local injection site reactions. Administration-related reactions were very common in patients receiving the SC rituximab formulation in the SparkTera (16) and SABRINA trials (12), reported in up to 50% of patients at some time during treatment. Symptoms included pain, swelling, induration, haemorrhage, erythema, pruritis and rash. The majority of the reactions following SC administration were reported as mild or moderate. |
| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | None available. |
| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | No information was provided in the application regarding comparative drug costs of the SC and IV rituximab formulations, including biosimilars. The application stated that IV administration takes approximately three to four hours which can incur high costs on patients, health care professionals (HCP) and the health care system. The SC formulation can be administered via hand-held syringe in less than ten minutes plus follow up time and thus has the potential to realize considerable cost savings. A time and motion study of SC versus IV rituximab found time savings for patients and health care professionals associated with SC administration of rituximab compared to IV administration (17). The Committee considered that whether time savings would be realized to the full extent found in the study was uncertain, given that rituximab is administered with other intravenous chemotherapy. |
| Availability: | Rituximab SC 1400 mg has regulatory approval and market availability in more than 60 countries globally. The 1600 mg strength is approved and available in around 20 countries. |
| Other considerations: | The Committee noted the correspondence from the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) requesting recognition of biosimilars of rituximab and trastuzumab on the EML. The Committee agreed that quality-assured biosimilars of these monoclonal antibodies represent an opportunity for expanding affordable access to cancer medicines for health systems. |
| Committee Recommendations: | The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of new sub-cutaneous injection formulations of rituximab to the complementary list of the EML for use in the treatment of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, chronic lymphocytic leukaemia and follicular lymphoma. The Expert Committee acknowledged the potential benefits of the sub-cutaneous formulation over the listed intravenous formulation. However, with the availability of biosimilar versions of intravenous rituximab, the Committee was concerned that listing of the sub-cutaneous formulation, for which biosimilars are not yet available, could limit competition and therefore limit access for patients. To help improve access, the Expert Committee recommended the current listing for intravenous rituximab on the EML should indicate that quality-assured biosimilars of rituximab should also be considered as essential medicines. In addition, the Expert Committee recommended that WHO continue to facilitate access to biosimilars through the Pre-Qualification programme and WHO Collaborative Registration Procedure. |
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Trastuzumab – new formulation – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trastuzumab</th>
<th>ATC Code: L01XC03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of a sub-cutaneous injection formulation of trastuzumab to the complementary list of the EML for use in the treatment of early stage and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support the inclusion of SC trastuzumab at this time, suggesting that the addition of this formulation could be considered as evidence emerges regarding real-world evidence of SC formulations providing reduced costs of care for the health workforce and/or facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>8.2.2 Targeted therapies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Injection (subcutaneous) 600 mg/5mL in 5mL vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Trastuzumab powder for intravenous injection was added to the complementary list of the EML in 2015 for treatment of early-stage and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Breast cancer is the most common form of malignancy in women (2). In 2018, the number of new breast cancer cases was over 2 million, with over 626,000 deaths (3). The HER2 receptor is an important target for the treatment of breast cancer. Amplification and/or overexpression of HER2 occurs in approximately 18%–22% of breast cancers (4, 5). HER2 amplification/overexpression (HER2-positivity) is associated with increased tumour aggressiveness, higher rates of recurrence, and increased mortality (5-10). Approximately 15–20% of deaths from breast cancer are likely to be due to HER-positive disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>Evidence for the clinical effectiveness of trastuzumab was evaluated at the time of listing in 2015. The current application presented the results of the phase III study BO22227 which was designed to demonstrate non-inferiority of treatment with SC trastuzumab (600 mg every three weeks) and IV trastuzumab (8 mg/kg loading dose, 6 mg/kg maintenance every three weeks) based on co-primary pharmacokinetic and efficacy endpoints, (trastuzumab $C_{\text{trough}}$ at pre-dose Cycle 8, and pathological complete response (pCR) rate at definitive surgery, respectively) (11). The pharmacokinetic results for the co-primary endpoint, $C_{\text{trough}}$ pre dose Cycle 8, showed non-inferiority of trastuzumab SC to trastuzumab IV, dose adjusted by body weight. Efficacy results for the co-primary end point of pCR also showed non-inferiority of trastuzumab SC to trastuzumab IV. 595 patients with HER2-positive, operable or locally advanced breast cancer including inflammatory breast cancer received eight cycles of either trastuzumab IV or trastuzumab SC concurrently with chemotherapy, followed by surgery, and continued therapy with trastuzumab IV or SC as originally randomized for 10 additional cycles, for a total of one year of treatment. pCR rates were 40.7 % (95 % CI: 34.7, 46.9) in the trastuzumab IV arm and 45.4 % (95 % CI: 39.2 %, 51.7 %) in the trastuzumab SC arm, a difference of 4.7 percentage points in favour of the trastuzumab SC arm. The lower boundary of the one-sided 97.5 % confidence interval for the difference in pCR rates was -4.0. Analyses with longer term follow-up of a median duration exceeding 40 months and 70 months supported the non-inferior efficacy of the SC formulation with comparable results of both event-free survival (EFS) and overall survival (OS).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) | Evidence for the safety of trastuzumab was evaluated at the time of listing in 2015. The current application stated that no new safety signals were reported in in Study MO28048, which investigated the safety and tolerability of trastuzumab SC as adjuvant therapy in HER2 positive EBC patients who were enrolled in either a trastuzumab SC vial cohort or a trastuzumab SC administration system cohort (12). Treatment of lower body weight patients with trastuzumab SC fixed dose in adjuvant EBC was not associated with increased safety risk, adverse events and serious adverse events, compared to the higher body weight patients (13). The final results of study BO22227 at a median follow-up exceeding 70 months were also consistent with the known safety profile for trastuzumab IV and trastuzumab SC, and no new safety signals were observed (11). |
| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | None available. |
| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | No information was provided in the application regarding comparative drug costs of the SC and IV trastuzumab formulations, including biosimilars. The application stated that IV administrations take approximately one hour which can incur high costs on patients, health care professionals (HCP) and the health care system. The SC formulation can be administered over five minutes via a hand-held syringe (HHS) or a single-use injection device (SID) and thus has the potential to realize considerable cost savings. A time and motion study of SC versus IV trastuzumab found time savings for patients and health care professionals associated with SC administration of trastuzumab compared to IV administration (14). The Committee considered that whether time savings would be realized to the full extent found in the study was uncertain, given that trastuzumab is administered with other intravenous chemotherapy. |
| Availability: | The SC formulation of trastuzumab has regulatory approval and market availability in around 100 countries globally. |
| Other considerations: | The Committee noted the correspondence from the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) requesting recognition of biosimilars of rituximab and trastuzumab on the EML. The Committee agreed that quality-assured biosimilars of these monoclonal antibodies represent an opportunity for expanding affordable access to cancer medicines for health systems. |
| Committee Recommendations: | The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of new sub-cutaneous injection formulations of trastuzumab to the complementary list of the EML for use in the treatment of early stage and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer. The Expert Committee acknowledged the potential benefits of the sub-cutaneous formulation over the listed intravenous formulation. However, with the availability of biosimilar versions of intravenous trastuzumab, the Committee was concerned that listing of the sub-cutaneous formulation, for which biosimilars are not yet available, could limit competition and therefore limit access for patients. To help improve access, the Expert Committee recommended the current listing for intravenous trastuzumab on the EML should indicate that quality-assured biosimilars of rituximab can also be considered as essential medicines. In addition, the Expert Committee recommended that WHO continue to facilitate access to biosimilars through the Pre-Qualification programme and WHO Collaborative Registration Procedure. |

**References:**
# Trastuzumab emtansine – addition – EML

**Trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested the addition of trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1) to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of unresectable locally advanced and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support inclusion of trastuzumab emtansine on the EML at this time, though noting recent studies demonstrating its utility as second-line therapy in the metastatic and non-metastatic settings. At the current time, given the narrow gain in overall survival and small benefit on disease-control, the technical unit considered that trastuzumab did not currently meet criteria as a priority medicine for breast cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>8.2.2 Targeted therapies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</td>
<td>Powder for injection 100 mg in vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Trastuzumab emtansine, as a single agent, is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-positive, unresectable locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer (MBC) who previously received trastuzumab and a taxane, separately or in combination. Both trastuzumab and taxanes are already included in the WHO Model List. T-DM1 was considered for inclusion on the EML by the Expert Committee in 2017 and was not recommended. At that time the Committee acknowledged the significant public health burden of breast cancer and noted the availability of other medicines for this condition (e.g. pertuzumab, lapatinib) which have never been proposed for evaluation for inclusion on the EML. The Committee considered that it would have been preferable to consider T-DM1 as part of a comprehensive review encompassing additional medicines, compared with the standard of care, better understanding the additional value and implications of adding them to national EMLs. Trastuzumab is currently included on the EML for treatment of metastatic HER2 positive breast cancer. EML-listed cytotoxic medicines for metastatic breast cancer include capecitabine, cyclophosphamide, docetaxel, doxorubicin, paclitaxel and vinorelbine. EML-listed hormonal therapies for MBC include anastrozole and tamoxifen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance: (burden of disease)</td>
<td>Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death among women globally, responsible for 15% of all cancer deaths. In 2018, the global cancer burden increased to 18.1 million cases, causing 9.6 million deaths (1). Changes in lifestyle, life expectancy and reproductive factors are responsible in many developing countries for a sharp increase in the incidence of breast cancer, and the number of deaths as a percentage of incident cases is greater than that seen in high income countries. For example, in 2008, this figure was 24% in high income countries, 38% in high-middle-income countries, 40% in low-middle-income and 48% in low income (2). The HER2 receptor has emerged as one of the most important targets for the treatment of breast cancer. HER2 is involved in regulating cell growth, survival, and differentiation (3). Amplification and/or overexpression of HER2 occurs in approximately 18%–22% of breast cancers (4, 5). HER2 amplification/overexpression (HER2-positivity) is associated with increased tumour aggressiveness, higher rates of recurrence, and increased mortality (5-10). The median age of patients presenting with HER2-positive breast cancer is in the mid-50s, approximately 5 years younger than the general breast cancer population (11). At the early stage, breast cancer is usually operable and can be treated with curative intent. However, approximately 20%–35% of patients experience relapse (12) and those with metastatic or unresectable disease are generally incurable. Such tumours often continue to express high levels of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HER2 (13).** Patients with metastatic disease have a 5-year life expectancy of approximately 18% in Europe (14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: benefits</th>
<th>Locally advanced and metastatic breast cancer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from the application)</td>
<td>The efficacy of single-agent T-DM1 at a dose of 3.6 mg/kg every three weeks has been investigated in Phase II and III trials in HER2-positive advanced breast cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pivotal Phase III EMILIA trial was a randomized, multi-centre, international, two-arm, open-label clinical trial which evaluated the efficacy and safety of treatment with T-DM1 compared to trastuzumab and a taxane (15, 16). The primary efficacy endpoints were overall survival (OS) and independent review committee-assessed progression-free survival (PFS). The study demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in both PFS (9.6 months versus 6.4 months, HR 0.65, 95% CI 0.59 to 0.77) and OS (30.9 months versus 25.1 months, HR 0.68, 95% CI 0.55 to 0.85) for T-DM1 compared with lapatinib plus capecitabine. The final OS analysis was scheduled to be conducted after the occurrence of 632 deaths. At the data cut-off date for this analysis (December 2014), median OS was prolonged in patients treated with T-DM1 (29.9 months) when compared with patients treated with capecitabine plus lapatinib (25.9 months; HR = 0.75, 95% CI 0.64 to 0.88) (16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The comparator regimen of lapatinib plus capecitabine used in the EMILIA trial has not been considered for inclusion on the Model List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Phase III TH3RESA trial was a randomized, open-label, multi-centre trial that compared T-DM1 with treatment of physician’s choice in 602 patients with progressive HER2-positive advanced breast cancer, previously treated with at least two HER2-directed regimens (17, 18). The study demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in both PFS (6.2 months versus 3.3 months, HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.42 to 0.66) and OS (median not reached at that time versus 14.9, HR 0.55, 95% CI 0.37 to 0.83) for T-DM1 compared with treatment of physician’s choice (17). At the data cut-off date for final OS analysis (February 2015), median OS was prolonged in patients treated with T-DM1 (22.7 months versus 15.8 months; HR = 0.68, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.85) (18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early breast cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Phase III KRISTINE study evaluated neoadjuvant T-DM1 plus pertuzumab compared with docetaxel, carboplatin and trastuzumab plus pertuzumab in 444 patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (19). The study found that total pathological complete response rates (a surrogate outcome for survival) were higher in patients receiving trastuzumab emtansine plus pertuzumab or docetaxel, carboplatin, than trastuzumab plus pertuzumab. However OS was not significantly different between treatment groups (HR 1.21, 95% CI 0.37 to 3.96). Event free survival significantly favored trastuzumab-containing regimen, without T-DM1 (HR 2.61, 95% CI 1.36 to 4.98) (20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the KATHERINE study, adjuvant T-DM1 significantly improved invasive disease–free survival rates compared to trastuzumab group in 1486 patients with residual disease following neoadjuvant chemotherapy plus trastuzumab-based anti-HER2 treatment (HR for invasive disease or death, 0.50; 95% confidence interval, 0.39 to 0.64) (21). OS did not significantly differ (HR, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.47 to 1.05). These results are based on an early interim analysis based on few events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary of evidence: harms | The safety profile of T-DM1 in MBC is based on pooled data from 1871 patients receiving single-agent T-DM1 treatment at 3.6 mg/kg every three weeks (Studies TDM3569g, TDM4258g, TDM4374g, TDM4688g, TDM4450g/BO21976, TDM4370g/BO21977, TDM4788g/BO22589, TDM4997g/BO25734 and TDM4529g/BO25430). The most common adverse events (AEs) for single-agent T-DM1 (AEs in >= 25% of patients) were nausea, fatigue and headache (22). |
| (from the application)      | The Phase III EMILIA study compared T-DM1 with lapatinib plus capecitabine treatment, in patients with HER2-positive locally-advanced or metastatic breast cancer (15). In accordance with the differing mechanisms of action, the safety profile of T-DM1 was different from that of lapatinib plus capecitabine, as shown by differences in incidence of common AEs. In the T-DM1 arm, the most common events (occurring in at least 25% of patients) were nausea, fatigue, thrombocytopenia, |
headache, constipation, diarrhoea, and increased aspartate aminotransferase, whereas the most common events associated with lapatinib plus capecitabine treatment were diarrhoea, palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia syndrome, nausea, vomiting, fatigue, and rash (Roche, data on file). Fewer patients were reported with AEs of Grade 3 or higher, and serious adverse events (SAEs) in the T-DM1 arm than in the lapatinib plus capecitabine arm.

In the Phase III TH3RESA study, fewer patients receiving T-DM1 than those receiving treatment of physician’s choice had AEs of Grade 3 or higher. Grade 3 or higher thrombocytopenia was reported more frequently in patients receiving T-DM1 (≥2% more patients than in the TPC arm), whereas patients receiving TPC reported more Grade ≥3 neutropenia, leukenia, febrile neutropenia and diarrhoea (17).

Cardiac safety of T-DM1 in patients with early breast cancer was evaluated in the Phase II Study TDM4874g/BO22857 (23). There were no events of symptomatic heart failure. One patient discontinued T-DM1 treatment as a result of an asymptomatic left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) decline. The most common AEs while receiving T-DM1 (in at least 20% of patients) were nausea, headache, epistaxis, asthenia, pyrexia, fatigue, arthralgia, thrombocytopenia, and myalgia. The most common Grade 3 or higher AEs (> 2%) reported while receiving T-DM1 were thrombocytopenia, alanine transaminase (ALT) increase, AST increase, neutropenia, and hypertension; all of which occurred in less than 10% of patients.

In the neoadjuvant KRISTINE (BO28408) study, safety was better in the T-DM1 + pertuzumab arm compared with trastuzumab, pertuzumab plus chemotherapy, with a lower incidence of, Grade ≥3 AEs: 13.0% in the T-DM1 + pertuzumab arm versus 64.4% in the trastuzumab, pertuzumab plus chemotherapy arm, serious AEs: 4.9% in T-DM1 + pertuzumab arm versus 28.8% in trastuzumab, pertuzumab plus chemotherapy arm, and AEs leading to treatment discontinuation: 3.1% in the T-DM1 + pertuzumab arm vs. 8.7% in the trastuzumab, pertuzumab plus chemotherapy arm. The most common grade 3–4 adverse events in the docetaxel, carboplatin, and trastuzumab plus pertuzumab group were neutropenia (55 [25%] of 219 vs one [<1%] of 223 with T-DM1 plus pertuzumab), diarrhoea (33 [15%] vs 2 [<1%]), and febrile neutropenia (33 [15%] vs 0). No deaths were reported during neoadjuvant treatment (19).

The overall safety profile of the T-DM1 arm in the adjuvant KATHERINE (BO27938) study was consistent with the known safety profile of T-DM1 (21). Any-grade adverse events were more common in the T-DM1 arm (98.8% versus 93.3%). Adverse events leading to randomized treatment discontinuation occurred in 133 (18.0%) T-DM1–treated patients and 15 (2.1%) trastuzumab-treated patients. The most common adverse events leading to discontinuation in the T-DM1 arm were laboratory abnormalities (platelet count decreased [4.2%], blood bilirubin increased [2.6%], aspartate aminotransferase increased [1.6%), alanine aminotransferase increased [1.5%]), peripheral sensory neuropathy (1.5%), and ejection fraction decreased (1.2%). The most common grade 3 or higher adverse events were decreased platelet count (5.7%) and hypertension (2.0%) in the T-DM1 group. Serious adverse events occurred in 94 patients (12.7%) receiving T-DM1. One fatal adverse event of intracranial hemorrhage after subject fall occurred in the T-DM1 arm. Adjudicated cardiac events occurred in four patients (0.6%) in the trastuzumab arm and in one patient in the T-DM1 arm (0.1%).
### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

The following is a summary of additional evidence presented as part of the 2017 Expert Committee consideration of T-DM1 in 2017 (24).

A 2016 meta-analysis of nine studies evaluated the safety and efficacy of T-DM1 in advanced HER2 positive breast cancer. The overall hazard ratios for PFS and OS were calculated by meta-analysing, respectively, three (EMILIA (15), TH3RESA (17), BO21976 (25)) and two (EMILIA, TH3RESA,) controlled trials. Median PFS significantly favoured T-DM1; difference ranged from 2.9 months to 5 months (total HR 0.60; 95% CI 0.53–0.69). Cumulative OS was associated with an improved survival for T-DM1 compared with treatment physician’s choice (odds ratio (OR) 0.60; 95% CI 0.48–0.75). Heterogeneity was low in both analyses.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) published its technology appraisal for T-DM1, assessing efficacy and cost–effectiveness (26–28). As part of the process, NICE reviewed evidence submitted by Roche, clinical experts and other stakeholders; clinical evidence came primarily from EMILIA and TH3RESA clinical trials. Because head-to-head treatment comparisons were available only for LC, the company conducted a Bayesian network meta-analysis using a fixed-effect model involving five clinical trials (EMILIA, CEREDEL, EGF100151, NCT00777101 and GBG26).

NICE’s Evidence Review Group (ERG), reviewing Roche’s submission, repeated the network meta-analysis using a random-effects model. From the ERG’s model, compared with CL, T-DM1 was associated with a 32% decrease in hazard of death (HR 0.68; 95% credible interval (Crl) 0.37–1.25) and a 35% reduction in the hazard of tumour progression or death (HR 0.65; 95% Crl 0.35–1.20). However, the authors report that Crl values “do not rule out the possibility that T-DM1 is less efficacious than comparators” (28).

After analysing the technology appraisal, NICE concluded that T-DM1 was a clinically effective for treatment for HER2-positive, unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer after treatment with trastuzumab and a taxane, but ultimately did not find it to be cost effective at the price that Roche was offering at the time (27).

### Comparison with trastuzumab

Trastuzumab is associated with relevant benefits in HER2-positive breast cancer patients. In a systematic review of eight studies, total 11 991 patients, the combined HRs for OS and disease-free survival (DFS) significantly favoured trastuzumab-containing regimens (HR 0.66; 95% CI 0.57–0.77; P < 0.00001; and HR 0.60; 95% CI 0.50–0.71; P < 0.00001, respectively) (29). Currently, a combination of trastuzumab with a taxane is considered to be the standard of care (i.e. first-line) in metastatic breast cancer. Medicines in this regimen are included on the WHO EML.

The phase 3 MARIANNE randomized controlled trial studied untreated HER2+ metastatic breast cancer patients receiving T-DM1 plus pertuzumab, T-DM1 plus placebo, or a combination of trastuzumab with a taxane (paclitaxel or docetaxel) (30, 31). At the cut-off date of May 2016, therapies containing T-DM1 were non-inferior to trastuzumab and taxane treatments for PFS. However, OS curves essentially overlapped (trastuzumab + taxane versus trastuzumab emtansine + placebo, HR 0.93, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.20; trastuzumab + taxane versus trastuzumab emtansine + pertuzumab HR 0.86, 95% CI 0.67 to 1.11) with survival medians approaching one each other (trastuzumab + taxane 50.86 months, trastuzumab emtansine + placebo 53.68, trastuzumab emtansine + pertuzumab 51.78) (32). T-DM1 was better tolerated, contributing to better quality of life secondary end-points and less treatment discontinuation related to adverse events (31).

### WHO Guidelines:

None available.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

A Canadian study demonstrated that the use of T-DM1 for the management of HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer results in substantial savings to the public health-care system when the costs of treatment related AEs are taken into account, due to less toxicity compared with lapatinib plus capecitabine (33). The findings were confirmed in sensitivity analyses in which the number and costs of AEs were changed, however, the magnitude of cost savings varied. Whether the same findings would be realized in other countries and health-care systems is not known.

T-DM1 has been accepted as a cost-effective treatment option in eligible patients with HER2+ metastatic breast cancer in the United Kingdom (34), Canada (35), Australia (36), Scotland (37), Ireland (38), France (39), and Sweden (40).
Availability: T-DM1 was first granted marketing approval in United States on February 2013, followed by the European Union (EU) and Japan in the same year. As of 15 November 2018, T-DM1 has been approved in more than 100 countries worldwide.

Other considerations: Based on results of the EMILIA study (15, 41), T-DM1 received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for use in the metastatic breast cancer setting as second line therapy after trastuzumab failure (42). The U.S. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) v3, 25 October 2018 clinical guidelines and compendium recommend use of T-DM1 as a first-line treatment option for patients with HER2-positive MBC in patients not eligible for pertuzuzumab-trastuzumab plus a taxane. Based on the trial data from Study BO22589/TDM4788g that demonstrated T-DM1 is noninferior with better quality of life compared with trastuzumab plus taxane, and possibly better tolerated for some patients, the NCCN panel included T-DM1 as one of the first-line options for the treatment of patients with HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer (MBC). Pertuzumab, trastuzumab, and a taxane, however, remain the preferred front-line regimen for HER2-positive metastatic disease based on data demonstrating improved overall survival (OS) compared with trastuzumab and a taxane. T-DM1 as first-line therapy should be considered only in patients not suitable for the preferred treatment (43).

The American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) clinical practice guideline recommends the use of T-DM1 for the treatment of HER2-positive advanced breast cancer that has progressed during or after first-line HER2-targeted therapy (Evidence quality: High; Strength of recommendation: Strong) (44). The same guideline also recommends the use of T-DM1 in patients whose HER2-positive breast cancer has progressed during or after second-line or greater HER2-targeted therapy if they have not previously been treated with T-DM1 (44). Updated European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) guidelines recommend T-DM1 in patients who have progressed through at least one line of trastuzumab-based therapy based on its OS benefit (Category IA) (45).

Committee Recommendations: The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EML Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration of trastuzumab emtansine. The Committee acknowledged that for second line treatment of metastatic breast cancer, trastuzumab emtansine was associated with a relevant survival benefit, within the range of the established threshold. However, the Committee noted that survival benefits did not meet the 4-6 month threshold when trastuzumab emtansine was used as first line treatment in the metastatic setting, or in early stage breast cancer.

Existing EML listed options are available for metastatic disease and may be suitable alternatives (e.g., trastuzumab, taxanes, etc.). However, the Committee noted the current challenges in achieving full access to trastuzumab in many settings. Taking this into account, trastuzumab emtansine for second-line treatment of metastatic disease (i.e. late in the care pathway) was considered to be a lower priority for EML inclusion at this time. Compared to the 2017 application, the Committee noted that few new clinical data were included in the current application and that the request was not based on a comprehensive review encompassing additional breast cancer medicines, compared with the standard of care, which would allow countries to understand the additional value of adding each option to national EMLs. The Expert Committee therefore did not recommend the addition of trastuzumab emtansine to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of unresectable locally advanced and metastatic HER-2 positive breast cancer.

References:


### Tyrosine-kinase inhibitors for non-small cell lung cancer – addition – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afatinib</td>
<td>L01XE13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlotinib</td>
<td>L01XE03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gefitinib</td>
<td>L01XE02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**
The application requested the addition of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) to the complementary list of the EML for first-line treatment of EGFR mutation positive non-small cell lung cancer.

**Applicant:**
Dr Sumitra Thongprasert

**WHO Technical Department:**
Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of EGFR TKIs on the EML, stating that there is sufficient evidence that these medicines are equivalent or superior to existing listed medicines, based on updated meta-analysis and real-world data, particularly in middle-income countries.

**EML / EMLc:**
EML

**Section:**
8.2.2 Targeted therapies

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Afatinib: capsule 20 mg, 40 mg, 50 mg
- Erlotinib: capsule 100 mg, 150 mg
- Gefitinib: capsule 250 mg

**Core / Complementary:**
Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:**
Square box

**Background:**
EGFR TKIs have been considered and rejected for inclusion on the EML on two previous occasions in 2015 and 2017. In each case, the Expert Committee acknowledge that individual patients with a drug-sensitive EGFR mutation may derive benefit from TKI therapy, which has been associated with similar efficacy and more favourable tolerability compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy. However, the requirements to screen patients for suitability for treatment must be taken into account by health systems (1, 2).

Cytotoxic chemotherapy currently included on the EML for treatment of NSCLC includes carboplatin, cisplatin, etoposide, gemcitabine, paclitaxel and vinorelbine.

**Public health relevance:**
Lung cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer globally, and the leading cause of cancer death, with estimated 2 million new cases and 1.7 related deaths in 2018. The economic impact of lung cancer has been estimated at around US $8 billion in lost productivity in the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) (3).

Moreover, in the absence of wide coverage of effective screening programs on global scale, lung cancer diagnoses occur in advanced stage in more than 60% of cases, with highly regional variability (4, 5). The mutational pattern of NSCLC varies across the different regions, with a higher prevalence in Asia-Pacific (up to 76% of patients) and the lowest registered in Oceania (12%). Africa, Europe and North America registered the same rate of EGFR mutated NSCLC, at around 20% (6-8).

Non-squamous NSCLC has been linked to gene mutations in EGFR. This disease, given its incidence, comprises a high burden and leads to a high dead rate. However, with the advanced in cancer gene directed treatment, the outcome of the disease has improved. The response rate doubled as compared to chemotherapy, the progression free survival (PFS) doubled and the median survival time increased to nearly 3 years if patient received both the targeted medicines and chemotherapy together (the median survival time for patient receiving chemotherapy only is ~10 months, in the historical series).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**
The application reported the findings and recommendations for EGFR-mutated NSCLC from the 2018 ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow up of metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (9).

The ESMO guidelines state that EGFR-TKIs are the standard of care for first-line treatment for advanced EGFR-mutated NSCLC (level of evidence: I; grade of recommendation: A).

EGFR mutation as an oncogenic target has proven predictive power in NSCLC from multiple phase 3 trials of EGFR-TKIs versus platinum-based chemotherapy (10-15). The improvement in objective response rate (ORR) and progression free survival (PFS) is consistent across all age groups,
The use of EGFR-TKI as first-line therapy has been associated with a greater benefit than as second-line treatment after chemotherapy for PFS (12.9 months vs 9.0 months (HR: 0.78, 95% CI 0.61-0.98, p=0.034)), ORR (67.8% and 55.6%, respectively, p = .001). Overall survival in patients receiving first-line TKI followed by second-line chemotherapy was longer than in patients receiving TKI second-line after chemotherapy (30.7 months vs 27.2 months (HR: 0.69, 95% CI 0.50-0.94, p=0.02) (17).

Evidence supports the continuation of EGFR-TKI treatment beyond radiological progression in patients who are clinically stable (18). EGFR-TKI use in combination with local radiation therapy in patients with oligoprogresive disease, has also been shown to be associated with significantly longer PFS (19).

The IMPRESS trial tested the continuation of gefitinib plus chemotherapy with placebo plus chemotherapy in patients with EGFR mutation-positive advanced NSCLC with progression after first-line gefitinib (20). The trial failed to show a benefit of the continuation strategy of the EGFR-TKI as add-on strategy; the continuation of gefitinib plus cisplatin and pemetrexed was detrimental to OS when compared with placebo plus cisplatin and pemetrexed (hazard ratio [HR], 1.44; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.07 to 1.94; p = 0.016; median OS, 13.4 v 19.5 months). Therefore, continuous use of EGFR-TKI in combination with chemotherapy is not recommended.

The NEJ009 trial evaluated the efficacy of a combination of gefitinib and carboplatin/pemetrexed in untreated advanced NSCLC patients with EGFR mutations (21). Carboplatin/pemetrexed/gefitinib demonstrated better PFS (mPFS: 20.9 vs 11.2 months, HR 0.49, 95% CI 0.39–0.62) and OS (mOS: 52.2 vs 38.8 months, HR 0.69, 95% CI 0.52–0.92) compared with gefitinib monotherapy in advanced EGFR mutated NSCLC, representing a first-line therapy option. The choice between first-line (gefitinib or erlotinib, (reversible)) and second-generation (afatinib, (irreversible)) EGFR-TKIs was investigated in two randomized studies. The phase 2B LUX-Lung 7 trial compared afatinib with gefitinib (22). The study reported similar tumour ORR and a modest non-clinically meaningful difference in PFS (mPFS 11.0 vs 10.9 months; HR 0.73, 95% CI 0.57–0.95, p=0.0165). OS was not statistically different (23). There was no difference in OS in patients with EGFR exon 19 mutation, contrary to earlier claims of benefit in this subgroup from the pooled analysis of LUX-Lung 3 and LUX-Lung 6 studies (24).

ARCHER 1050 is a randomized phase 3 study that compared dacomitinib (a second generation EGFR-TKI) with gefitinib in stage IV EGFR-mutated lung cancer patients without CNS metastasis (25, 26). The study showed an improved PFS in the dacomitinib arm (mPFS 14.7 vs 9.2 months; HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.47–0.74, p < .0001). The mOS was 34.1 months with dacomitinib vs 26.8 months with gefitinib (HR 0.76, 95% CI 0.58–0.993, p < .04). The OS probabilities at 30 months were 56.2% and 46.3% with dacomitinib and gefitinib, respectively.

The toxicity profile of EGFR-TKIs is generally clinically manageable, with 6% of toxicity-related treatment discontinuation reported in one pooled analysis (27, 28).

The use of EGFR-TKI was favoured over chemotherapy in quality of life (QoL) analyses, reporting a longer time to clinical deterioration and maintained overall QoL (29-31).

For afatinib, an extensive investigation of patient-reported symptoms and health-related QoL benefits have been reported, showing that afatinib delayed the time to deterioration for cough (HR, 0.60; 95% CI, 0.41 to 0.87; p = .007) and dyspnoea (HR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.50 to 0.93; p = .015), with more patients on afatinib (64%) versus chemotherapy (50%) experiencing improvements in dyspnoea scores (p = .010), the cardinal symptom for lung cancer patients (32). For erlotinib, a secondary analysis from the OPTIMAL (CTONG-0802) phase 3 clinical trial, showed that patients receiving erlotinib experienced clinically relevant improvements in QoL compared with the chemotherapy group, across different scales to assess general outcome and lung specific subscales (33). Data for gefitinib are still consistent with the findings for the other two EGFR-TKIs: time to deterioration in physical and life well-being favour gefitinib over chemotherapy (HR of time to deterioration, 0.34; 95% CI, 0.23-0.50; p < .0001 and HR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.28-0.65; p < .0001, respectively) (29).
## Additional evidence:

### (not in the application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

- **Cost- effectiveness analysis (CEA):** Compared to standard cisplatin-containing chemotherapy, the EGFR-TKI is more cost-effective; the result was consistent with an analysis performed in the population unsuitable for chemotherapy vs. palliative care.

- **A cost-effectiveness analysis performed by the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review showed that the use of each of the first-line EGFR-TKI regimens resulted in a 0.84 life-year gain in survival relative to chemotherapy. Quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) gained versus chemotherapy were also very similar, ranging from 0.60 for gefitinib to 0.62 for afatinib and erlotinib. Incremental costs versus chemotherapy were lower for gefitinib (approximately US$66,000) than for the other EGFR-TKIs, as a function of a shorter duration of time spent in the progression-free state (and a consequently shorter duration of treatment). Cost-effectiveness estimates were similar across the EGFR-TKIs, ranging from approximately $110,000 - $150,000 per QALY gained.

- In another cost-effectiveness analysis, two different strategies were compared: the 'EGFR testing strategy', in which EGFR mutation testing was performed before treatment and patients with EGFR mutations received gefitinib while those without mutations received standard chemotherapy, to the 'no-testing strategy,' in which genetic testing was not conducted and all patients were treated with standard chemotherapy. The authors concluded that the combination use of gefitinib and EGFR testing can be considered a cost-effective first-line therapy compared to chemotherapy such as carboplatin-paclitaxel for the treatment for NSCLC in Japan.

- Technology appraisal guidance issued by NICE for first-line EGFR-TKIs gefitinib, erlotinib and afatinib state that these medicines are recommended treatment options people with locally advanced or metastatic EGFR mutation positive NSCLC if the manufacturers provide the drugs at agreed fixed or discounted prices.

### Availability:

- Originator brands of afatinib, erlotinib and gefitinib are manufactured by Boehringer Ingelheim, Roche and AstraZeneca, respectively. Generic brands are becoming available.

### Other considerations:

- Based on the results of the LUX-Lung 3 study, afatinib received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for first-line use in metastatic EGFR+ NSCLC.

- Based on the results of the OPTIMAL (38) and EURTAC (13) studies, erlotinib received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for use in metastatic EGFR+ NSCLC.

- Based on the results of the IPASS study, gefitinib received a score of 4 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for first-line use in metastatic EGFR+ NSCLC.

### Committee Recommendations:

- The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EML Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration of the tyrosine kinase inhibitors afatinib, erlotinib and gefitinib.

- The Committee noted that afatinib, erlotinib and gefitinib were all scored as 4/5 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for this indication.

- The Expert Committee recommended the addition of erlotinib with a square box to the complementary list of the EML for first-line treatment of EGFR mutation positive advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Afatinib and gefitinib should be considered as therapeutically equivalent alternatives. The Committee noted that these medicines are associated with relevant survival benefits for patients, acceptable toxicity and improvements in quality of life compared to chemotherapy.

- The Committee also noted that since these medicines were considered for inclusion on the EML in 2015, generic versions of these medicines are more widely available, as are quality-assured diagnostic molecular tests for EGFR mutations.

## References:

### Medicines for multiple myeloma – addition – EML

| Bortezomib | ATC Code: | L01XX32 |
| Lenalidomide | ATC Code: | L01AX04 |
| Thalidomide | ATC Code: | L04AX02 |

**Proposal:**
The application requested the addition of bortezomib, lenalidomide and thalidomide to the EML for the treatment of newly diagnosed multiple myeloma patients in non-transplant settings.

**Applicant:**
Dr Vanessa Piechotta, Dr Marius Goldkuhle, Prof Christof Scheid, Dr Nicole Skoetz

**WHO Technical Department:**
Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of these medicines on the EML. The technical unit noted that use of these medicines is either as part of pre-autologous stem cell transplantation treatment in fit patients, and as an alternative treatment in transplant-ineligible patients, although the difference in transplant eligible and ineligible patients was not addressed in the application.

**EML / EMLc**
EML

**Section:**
8.2.2 Targeted therapies (bortezomib)
8.2.3 Immunomodulators (lenalidomide, thalidomide)

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Bortezomib: lyophilised powder for injection 3.5 g
- Lenalidomide: capsule 25 mg
- Thalidomide: capsule 50 mg

**Core / Complementary:**
Complementary

**Individual / Square box listing:**
Individual listing for each medicine.

**Background:**
(Treatments for multiple myeloma had not previously been considered by the Expert Committee for addition to the EML. Abbreviations: M = melphalan, P = prednisone, C = cyclophosphamide, D = dexamethasone, V = bortezomib, R = lenalidomide, T = thalidomide.

**Public health relevance:**
(Multiple myeloma (MM) is the second most common haematological malignancy and accounts for 2.1% of all cancer deaths in the United States (1, 2). In 2018, 159,985 new MM cases and 106,105 MM deaths were estimated worldwide (3). Globally, myeloma caused 2.1 million disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) in 2016 (4). Globally, the incidence rate increased by 126% between 1990 and 2016 and is strongly related to age (4, 5). The largest increase has been observed in low- and middle-income countries (4). Based on the latest statistics in the US, the median age of myeloma diagnosis across all races and both genders is 69 years (2). In high-income countries (HIC), autologous stem cell transplantation (ASCT) is routinely used for younger patients with a good general state of health. However, ASCT is not available in many low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) (3). Lack of access to general and specialized healthcare leads to wide disparities in survival rates between HICs and LMICs. In the UK, 47% of diagnosed MM patients are predicted to survive at least five years (32.5% at least 10 years) (5). In comparison, a 5-year survival rate of only 7.6% was recently reported in Nigeria, as a result of constraints in access to ASCT, unavailability of medicines for MM and delayed diagnosis with more advanced presentations and related organ failures (6). For example, of patients diagnosed with MM in Nigeria, up to one-third qualify for renal dialysis as a result of MM-related end-stage nephropathy (7). In non-transplant settings (no transplant-accessibility or transplant-ineligibility), the introduction of immunomodulatory drugs and proteasome inhibitors has led to an improvement in the overall survival of patients. A retrospective analysis of 631 patients, who received an initial therapy of bortezomib, lenalidomide, or thalidomide, reported a median OS of 7.3 years (95% CI: 5.9; not reached). In comparison, a median OS of 3.8 years (95% CI: 3.1; 4.6) was reported for 425 patients, whose initial therapy did not include these agents (8). The lack of availability ASCT services is more common in low-middle income countries. Some regions of the world lack access to stem cell transplantation entirely; for example, in sub-Saharan Africa there is no facility to deliver ASCT care for MM patients outside of South Africa (4). This raises the issue of a public health urgency requiring diversified actions including ensuring access to effective medicines,
and building capacity for transplant services. The application focused on the transplant-ineligible / inaccessible setting, more applicable in LMIC, proposing the inclusion in the EML of bortezomib, lenalidomide and thalidomide to address an unmet medical need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The application presented the findings of a Rapid Cochrane Network Meta-Analysis conducted to compare the efficacy and safety of bortezomib, lenalidomide and thalidomide versus the former standard treatment of melphalan and prednisone (still used in many LMICs) for transplant-ineligible MM patients. Twenty-six randomized controlled trials (11,403 participants) were eligible for inclusion in the NMA: (Myeloma XI (9), EMN01 (10), FIRST (11), ECOG E1A06 (12), MM-015 (13), HOVON 87 (14), Myeloma IX (15), GBRAM0002 (16), Kim 2007 (17), Ludwig 2009 (18), TMSG (19), HOVON 49 (20), IFM 99-06 (21), GisMM2001-A (22), MM03 (23), IFM 01/01 (24), NMSG #12 (25), Katsuoka 2013 (26), UPFRONT (27), VISTA (28), Gem2005 (29), Mookerje 2017 (30), SWOG S0777 (31), E1A05 (32), GIMEMA-MM-03-05 (33), NCT01274403 (34)). Included participants were randomized to 21 different treatment regimens involving fixed or continuous therapy with combination regimens involving melphalan (M), prednisone (P), cyclophosphamide (C), dexamethasone (D), bortezomib (V), lenalidomide (R) and thalidomide (T). Overall survival was measured for all 21 treatment regimens and a total of 11,071 patients. The network was not fully connected and consisted of three subnetworks comprising 30 pairwise comparisons. Compared to MP, four regimens showed a significant, clinically meaningful improvement in overall survival: Continuous VRDc (bortezomib, lenalidomide, dexamethasone) (HR: 0.49 [95% CI: 0.26; 0.92]), continuous VTMPc (bortezomib, thalidomide, melphalan, prednisone) (HR: 0.49 [95% CI: 0.26; 0.93]), fixed RD (HR: 0.63 [95% CI: 0.40; 0.99]), and fixed TMP (thalidomide, melphalan, prednisone) (HR: 0.75 [95% CI: 0.58; 0.97]). The estimated differences in median OS compared to MP were 37.4 months for VRDc and VTMPc, 21.1 months for RD and 12.0 months for TMP. The confidence in estimates for overall survival could be rated for RD, TMP, VMP, and VRDc. The use of RD, TMP, and VRDc for first-line treatment of multiple myeloma patients likely results in a large increase in overall survival (moderate confidence in estimates). The use of VMP as initial myeloma therapy may result in a large increase in overall survival (low confidence in estimates). The clinical benefit of the treatments was assessed in the application according to the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 (35). The application graded the magnitude of clinical benefit as 4 (survival benefit compared to comparator >9 months (36)) for VRDc, VTMPc, RD, RDc, VMP, RCPc, and TMP. The Committee noted that to date, the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 has been validated only for solid tumours and that a version validated for haematological malignancies is in development. (Unpublished data of ESMO-MCBS ratings for the proposed medicines were shared with the Expert Committee).

Progression-free survival was measured for all 21 treatment regimens and a total of 10,389 patients. The network was not fully connected and consisted of four subnetworks comprising 29 pairwise comparisons. In general, continuous treatment regimens were superior to fixed MP, and 7 out of 11 compared bortezomib, lenalidomide, or thalidomide combinations showed a significant improvement of PFS compared to MP. The confidence in estimates for PFS could be rated for RD, TMP, and VRDc, but could not be rated for VMP, because VMP was not connected to MP in the network. The use of RD, TMP, and VRDc for first-line treatment of MM patients likely results in a large increase in PFS (moderate confidence in estimates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverse events of grade 3 and 4 were reported in 9 studies for 13 treatment regimens in 3,318 patients, however the studies were not comparable in NMA. Serious adverse events (SAEs) were reported in 8 studies for 14 treatment regimens in 7,306 patients. The relative risk (RR) for at least one SAE was similar across treatment regimens. The confidence in estimates could only be rated for VMP. There was moderate confidence in the estimates that VMP likely increases occurrence of SAEs (RR 1.28, 95% CI 1.06-1.54). Infections were reported in 15 studies for 17 treatment regimens in 7,470 patients. The RR for infections tended to be slightly higher for patients receiving lenalidomide-based therapies compared to patients receiving thalidomide-based therapies. The RR for infections was also significantly higher in patients receiving continuous therapies compared to fixed MP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polyneuropathies were reported in 18 studies for 19 treatment regimens in 8,978 patients. The RR for polyneuropathies was the highest in patients receiving bortezomib-based therapies compared to MP (RR: 88.22 [95% CI: 5.36; 1451.11] to 441.08 [95% CI: 7.74; 25 145.52]). The RR for polyneuropathy appeared to be smaller for patients receiving lenalidomide-based therapies, compared to patients receiving thalidomide-based therapies. Thromboembolism was analysed from 13 studies for 13 treatment regimens in 4,277 patients. The RR for thromboembolism was higher for patients receiving continuous therapy compared to fixed duration MP (RR: 3.91 [95% CI: 0.41; 37.12] to 13.09 [95% CI: 1.03; 167.25]). Patients receiving a thalidomide-based therapy had a greater risk for thromboembolism compared to patients receiving bortezomib- or lenalidomide-based therapies, or MP.

Withdrawals due to adverse events were reported in 16 studies for 19 treatment regimens in 7,052 patients. The RR to discontinue assigned therapy was greater for patients receiving double or triple drug combinations compared to MP alone (RR: 1.06 [95% CI: 0.63; 1.81] to 8.92 [95% CI: 3.82; 20.84]). Study withdrawal was similar across bortezomib-, lenalidomide-, and thalidomide- based regimens. There was no difference between double versus triple drug combinations or between fixed duration versus continuous therapy. The confidence in estimates for withdrawals due to AEs was rated for RD, TMP, VMP, and VRD. Compared to MP, use of RD, TMP, and VRD results in a large increase in withdrawals due to AEs (high confidence in estimates). Use of VMP probably results in little or no difference in withdrawals due to AEs (moderate confidence in estimates).

**Additional evidence:**

The Expert Committee also considered additional evidence, not presented in the application, for the treatment of MM in the ASCT-eligible / accessible settings.

The standard treatment for ASCT-eligible MM patients involves induction therapy followed by high-dose melphalan and ASCT with lenalidomide maintenance.

A meta-analysis of four studies (1,572 patients) compared bortezomib-based induction therapy prior to ASCT with non-bortezomib-based induction therapy. The studies compared bortezomib-dexamethasone with vincristine-doxorubicin-dexamethasone (IFM 2005-01 trial); bortezomib-doxorubicin-dexamethasone with vincristine-doxorubicin-dexamethasone (HOVON-65); and bortezomib-thalidomide-dexamethasone with thalidomide-dexamethasone (PETHEMA GEM05MENOS65 and GIMEMA MM-BO2005). The bortezomib-based therapies were associated with longer PFS (+7.3 months; HR: 0.75), longer OS (+5% at 3 years, HR:0.80) and greater activity (complete response rates: +14%, OR=2.05), compared to non-bortezomib-based therapies. Peripheral neuropathy was reported more frequently in bortezomib treated patients compared to non-bortezomib treated patients: 19% versus 7% (all grade), and 3.3% versus 2% (≥ grade 3) (37).

A randomized controlled trial involving 525 patients with newly-diagnosed MM evaluated the efficacy and safety of the addition of bortezomib to lenalidomide and dexamethasone (SWOG S0777). Findings were consistent with the thalidomide-containing regimens: the addition or bortezomib to lenalidomide-dexamethasone was associated with gains in both PFS (+13 months, HR=0.71) and OS (+11 months, HR=0.71). Adverse events of grade 3 or higher, and treatment discontinuations were also more common in the bortezomib-treated group (38).

The Committee also considered the role of lenalidomide after ASCT, as maintenance up to relapse and maximal tolerance. A metaanalysis of three RCTs trials (CALGB/Alliance 100104 study, IFM 2005-02 Trial and the Italian GIMEMA RV-MM-PI-209) involving 1,208 patients evaluated the effect of lenalidomide maintenance after ASCT in newly diagnosed MM. Lenalidomide maintenance demonstrated a significant gain in both PFS and OS: PFS in patients receiving lenalidomide was 29.3 months longer (HR: 0.48; 95% CI, 0.41 to 0.55). The 7-year survival rate was 62% with lenalidomide maintenance and 50% with placebo or observation (HR: 0.75; 95% CI, 0.63 to 0.90). The use of lenalidomide resulted in more major adverse events than placebo. In particular, an increased risk of secondary malignancies was observed, 6.1% Vs 2.8% with placebo/ no maintenance (39). The long-term follow-up data of CALGB (Alliance) 100104 study showed a meaningful and significant OS gain in patients receiving lenalidomide maintenance. After three interim analyses, the study was unblinded at a median follow-up of 18 months, at which point 86 (67%) of 128 patients without progressive disease in the placebo group chose to cross over to the lenalidomide group. The analysis of survival on the intention-to-treat population demonstrated an increase in 3-year OS of 8%, with 88% (95% CI, 84 to 93) among patients in the lenalidomide group and 80% (95% CI, 74 to 86) among patients in the placebo group (hazard ratio, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.40 to 0.95) (40).
The Myeloma XI study more recently provided results consistent with the previous clinical trials of lenalidomide maintenance, confirming a gain in median PFS (39 months versus 20 months; HR: 0.46 [95% CI 0.41–0.53]; p<0.0001) but not in OS (78.6% versus 75.8%; p=0.15). The analysis was published at 31 months of median follow-up (41). Notably, mature data for OS in ASCT-eligible settings require long-term follow-up. For this reason, PFS and myeloma response rates have been agreed as valuable surrogate endpoints for OS and PFS is used as primary endpoint to assess the benefit of anti-myeloma medicines (42).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
<th>None available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</td>
<td>The application summarized the findings of a scoping review undertaken for economic evidence that addressed treatment regimens based on bortezomib, thalidomide or lenalidomide as first-line therapy in MM. The scoping review identified two cost-analyses (43, 44), one cost-impact analysis (45) and one retrospective study of claims data (46). Also identified was a Health Technology Assessment report by NICE (47). Reported incremental cost-effective ratios in the NICE technology appraisal ranged from GBP 2,234 per quality adjusted life year (QALY) to over GBP 300,000, compared to MP depending on the intervention (47). A US cost-analysis found the monthly on-treatment costs (drug cost, medical costs and AE management costs) were lowest for MP alone and highest for MPT. The total cost over 20-years for treatment with VMP and MPT where almost or over twice as high as with MP alone. Compared to VMP, MP was more effective with regard to costs per life-year and cost per QALY, while compared to MPT, VMP was cost saving (44). The cost-impact model addressed the total costs associated with first-line treatment of newly diagnosed MM who were ineligible for stem cell transplant in France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom, modelled over 5 years. Three scenarios were evaluated and compared. A baseline-scenario represented the 2017 uptake of lenalidomide in the assessed countries. The market-shares in this scenario were 64% for bortezomib, 25% for thalidomide and 11% for lenalidomide. The second scenario involved a steady increase of the uptake of lenalidomide to 50% of the market in year five. The third scenario evaluated a 20% increased uptake of the triple regimen carfilzomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone as a second-line of treatment. Direct drug costs were averaged from the listing prices across the five countries. The assumed annual treatment costs for the baseline scenario raged between EUR 40,692 and EUR 40,781 per patient and year, while the total costs for an increased uptake of lenalidomide ranged between EUR 41,559 and EUR 44,139 per patient and year. The difference between both situations rose relatively steady from 2.13% of the total cost of the baseline scenario in year one to 8.23% of the baseline scenario in year five. Across all three scenarios the total treatment cost in the fifth year of treatment were lowest for the baseline scenario. For the increase uptake of lenalidomide in first line therapy, the annual costs per patient in year five were EUR 44,139. For the 20% uptake of the triplet regimen as second-line treatment, the total increase in year five in total cost per patient and year was EUR 52,528 (45). A retrospective study, based on US claims data from 2006 to 2013 assessed patient monthly direct cost and cost patterns over quarterly time periods for patients with newly diagnosed MM treated with either bortezomib or lenalidomide based regimens. Costs were evaluated for 444 patients with newly diagnosed MM treated first-line with lenalidomide and 737 with bortezomib, for which data from treatment initiation until next treatment was available. For patients with first line treatment of lenalidomide the monthly treatment cost decreased steadily from US$ 15,090 in the first to the third month since start of treatment to US$ 5,266 in month 19 or longer. In patients treated with first-line bortezomib the monthly costs fell from US$ 16,126 in the first three months of treatment to US$ 4,833 in the 19th month or longer. Multivariable regression unadjusted for factors such as sex, age, number of prescriptions before index date for the beginning of first-line treatment, previous cancer history, etc. showed mean total cost of US$ 7,534 (standard deviation (SD) 3207) for patients treated first-line with lenalidomide, compared to US$ 10,763 (SD 3938) in patients receiving first-line bortezomib. Monthly pharmacy costs included in the total monthly cost in the unadjusted analysis were US$ 4,101 (SD 1931) and US$ 4,855 (SD 2431) for lenalidomide and bortezomib, respectively (46).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other considerations:

#### Committee Recommendations:

The Committee acknowledged the treatment of MM to be complex and recognized the need to provide the best available care within the context of both non-transplant and transplant settings.

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of bortezomib, lenalidomide and thalidomide to the complementary list of the EML for the treatment of multiple myeloma patients in both non-transplant and transplant eligible/available settings, on the basis of good evidence showing large improvement in survival outcomes with acceptable safety for patients with newly-diagnosed multiple myeloma.

With regard to MM treatment in transplant-eligible populations, the Committee noted the additional evidence presented as part of the review process supporting standard regimens used in the induction phase before ASCT involving 3-drug combinations: VTD (bortezomib, thalidomide, dexamethasone), VCD (bortezomib, cyclophosphamide, dexamethasone), PAD (bortezomib, doxorubicin, dexamethasone) and RVD (lenalidomide, bortezomib, dexamethasone); and of the benefit of lenalidomide maintenance therapy following ASCT.

In the non-transplant setting, the Committee acknowledged that the proposed medicines are administered as part of treatment regimens involving companion cytotoxic agents and/or steroids (melphalan, cyclophosphamide, prednisone, dexamethasone). Accordingly, the Committee recommended the addition of melphalan to the complementary list of the EML for treatment of multiple myeloma, and that the current listings for cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, prednisone and dexamethasone be extended to include multiple myeloma as an indication.

### References:
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# Anti PD-1 / PD-L1 Immune checkpoint inhibitors – addition – EML and EMLc

## Atezolizumab
## Nivolumab
## Pembrolizumab

### Proposal:
The application requested the addition of atezolizumab, nivolumab and pembrolizumab to the complementary list of the EML for the following indications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Indications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atezolizumab</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivolumab</td>
<td>Early and advanced stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
<td>Early and advanced stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATC Code:
- Atezolizumab: L01XC32
- Nivolumab: L01XC17
- Pembrolizumab: L01XC18

### Applicant:
Jean-Yves Douillard, Chief Medical Officer, European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO)

### WHO Technical Department:
Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it not support inclusion of these medicines on the EML at this time, though noting with great interest the emerging data on long-term outcomes in this clinically relevant class of medicines.

### EML / EMLc:
- EML

### Section:
8.2.3 Immunomodulators

### Dose form(s) & strengths(s):
- Atezolizumab: concentrate solution for infusion 1.2 g/20 mL
- Nivolumab: concentrate solution for infusion 10 mg/mL
- Pembrolizumab: powder for injection 50 mg

### Core / Complementary:
Complementary

### Individual / Square box listing:
Individual listings requested

### Background:
Atezolizumab, nivolumab and pembrolizumab belong to the class of PD-1/PD-L1 immune-check point inhibitors (ICI) and had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. The EML currently includes cytotoxic chemotherapies for NSCLC, but there are no alternative medicines currently on the EML for the treatment of metastatic melanoma.

### Public health relevance:
Lung cancer is the most diagnosed and the leading cause of death for cancer worldwide, with an estimated 2 million new cases and 1.7 million deaths in 2018 (1). Lung cancer is a highly lethal malignancy, with an economic impact estimated around $8 billion productivity lost in the BRICS countries (2). Moreover, in the absence of a wide coverage of an effective screening program in place on global scale, lung cancer diagnoses occur in advanced stage in more than 60% of cases, with highly regional variability (3-5). Over 80% of lung cancers are classified as non-small cell lung cancer. Although targeted therapies have redefined the therapeutic landscape for some patients, these therapies are ineffective in patients whose tumours lack the particular genetic mutations/alterations – the majority of NSCLC patients. For this reason, ICI therapy is becoming part of the treatment of such patients, in an attempt to improve survival and quality of life. The ICI target the immune-competent cells, like T-lymphocytes and antigen-presenting cells, releasing the tumour-induced immunosuppressant milieu (e.g. PD1, PD-L1) or strengthening the immune-activating signals of immune-response (e.g. GITR, pro-inflammatory interleukins, interferon-gamma) (6). The availability of ICIs in NSCLC addresses an unmet need for patients considered to have a poor prognosis in advanced stage, in the absence of an indication of targeted therapy.

Melanoma is the most lethal form of skin cancer. In 2018, nearly 300,000 new cases were diagnosed worldwide, with over 60,000 deaths (1). As a cancer related to the exposure to sunlight, melanoma demonstrates greater variation in incidence rates across different ethnic
groups and is more commonly among fair-skinned Caucasian populations. Incidence of melanoma peaks at the 7th decade of life; however, though half of the diagnoses are in patients aged between 55 and 74 years, melanoma is the most common cancer diagnosed in adolescents and young adults 20-29 years and the most commonly diagnosed cancers in young adults worldwide (7). Early detection and resection of melanoma is the most effective treatment strategy, with a traditionally poor prognosis for metastatic disease (8).

**Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)**

### NSCLC (front-line)

**Pembrolizumab**

The phase 3 KEYNOTE-024 study evaluated pembrolizumab as front-line treatment in patients with advanced NSCLC showing PD-L1 expression ≥ 50%, in absence of EGFR mutation or ALK translocations (non-oncogene-driven NSCLC) (9). Approximately 30% of screened patients had tumour PD-L1 expression ≥ 50%. 305 patients were randomized to receive 200 mg pembrolizumab every 3 weeks (up to 2 years) or 4-6 cycles of standard platinum-doublet chemotherapy. Patients in the chemotherapy group were permitted to cross over to the pembrolizumab group if they experienced disease progression. In the intention-to-treat population, progression free survival and overall survival were significantly longer in the pembrolizumab group than the chemotherapy group (PFS: hazard ratio (HR) 0.50; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.68; P<0.001; OS: HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.41–0.89; P=0.005). Health-related quality of life measures also favoured pembrolizumab (10).

An updated survival report with a 25.2 months median follow-up, confirmed the superiority of pembrolizumab over chemotherapy: the HR for OS was 0.63 (95% CI, 0.47–0.86), with a median (95% CI) OS of 30.0 months (18.3–not reached) in the pembrolizumab arm and 14.2 months (9.8–19.0) in the chemotherapy arm; the Kaplan-Meier estimate of OS at 12 months was 70.3% (95% CI, 62.3%–76.9%) for the pembrolizumab group and 54.8% (95% CI, 46.4%–62.4%) for the chemotherapy group (11). Eighty-two patients, allocated to the chemotherapy arm, crossed over to receive pembrolizumab upon meeting eligibility criteria. In term of magnitude of benefit, pembrolizumab provided a gain of median OS of +15.8 months and +15.5% at 1 year.

Based on the KEYNOTE-024 trial results, the clinical benefit of pembrolizumab in the front-line setting measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 received a score of 4 (12).

The frontline use of pembrolizumab was investigated in NSCLC other than PD-L1>50%, to assess if the benefit was conserved in unselected populations of patients. The phase 3 KEYNOTE-042 trial randomized patients with NSCLC EGFR/ALK wild type showing PD-L1≥1%, both adenocarcinoma and squamous NSCLC, to receive either pembrolizumab 200 mg every 3 weeks or standard chemotherapy (paclitaxel plus carboplatin or pemetrexed plus carboplatin), stratifying per PD-L1 expression at three thresholds of PD-L1: ≥ 50%, ≥20% and ≥1% (13). 1274 patients were randomized: 637 to each arm. 599 patients (47.0%) had PD-L1 ≥50%, 818 (64.2%) had ≥20%. Pembrolizumab improved OS in NSCLC patients with PD-L1≥ 50% (HR 0.69, 95% CI 0.56 to 0.85), consistent with the results of Keynote-024 for the PD-L1 enriched population. The median OS (up to approximately 38 months) with the PD-L1 inhibitor was 20.0 months versus 12.2 months with chemotherapy. The HR for OS was 0.77 (95% CI 0.64 – 0.92) and 0.81 (95% CI 0.71 – 0.93) for PD-L1 ≥20% and ≥1%, respectively. In patients with limited expression of PD-L1 (1%–49%) the stratified analysis of survival showed that OS reached 17.7 versus 13.0 months in PD-L1 ≥20% and 16.7 and 12.1 in PD-L1 ≥1%, respectively these subpopulations. However, an exploratory analysis of KEYNOTE-042 showed that the survival advantage associated with pembrolizumab versus chemotherapy in patients with a tumour proportion score between 1-49% was not relevant (median OS: 13.4 vs. 12.1 months; HR 0.92, 95% CI 0.77 to 1.11). The overall benefit might be driven by the enriched population with high expression of PD-L1 as the preponderance of the OS benefit was seen in patients with ≥50%, the only subgroup gaining more than 6 months overall survival.

### NSCLC (second-line)

**Pembrolizumab**
The KEYNOTE-010 trial randomized 1034 patients with previously treated squamous (22% of the population) and non-squamous (78%) NSCLC with PD-L1 expression of at least 1% of tumor cells to receive pembrolizumab (2 mg/kg or 10 mg/kg, every 3 weeks) or docetaxel 75 mg/m2 every 3 weeks (14). Approximately two thirds of NSCLC patients screened met the PD-L1 threshold of 1%, and 28% showed high expression (≥ 50%), consistent with previous findings in Keynote-024. Patients were stratified in PD-L1 1-49% and PD-L1 ≥ 50%. OS was longer for pembrolizumab versus docetaxel (2 mg/k, HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.58 - 0.88; 10 mg/kg, HR 0.61, 95% CI 0.49 - 0.75). Median overall survival was 10.4 months (95% CI 9.4–11.9) for the pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg group, 12.7 months (10.0–17.3) for the pembrolizumab 10 mg/kg group, and 8.5 months (95% CI, 7.5–9.8) for the docetaxel group. 1-year overall survival was 43.2% versus 52.3% versus 34.6%.

Based on the KEYNOTE-010 trial results, the clinical benefit of pembrolizumab in the second-line setting measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 5/5 (12).

In patients with a PD-L1 tumor proportion score of ≥ 50%, the greatest benefit was observed for OS for pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg versus docetaxel with HR 0.54 (95% CI 0.38–0.77; p=0.0002), and for pembrolizumab 10 mg/kg versus docetaxel HR 0.50 (0.36–0.70; p=0.0001). Median OS was 14.9 months and 17.3 months for the 2 mg/kg and 10 mg/kg arms respectively, longer than chemotherapy arm (8.2 months). After the primary analysis, crossover from docetaxel to pembrolizumab was allowed. 36-months overall survival rate was 23% for the pembrolizumab groups (pooling the two dose arms) vs 11% for docetaxel (15).

**Nivolumab**

The role of nivolumab as second-line treatment of NSCLC has been investigated two phase 3 clinical trials, CheckMate-017 and CheckMate-057. In CheckMate-017, 272 patients with squamous NSCLC were randomized to receive nivolumab 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks, or docetaxel, at a dose of 75 mg/m2 every 3 weeks (16). The median OS was 9.2 months (95% CI, 7.3 to 13.3) in the nivolumab group versus 6.0 months (95% CI, 5.1 to 7.3) in the docetaxel group. The OS rate at 1 year was 42% (95% CI, 34 to 50) in the nivolumab group versus 24% (95% CI, 17 to 31) in the docetaxel group. OS was improved in those who received nivolumab (HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.44–0.79, p=0.001). The rate of confirmed objective response was higher with nivolumab than with docetaxel (20% [95% CI, 14 to 28] versus 9% [95% CI, 5 to 15]; p=0.008). The median PFS was 3.5 months (95% CI, 2.1 to 4.9) in the nivolumab group and 2.8 months (95% CI, 2.1 to 3.5) in the docetaxel group, consistent with the mechanism of action of ICIs, where atypical patterns of response are described (pseudo progression) and long-lasting post-progression benefit persisting (17). The level of PD-L1 expression was neither prognostic nor predictive of any of the efficacy end points.

Based on the CheckMate-017 trial results, the clinical benefit of nivolumab in the second-line setting in squamous cell NSCLC measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 5/5 (12).

In CheckMate-057, 582 patients with non-squamous NSCLC (e.g. adenocarcinoma) were randomized to nivolumab or docetaxel (18). Nivolumab improved OS compared to docetaxel: at the time of interim analysis, median OS was 12.2 months (95% CI, 9.7 to 15.0) for nivolumab and 9.4 months (95% CI, 8.1 to 10.7) for docetaxel, with a HR of 0.73 (96% CI, 0.59 to 0.89; p=0.002). One-year OS rates were 51% (95% CI, 45 to 56) and 39% (95% CI, 33 to 45) for nivolumab and docetaxel, respectively. The survival HRs per subgroup analysis did not favor nivolumab over docetaxel in the EGFR mutated NSCLC population (oncogene- driven disease, HR=1.18) (19). Moreover, the EGFR wild type populations seemed to derive the greatest benefit, with an HR=0.66 (0.51–0.86).

Based on the CheckMate-057 trial results, the clinical benefit of nivolumab in the second-line setting in non-squamous cell NSCLC measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 5/5 (12).

In an updated analysis of CheckMate-017 and CheckMate-057, pooled 2-year OS favored nivolumab in both squamous and non-squamous NSCLC (squamous: 29% [95% CI, 24% to 34%] versus 16% [95% CI, 12% to 20%]; non-squamous: 23% [95% CI, 16% to 30%] versus 8% [95% CI, 5% to 13%] HR=0.66 vs 0.77; p<0.0001). The median OS was 9.2 months (95% CI, 7.3 to 10.8) for nivolumab vs 6.0 months (95% CI, 5.1 to 7.3) for docetaxel: 1-year OS was 43.2% versus 52.3% versus 34.6% for nivolumab, docetaxel and placebo arms respectively (12).
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In the pooled analysis of OS in the intention-to-treat population (n = 854) with squamous (n = 272 [31.9%]) and non-squamous (n = 582 [68.1%]) NSCLC, median OS was 11.1 months (95% CI, 9.2 to 13.1 months) with nivolumab versus 8.1 months (95% CI, 7.2 to 9.2 months) with docetaxel (HR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.62 to 0.84). Higher PD-L1 expression levels were associated with greater OS benefit with nivolumab (HR, 0.42; 95% CI, 0.28 to 0.63) in patients with ≥ 50% PD-L1 expression, but a benefit was still observed in patients with <1% PD-L1 expression (HR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.61 to 0.99). Among nivolumab treated patients, 37% of confirmed responders with squamous NSCLC and 34% with non-squamous NSCLC had ongoing responses after 2 years’ minimum follow-up and no patient in docetaxel group had an ongoing response. Consistent with the primary analyses, 2-year OS benefit with nivolumab versus docetaxel was observed in patients with squamous NSCLC regardless of PD-L1 expression level. However, in patients with non-squamous NSCLC, higher levels of PD-L1 were associated with a greater magnitude of OS benefit with nivolumab but NSCLC with PD-L1<1% still derived greater benefit from ICI than chemotherapy: in patients with ≥ 50% PD-L1 expression, the HR for OS on the basis of 2 years’ minimum follow-up was 0.38 (95% CI, 0.24 to 0.60) for patients with non-squamous NSCLC.

Atezolizumab

The phase 3 OAK trial randomized 850 immuno-oncology naïve patients with advanced squamous and non-squamous NSCLC previously treated with one or two lines of chemotherapy to receive atezolizumab 1200 mg fixed dose every 3 weeks or standard docetaxel 75 mg/m² every 3 weeks (21). Treatment was administered until unacceptable toxicity or disease progression. Atezolizumab could be continued beyond disease progression if clinical benefit demonstrated despite evidence of radiological disease progression at CT scan, to rule out atypical pattern of response (i.e. pseudo progression). No crossover to atezolizumab was allowed. Patients were stratified by PD-L1 expression. OS was improved in the ITT study population with atezolizumab, reaching a median OS of 13.8 months (95% CI 11.8–15.7) versus docetaxel (9.6 months [8.6–11.2]), with HR 0.73 [95% CI 0.62–0.87], p=0.0003).

Based on the OAK trial results, the clinical benefit of atezolizumab in the second-line setting measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 5/5 (12).

Subgroup analysis showed a greater magnitude of benefit in patients with higher PD-L1 expression, both assessed on tumor cells (TC) or immune- infiltrating cells (IC): the net benefit gain in TC1/2/3 or IC1/2/3 population was +5.4 months (HR 0.74 [95% CI 0.58–0.93], p=0.0102) and +5.5 months in TC2/3 or IC2/3 population (HR 0.67 [95% CI 0.55–0.82], p<0.0003).

Metastatic melanoma

Pembrolizumab

The role of pembrolizumab was investigated in randomized trials and cohort studies for metastatic or unresectable locally advanced melanoma as monotherapy, both in BRAF-mutated and wild-type tumors.

The phase 1 Keynote-001 trial evaluated pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg and 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks in patients with advanced melanoma (22). Around one third of the population was pretreated with ipilimumab. The overall response rate during receipt of therapy, across all doses, based on assessment by the investigator according to immune-related response criteria was 38%. An updated analysis showed an estimated 5-year OS rate of 34% in all patients enrolled (pretreated with chemotherapy, targeted agents or ipilimumab) and 41% in treatment-naïve patients (23). Median OS was 23.8 months (95% CI, 20.2-30.4) and 38.6 months (95% CI, 27.2- NR) in pretreated and treatment-naïve patients, respectively with a 5-year PFS rates of 21% and 29%.

The phase 2 Keynote-002 trial assessed the efficacy and safety of pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg or 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks versus investigator-choice chemotherapy (paclitaxel plus carboplatin, paclitaxel, carboplatin, dacarbazine, or oral temozolomide) in patients with ipilimumab-refractory melanoma (1:1 randomization, n=540 patients) (24, 25). Median OS was 13.4
months for 2 mg/kg, 14.7 months for 10 mg/kg, and 11.0 months for chemotherapy. 18-months OS rates were 40%, 44%, and 36%; 24-months rates were 36%, 38%, and 30%. HR (95% CI) for OS was 0.86 (95% CI 0.67–1.10) for 2 mg/kg and 0.74 (0.57–0.96) for 10 mg/kg, with no difference between doses (0.87 [95% CI 0.67–1.12]). The benefit was consistent across the subgroups, of age (younger or older than 65 years), plasma LDH normal or elevated, sex and BRAF status (mutant or wild-type).

Based on the Keynote-002 trial results, the clinical benefit of pembrolizumab for melanoma in the second-line setting measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 3/5 (12).

The phase 3 Keynote 006 trial assessed pembrolizumab (10 mg/kg every 2 weeks or every 3 weeks) as first-line therapy for advanced melanoma, versus ipilimumab (3 mg/kg), the standard of care at the time of the investigation (26, 27). Median OS was not reached in either pembrolizumab group and was 16.0 months with ipilimumab (HR 0.68, 95% CI 0.53–0.87 for pembrolizumab every 2 weeks vs ipilimumab and 0.68, 0.53–0.86 for pembrolizumab every 3 weeks vs ipilimumab). 24-month OS rate was 55% in the 2- and 3-week group, and 43% in the ipilimumab group, showing limited differences between pembrolizumab dosing schedules.

**Nivolumab**

CheckMate 037 assessed the efficacy and safety of nivolumab (3 mg/kg every 2 weeks) in ipilimumab-progressing patients, compared with standard chemotherapy (dacarbazine, paclitaxel combined with carboplatin every 3 weeks) (28). Confirmed objective responses were reported in 31.7% (95% CI 23.5–40.8) in nivolumab group versus 10.6% (3.5–23.1) in the chemotherapy arm. However overall survival did not differ between arms, being 15.74 (12.88 to 19.88) in the nivolumab group and 14.39 (11.66 to 18.17) in the investigator’s choice group (HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.24) (29).

CheckMate 066 tested nivolumab frontline versus dacarbazine, showing a gain in OS of 73% vs 42% at 1 year (30, 31). Response rate also favoured nivolumab, 40% vs 14%. 3-year OS survival rates were 51.2% (95% CI, 44.1%-57.9%) and 21.6% (95% CI, 16.1%-27.6%), respectively. The median OS was 37.5 months (95% CI, 25.5 months–not reached) in the nivolumab group and 11.2 months (95% CI, 9.6-13.0 months) in the dacarbazine group (HR, 0.46; 95% CI, 0.36-0.59), with a net benefit of OS of +26.3 months.

CheckMate 067 tested the combination treatment of the two ICIs nivolumab and ipilimumab against nivolumab monotherapy and ipilimumab alone in a 1:1:1 ratio (32, 33). Median PFS was 11.5 months (95% CI, 8.9 to 16.7) with nivolumab plus ipilimumab, compared with 2.9 months (95% CI, 2.8 to 3.4) with nivolumab (HR 0.42; 99.5% CI, 0.31 to 0.57) and 6.9 months (95% CI, 4.3 to 9.5) with nivolumab (HR for the comparison with ipilimumab, 0.57; 99.5% CI, 0.43 to 0.76; p<0.001). A subgroup analysis according to PD-L1 expression was performed. Patients with tumours positive for PD-L1, achieved a median PFS of 14.0 months in the nivolumab-plus-ipilimumab group and in the nivolumab group, but in patients with PD-L1–negative tumours, PFS was longer with the combination therapy than with nivolumab alone (11.2 months [95% CI, 8.0 to not reached] vs 5.3 months [95% CI, 2.8–7.1]). The 4-year follow-up updated results confirmed the earlier findings: median OS was not reached (95% CI 38.2–not reached) in the nivolumab plus ipilimumab group, 36.9 months (28.3–not reached) in the nivolumab group, and 19.9 months (16.9–24.6) in the ipilimumab group. The results of subgroup analyses suggested that the greatest benefit with the combination of nivolumab and ipilimumab versus nivolumab alone may occur in the context of negative PD-L1 tumour expression. In the subgroup of patients with PD-L1–positive tumours, both nivolumab alone and nivolumab plus ipilimumab resulted in a similar prolongation of PFS compared to ipilimumab alone. This finding suggested the role of immunotherapy as monotherapy in “inflamed tumours”, showing high expression of PD-L1 and a role of combination therapy for “non-inflamed” tumours, for which the combination IC1 could derive a major benefit, acting synergistically on different steps of immune activation.

The clinical benefit of nivolumab for first-line treatment of metastatic melanoma measured with the European Society for Medical Oncology-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) v1.1 was scored at 4/5 (12).
Early stage (resected) melanoma
The discussion around the role of immunotherapy in the adjuvant setting of melanoma is ongoing, with data of OS expected to confirm the optimal strategy of care, particularly between the ipilimumab and the PD-1 blockers, including the safety profile.

Pembrolizumab
Pembrolizumab was assessed as an adjuvant agent in the phase 3 Keynote 054 trial, for patients with stage III resected melanoma. Patients were randomized to receive pembrolizumab 200 mg every 3 weeks for 18 doses or placebo (n=1019) (34). Pembrolizumab showed a superior relapse-free survival rate, from 61% to 75.4% at 12 months (HR=0.57, 95% CI 0.43–0.74); the data were consistent across the PD-L1 prespecified subgroups.

Nivolumab
The CheckMate-238 trial compared high-dose ipilimumab versus nivolumab 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks up to 12 months (35). Patients with stage resected III and IV with no evidence of disease (NED) derived major benefit from nivolumab: relapse-free survival at 12 months was 70.5% and 60.8%, respectively (HR=0.65, 95% CI 0.51–0.83). At 24-months follow-up, nivolumab was shown to be superior with +13% of relapse-free survival (35, 36). The benefit was consistent across the subgroups of PD-L1 expression, in PD-L1 less than 5% or 5% and more.

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSCLC frontline</th>
<th>Pembrolizumab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Keynote 024, treatment-related adverse events (TRAE) occurred in 73.4% of the patients in the pembrolizumab group and in 90.0% of the patients in the chemotherapy group of which 53.3% vs 26.6% were grade 3 (moderate-severe) to grade 5 (toxic death) in the chemotherapy and pembrolizumab groups, respectively. The treatment discontinuation rate was slightly higher in the chemotherapy arm (10.7%) than the ICI arm (7.1%) due to these TRAEs (9). TRAEs for pembrolizumab were consistent with an immune-mediated process, meaning an autoimmune event or an immune-activation syndrome, the most common being hypo- and hyper-thyroidism (9% and 8%, all grade 1 and 2, non-severe events not leading to discontinuation of therapy and registered as laboratory transient and not clinically relevant alterations of plasma thyroid hormones), diarrhoea (in 14.3% of the patients), fatigue (10.4%), and pyrexia (10.4%) in the pembrolizumab group; for chemotherapy, the bone marrow toxicity (anaemia in 44.0%) and traditional systemic TRAEs were observed (nausea in 43.3% and fatigue in 28.7%); anti-emetic premedication was allowed per protocol, consistent with institutional and international guidelines for moderately to highly-emetogenic platinum-containing CT regimens in the standard of care arm. In Keynote 042, despite a longer duration of treatment exposure, grades 3 to 5 treatment-related adverse events occurred much less often with pembrolizumab than with chemotherapy (17.8% vs. 41.0%) (13). Grades 3 to 5 immune-related adverse events and infusion reactions occurred more frequently among patients treated with pembrolizumab versus chemotherapy (8.0% vs. 1.5%). The respective rates of treatment discontinuation (9.0% vs. 9.4%) and treatment-related deaths (2.0% vs. 2.3%) were comparable between treatment arms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCLC second-line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Keynote-010 trial the safety profile favored pembrolizumab with less grade 3-5 adverse events, namely 16% vs 35% in the chemotherapy arm, and decreased appetite (14%) and fatigue (14%) for ICI and neutropenia (14%), alopecia (33%), anemia (13%) and oral mucositis (14%) for chemotherapy (14). There was no difference in the efficacy or safety of pembrolizumab at 2 or 10 mg/kg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivolumab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the CheckMate-017, treatment-related adverse events, including hematologic and nonhematologic events, occurred less frequently with nivolumab than with docetaxel: in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nivolumab group, 58% of the patients had events of any grade of which 7% grade 3 or 4; in the docetaxel group, this occurred in 86% of the patients of which 55% were grade 3 or 4 (16). The safety profile was consistent with the class- side effects with no new signals of safety, namely the most frequently reported treatment-related adverse events with nivolumab were fatigue and asthenia and for docetaxel were neutropenia (33%; 10% febrile neutropenia), fatigue (33%), alopecia (22%), and nausea (23%), peripheral neuropathy (11%). 3% and 10% of patients discontinued the treatment for an adverse event in ICI and CT arm, respectively.

In the CheckMate-057, the safety profile and pattern of adverse events in non-squamous NSCLC patients were consistent with the data from squamous population: treatment-related adverse events were observed in 69%/10%/5% in nivolumab arm and 88%/54%/15% in docetaxel arm for any grade/grade 3-4/discontinuation rate, respectively (18).

Atezolizumab
In the phase 3 OAK trial tolerability was better with atezolizumab, with 15% of 609 patients treated with atezolizumab experiencing a grade 3-4 treatment-related toxicity compared with 43% of 578 patients treated with docetaxel (21). Fatigue (87 [14%] patients), nausea (53 [9%] patients), decreased appetite (52 [9%] patients), and asthenia (51 [8%] patients) were the most common atezolizumab-related adverse events of any grade.

Metastatic melanoma
Pembrolizumab
Safety analysis showed a higher incidence of grade 3-4 treatment-related adverse events in patients receiving chemotherapy (26%) versus pembrolizumab (11% in the 2mg/kg group, 14% in the 10 mg/kg group) (24). The most common serious treatment-related adverse events observed in the combined pembrolizumab treatment groups were diarrhoea and pneumonitis. There were no treatment-related deaths. Treatment interruption as a result of treatment-related adverse events was needed in 15 (8%) of 178 patients treated with pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg, 15 (8%) of 179 patients treated with pembrolizumab 10 mg/kg, and 30 (18%) of 171 patients treated with chemotherapy. Treatment-related adverse events led to permanent treatment discontinuation in five (3%) patients given pembrolizumab 2 mg/kg, 12 (7%) given pembrolizumab 10 mg/kg, and 10 (6%) patients given chemotherapy.

In the Keynote 006, around two-thirds of the study population experienced a treatment-related adverse event; however, grade 3 to 5 adverse events that were attributed to a study drug by investigators occurred in 13.3% of patients receiving pembrolizumab every 2 weeks, 10.1%, every 3 weeks and 19.9% of patients receiving ipilimumab, respectively, with a safety profile favorable for the PD-1 blocker over CTLA-4 inhibitor (26). The rate of permanent discontinuation of a study drug because of treatment-related adverse events was lower in each pembrolizumab group than in the ipilimumab group (4.0%, 6.9%, and 9.4%, respectively).

Nivolumab
In CheckMate 066, treatment-related grade 3/4 adverse events occurred in 15.0% (31 of 206) of nivolumab-treated patients and in 17.6% (36 of 205) of dacarbazine-treated patients (30, 31).

In the CheckMate 238, nivolumab showed a major tolerability and better safety profile with 14.4%/9.7% grade 3 and 4 adverse events/treatment-related discontinuation, compared with 45.6%/42.6% in the ipilimumab arm (32, 33).

Early stage (resected) melanoma
No data were presented in the application regarding the safety of immune checkpoint inhibitors for melanoma in the early/resected stage setting.

| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | None available. |
**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSCLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application presented a cost-effectiveness analysis of front-line pembrolizumab in advanced non-oncogene driven NSCLC expressing high levels of PD-L1 (37). Data of safety and efficacy were derived from Keynote 024 trial (13). The analysis was conducted from the perspective of a US third-party public healthcare payer (updated to $US, year 2016 values). Pembrolizumab would be expected to result in an incremental cost of $US98,281 per quality adjusted life year (QALY) gained or an incremental cost of $US78,873 per life year (LY) gained. Including cost of PD-L1 testing had a very small impact on the model results. With a 5-year time horizon, the ICER was $US99,998/LY and $US122,024/QALY; with a 10-year time horizon, the ICER was $US83,065 and $US103,101/QALY. Base-case results indicated that, compared with standard of care over a 20-year time horizon, pembrolizumab would be expected to result in an additional 1.31 LYs and an additional 1.05 QALYs gained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In second line setting, a cost-effectiveness analysis was presented for pembrolizumab versus docetaxel in the enriched population with PD-L1> 50%. Base case results project for PD-L1 positive (TPS ≥50%) patients treated with pembrolizumab a mean survival of 2.25 years (38). For docetaxel, a mean survival time of 1.07 years was estimated. Expected QALYs were 1.71 and 0.76 for pembrolizumab and docetaxel, respectively. The incremental cost per QALY gained with pembrolizumab vs docetaxel is $168,619/QALY, which is cost-effective in the US using a threshold of 3-times GDP per capita. |

**Melanoma**

The cost-effectiveness of nivolumab for the treatment of advanced melanoma patients has been investigated in England. A Markov state-transition model was developed to estimate the lifetime costs and benefits of nivolumab versus ipilimumab and dacarbazine for BRAF mutation-negative patients and versus ipilimumab, dabrafenib, and vemurafenib for BRAF mutation-positive patients (39). Nivolumab was the most cost-effective treatment option in BRAF mutation-negative and mutation-positive patients, with incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of £24,483 and £17,362 per QALY, respectively. A similar analysis was performed for pembrolizumab in advanced melanoma in Portugal (40). A cost-effectiveness model was developed to analyse the costs and consequences of treatment with pembrolizumab compared to treatment with ipilimumab in patients with advanced melanoma not previously treated with ipilimumab. Pembrolizumab increased life expectancy in 1.57 undiscounted life-years (LYs) and was associated with an increase in costs versus that of ipilimumab. The estimated incremental cost-effectiveness ratio was £47,221 per QALY and €42,956 per LY. The authors concluded that considering the usually accepted thresholds in oncology, pembrolizumab is a cost-effective alternative for treating patients with advanced melanoma in Portugal. |

**Availability:**

| Atezolizumab (trade name Tecentriq, Genetech Inc.) is available as a 60 mg/mL injection solution for intravenous use as 840 mg/14 mL and 1,200 mg/20 mL single-dose vials. |

Nivolumab (trade name Opdivo, Bristol-Myers Squibb) is available as a 10 mg/mL injection solution for intravenous use as 40 mg/4 mL, 100 mg/10 mL and 240 mg/24 mL single-dose vials. |

Pembrolizumab (trade name Keytruda, Merck Sharp & Dohme) is available as 50 mg lyophilized powder for intravenous injection and as a 25 mg/mL injection solution for intravenous use as 100 mg/4 mL single-dose vial. |

**Other considerations:**

As a result of Keynote-024, pembrolizumab was approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) as first line therapy for patients with NSCLC with high PD-L1 expression (PD-L1≥50%) as assessed at immuno-histochemistry. In the approval trial, the PD-L1 expression was assessed in FFPE tumour samples at a central laboratory with the use of the commercially available PD-L1 IHC 22C3 pharmDx assay (Dako) on histology specimens. However, the assessment of PD-L1 IHC of cytology cell-block was as reliable as the histology assessment, in independent assessments (20–22). The PD-L1 IHC 22C3 pharmDx assay is the companion diagnostic of pembrolizumab frontline with the threshold of “high expression” PD-L1 tumour proportion score of ≥ 50%. This finding is clinically relevant since the collection of a histology sample may be challenging in lung cancer diagnosis,
particularly when bronchoscopy with fine-needle aspirations is used. In detail, cell block cytology is a technique used in cytopathology (in addition to smears) for evaluation of tissue from fine needle aspirations or fluid aspiration for which the cells in solution are then concentrated via centrifuge from cytological specimens into paraffin blocks that can be cut and stained by the same methods used for histopathology. Based on this evidence, the use of the cell-block is considered as a reliable specimen to assess the PD-L1 status, reducing the need of more invasive procedures and increasing the likelihood to have an informative specimen in term of prediction to treatment response with few cytology materials.

Pembrolizumab as monotherapy is indicated in the frontline treatment of advanced EGFR and ALK wild type NSCLC showing PD-L1 hyperexpression i.e. PD-L1≥50% and for the second line treatment of advanced NSCLC with a PD-L1 tumour expression ≥1% after platinum-containing chemotherapy failure, and in association with chemotherapy for the frontline treatment of NSCLC, regardless PD-L1 status. Moreover, pembrolizumab is indicated for the frontline treatment of metastatic melanoma, with no biomarker for patients’ selection. Patients are treated with pembrolizumab until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Expert Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EML Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration of the immune checkpoint inhibitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expert Committee noted that there were no treatment options for metastatic melanoma currently included on the Model List. The Committee recommended the addition of nivolumab and pembrolizumab to the complementary list of the EML, for use as front-line monotherapy for treatment of patients with unresectable and metastatic melanoma on the basis of evidence of significantly increased overall survival for patients that met the recommended threshold for benefit, and in the absence of other EML-listed treatment options. Listing should be for nivolumab with a square box indicating pembrolizumab as a therapeutically equivalent alternative. The Committee noted that nivolumab was scored as 4/5 on the ESMO-MCBS v1.1 for this indication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee considered that more mature data would be necessary before listing of these medicines could be considered for use in adjuvant indications of radically resected melanoma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expert Committee did not recommend listing of atezolizumab, nivolumab or pembrolizumab for treatment of patients with metastatic NSCLC at this time, as the Committee considered that their precise place in the treatment/immunotherapy of this condition is still evolving. The Committee noted the evidence of efficacy in the treatment of patients with metastatic NSCLC with these agents. The Committee observed that the duration of follow-up of the single studies for frontline and second line immunotherapy in trials for lung cancer was generally shorter than 3 years, and considered that data from longer follow-up would better capture the actual magnitude of benefit. By the time of the next Expert Committee meeting in 2021, more mature data will be available for metastatic NSCLC and also for use of these agents in locally advanced non-resectable disease, and as adjuvant therapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, the Committee noted that the landscape of clinical development of cancer immunotherapy still has some areas of uncertainty with regard to the optimal time for introduction of treatment (front-line or second line), appropriate patient selection, and whether or not use of ICIs in combination with other medicines is superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expert Committee expressed concern about the potential budget impact of oncology medicines which could be an impediment to access, and countries may not be able to list these medicines on their national EMLs. Therefore, the Committee recommended that WHO engage stakeholders to find ways to facilitate better access and affordability as a high priority through avenues such as the Medicines Patent Pool, WHO prequalification and collaborative registration procedures. The Committee also recommended ongoing activities of the EML Cancer Medicines Working Group to include identification of obstacles to access and affordability of cancer medicines, and pricing data collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References:


### Medicines for prostate cancer – addition – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Abiraterone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Enzalutamide</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATC Code:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ATC Code:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02BX03</td>
<td>L02BB04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposal:</strong></th>
<th>The application requested the addition of abiraterone and enzalutamide to the EML for use in the treatment of metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge Ecology International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support the inclusion of abiraterone or enzalutamide on the EML for management of castration-resistant prostate cancer at this time, though noting with interest ongoing studies and more mature data that may demonstrate significant benefit, particularly for overall survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>8.2.4 Hormones and antihormones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</strong></td>
<td>Abiraterone: tablet 250 mg, 500 mg Enzalutamide: capsule 40 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>In 2017, the Expert Committee considered an application requesting inclusion of enzalutamide on the EML for the treatment of prostate cancer, but did not recommend inclusion, instead recommending a comprehensive review of prostate cancer medicines including abiraterone to be considered at its next meeting (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer in men and the fourth most common cancer overall. In 2018, approximately 1.3 million men were diagnosed with prostate cancer (2). When patients are diagnosed with prostate cancer, if they are treated early and tumours are localized, the prognosis is often favourable. However, some patients will relapse, which in nearly all cases, leads to castration resistant prostate cancer (CRPC). At the CRPC stage, the disease is no longer responsive to androgen deprivation therapy (ADT), thus limiting the available treatment options with a greater disease burden. There are currently six treatments being used to treat CRPC. Enzalutamide and abiraterone acetate have several advantages over the other treatments. Four of the other treatments are invasive and require I.V. administration, leukapheresis, or the use of radiopharmaceuticals. Enzalutamide and abiraterone acetate are the only daily oral tablets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enzalutamide</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application described the findings of two randomized placebo-controlled Phase III studies of enzalutamide for treatment of mCRPC. The AFFIRM trial randomly assigned 1,199 men with metastatic CRPC (mCRPC) who had previously taken docetaxel to 160 mg enzalutamide or placebo daily (3). Both groups received continuing androgen deprivation therapy. Overall survival (OS) favoured enzalutamide (18.4 months versus 13.6 months; HR 0.63; 95% CI 0.53–0.75; p&lt; 0.001). Progression free survival (PFS) also favoured enzalutamide (8.3 months versus 2.9 months; HR 0.40; 95% 0.35–0.47; p&lt; 0.001). 54% of enzalutamide treated patients experienced a 50% or greater decrease in PSA levels compared to only 2% in the control arm (p&lt;0.001).&lt;br&gt;The PREVAIL trial investigated enzalutamide in first-line setting in men with mCRPC who were chemotherapy naive. 1,717 patients were randomized to receive 160 mg enzalutamide or placebo daily (4). The study was stopped after a planned interim analysis showed benefit for enzalutamide. Significantly fewer deaths were reported in the treatment arm compared to placebo (28% versus 35%; HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.60-0.84l p&lt;0.001).&lt;br&gt;<strong>Abiraterone acetate</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application described the findings of two randomized placebo-controlled Phase III studies of abiraterone for treatment of mCRPC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The COU-AA-301 trial randomly assigned 1,195 patients who had failed prior docetaxel therapy to receive prednisone 5 mg twice daily with either abiraterone 1000 mg daily or placebo (5). The primary end point was overall survival and was significantly longer in the abiraterone-prednisone arm compared to the control arm (14.8 months versus 10.9 months; HR 0.65, 95% CI 0.54-0.77; p<0.001). Abiraterone was also associated with significant benefit compared to placebo for the secondary end points of time to PSA progression (10.2 months versus 6.6 months; HR 0.58, 95% CI 0.46-0.73; p<0.001), and progression free survival (5.6 months versus 3.6 months; HR 0.67, 95% CI 0.59-0.78; p<0.001).

The COU-AA-302 trial randomly assigned 1,088 chemotherapy naïve patients with prostate cancer to receive abiraterone 1000 mg daily plus prednisone 5 mg twice daily or placebo plus prednisone (6). Median overall survival was observed to be longer in abiraterone treated patients compared to the placebo group (34.7 months versus 30.3 months; HR 0.81, 95% CI 0.70-0.93; p=0.0033).

Enzalutamide versus abiraterone acetate

The application described the findings of three studies in which enzalutamide and abiraterone were compared.

A network meta-analysis of eight RCTs involving 8,666 patients with mCRPC compared the efficacy of abiraterone, enzalutamide and orteronel (7). Pooled hazard ratios for the primary endpoint of overall survival were 0.71 and 0.78 for enzalutamide and abiraterone, respectively compared to control groups. Enzalutamide also significantly improved progression free survival (HR 0.36), whereas abiraterone was not associated with a significant improvement. Enzalutamide and abiraterone were both associated with significant improvements in time to PSA progression compared to controls (HR 0.20 and 0.56, respectively). There was no significant associations for either drug with regard to the development of adverse events.

A retrospective study of patients with mCRPC receiving treatment with enzalutamide (n=807) or abiraterone (n=2,591) compared real-world treatment patterns and adherence to therapy (8). Abiraterone treated patients were found to have higher medication possession ratios (MPRs) than enzalutamide treated patients, suggesting greater medication adherence to abiraterone. Abiraterone treated patients also had lower Kaplan-Meier rates of dose reduction.

A second retrospective study compared the combined duration of prostate cancer treatments of mCRPC patients initiated on abiraterone (n=2,591) or enzalutamide (n=807) (9). Compared with patients initiated on enzalutamide, patients initiated on abiraterone had fewer discontinuations of mCRPC treatments (HR 0.73, P = 0.004) or of any prostate cancer treatments (HR = 0.61, P = 0.002) at 3 months and the result was maintained up to 24 months. The median duration of mCRPC treatments was 4.1 months longer for patients initiated on abiraterone compared with those initiated on enzalutamide (18.3 vs. 14.2 months, P < 0.001). Similarly, the median duration of any prostate cancer treatment was longer for patients initiated on abiraterone compared with those initiated on enzalutamide (not reached vs. 22.2 months, P < 0.001).
**Summary of evidence: harms**

| **Enzalutamide** | From the PROSPECT trial in patients with non-metastatic disease, adverse events of grade 3 or higher occurred in 31% of enzalutamide treated patients compared with 23% receiving placebo. The most commonly reported adverse events occurring more frequently in the enzalutamide group included fatigue, hot flush, hypertension, nausea and constipation. (10). From the AFFIRM trial in previously treated patients with mCRPC, adverse events of grade 3 or above were reported in 45.3% of patients in the enzalutamide arm compared to 53.1% of placebo treated patients. Enzalutamide treated patients experienced a higher incidence of any grade fatigue, diarrhoea, hot flashes, musculoskeletal pain, headache and seizures compared to placebo treated patients. Adverse events causing death occurred in 3% and 4% of enzalutamide and placebo treated patients, respectively (3). From the PREVAIL trial in chemotherapy naïve patients with mCRPC, adverse events of grade 3 or more were reported in 43% of the patients in the enzalutamide group, and 37% in the placebo group. Common adverse events occurring at least 2% more frequently in the enzalutamide group included fatigue, back pain, constipation and arthralgia (4). |
| **Abiraterone** | In the COU-AA-301 trial, there were more deaths, treatment discontinuations, and treatment discontinuations due to adverse events in the placebo arm versus the abiraterone arm. Common adverse events occurring at similar frequency between treatment groups were fatigue, back pain, nausea, constipation, bone pain and arthralgia. Urinary tract infection was observed more frequently in the abiraterone arm (5). The most common grade 3 or greater adverse events of special interest reported in the COU-AA-302 trial occurring more frequently in the abiraterone arm were cardiac disorders (8% versus 4%), increased alanine aminotransferase (6% versus <1%) and hypertension (5% versus 3%) (6). |

**Additional evidence: (not in the application)**

| A recent prospective randomized phase II study (n=72) investigated the effect of the administration of low dose abiraterone (250 mg daily) with a low-fat meal, compared to standard dose abiraterone (1000 mg daily) administered under fasting conditions (11). At 12 weeks, a greater effect on prostate-specific antigen (PSA) was observed in the low-dose arm compared with the standard dose arm (mean log change -1.59 versus -1.19) meeting the predefined non-inferiority criteria. The PSA response rate was 58% and 50% in the low-dose and standard-dose arms, respectively. Median PFS was approximately 9 months in both groups. Androgen levels decreased similarly in both arms. Abiraterone concentrations were higher in the standard-dose group, yet there was no difference in PSA response or PFS. The study authors considered these data could have significant pharmacoeconomic implications and deserve consideration by prescribers, payers and patients. However, the study also concludes that additional studies are required to determine long-term efficacy of this dosing strategy. |

**WHO Guidelines:** None available.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

| Many of the cost-benefit studies have been done using the prices from originator companies. Both drugs are now also available from generic suppliers, and as competition among generic suppliers expands, prices should decline considerably. Before generic entry, some publicly quoted prices for the active pharmaceutical ingredient enzalutamide were in the range of US$6,000 to US$13,000 per kilo. At US$6,000 per kilo, the cost of the API for one 40 mg capsule of enzalutamide would be US$0.24 (US $0.006 per mg). Prices of generic abiraterone acetate vary. One company offers 120 x 250 mg abiraterone acetate tablets for approximately US$238.40. The price for a unit of the API is US$7,947 per kilo and US$0.007947 per milligram. It is anticipated that API costs could decline to US$300/kg to US$900/kg over time for both products, in line with prices for tamoxifen ($271/kg), capecitabine ($393/kg) and prednisolone ($962/kg). A decline of that magnitude would result in API costs of $0.012 to $0.036 per 40mg capsule, or $0.048 to $0.144 per day, for enzalutamide, and $0.075 to $0.225 per 250mg tablet or $0.30 to $0.90 per day for abiraterone acetate (without prednisone). Technology appraisal guidance issued by NICE for enzalutamide and abiraterone state that these medicines are recommended treatment options people with metastatic hormone-relapsed prostate cancer if the manufacturers provide the drugs at agreed fixed or discounted |
Similarly, the National Centre for Pharmacoeconomics in Ireland approved reimbursement for enzalutamide and abiraterone only after price negotiations were conducted. The application summarized numerous studies that investigated the cost-effectiveness of enzalutamide and abiraterone, noting that many study authors were affiliated with the pharmaceutical manufacturers at the time of publication. The studies cited the high originator prices and are of limited use when considering whether these medicines would be cost-effective in resource-limited settings, when and where the medicines available at lower prices from generic suppliers.

**Availability:**
Enzalutamide and abiraterone acetate have worldwide regulatory approval. There are many generic versions of abiraterone acetate available, while only a single generic version of enzalutamide.

**Other considerations:**
N/A

**Committee Recommendations:**
The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EML Cancer Medicine Working Group with regard to the proposed threshold of 4-6 months of overall survival benefit as a guiding principle for prioritizing cancer medicines for inclusion on the EML, and applied this principle to the consideration of abiraterone and enzalutamide. The Expert Committee recommended the addition of abiraterone to the complementary list of the EML for use in the treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. The Expert Committee acknowledged the significant public health burden of prostate cancer, which afflicts an increasing number of people in all countries, irrespective of income. The Committee recalled that the EML currently includes docetaxel, bicalutamide and leuprorelin for use in the treatment of metastatic prostate cancer. However, a significant proportion of patients will not respond to these medicines and patients will ultimately develop resistance. The Expert Committee noted that abiraterone and enzalutamide have each been shown to be effective treatments for metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer, both in chemotherapy-naive and in pre-treated patients. The Committee noted that abiraterone had not shown any relevant clinical advantage over enzalutamide in terms of efficacy outcomes or safety. However, the Committee recognized the potential advantages offered by abiraterone in terms of emerging dosing strategies (lower doses may be possible when administered with food), reduced pill burden potentially improving adherence, wider availability of generics and potential associated cost savings. Given that metastatic prostate cancer often requires treatment over longer periods of time (above 1 year) and that low dosing and availability of generics would be associated with substantial cost savings, the Committee decided not to recommend listing abiraterone with a square box indicating enzalutamide as an alternative. While enzalutamide remains an effective therapeutic option for mCRPC, its use instead of abiraterone could result in considerable additional expenditure at country level, without additional clinical benefit. The Committee considered that addition of abiraterone alone on the EML serves to support its use, promoting competition between brand and generic medicines, and improving access and affordability.

**References:**
Section 10: MEDICINES AFFECTING THE BLOOD

10.2 Medicines affecting coagulation

*Direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) - dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, edoxaban – addition - EML*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct oral anticoagulants</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apixaban</td>
<td>B01AF02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabigatran etexilate</td>
<td>B01AE07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edoxaban</td>
<td>B01AF03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivaroxaban</td>
<td>B01AF01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: Two applications requested the inclusion of direct oral anticoagulants on the EML for the prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation (NVAF) and for treatment of venous thromboembolism.

Applicants: 1. Dr Mariachiara DiCesare, Dr Xinyi Leng, Dr Ezequiel Zaiedel 2. Dr Ignacio Neumann, Dr Holger J Schunemann

WHO Technical Department: Comments on the applications were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the addition of DOACs to the complementary list of the EML as they are effective medicines for which EML listing may improve equity by making them more accessible to patients, and driving costs down.

EML / EMLc: EML

Section: 10.2 Medicines affecting coagulation

Dose form(s) & strengths(s): Apixaban: tablet 2.5 mg, 5 mg  Dabigatran etexilate: capsule 110 mg, 150 mg  Edoxaban: tablet 30 mg, 60 mg  Rivaroxaban: tablet 15 mg, 20 mg

Core / Complementary: Core

Individual / Square box listing: 1. Square box listing of dabigatran 2. Individual listing for each medicine

Background: In 2015, the Expert Committee rejected an application seeking inclusion of dabigatran, rivaroxaban and apixaban as a therapeutic group on the EML for the treatment of NVAF. The Committee considered that although the evidence presented indicated a favourable overall clinical benefit of DOACs over warfarin, the absolute magnitude of benefit was limited, inconsistent across trials and may be influenced by a number of factors, such as the quality of oral anticoagulation (time in therapeutic range). The committee considered that in order for countries to maximize use of available resources, further research was necessary to explore the unmet need in terms of anticoagulation in people unable to be stabilized with warfarin and in clinical settings where access to warfarin monitoring is not readily available. The Committee expressed some concern regarding safety of DOACs, noting that there were currently no specific antidotes that would reverse anticoagulant effects in case of emergency. The Committee also acknowledged that the large difference in cost between DOACs and warfarin was not proportional to the observed incremental clinical benefit. Full details are available in the technical report of the 2015 Expert Committee meeting (1).

Public health relevance: Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most commonly diagnosed cardiac arrhythmia (2) and a major public health issue affecting 37.6 million individuals globally in 2017 (3). The incidence and prevalence of AF are expected to increase over the next 30 years (4-6). Without antithrombotic treatment, the risk of stroke in patients with atrial fibrillation is around 5% per year, but it can be as high as 10% per year if other risk factors are present (7). In a cohort of 15,400 individuals with atrial fibrillation in 47 countries, the highest number of strokes occurred in patients in Africa (incidence 89/1137 [8%] per year), China (incidence 143/2023 [7%] per year), and Southeast Asia (incidence 88/1331 [7%] per year) (8).
In low and middle-income countries, stroke is associated with an increased mortality and significant disability, specially, in disadvantaged populations (9-11). Additionally, according to a recent WHO survey of 177 countries, provisions for the treatment and rehabilitation of patients with stroke are available in less than a quarter of public healthcare facilities in low and middle-income countries (12).

Deep venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolism are major contributors to global disease burden. Their estimated incidence ranges from 0.7 to 2.7 per 1000 patients-year in Western Europe, 1.1 to 2.4 per 1000 patients-year in North America and 0.2 to 1.6 patients-year in Latin America and Asia (13). Additionally, venous thromboembolism markedly increases with age, with incidences as high as 4.29 to 5.64 per 1000 patients-year in individuals older than 70 years (14, 15). Thus, venous thromboembolism is likely to become an even more prominent problem with aging populations.

### Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

**Application 1 - NVAF:**

This application presented the results of a meta-analysis that updated a published meta-analysis of four RCTs by Ruff et al (16) with data from the J-ROCKET AF trial (17) involving a total of 59,819 participants. Compared with warfarin, DOACs were associated with a significantly reduced risk of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with NVAF (Risk ratio (RR) 0.80, 95% CI 0.71 – 0.91, P=0.003; absolute effect: 8 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 3 fewer to 11 fewer). The quality of evidence was rated as high using GRADE.

This application also presented the results of a systematic literature review of observational studies reporting real-world data for DOACs versus vitamin K antagonists for the primary efficacy outcome of stroke and systemic embolism. Of 23 studies included in the quantitative data synthesis, 12 studies provided data for the primary efficacy outcome of stroke and systemic embolism (18-29). In these studies, NOACs were associated with a reduced risk of stroke and systemic embolism compared with warfarin in patients with NVAF (Risk ratio (RR) 0.79, 95% CI 0.71-0.89, p<0.001; absolute effect: 5 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 3 fewer to 7 fewer). The quality of evidence was rated as very low using GRADE, due to the evidence being based on observational studies with heterogenous findings.

When compared individually with warfarin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban and apixaban were each associated with a lower risk of stroke and systemic embolism than warfarin. No real-world data were available for edoxaban.

**Application 2 - NVAF:**

This application conducted a meta-analysis of 8 systematic reviews (30-37) and 13 randomized trials involving a total of 75,543 participants with AF and one or two additional risk factors for stroke (17, 38-49). Participants were randomized to a DOAC or warfarin (target international normalized ratio 2.0 to 3.0) and were followed for 2 to 3 years. Individuals with estimated creatinine clearance of less than 30 ml per minute or a high risk of bleeding were excluded.

Use of DOACs instead of vitamin K antagonists in individuals with non-valvular atrial fibrillation was associated with decreased mortality (RR 0.90, 95%CI 0.85-0.94, high certainty evidence) and decreased risk of stroke (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.72-0.96; absolute effect: 7 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 11 fewer to 4 fewer), high certainty evidence). Also, DOACs were found to probably decrease the risk of systemic embolism (RR 0.74, 95%CI 0.48-1.13; absolute effect: 1 fewer event per 1000 (95% CI 1 fewer to 0 fewer), moderate certainty evidence) and major bleeding (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.66-0.98; absolute effect: 11 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 20 fewer to 1 fewer), moderate certainty evidence).

**Application 2 – venous thromboembolism:**

This application conducted a meta-analysis of 24 systematic reviews (50-73) and 12 randomized trials involving 28,876 participants with an objectively confirmed symptomatic proximal deep venous thrombosis or pulmonary embolism (74-85). Participants were randomized to a DOAC or to an initial treatment with low molecular weight heparin (5 to 10 days) followed by dose-adjusted warfarin (target international normalized ratio 2.0 to 3.0). Dabigatran was also
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**Summary of evidence: harms**

*from the application*

| Application 1: | From the updated meta-analysis of five RCTs (16, 17), DOACs were found to be associated with a significantly lower risk of major bleeding compared with warfarin (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.74–0.99, p=0.04; absolute effect: 8 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 1 fewer to 16 fewer). The quality of the evidence was rated as moderate using GRADE, downgraded due to inconsistency. This application also presented the results of a systematic literature review of observational studies reporting real-world data for DOACs versus vitamin K antagonists for the primary safety outcome of major bleeding. Of 23 studies included in the quantitative data synthesis, 17 studies provided data for the primary safety outcome (18, 20, 22–29, 86-92). In these studies, DOACs were associated with a lower risk of bleeding compared with warfarin in NVAF patients (RR 0.72, 95% CI 0.64–0.80, p<0.001, absolute effect 9 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 6 fewer to 11 fewer). The quality of evidence was rated as very low using GRADE, due to the evidence being based on observational studies with heterogeneous findings. When compared individually with warfarin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban and edoxaban were each associated with a lower risk of major bleeding than warfarin. No real-world data were available for edoxaban.

| Application 2: | As reported above, randomized trial evidence suggests that DOACs are probably associated with a lower risk of major bleeding than vitamin K antagonists in the treatment of NVAF (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.66–0.98; absolute effect: 11 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 20 fewer to 1 fewer), moderate certainty evidence) and venous thromboembolism (RR 0.63, 95%CI 0.47–0.84; absolute effects 6 fewer events per 1000 (95% CI 9 fewer to 3 fewer), high certainty evidence). Large observational studies on “real world” populations suggest that the risk of bleeding with DOACs may be equivalent to or lower than the risk with vitamin K antagonists.

- A large cohort of 156,005 adults with atrial fibrillation and venous thromboembolism in the United Kingdom suggested a lower risk of bleeding with apixaban in comparison with warfarin (HR 0.69, 95% CI 0.54–0.79 in individuals with atrial fibrillation; HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.46 to 0.79 in individuals without atrial fibrillation). Also, investigators observed no significant differences in the risk of bleeding for the comparisons of rivaroxaban versus warfarin (HR 1.12, 95% CI 0.99 to 1.26 in individuals with atrial fibrillation; HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.82 to 1.10 in individuals without atrial fibrillation) and dabigatran versus warfarin (HR 0.87, 95% CI 0.72 to 1.04 in individuals with atrial fibrillation; HR 0.98, 95% CI 0.71 to 1.35 in individuals without atrial fibrillation) (25).

- A propensity-matched analysis of 76,940 individuals with non-valvular atrial fibrillation of an administrative database from the United States suggested a lower risk of bleeding with apixaban in comparison to warfarin (HR: 0.60, 95 % CI: 0.54-0.65) (29).

- A community based population study of 59,525 adults with venous thromboembolism in Canada and the United States showed a similar risk of bleeding with DOAC and VKA (HR 0.99, 95% CI 0.84 to 1.16) (93).

- A propensity score matched analysis of 45,361 patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation of an administrative database from the United States, showed a lower risk of
bleeding with dabigatran (HR 0.69 m 95% CI 0.50-0.96) and apixaban (HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.39-0.71) in comparison to warfarin. In patients using rivaroxaban, investigators observed a similar risk of bleeding in comparison to warfarin (HR 0.98, 95% CI: 0.83-1.17) (94).

- A propensity-matched cohort of 29,963 adults with venous thromboembolism in Denmark, also suggested a similar risk of bleeding with DOAC and VKA (HR 1.19, 95% CI: 0.66 to 2.13)(95).

The application also reported data from recent and ongoing trials involving specific antidotes for emergency reversal of anticoagulation in patients receiving DOACs:

Idarucizumab is a monoclonal antibody fragment that has been investigated for use in reversing the anticoagulant effect of dabigatran in the RE-VERSE AD trial in 503 patients with life-threatening bleeding or about to undergo an urgent procedure (96). Following administration of 5 g of IV idarucizumab, anticoagulation was completely reverted in 98% of patients within 4 hours.

Andexanet alfa has recently been approved as an antidote for rivaroxaban and apixaban based on results of two open label randomized trials of rivaroxaban or apixaban compared to placebo (ANNEXA-R and ANNEXA-A). The primary outcome of both trials was anti-factor Xa activity measured with a chromogenic assay. The results showed a reduction of anti-factor Xa activity of 92±11% with andexanet vs. 18±15% with placebo in the rivaroxaban study and a reduction of 94±2% with adexanet vs. 21±9% with placebo in the apixaban study (97). There is an ongoing open-label, non-randomized trial (ANNEXA-4) evaluating the effects of andexanet on clinical endpoints in patients with acute bleeding under treatment with rivaroxaban or apixaban. In an interim report of this study, of the 47 patients available for analysis, 37 were judged as having good hemostasis by an independent adjudication committee (98).

**Additional evidence: (not in the application)**
N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**
There are no WHO guidelines currently available for the treatment of NVAF or venous thromboembolism.

Oral anticoagulation with warfarin or DOACs (apixaban, dabigatran, rivaroxaban) in patients with AF at high risk of stroke based on a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 2 or more is recommended in multiple international guidelines (99-102).

For management of venous thromboembolism, recent, yet to be published American and Latin American guidelines are reported to support short term anticoagulation in individuals at low risk of recurrence and indefinite anticoagulation in individuals at high risk (e.g., unprovoked events). DOACs are the preferred alternative over warfarin.

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**
Reported monthly costs of DOACs in the two applications indicate that the costs for DOACs range widely between countries: from US$ 20-50 per month in Latin American countries, to US$ 90 per month in the United Kingdom, to up to US$ 600 per month in the United States and Canada.

**Application 1:**
A 2016 systematic review of 54 studies from 21 countries reporting cost-effectiveness analyses of DOACs (103) concluded that DOACs are cost-effective in several countries, independent of their health system, direct costs of DOACs and vitamin K antagonists, and costs of diseases. The authors defined a drug as cost-effective when the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio was below the willingness to pay value. Most studies used a conventional Markov decision analysis model, and the rate of events was gathered from the RCTs of DOACs. This application updated the systematic review, including 64 cost-effectiveness analyses from 28 high- and middle-income countries from around the world. Most of them used same criteria, but newer cost-effectiveness analyses from USA included costs from healthcare resource use and real world data from health systems to determine rate of stroke and bleeding rather than data solely from randomized trials. All studies to date demonstrated that DOACs were a cost effective strategy. The studies included in the updated systematic review are referenced in the application.

**Application 2 - NVAF:**
The application identified two systematic reviews of economic evaluation of any DOAC versus vitamin K antagonists in patients with AF. The first article identified was a systematic review of cost-utility analyses of dabigatran, rivaroxaban or apixaban versus warfarin. This review included 18 primary studies conducted in North America and Europe. All but one used a Markov model to extrapolate long-term data basing the calculation on the effectiveness and safety results from landmark trials. The majority of the models used the perspective of the payer. Thirteen models compared dabigatran versus warfarin, four rivaroxaban versus warfarin and four apixaban versus warfarin. Although there was some inconsistency among the conclusions of the individual models, the large majority showed that DOACs were cost-effective with ICERs below the williness to pay thresholds and sometimes dominant over warfarin (104).

The second article identified was a systematic review of cost-utility analyses of apixaban versus warfarin. This review identified 26 primary studies conducted in North America, Latin America and Europe. All the studies except of one used a Markov model to extrapolate long-term data with the effectiveness and safety results from landmark trials. The majority of the models used the perspective of the payer with a lifetime horizon. The results showed that apixaban was cost-effective with ICERs below the williness to pay thresholds (105).

**Application 2 – venous thromboembolism:**

The application identified five cost comparisons between DOACs and VKA for patients with venous thromboembolism. Four reports suggested that DOACs are cost-saving compared with warfarin (106-109) and one study found an equivalent cost between DOACs and vitamin K antagonists (110).

In addition, the application identified 14 economic evaluations that compared the cost and effectiveness of DOACs versus vitamin K antagonists (107, 111-123). All suggested that DOACs are cost-effective compared to warfarin.

**Availability:**

Dabigatran, manufactured by Boehringer Ingelheim, apixaban, manufactured by Bristol-Myers Squibb, and rivaroxaban, manufactured by Bayer, all have wide global regulatory approval. Edoxaban, manufactured by Daiichi Sanyko Company, has regulatory approval from regulatory authorities in the USA, Europe, Japan, Canada and Nigeria.

**Other considerations:** N/A

**Committee Recommendations:**

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of dabigatran with a square box to the core list of the EML for the prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation and for treatment of venous thromboembolism based on favourable efficacy and acceptable safety. The square box refers to apixaban, edoxaban and rivaroxaban as therapeutically equivalent alternatives.

The Committee noted that the DOACs demonstrated clinical benefits in terms of reduced mortality, reduced risk of stroke or systemic embolism, and were associated with fewer severe/major bleeding episodes compared to well controlled warfarin in patients with NVAF.

In the treatment of patients with VTE, DOACs were associated with small reductions in mortality, risk of subsequent / recurrent thromboembolic events and major bleeding compared to low-molecular weight heparin and vitamin K antagonists.

The use of DOACs may also have relevant health system benefits related to the infrastructure required for warfarin treatment monitoring, as they do not require laboratory monitoring. The Committee noted that DOACs have higher daily treatment costs than warfarin, but have been found to be a cost-effective intervention. It is recommended that countries take all these factors into consideration when selecting anticoagulants to best suit their national and local needs and circumstances.

The Expert Committee recommended that WHO take action to facilitate access to these medicines through the WHO pre-qualification programme, and through collaboration with partners such as the Medicines Patent Pool.
References:
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# Section 12: CARDIOVASCULAR MEDICINES

## 12.3 Antihypertensive medicines

**Fixed-dose combination antihypertensives - addition – EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril + amlodipine</td>
<td>C09BB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>C09BA03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telmisartan + amlodipine</td>
<td>C09DB04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>C09DA07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:
The application proposed the addition of four two-drug fixed dose combinations (FDC) to the core list of the EML for use in the treatment of hypertension.

### Applicant:
Sandeep Kishore, Arnhold Institute for Global Health & Young Professionals Chronic Disease Network; Anthony Rodgers, The George Institute for Global Health; Marc Jaffe, Resolve to Save Lives, Viral Strategies and Kaiser Permanente Northern California; Tom Frieden, Resolve to Save Lives, Vital Strategies

### WHO Technical Department:
Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department for Management of Noncommunicable Diseases, Disability, Violence and Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of dual FDC antihypertensives to the EML, stating that most people with hypertension require more than one antihypertensive agent to achieve control and that FDCs are likely to improve adherence to treatment.

### EML / EMLc
EML

### Section:
12.3 Antihypertensive Medicines

### Dose form(s) & strength(s):
- **Lisinopril + amlodipine:** tablet 10 mg + 5 mg; 20 mg + 5 mg; 20 mg + 10 mg
- **Lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide:** tablet 10 mg + 12.5 mg; 20 mg + 12.5 mg; 20 mg + 25 mg
- **Telmisartan + amlodipine:** tablet 40 mg + 5 mg; 80 mg + 5 mg; 80 mg + 10 mg
- **Telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide:** tablet 40 mg + 12.5 mg; 80 mg + 12.5 mg; 80 mg + 25 mg

### Core / Complementary:
Core

### Individual / Square box listing:
Square box listings as representative of the following pharmacological class combinations:
- ACE inhibitor + dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker
- ACE inhibitor + thiazide or thiazide-like diuretic
- Angiotensin receptor blocker + dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker
- Angiotensin receptor blocker + thiazide or thiazide-like diuretic

Square box listings of the components of the FDCs should be interpreted by countries as limited to:
- Lisinopril > any ACE inhibitor (ATC code C09AA--)
- Telmisartan > any angiotensin receptor blocker (ATC code C09CA--)
- Amlodipine > any once-daily dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker (intrinsically long-acting e.g., amlodipine, lercanidipine, lacidipine; or modified-release e.g., nifedipine, felodipine)
- HCTZ > chlortalidone or indapamide.

### Background:
The pharmacological classes of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, calcium channel blockers and thiazide diuretics are all represented on the EML with square box listings. The individual components of the proposed FDCs are included on the EML either specifically (amlodipine, hydrochlorothiazide) or as members of pharmacological classes represented by square box listings (lisinopril (represented by enalapril), telmisartan (represented by losartan)).

In 2017, an application for inclusion of a FDC of lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide on the EML was not recommended by the Expert Committee. The Committee considered that listing a single FDC of medicines for treatment of hypertension would limit choice from the variety of
combinations, component medicines and dosages available that would be necessary to tailor therapy for individual patients. However, the Committee acknowledged that appropriate FDCs for hypertension may have advantages over the single medicines given concomitantly, including increased adherence and reduced pill burden. An explanatory note to this effect was included in Section 12 of the EML (1). To address the concerns of the 2017 Expert Committee, the current application proposed four different combinations, with each component qualified with a square box, and with multiple dose options.

**Public health relevance:**

**Cardiovascular diseases** are the leading cause of death globally, responsible for 31% of total deaths in 2016. [Global Health Estimates 2016: Deaths by Cause, Age, Sex, by Country and by Region, 2000-2016. Geneva WHO, 2018 - http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/estimates/en/ ] Hypertension is the leading modifiable risk factor for cardiovascular disease. The global prevalence of hypertension (defined as systolic and/or diastolic blood pressure more than or equal to 140/90 mmHg) in adults was 24.1% in men and 20.1% in women in 2015. The number of adults with hypertension has increased by over half a billion to 1.13 billion in the 40 years to 2015, with the increase seen largely in low- and middle-income countries (2).

In low- and middle-income countries, nearly three quarters of patients treated for hypertension in 2010 did not have adequate blood pressure control (3). Data from the ALLHAT trial (4) suggest that two or more antihypertensive medicines are required by the majority of patients in order to achieve blood pressure targets below 140/90 mmHg. A meta-analysis of 42 trials involving almost 11,000 participants found that combination therapy using medicines from any two pharmacological classes of thiazide diuretics, beta-blockers, ACE-inhibitors and calcium channel blockers produces a greater blood pressure lowering effect than doubling the dose of monotherapy (5). Greater blood pressure lowering effects have been associated with greater reductions in cardiovascular events such as myocardial infarction and stroke (6-9).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

**Dual versus monotherapy for initial treatment of hypertension**

A systematic review conducted for the application of dual versus monotherapy as initial treatment identified 33 randomized trials involving over 10,000 participants. Compared to patients receiving monotherapy, there was a 27% increase in the rate of achieving blood pressure control among patients receiving dual combination therapy. The application also described the results of three studies that compared initial combination antihypertensive treatment with alternative initial treatment regimens including monotherapy, sequential monotherapy and stepped-care (10-12). In all comparisons, combination therapy was associated with greater improvements in blood pressure control, without an increase in adverse events.

**Effects of combination therapy versus placebo on cardiovascular events**

As in the 2017 application, the current application presented the same findings of a review of 11 randomized controlled trials involving 35 208 patients comparing combination antihypertensive treatment with placebo/no treatment on cardiovascular outcomes and mortality (13-23). Combination therapy was found to significantly reduce the risk of cardiovascular outcomes and mortality for all studies combined, and to a greater extent when only the studies demonstrating a reduction in systolic pressure of more than 6 mmHg were considered.

**Review of RCTs assessing antihypertensive effects of the proposed FDCs**

**Lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide**

Two trials reported data for either the comparison of lisinopril + HCTZ versus placebo or versus component monotherapy (24, 25). In both studies, combination therapy was associated with a significant reduction in both systolic and/or diastolic blood pressure.

Two trials reported data for the comparison of lisinopril + HCTZ with alternative dual combination therapy (sustained release verapamil + trandolapril, atenolol + chlorthalidone
There were no significant differences in the adjusted mean change from baseline in sitting systolic or diastolic blood pressure between treatment groups.

### Telmisartan + amlodipine

- **One trial** reported data for various strength combinations of telmisartan (20-80 mg) + amlodipine (2.5-10 mg) versus placebo (27). Six trials reported data for various strengths of the combination compared with single component monotherapy at the same or higher dose (28-33). All studied comparisons favoured dual combination therapy for differences in mean systolic and diastolic blood pressure.
- **One trial** compared telmisartan 80 mg + amlodipine 5 mg with olmesartan 40 mg + HCTZ 12.5 mg (34). At 6 months, both combinations were associated with significant reductions in mean systolic and diastolic blood pressure. There was no significant difference between treatment groups.

### Telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide

- **Two trials** reported data for the comparison of telmisartan + HCTZ versus placebo (35, 36). In both studies, there were significant differences in both systolic and diastolic blood pressure favouring combination therapy.
- **Three trials** reported data for the comparison of telmisartan + HCTZ versus telmisartan monotherapy (37-39). Combination therapy was significantly more effective than the corresponding strength of telmisartan monotherapy in reducing mean systolic and diastolic blood pressure.
- **Four trials** reported data for the comparison of telmisartan + HCTZ with the same combination at different doses of HCTZ (40), or different dual combinations (36, 41, 42). Both doses of telmisartan + HCTZ (12.5 mg and 25 mg) produced reductions from baseline in adjusted mean seated systolic and diastolic blood pressure, with the 25 mg HCTZ combination producing a greater blood pressure lowering effect (40). Comparisons of telmisartan + HCTZ with dual combination therapy with valsartan + HCTZ, showed that compared with placebo, both combinations produced substantial reductions in blood pressure. Patients treated with telmisartan + HCTZ had significantly greater reductions in systolic and diastolic blood pressure than patients treated with valsartan + HCTZ (36, 41). In the comparison of telmisartan + HCTZ versus dual combination therapy with barnidipine (a calcium channel blocker) + losartan, blood pressure was reduced in both treatment arms, however, the blood pressure lowering effect was greater in the barnidipine + losartan group (42).

### Lisinopril + amlodipine

- **One small (n=15) cross-over trial** compared lisinopril + amlodipine with single component monotherapy (43). After one month, combination therapy demonstrated a significant additional blood pressure lowering effect compared with each component monotherapy.

### Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

The adverse event profiles of ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, thiazide diuretics, and dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers are well known. Safety data from the studies of the dual combination therapies presented with the application are consistent with the known adverse event profiles of these medicines.

An analysis of 33 placebo controlled trials of antihypertensive therapy as monotherapy or dual combination therapy found that dual therapy was associated with adverse events at less than double the rate observed for monotherapy (7.5% versus 5.2%) (44), suggesting that there is not an additive effect of dual therapy in relation to adverse events.

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

The HEARTS technical package for cardiovascular disease management in primary care includes recommended treatment protocols for dual combination antihypertensive treatment as both first- and second-line interventions for hypertension (45, 46).

Dual combination antihypertensive therapy is recommended for use in patients not controlled on monotherapy, and in selected patients as initial therapy in multiple international guidelines including Europe (47), the United States (48), India (49) Thailand (50) and China (51). Single pill fixed-dose combinations are recommended in most guidelines as an alternative to separate pills to improve patient adherence. The 2018 European guidelines also recommended fixed-dose combination therapy as initial therapy in most patients (47).
### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The application presented a review of private sector prices in India of the proposed FDCs versus their component monotherapies which showed the FDC prices to be similar or slightly lower than component monotherapies. However, the Committee noted that this may not be the case in every jurisdiction. For example, a review of the MSH International Medical Products Price Guide (2015) reports the mean buyer prices to be US$0.1977, US$0.0233 and US$0.0077 for lisinopril + HCTZ 20 mg/12.5 mg, lisinopril 20 mg, and HCTZ 12.5mg, respectively. The Committee agreed that medicine prices should be considered with regard to the potential cost-savings from improved hypertension control due to improved compliance (52-54), reduced need for repeat visits to achieve BP control and with the use of FDC in settings where individuals requiring more than one BP lowering drug may have limited access to multiple drug classes (55, 56). A price advantage of an FDC over its component monotherapies may be justified by a demonstrated advantage in clinical outcome or compliance. FDC therapy may also be associated with reduced health system costs and out of pocket costs for patients. In a meta-analysis published in 2011 (57), the annual total health care costs from 44,336 patients in all included observational studies (n = 7) were lower for patients treated with FDC compared to individual monotherapy for hypertension (mean pooled difference US$1357; 95% CI: US$778, US$1935). An analysis using data from the 2004 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey in the United States (58) demonstrated that total monthly prescription expenditures were lower for 23 of 27 FDC medications examined compared to the separate individual drugs (mean decrease in monthly total costs US$20.89, 95% CI US$20.10, US$21.68). Using pharmacy claims data in Japan, a study demonstrated transitioning to FDC therapy from separate drugs was associated with an annual saving of $112 for patients (59). The cost savings of FDC therapy for patients also translate to the larger health system. In Canada, 60-100% of patients receiving two separate drugs transitioning to FDC therapy has been estimated to lead to a yearly cost-saving of $27 to $45 million (60).

### Availability:

The proposed FDCs are available globally, either in the stated combinations, or alternatives within pharmacological classes.

### Other considerations:

N/A

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of four two-drug FDCs, each with multiple strength formulations to the core list of the EML for use in the treatment of hypertension. Each component of the combinations should be listed with a square box, indicating that other medicines within the respective pharmacological classes represent therapeutically equivalent alternatives. For the CCB component, the square box should be limited to dihydropyridine class of CCBs.

The Committee accepted the efficacy of FDC antihypertensives compared to placebo or monotherapy for reducing blood pressure and cardiovascular events but expressed concern that the application did not provide strong evidence of the claimed advantages of FDC therapy versus dual component monotherapy. However, the Committee accepted that many patients require multiple antihypertensive treatment to achieve blood pressure targets and recognized that FDCs may confer advantages for patients over single medicines given concomitantly in terms of better adherence and reduced pill burden.

The Committee considered that the ongoing availability of single agent antihypertensive medicines is critical to allow treatment modification where necessary, and that FDCs should not displace single components at country level.

The Committee also noted that the availability of multiple FDCs in varying strengths may be associated with significant supply chain and affordability issues for LMICs. The Committee noted that the cost of FDCs versus the sum of the cost of component monotherapies varies in different settings and is not always the same (or lower) than the sum of component monotherapies. The Committee stressed that the cost of FDCs should not be significantly higher than the sum of the cost of their component monotherapies. In particular, in resource-constrained settings where access is limited, the opportunity costs associated with treating patients with FDCs must be considered.
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12.5 Antithrombotic medicines

12.5.2 Thrombolytic medicines

Alteplase - addition – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alteplase</th>
<th>ATC Code: B01AD02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of alteplase on the complementary list of the EML as a thrombolytic agent for use in patients diagnosed with acute ischaemic stroke (AIS) with a potentially handicapping neurological deficit at the time of thrombolysis, and treatment within 4.5 hours after onset of stroke symptoms (or after last proof of good health if unknown onset of symptoms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants:</td>
<td>Patrik Michel, Michael Brainin on behalf of the World Stroke Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the addition of alteplase to the EML, stating that it is a useful and effective drug and lowers morbidity and mortality associated with stroke when utilized correctly, and that cost-effectiveness had been demonstrated in various settings. The technical unit also noted that use of alteplase requires organized pre-and in-hospital care pathways in stroke-ready facilities, clinical training in diagnosing stroke, capacity to perform and interpret acute neuroimaging, continuous surveillance for at least 24 hours, and basic stroke management skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>12.5.2 Thrombolytic medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</td>
<td>Powder for injection: 10 mg, 20 mg, 50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background:</td>
<td>Alteplase had not been previously considered for inclusion on the EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health relevance:</td>
<td>Globally, stroke is the second leading cause of death and disability, with the bulk of the burden (almost 80%) residing in low to middle-income countries (LMIC) (1, 2). In 2016, there were almost 14 million new cases of stroke, 5.5 million deaths associated with stroke and about 81 million stroke survivors. 30% of strokes are fatal in the first year and a further 70% of survivors are left with some level of disability. Although stroke incidence, mortality and disability burden rates have declined since 1990, in 2016 the absolute number of people who died from stroke, remained disabled from stroke, were affected by stroke (as measured by incidence of new strokes), or survived stroke had almost doubled largely due to aging of the population and population growth (2). In well a well-developed stroke system, about 25% of all AIS patients who arrive to a stroke centre within 24 hours of last proof of usual health are eligible for intravenous thrombolysis (3). In Europe the current true rate is only 7.3% for all AIS patients (4), in the USA this number is probably similar (5). Very few patients in LMICs receive intravenous thrombolysis (6, 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of evidence: benefits</td>
<td>A 2014 Cochrane systematic review of 27 trials involving 10,187 participants assessed the effectiveness and safety of thrombolytic therapy for treatment of acute ischaemic stroke (8). Ten trials in the review assessed alteplase in 6,886 participants. Compared to control, intravenous alteplase administered within six hours, was associated with a significant reduction in death or dependence (odds ratio (OR) 0.84 (95% CI 0.77 to 0.93, P = 0.0006)), corresponding to death or dependence in 40 fewer participants per 1000 treated (95% CI 20 fewer to 65 fewer). When a random-effects model analysis was performed due to the significant heterogeneity of treatment effect among the trials, the OR was 0.80 (95% CI 0.66 to 0.97, P = 0.03). For participants receiving alteplase within three hours (6 trials, 1,779 participants), there was a significant reduction in death or dependence compared to control (59.3% versus 68.3%, OR 0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was no non-significant reduction of death in the long-term follow-up of patients treated within three hours with an OR of 0.91 (95% CI 0.73 to 1.13, P = 0.39), with no statistically significant heterogeneity (P = 0.22) and 14 fewer per 1000 deaths (95% CI 26 fewer to 55 fewer).

A meta-analysis of individual patient data from 6,756 patients in nine randomised trials comparing alteplase with placebo or open control (9) found alteplase to be associated with increased odds of a good stroke outcome at 3-6 months (defined as a modified Rankin Score of 0 or 1) when administered within 4.5 hours of stroke onset, with earlier treatment (within 3 hours) associated with greater proportional benefit, irrespective of patient age or stroke severity.

### Summary of evidence: harms

The application presented a summary of the key safety outcomes reported in the 2014 Cochrane systematic review (8).

Alteplase was associated with a greater proportion of patients experiencing early death (all causes, within seven to 10 days) compared to control (OR 1.44 (95% CI 1.18 to 1.76, P = 0.0003; 5535 participants) corresponding to 25 more deaths per 1000 participants treated in absolute terms (95% CI 11 more to 40 more).

Alteplase was associated with a significant increase in the rate of fatal intracranial haemorrhage within seven to 10 days compared to control (OR 4.18, 95% CI 2.99 to 5.84, P < 0.0001; 6683 participants) corresponding to 30 additional ICH per 1000 treated participants in absolute terms (95% CI 20 to 40).

Early death due to causes other than fatal ICH occurred in 5.2% of alteplase treated patients compared with 5.7% of the control group (OR 0.93, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.18, P = 0.54, 5303 participants).

There was no significant effect observed on deaths from all causes during follow-up (3-6 months) between alteplase and control (OR 1.05, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.20; 7012 participants), corresponding to 7 more deaths per 1000 participants treated (95% CI 2 fewer to 25 more). Oroolingual angioedema associated with alteplase administration has been reported in case series studies (10, 11).

### WHO Guidelines:

WHO does not have approved guidelines for the management of acute ischaemic stroke. “Treatment of acute ischaemic stroke with intravenous thrombolytic therapy” was included as a policy option and cost-effective intervention in the draft updated Appendix 3 of the Global Action Plan for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases 2013-2020, to assist Member States in implementing actions to achieve targets for prevention and control of NCDs (12).

Use of IV alteplase within 4.5 hours of stroke onset is recommended in multiple national and international guidelines (13-18).

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The application reports the price for a single IV dose of 63 mg alteplase for a 70 kg patient to range from US$ 260 (Brazil, public hospital) to US$ 6,400 (average billing amount in USA) (19, 20).

Implementing and administering alteplase within the recommended 4.5 hours requires some initial investments in prehospital and intrahospital services. Many of these investments (such as stroke unit surveillance and care) will benefit stroke patients anyway, independently of thrombolysis being offered or not. These additional costs have to be balanced by generally shorter hospital stays, lesser rehabilitation needs, and lesser long-term care (including nursing homes and home care), given the reduction of handicap from thrombolysis (21).

The UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) concluded the cost for all treatment windows up to 4.5 hours were below accepted willingness to pay thresholds for alteplase (19). In another UK-based model, the authors concluded that any strategy that increases thrombolysis rates will result in cost savings and improved patient quality of life (22). Studies from China and Brazil have also found alteplase treatment to be a cost-effective intervention (23, 24).
A review of 16 studies from the US, UK, Australia, China, Canada, New Zealand Denmark and Spain of the cost-effectiveness of IV alteplase thrombolysis found that alteplase was a dominant or cost-effective strategy compared with traditional treatment in all but one of the studies (25).

Availability: 
Alteplase has marketing approval in 104 countries globally. The 10 mg and 20 mg strengths may not available in all jurisdictions.

Other considerations: 
The Committee noted the use in practice of alteplase in acute myocardial infarction and considered that it is likely that alteplase would be used for this indication in some settings. The committee noted that the EML currently includes streptokinase for MI and would welcome a future application reviewing the evidence for streptokinase and alteplase for this indication.

Committee Recommendations: 
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of alteplase to the complementary list of the EML as a thrombolytic agent for use in patients diagnosed with acute ischaemic stroke on the basis of the evidence presented of improved patient outcomes in terms of reduced death or dependence when alteplase is administered within 4.5 hours of the onset of stroke symptoms.

The Expert Committee acknowledged the significant global burden of stroke in terms of death and disability, and particularly in low- and middle-income countries. The Committee noted that optimal use of alteplase would require timely and highly organized care pathways, in facilities that are equipped and capable of managing stroke patients.

References:
12. Preparation for the third High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases, to be held in 2018 - Report by the Director-General. WHA70/A70.27-en.pdf.
### Section 17: GASTROINTESTINAL MEDICINES

#### 17.2 Antiemetic medicines

**Aprepitant – addition – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aprepitant</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> A04AD12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of aprepitant on the EML and EMLc as an antiemetic medicine for the supportive care of cancer patients receiving moderately to highly emetogenic chemotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicants:</strong></td>
<td>European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the inclusion of aprepitant on the Model Lists as supportive care for chemotherapy-induced nausea in patients receiving moderately to highly emetogenic antineoplastic chemotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>17.2 Antiemetic medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</strong></td>
<td>Capsule: 40 mg, 80 mg, 125 mg, 165 mg Powder for oral suspension: 125 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Aprepitant has not previously been considered for inclusion on the Model Lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting (CINV) is one of the most represented and significant side effects related to chemotherapy. According to European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO) and to the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer (MASCC), vomiting and, especially, nausea, continue to be two of the most distressing side-effects of cancer chemotherapy (1). Inadequately controlled CINV and radiation-induced nausea and vomiting (RINV) can precipitate a number of medical complications, resulting in life threatening conditions, including severe dehydration and electrolyte imbalance with ECG changes or myocardial dysfunctions and Mallory-Weiss tears of the esophagus; these complications can impact on the burden of care, increasing the efforts and costs of hospitalization and reducing the overall quality of life for patients, including a poorer outcome (2). The distress resulting from these symptoms may potentially lead to the patient’s refusal to continue with the most effective antitumor therapy (3). According to a temporal criterion, the chemotherapy associated emetic symptoms are categorized as acute or delayed: acute CINV occurs in the first 24 hours after chemotherapy, and delayed CINV at more than 24 hours. Aprepitant is indicated for prevention of both acute and delayed CINV. A four-level classification of chemotherapy agents has been accepted by registration authorities and groups producing recommendations on antiemetics, according to the emetogenic potential: high (emetogenic risk &gt; 90%), moderate (30%–90%), low (10%–30%), and minimal (&lt;10%). To provide an example, anthracycline-taxane containing regimens and cisplatin&gt; 50 mg/m2 are considered highly emetogenic; carboplatin, bendamustine and doxorubicin monotherapy are classified as moderately emetogenic; docetaxel monotherapy, gemcitabine, 5-FU and bortezomib are considered low emetogenic medicines (4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)</th>
<th>The application presented the findings of multiple clinical trials of aprepitant, using the MASCC / ESMO 2016 consensus guidelines for the prevention of chemotherapy and radiotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting (1) as a reference source. For the prevention of highly emetogenic chemotherapy CINV, a three-drug regimen including single doses of an anti-5HT3, dexamethasone and anti-NK1 given before chemotherapy is recommended [MASCC level of confidence: high; MASCC level of consensus: high; ESMO level of evidence I; ESMO grade of recommendation: A] in the MASCC/ESMO Guidelines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults:</td>
<td>In a multi-centre, double-blind placebo controlled trial in 421 Chinese cancer patients (5), addition of aprepitant to standard therapy with granisetron and dexamethasone resulted in an increased absolute rate of patients achieving a complete response (no emesis and no use of rescue therapy) during the overall phase (+12.9%, P=0.007). The benefit was mainly attributable to better control of delayed CINV with an increase of 14.6% of patients in absolute terms. Complete response rates for treatment groups were almost identical for acute CINV. In a multicentre, double-blind placebo controlled trial in 324 Japanese cancer patients (6), addition of aprepitant to therapy with a 5HT3 receptor antagonist and dexamethasone prior to chemotherapy resulted in a higher percentage of patients with “no vomiting” in the overall phase (78.2 vs. 54.8%; p&lt;0.0001), delayed phase (80.1 vs. 56.9; p&lt;0.0001), and acute phase 96.0% vs. 91.1%, respectively; p=0.0495). The percentage of patients with “no significant nausea” was higher in the aprepitant group than in the placebo group in the overall phase (85.4 vs 74.7; p=0.0143) and in the delayed phase (85.4 vs 76.0 %; p=0.0274), but there was no difference between groups in the acute phase. Similar results have been observed in patients receiving moderately to highly emetogenic chemotherapy in other disease-oriented clinical trials using moderately to highly emetogenic regimens, including treatments for lung cancer and germ-cell tumours trials in Asian and non-Asian populations (7-12). In a clinical trial of 264 patients preparing to undergo a stem cell transplant, patients were randomized to receive oral aprepitant or placebo in combination with oral ondansetron and dexamethasone during and for 3 days after the completion of the preparative high-dose cyclophosphamide regimens before the transplant (13). Patients who received aprepitant had higher complete response rates (81.9% versus 65.8%; p&lt;0.001) compared to the standard treatment. 48.9% of patients in the aprepitant arm were able to maintain an intake of food &gt;50% of normal versus only 14.6% of patients in the placebo arm, supporting the value of aprepitant in the overall supportive care of cancer patients. Children: In a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, chemotherapy naïve children aged 5 to 18 years receiving highly emetogenic chemotherapy were randomized to intravenous ondansetron (0.15 mg/kg) and dexamethasone (0.15 mg/kg) prior to chemotherapy followed by oral ondansetron and dexamethasone and either oral aprepitant (15-40 kg = days 1-3, 80 mg; 41-65 kg = day 1, 125 mg and days 2-3, 80 mg) 1 hour before chemotherapy or placebo (n=96) (14). The patients enrolled presented with both hematological and solid tumors: 25% received the treatment for Hodgkin lymphoma and around three quart for sarcoma (osteosarcoma, Ewing sarcoma, rhabdomyosarcoma). Overall, 84% of patients in the placebo arm had moderate to severe vomiting compared to 56% in the aprepitant arm (p = 0.004). There was less moderate and severe vomiting reported in the group receiving aprepitant compared to the placebo group (38 vs. 72 %, p = 0.001) in the acute phase and a non-significant difference between the two groups in the delayed phase (42 vs. 56 %, p = 0.18). Complete response was higher in aprepitant arm, registered in the acute phase for 48 % of patients compared to 12 % in placebo arm (p=0.001). The use of aprepitant resulted in better food intake (normal in 48% and 28% of the children receiving aprepitant versus placebo, p=0.04) and fluid intake (normal in 62% and 40%, p=0.03). In another phase 3 trial, aprepitant for CINV prevention was assessed in patients aged 6 months to 17 years scheduled to receive either moderately or highly emetogenic chemotherapy (15). 307 patients were randomized to receive aprepitant plus ondansetron on day 1, followed by aprepitant on days 2 and 3, or placebo plus ondansetron on day 1 followed by placebo on days 2 and 3; dexamethasone was incorporated in nearly one third of the patients, with no difference between the study and control group. Patients presented with hematological and solid tumors. 77/152 (51%) patients in the aprepitant group and 39/150 (26%) in the control group achieved a complete response in the delayed phase (p&lt;0.0001), reporting an increase of 25% in absolute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recognized the importance of adequate control of nausea and vomiting in patients undergoing cancer chemotherapy, in terms quality of life and clinical outcomes of treatment.

The Expert Committee recommended the addition of aprepitant to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc as an antiemetic medicine for the supportive care of cancer patients receiving chemotherapy.

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) The safety of aprepitant has been evaluated in the clinical trials. Hu et al (5) reported similar occurrences of drug-related adverse events (AEs) in 11.7 % (24/205) of patients in the aprepitant group and 13.3 % (28/210) of patients in the placebo-controlled therapy group. One or more AEs were reported in 40.0 % (8/205) of patients in the aprepitant group and in 44.3 % (93/210) of patients in the standard therapy group, representing similar occurrences. AEs included fatigue (5.9% and 1.9% in the aprepitant and placebo-controlled group, respectively), dizziness (2.4% and 0%), anaemia (2% and 0%), insomnia (2% and 5.7%), upper abdominal pain (0% and 2.9%), and noncardiac chest pain (0% and 1%). Overall, no severe drug-related serious AEs or laboratory anomalies were reported during cycle 1, and there were no discontinuations due to medication-related AEs.

In the trial of patients preparing for stem-cell transplantation (13), incorporation of aprepitant had no effect on the engraftment and the survival, supporting the oncological safety in terms of the cancer outcome and excluding significant interference with the antineoplastic agents used. Pharmacokinetic studies have shown that drug-drug interactions with aprepitant may exist, but are not considered clinically meaningful (17).

In children, the safety profile of aprepitant appears consistent with the reports in adult populations (15).

Additional evidence: (not in the application) N/A

WHO Guidelines: None available.

Costs / cost-effectiveness: The application presented two studies that evaluated the cost-effectiveness of aprepitant regimens for CINV. In a decision–analytic model study in Germany, an aprepitant regimen (aprepitant/ondansetron/dexamethasone) was compared with a control (ondansetron/dexamethasone) regimen, addressing clinical results and resource utilization, (18). Incremental drug cost per patient and cycle for antiemetic prophylaxis was €73.38. Expected health-care utilization cost was €154.99 in the aprepitant group and €178.77 in the control group. Hence, it was estimated that 42% of the aprepitant drug cost was offset by lower resource use in the aprepitant group. Cost offsets arose mainly from lower doses of dexamethasone (€12.54), reduced use of rescue medication (€7.38), and avoided hospitalizations (€15.86). For the cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), the range was €26,135–31,646 per QALY gained with aprepitant and was judged cost-effective.

The same conclusion was reached in a CEA performed in UK, considering patients receiving chemotherapy for breast cancer (19). An average of £37.11 (78%) of the cost of aprepitant was offset by the reduction in health care resource utilization costs; use of the aprepitant was associated with an additional cost of £28 for each emesis-free day gained and £22 for each CINV-free day gained. The ICER with aprepitant, was £10,847/QALY.

Availability: Aprepitant is available globally. Generic brands are available.

Other considerations: Aprepitant should be used in combination with dexamethasone and a 5HT3 receptor antagonist.
moderately to highly emetogenic chemotherapy on the basis of a favourable benefit to risk profile.

The Committee noted that aprepitant, in combination with dexamethasone and a 5HT3 receptor antagonist (eg ondansetron), is more effective than standard antiemetic therapy at reducing both acute and delayed onset nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy.
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**Ondansetron – square box – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ondansetron</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATC Code:</strong> A04AA01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the addition of a square box to the listing of ondansetron on the EML and EMLc, to correct an omission from the original recommendation to list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicants:</strong></td>
<td>EML Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence &amp; Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the addition of a square box to the listings of ondansetron as representative of the pharmacological class of 5-HT3 receptor antagonists, stating that this class of medicines are essential medicines for the optimal management of common treatment-related adverse events associated with emetogenic chemotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>2.3 Medicines for other common symptoms in palliative care 17.2 Antiemetic medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</strong></td>
<td>Injection: 2 mg base/mL in 2- mL ampoule (as hydrochloride)  Oral liquid : 4 mg base/5 mL  Solid oral dosage form: Eq 4 mg base; Eq 8 mg base; Eq 24 mg base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Square box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Ondansetron was first included on the EML and EMLc following a review of antiemetic medicines considered by the 2009 Expert Committee (1). Listing was recommended with a square box symbol, designating ondansetron as representative of the pharmacological class of 5-HT3 receptor antagonists. However, the square box was inadvertently omitted when the lists were published.  Alternative 5-HT3 receptor antagonists within the pharmacological class are shown below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATC Code</strong></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04AA01</td>
<td>Ondansetron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04AA02</td>
<td>Granisetron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04AA03</td>
<td>Tropisetron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04AA04</td>
<td>Dolasetron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04AA05</td>
<td>Palonosetron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional evidence:</strong></td>
<td>A 2016 systematic review of 299 studies (58,412 patients) identified during the application review process investigated the comparative safety and effectiveness of 5-HT3 receptor antagonists in patients undergoing chemotherapy. The review concluded that most 5-HT3 receptor antagonists used alone, or in combination with corticosteroids, were effective at decreasing the occurrence of nausea and/or vomiting, and were similarly safe when compared to each other (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Guidelines:</strong></td>
<td>None available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</strong></td>
<td>The square box indicating therapeutic equivalence between alternative 5-HT3 receptor antagonists will allow tendering among available options or competition in pooled procurement mechanisms at country/local level or benchmarking for lowering prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability:</strong></td>
<td>The 5-HT3 receptor antagonists have wide market availability and are available in generic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other considerations:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>The Expert Committee recommended the addition of a square box to the listing of ondansetron on the EML and EMLc, noting that the original recommendation to list ondansetron in 2009 had included a square box.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 17.5 Medicines used in diarrhoea

**ORS and zinc (co-packaged) – new formulation – EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral rehydration salts and zinc sulfate</th>
<th>ATC Codes: A07CA, A12CB01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested inclusion of co-packaged oral rehydration salts (ORS) and zinc sulfate tablets on the core list of the EMLc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicants:</strong></td>
<td>Diarrhea Innovations Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>17.5 Medicines used in diarrhoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Powder for dilution (refer section 17.5.1) – solid oral dosage form (refer section 17.5.2) *co-packaged for the treatment of acute diarrhoea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Oral rehydration salts and zinc sulfate 20 mg solid oral dosage form are currently both listed individually on the EML and EMLc for use in the treatment of diarrhoea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Diarrhea is present globally, in all regions and among all populations. However, an inequitable proportion of diarrhoea morbidity and mortality occurs in low-income countries, which in turn have fewer resources and less robust infrastructure to manage the burden (1). The Global Burden of Disease Study (GBD) estimated diarrhoea as the eighth leading cause of death, responsible for well more than 1.6 million deaths and the fifth leading cause of death among children younger than 5 years (446,000 deaths). Approximately 90% (89.37%) of diarrheal deaths occurred in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong></td>
<td>The benefits associated with ORS and zinc have been previously considered and accepted at the time of the original listings. The current application identified a number of studies (3-8) that provide supporting evidence for the benefits of co-packaged ORS and zinc, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased uptake and coverage of ORS and zinc (as a combination therapy, and as individual components), reducing the risk of severe health consequences of chronic diarrhoea and stunting, acute diarrhoea, and zinc deficiency among children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved adherence to the combined therapy of ORS and zinc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved adherence to/preparation of individual components (e.g., correct concentration of prepared ORS and completion of a full course of zinc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved dispensing practices by health care workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced hospitalizations due to diarrhoea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reductions in inappropriate antibiotic prescription and use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced satisfaction levels by caregivers with ORS and zinc relative to status quo products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced opportunities for developing private-sector models and leveraging value chains to improve availability and access closer to the household level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong></td>
<td>Overall, ORS is safe, with few reports of adverse events. Additional adverse events that occur with ORS administration include edematous (puffy) eyelids, which are a sign of over hydration, and vomiting. Zinc supplementation has been utilized extensively with demonstrated safety in the treatment of diarrhoea. To date, there have been no reports of severe adverse reactions from any form of zinc treatment for diarrhoea, alone or in combination with ORS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional evidence:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WHO Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Low-osmolarity ORS (containing 75 mEq/L of sodium and 75 mmol/L of glucose) | After each loose motion:  
- In a child younger than 2 years of age, provide 50 mL to 100 mL of ORS solution.  
- In a child 2 to 10 years of age, provide 100 mL to 200 mL of ORS solution.  
- In a child older than 10 years of age, provide ORS ad libitum (i.e., to drink freely). |
| Zinc sulfate from the start of the diarrhea:                                |  
- In a child younger than 6 months, provide one-half of a 20 mg tablet (i.e., 10 mg) once a day for 10 to 14 days.  
- In a child older than 6 months, provide one whole 20 mg tablet once a day for 10 to 14 days. |

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The application presented the comparative costs of co-packaged and individually packaged ORS and zinc from five African countries. In each case, the co-packaged product was less expensive than the combined cost of the individual products.

### Availability:

Co-packaged ORS and zinc is available from multiple suppliers.

### Other considerations:

The Committee noted the multiple letters of support received in relation to this application.

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of co-packaged oral rehydration salts (ORS) and zinc sulfate tablets on the core list of the EMLc. The Committee considered that since these products are recommended to be administered together in the management of diarrhoea, the availability of the co-packaged product will be practical and support better adherence to treatment. Countries may also realize cost savings with the co-packaged product.  

### References:

### Section 18: MEDICINES FOR ENDOCRINE DISORDERS

#### 18.5 Insulin and other medicines used for diabetes

Long-acting insulin analogues (including biosimilars) – addition – EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-acting insulin analogues (including biosimilars)</th>
<th>ATC Code: A10AE05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insulin detemir</strong></td>
<td>ATC Code: A10AE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insulin glargine</strong></td>
<td>ATC Code: A10AE06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:** The application proposed the inclusion of long-acting insulin analogues on the core list of the EML for treatment of patients with type 1 diabetes.

**Applicant:** Andrea C. Tricco, Huda M. Ashoor, Jasmin Antony, Zachary Bouck, Myanca Rodrigues, Ba’ Pham, Paul A. Khan, Vera Nincic, Nazia Darvesh, Fatemeh Yazdi, Marco Ghassemi, John D. Ivory, Wanruudee Isaranuwatchai, Areti Angeliki Veroniki, Catherine H. Yu, and Sharon E. Straus, Knowledge Translation Program, St Michael’s Hospital, Toronto, Canada.

**WHO Technical Department:** Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support the application to add long-acting insulin analogues (including biosimilars) to the EML, nor was the application developed in consultation with the technical department.

**EML / EMLc**

- **Section:** Core

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**

- Insulin detemir: injection 100 units/mL
- Insulin glargine: injection 100 units/mL
- Insulin degludec: injection 100 units/mL

**Core / Complementary:** Core

**Individual / Square box listing:** Square box

**Background:** (if relevant, e.g. resubmission, previous EC consideration)

Human insulin has been included on the EML since the first list in 1977 (1). In 1985, the WHO Expert Committee on the Selection and Use of Essential Medicines approved the inclusion of isophane neutral protamine Hagedorn (NPH) insulin (2). Since 1996, different insulin analogues, altered form of human insulins, have been introduced on markets worldwide. Over the last years additional comparative evidence on biosimilars and reference medications in terms of efficacy and safety became available. In 2017, at the 21st meeting of the Expert Committee of the WHO EML, an for the inclusion of long-acting analogues to the EML was rejected due to the limited magnitude of the benefits of analogues over human insulin in terms of reduced glycated haemoglobin and reduced hypoglycaemia as compared to the large difference in price between analogues and human insulin (3). Since that time, additional evidence has become available encompassing both effectiveness and increasing affordability of analogues.

**Public health relevance:** (burden of disease)

Diabetes mellitus has an increasing worldwide prevalence. If current trends continue, it is estimated that 642 adults will be living with diabetes by 2040 (4). The incidence of type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) accounts for a small proportion of all diabetes (range: 5-10%) (5). All people living with type 1 diabetes have an absolute need for insulin for survival. Insulin is also required by a subset of patients with type 2 diabetes (6). Lack of access to affordable insulin is a problem globally and contributes to the complications of untreated or sub-optimally treated diabetes and premature deaths (7).
### Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

The application presented the findings of a network meta-analysis to evaluate the comparative effectiveness and safety of long- or intermediate-acting insulin versus biosimilar insulins in patients with T1DM, updating the results of a previous systematic review. The review compared basal regimens and categorizes treatments as per class of basal insulin (i.e., intermediate acting, long-acting and ultra-long-acting), and specific type of basal insulin, including insulin origin and insulin frequency. The analyses were adjusted for bolus regimen. Sixty-eight primary studies (8-75) (and 12 companion reports) involving 15,150 patients with average age ranging from 23 to 54 years were included. Sixty-two (91%) studies were RCTs and the majority had an unclear/high risk of bias on random sequence generation, allocation concealment, selective reporting, and “other” bias (e.g., funding bias). Details of the included studies are available in Appendix File 1 of the application at: https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/s18.5_insulin-analogues.pdf?ua=1.

Primary efficacy outcomes of the network meta-analysis were A1c and fasting plasma glucose. Secondary efficacy outcomes were mortality, any (total) vascular complication, microvascular complications, macrovascular complications and quality of life.

#### A1c

A basal insulin class NMA was conducted including 26 RCTs and 9,241 patients and 3 treatment nodes (long-acting, intermediate-acting, and ultra-long-acting biosimilar). Long-acting insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (mean difference MD -0.14, 95% confidence interval CI: -0.21 to -0.07).

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted on the A1c outcome including 34 RCTs and 11,894 patients and 9 treatment nodes. Across the 36 treatment comparisons, the following 11 showed statistically significant results:

- Intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered four times a day was **inferior** to intermediate-acting (animal and human) insulin administered twice a day (mean difference MD 0.31, 95% confidence interval CI: 0.05 to 0.57)
- Intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid was **inferior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD 0.43, 95% CI: 0.23 to 0.63)
- Intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid was **inferior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered once daily (od) (MD 0.32, 95% CI: 0.10 to 0.53)
- Long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid (MD -0.46, 95% CI -0.67 to -0.24)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid (MD -0.49, 95% CI -0.70 to -0.29)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered od (MD -0.18, 95% CI -0.30 to -0.06)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (animal and human) insulin administered bid (MD -0.19, 95% CI -0.37 to -0.01)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (animal) insulin administered bid (MD -1.27, 95% CI -2.54 to -0.01)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid (MD -0.50, 95% CI -0.69 to -0.31)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered od (MD -0.18, 95% CI -0.29 to -0.08)
- Ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was **superior** to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid (MD -0.44, 95% CI -0.64 to -0.23)

A sensitivity analysis to examine the impact of imputing missing standard deviations on the results resulted in the exclusion of seven trials. The pairwise treatment comparisons above were no longer statistically significant when the seven trials were excluded. When meta-regression analyses were conducted for follow-up duration, A1c level (mild: <8%, severe: ≥8%); proportion of women; duration of diabetes, and risk of bias associated with random sequence generation and allocation concealment; none of the results remained statistically significant. Statistically significant results were shown for meta-regression analyses on:
Fasting plasma glucose
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted on the fasting plasma glucose outcome including 21 RCTs, 7,685 patients, and 3 treatment nodes. Long-acting insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (MD -1.03, 95% CI: -1.33 to -0.73) and ultra-long-acting insulin was superior to intermediate-acting insulin (MD -1.45, 95% CI: -2.12 to -0.79).

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted on the fasting plasma glucose outcome including 28 RCTs, 9,773 patients, and 8 treatment nodes. Across the 28 treatment comparisons, the following nine showed statistically significant results:

- Long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD -1.07, 95% CI: -1.98 to -0.15)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD 0.82, 95% CI: -1.21 to 0.43)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD 0.12, 95% CI: -1.66 to 0.85)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD -1.15, 95% CI: -1.82 to -0.49)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was superior to long-acting (human) bid (MD 0.43, 95% CI: -0.82 to 0.05)
- Ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered qid (MD -1.20, 95% CI: -2.31 to -0.09)
- Ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) bid (MD 0.55, 95% CI: -2.24 to 0.87)
- Ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered od (MD -1.45, 95% CI: -2.34 to -0.56)
- Ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was superior to long-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD 0.73, 95% CI: -1.38 to -0.08).

Mortality
A NMA was not possible for all-cause mortality for basal insulin classes. Two pairwise meta-analyses were possible for long-acting versus intermediate-acting insulin (4 RCTs, 1682 patients), as well as ultra-long-acting versus long-acting insulin (2 RCTs, 1540 patients). None of the results were statistically significant.

A NMA was not possible for all-cause mortality for specific types of insulin. Three pairwise meta-analyses were possible comparing long-acting (human) insulin administered bid versus intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (2 RCTs, 653 patients), long-acting (human) insulin administered od versus long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od (2 RCTs, 1093 patients) and long-acting (human) insulin administered od versus ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od (2 RCTs, 1540 patients). None of the results were statistically significant.

Any (total) vascular complication
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted on any vascular complication, including 11 RCTs and 4,709 patients. Across the 3 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.
A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted on any vascular complication including 13 RCTs and 5,589 patients. Across the 10 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

**Microvascular complications**
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted to compare long-acting, intermediate-acting and ultra-long acting insulins on microvascular complications including 8 RCTs and 3,131 patients. The transitivity assumption was upheld but inconsistency could not be assessed since there were no closed loops in the network meta-analysis diagram. Across the 3 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted on microvascular complications including 10 RCTs and 4,011 patients. Across the 10 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

**Macrovacular complications**
For basal insulin classes, a NMA was not possible for macrovascular complications. Two pairwise meta-analyses were possible: long-acting insulin versus intermediate-acting insulin (3 RCTs, 998 patients) and ultra-long-acting biosimilar insulin versus long-acting insulin (3 RCTs, 2,098 patients). The results of pairwise treatment comparisons were not statistically significant.

For specific types of insulin, a NMA was not possible for macrovascular complications. Two pairwise meta-analyses were possible for long-acting (human) insulin administered bid versus intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (4 RCTs, 1258 patients) and long-acting (human) insulin administered od versus ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) od (2 RCTs, 1540 patients). The results were not statistically significant.

**Quality of life**
A NMA or pairwise meta-analyses were not possible for health-related quality of life for basal insulin classes or specific types of insulin. One study including 517 patients reported total quality of life and long-acting (human) insulin administered od was not statistically significant compared with intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid. The same study reported general quality of life and long-acting (human) insulin administered od was not statistically significant compared with intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid. With respect to basal insulin classes, similar results were observed when long-acting insulin was compared to intermediate-acting insulin.

---

**Summary of evidence: harms**
(from the application)

**Weight change**
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted including 16 RCTs, 6,822 patients, and 3 treatment nodes. Long-acting insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (MD -0.70, 95% CI: -1.07 to -0.33).

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted including 20 RCTs, 8,335 patients, and 7 treatment nodes. Across the 21 treatment comparisons, the following four showed statistically significant results:

- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (MD -0.85, 95% CI: -1.24 to -0.46)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was superior to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered od (MD -1.18, 95% CI: -2.13 to -0.24)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was superior to long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered bid (MD -0.96, 95% CI: -1.91 to -0.01)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was superior to ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od (MD -0.69, 95% CI: -1.32 to -0.06).

**All-cause hypoglycaemia** (defined differently across RCTs)
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted including 17 RCTs and 5,949 patients. Across the 3 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted including 22 RCTs and 6,917 patients. Across the 21 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

**Major or serious hypoglycaemia** (defined differently across RCTs)
A basal insulin class NMA was conducted including 19 RCTs, 7324 patients, and 3 treatment nodes. Long-acting insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (odds ratio OR 0.63, 95% CI: 0.51 to 0.76).

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted including 25 RCTs and 9,300 patients. Across the 21 treatment comparisons, the following four showed statistically significant results:
### WHO Guidelines:

**Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WHO Guidelines:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od was <em>superior</em> to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (odds ratio OR 0.48, 95% CI: 0.24 to 0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was <em>superior</em> to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (OR 0.69, 95% CI: 0.54 to 0.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was <em>superior</em> to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (OR 0.53, 95% CI: 0.39 to 0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-acting (human) insulin administered od was <em>superior</em> to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered od (OR 0.60, 95% CI: 0.42 to 0.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor or mild hypoglycemia

For basal insulin classes, a NMA was not possible. One pairwise meta-analysis was possible for long-acting versus intermediate-acting insulin (8 RCTs, 2,949 patients) and the results were not statistically significant.

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted including 11 RCTs and 3,926 patients. Across the 15 treatment comparisons, none were statistically significant.

**Nocturnal hypoglycemia** (defined differently across RCTs)

A basal insulin class NMA was conducted including 16 RCTs, 6,669 patients, and 3 treatment nodes. Long-acting insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (OR 0.71, 95% CI: 0.57 to 0.89) and ultra-long-acting biosimilar insulin was statistically superior to intermediate-acting insulin (OR 0.60, 95% CI: 0.42 to 0.86).

A specific type of insulin NMA was conducted including 19 RCTs and 7,564 patients. Across the 15 treatment comparisons, the following two showed statistically significant results:

- Intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid was *inferior* to ultra-long-acting (biosimilar) insulin administered od (OR 1.58, 95% CI: 1.11 to 2.25)
- Long-acting (human) insulin administered bid was *superior* to intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid (OR 0.59, 95% CI: 0.44 to 0.79)

### Incident cancers

For basal insulin classes, a NMA was not possible. One pairwise meta-analysis was possible for long-acting versus intermediate-acting insulin (3 RCTs, 1,651 patients) and the results were not statistically significant.

For specific types of insulin, a NMA was not possible. One pairwise meta-analysis was possible (2 RCTs and 1204 patients), which compared long-acting (human) insulin administered od versus intermediate-acting (human) insulin administered bid. The results were not statistically significant.

### Any (total) adverse events, serious adverse events, and dropouts due to adverse events

For basal insulin classes, NMAs were conducted on any adverse events including 16 RCTs and 5,367 patients, on serious adverse events including 20 RCTs and 6,840 patients, and on withdrawals due to adverse events including 14 RCTs and 5,440 patients. Across the 3 treatment comparisons in each NMA, none were statistically significant.

For specific types of insulin, NMAs were conducted on any adverse events including 22 RCTs and 6,830 patients, on serious adverse events including 26 RCTs and 8,989 patients, and on withdrawals due to adverse events including 21 RCTs and 7,795 patients. Across the 15 treatment comparisons in each NMA, none were statistically significant.

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

The current application does not include data on long-acting insulin analogue use in children. Long-acting insulin analogues have been investigated extensively in the pediatric age-group in low and high resource settings and were found to be safe and effective (76-80). They are approved in children from age 2 years (glargine and detemir) or one year (degludec) (81). Long-acting analogues have also been successfully used in infants and have shown positive effects on glucose control and on hypoglycaemia. However, the evidence is based on case reports (82, 83).

---
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### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

Ten cost effectiveness analyses reported in three studies compared long-acting insulin detemir once a day with intermediate-acting insulin NPH once a day. Two studies found that detemir was less costly and more effective, while the third showed that detemir was more costly but also more effective than NPH. Two cost effectiveness analyses reported in a single study compared long-acting insulin detemir once a day with long-acting insulin glargine once a day. This study demonstrated that detemir is more cost-effective than glargine. Finally, a single cost effectiveness analysis in a single study compared ultra-long-acting biosimilar insulin degludec once a day with long-acting insulin glargine insulin once a day. Degludec was shown to be the more cost-effective treatment in comparison to glargine.

### Availability:

Three pharmaceutical companies are solely responsible for the supply of almost all insulin on markets worldwide. Despite being available for almost 100 years, achieving reliable, equitable and affordable access to insulin, human or analogue, remains a public health challenge in many countries. The Committee recognized the need for a wider understanding of the complexities of access to insulin and the current insulin market and recommended WHO prioritize the coordination of a series of actions to address the issues of insulin access and affordability.

### Other considerations:

The review found long-acting insulin analogues to be superior to intermediate acting insulin with regard to major or serious hypoglycaemia, which may represent an advantage particularly in settings where food security is not reliable. Glucagon, used in the management of severe hypoglycaemia, has very limited availability in many low-resource settings. Thus, the lower incidence of major or serious hypoglycemia associated with the use of (ultra) long-acting insulin analogues may offer further advantages in such settings. The Committee acknowledged and noted the comments received in relation to this application from organizations and individuals expressing concern about the potential inclusion of insulin analogues on the Model List and associated consequences.

### Committee Recommendations:

The Expert Committee acknowledged that insulin is a life-saving essential medicine for which a compelling public health need exists. Yet despite being available for almost 100 years, achieving reliable, equitable and affordable access to insulin remains a public health challenge in many countries.

The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of insulin analogues to the EML, reiterating the conclusion of the 2017 Expert Committee, that while long-acting insulin analogues are an effective treatment for type 1 diabetes, the available evidence shows efficacy and safety advantages of analogues compared to human insulin which are insufficiently large to justify the cost differential that continues to exist in most settings. The Expert Committee remained concerned about the ongoing problems of access and affordability of insulin worldwide, despite human insulin not being patented. The Committee noted the long-standing domination of the insulin market by three manufacturers, limiting broader competition and slowing the entry of biosimilars to the market. Recognizing the complexities of these problems and the need for a wider understanding of the insulin market and access to insulin, the Committee recommended WHO coordinate a series of
actions to address the issues of insulin access and affordability. In the absence of other coordinated actions, the Committee considered that the inclusion of insulin analogues for adults on the EML would be inadequate to address the underlying issues of poor access and affordability of insulins more generally. The Committee recommended that a WHO-led approach should be multi-factorial and multi-disciplinary and should include:

- establishment of an independent WHO technical working group on access to insulin;
- consultation with Member States and other stakeholders to identify/clarify barriers to access at country level;
- strategies to address current regulatory barriers for biosimilar insulins, such as the expansion of the WHO Prequalification Programme;
- development of a comprehensive approach to address insulin prices, including mechanisms for pooled procurement;
- identification of evidence and research gaps regarding insulin use and supply, including setting-specific differences in clinical practice and health systems (e.g. food insecurity, displaced populations, emergencies).

The Committee would welcome a report that comprehensively describes the actions that are undertaken by WHO over the next biennium and an application that reviews more in depth current challenges for optimal global access and the role of insulin analogues in children.

References:
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### 18.6 Medicines for hypoglycaemia

**Diazoxide – addition - EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diazoxide</th>
<th>ATC Code: V03AH01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of diazoxide on the EMLc for the management of hypoglycaemia secondary to prolonged hyperinsulinism (HI).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Applicant:** | Global Pediatric Endocrinology and Diabetes (GPED)  
Caring and Living as Neighbours (CLAN)  
Congenital Hyperinsulinism International (CHI) |
| **WHO Technical Department:** | Comments on the applications were received from the WHO department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it supported the addition of diazoxide to the complementary list of the EMLc, stating that congenital hyperinsulinism is a rare but serious condition requiring specialist assessment and care, and that inclusion of diazoxide on the EMLc could facilitate access to this medicine in countries where it is currently unavailable. |
| **EML / EMLc** | EMLc |
| **Section:** | 18.6 Medicines for hypoglycaemia |
| **Dose form(s) & strength(s):** | Oral liquid: 50 mg/mL  
Tablet: 50 mg |
| **Core / Complementary:** | Complementary |
| **Individual / Square box listing:** | Individual |
| **Background:** (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration) | Diazoxide had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EMLc for hypoglycaemia secondary to prolonged HI. |
| **Public health relevance:** (burden of disease) | Congenital hyperinsulinism disorders are a group of disorders characterized by inappropriately persistent secretion of insulin in the context of low blood glucose. This condition can be transient or permanent. It is responsible for permanent neurological damage in the newborn and infant. Congenital hyperinsulinism has an estimated incidence ranging from 1 in 50,000 live births, with considerably higher incidence (up to 1 in 2,500) seen in populations with high rates of consanguineous unions (1). Recurrent episodes of hypoglycaemia produced by HI increase risk for seizures, brain damage and intellectual disability. Management of hypoglycaemia is critical to prevent and reduce the risk of these serious consequences (2).  
Neurological damage is present in up to 50% of children with early onset HI.  
Neurodevelopmental damage is observed in transient, permanent, mild and severe forms of HI, emphasizing the need for rapid diagnosis and prompt management (3-6).  
Diazoxide is indicated for hypoglycaemia that is secondary to transient and prolonged inappropriate insulin secretion and as a first line treatment in patients with permanent HI where a dietary approach alone does not appropriately prevent hypoglycaemia. |
| **Summary of evidence: benefits** (from the application) | No randomized controlled trials involving diazoxide were identified in the application.  
Case series studies from China (7), Germany (5), Turkey (8, 9), Thailand (10) and the United Kingdom (11) have reported the clinical response to diazoxide therapy ranging from 40% to 74% at dose ranges up to 20 mg/kg/day.  
The effect of diazoxide depends on the genetic cause of hyperinsulinism. The majority of cases of neonatal onset persistent congenital HI are caused by defects in the KATP channel genes of the beta-cell of the pancreas, and diazoxide is ineffective in these patients (12). |
### Summary of evidence: harms
(from the application)

The total number of patients who have received diazoxide to date has not been assessed. It is estimated that tens of thousands of patients have received diazoxide since 1964. The application summarized safety findings for diazoxide from cohort studies and case reports (5, 7, 13-24). The medicine is usually well tolerated. Adverse effects include water retention and hyponatremia at onset of therapy, and hypertrichosis (in particular on back and limbs) that is reversible after the treatment is discontinued. Less commonly reported adverse events include rash, thrombocytopenia, neutropenia, heart failure, extrapyramidal adverse events and paradoxical hypoglycaemia. Adverse events may be dose-related and are usually reversible with dose reduction or discontinuation of therapy. Heart failure secondary to water retention has been reported in premature babies and associated with reopening of the ductus arteriosus. Diazoxide is recommended to be used with caution in these patients (13). Pulmonary hypertension has been reported to the US Food and Drug Administration and Health Canada in neonates and infants treated with diazoxide. The application noted that overall, the quality of the safety data is weak as it comes from small series of patients and case reports. No randomized controlled trials are available. Adverse events data was not systematically collected in the cohort studies. The likelihood that adverse events were associated with diazoxide was not assessed in any of the cohort studies or case reports.

### Additional evidence: (not in the application)

A retrospective cohort study of 295 patients investigated the prevalence of adverse events in children with congenital HI treated with diazoxide (25). 2.4% of children developed pulmonary hypertension after initiation of diazoxide (most of them had additional risk factors such as prematurity, structural heart disease and respiratory failure). In addition, 15.6% developed neutropenia, 4.7% thrombocytopenia and 5% hyperuricemia. The authors concluded that screening for neutropenia, thrombocytopenia and hyperuricemia in diazoxide treated patients may be of value given the relatively high prevalence of these events.

### WHO Guidelines:

The 2013 WHO Pocket book of Hospital Care for Children (26) recognizes the importance of hypoglycaemia and the need to treat it as an emergency in order to prevent neurological sequelae. It focuses on the most common causes of hypoglycaemia and does not consider hyperinsulinism or make recommendations regarding diazoxide treatment.

Clinical practice guidelines for congenital hyperinsulinism developed by the The Japanese Society for Pediatric Endocrinology and The Japanese Society of Pediatric Surgeons (12) make the following recommendations for first-line treatment of congenital HI:

- Maintain blood glucose above the target range by continuous glucose infusion.  
  [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level A]
- When blood glucose is successfully maintained by continuous glucose infusion, nutritional support by frequent feeding, continuous feeding, cornstarch (after 9 months), or formula for glycogen storage diseases should be attempted.  
  [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level A]
- When blood glucose is not maintained by continuous glucose infusion, or when it is difficult to withdraw glucose infusion for an extended period, a 5-day trial of oral diazoxide, in 2–3 divided doses, at 5–15 mg/kg/d should be attempted, unless contraindicated by cardiac failure or pulmonary hypertension.  
  [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level A]
- When diazoxide is effective in stabilizing blood glucose levels, intravenous glucose infusion should be withdrawn and transfer to nutritional support (frequent feeding, continuous feeding, or cornstarch formula for glycogen storage diseases) should be attempted.  
  [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level A]
- While on diazoxide, the patient should be on a glucose self-monitoring regimen to detect episodes of hypoglycaemia. Furthermore, CBC, blood chemistry, and physical examination should be performed to detect frequent adverse events, such as hypertrichosis, tachycardia, or edema.  
  [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level B]
• When euglycemia is not achieved by the first line treatment and continuous glucose infusion cannot be withdrawn, the second line treatment should be initiated. [Recommendation level 1, Evidence level A]

Costs / cost-effectiveness: No information was provided in the application regarding the cost and cost-effectiveness of diazoxide. Preliminary results of an international survey of paediatric endocrinologists conducted in 2018 by Congenital Hyperinsulinism International to assess the availability and need for diazoxide reported that 53% of respondents agreed that cost to the patient was an obstacle to accessing diazoxide.

Availability: Global availability, reliable supply and regulatory approval of diazoxide is variable.

Other considerations: N/A

Committee Recommendations: The Expert Committee recommended the addition of diazoxide to the complementary list of the EMLc for the management of hypoglycaemia secondary to prolonged hyperinsulinism (HI), based on evidence of favourable efficacy and tolerability, and taking into account the serious consequences of this condition in children not treated.

The Committee noted the variable global availability and reliability of supply of diazoxide and considered inclusion of diazoxide on the EMLc could help to facilitate more reliable access.

References:


## 18.7 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines

### Medicines for first-line treatment of primary hyperthyroidism – review – EML and EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code</th>
<th>ATC Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methimazole</td>
<td>H03BB01</td>
<td>Propylthiouracil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:
The application requested:
- inclusion on the core list of the EML and EMLc of methimazole (INN thiamazole) with a square box for the first line management of Graves' hyperthyroidism in children and non-pregnant adults;
- transferring the current EML listing for propylthiouracil from the core to the complementary list, and removal of the square box.
- Inclusion of a note with the listing of propylthiouracil specifying use only when alternative first-line treatments are not appropriate or available, to reinforce its place as a second-line therapy.

### Applicant:
Global Pediatric Endocrinology and Diabetes (GPED)

### WHO Technical Department:
Comments on the application were received from the WHO Department of Management of NCDs, Disability, Violence & Injury Prevention. The technical unit advised that it did not support the requests made in the application and considered the evidence presented in the application to be deficient.

### EML / EMLc
EML and EMLc

### Section:
18.8 Thyroid hormones and antithyroid medicines

### Dose form(s) & strengths(s):
- Methimazole: tablet 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg
- Propylthiouracil: tablet 50 mg

### Core / Complementary:
- Methimazole: core
- Propylthiouracil: complementary

### Individual / Square box listing:
- Methimazole: Square box incorporating carbimazole as a therapeutically equivalent alternative.
- Propylthiouracil: individual

### Background:
Propylthiouracil (PTU) with a square box has been included on the core list of the EML since the first list in 1977. In 2007, it was added (without a square box) to the complementary list of the EMLc. The EMLc Subcommittee noted that PTU was licensed for use in children aged over 6 years, although in some settings carbimazole (CMZ) was the more commonly used drug. The EMLc Subcommittee decided to list PTU but recommended the role of CMZ in children be reviewed (1).

### Public health relevance:
Graves' disease is the most common cause of hyperthyroidism. Women are affected more frequently than men at a ratio of 8:1, most commonly in the third to fifth decade of life (2). A meta-analysis of European studies estimated a mean prevalence rate of 0.75% for males and females combined and an incidence rate of 51 cases per 100,000 per year with a significant influence of ethnicity and iodine nutrition (3). Among children, Graves' disease represents more than 90% of the cases of hyperthyroidism with an incidence ranging from 0.1 per 100,000 children and 3.0 per 100,000 adolescents per year (4).

### Summary of evidence: benefits
The application identified four randomized controlled trials that compared the effectiveness of PTU and MMI in adults and one retrospective study in children and adolescents. The trials in adults found MMI to have similar or greater effectiveness than PTU at reducing or normalizing thyroid hormone concentrations (5-8). The paediatric study found no significant difference in the mean duration for normalization of serum T4 concentration between MMI (1.7 ± 1.0 months) and PTU (2.3 ± 2.4) treated patients (9).

Two randomized controlled trials evaluated the effect of MMI (10) and CMZ (11) taken once, twice or three times daily. The results indicated that once daily dosing is as effective as multiple daily dosing.

The application acknowledged that in general, less information was available for CMZ but because CMZ is metabolized to MMI after absorption, it was assumed that data that apply to MMI also apply to CMZ.
**Summary of evidence: harms**

(From the application)

Overall, both PTU and MMI/CMZ all present with minor and major adverse events in adults and in children. However, major adverse events were less commonly reported for patients receiving MMI/CMZ. Common minor side effects for these medicines include pruritis, skin rash, urticaria and arthralgias. Major adverse events are uncommon but include agranulocytosis, hepatic failure, vasculitis and fetal malformations.

In the RCT by Nakamura et al (5), the overall incidence of adverse events was higher in the PTU group than the MMI 30 mg/d group (51.9% versus 30%). The percentage of patients who showed AST and ALT higher than double the upper range of the normal standard was significantly higher for the PTU group compared to the MMI 30 mg/d group (26.9% versus 6.6%). Skin eruption or urticaria was similar between groups. Leukocytopenia (less than 1000/mm3) was observed in five patients in the PTU group only.

A retrospective cohort study of 71,379 Taiwanese patients found MMI/CBZ to be associated in a dose-dependent manner with an increased risk for hepatitis compared to PTU. However, no significant difference in risk was observed between groups for acute liver failure or cholestasis (12).

In the paediatric retrospective study, minor adverse events were observed more frequently among PTU treated patients compared to MMI treated patient (31.9% versus 25.0%), although the difference was not significant. The incidence of liver dysfunction was significantly higher among PTU treated patients (18.9% versus 6.3%) (9). A 2000 RCT involving 40 children found no difference in side effects between patients receiving PTU or MMI within the same age groups (13).

Agranulocytosis has been observed with both MMI/CMZ and PTU (14). There have been reports of PTU-related liver failure and death in adults and children (15), where the risk is five times higher in children than in adults. Between 1990 and 2008, a total of 23 PTU-related liver transplants were reported, and 30% of recipients were pediatric patients. No MMI-related liver transplants were reported in the same time period (16). Antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibodies (ANCA) vasculitis has been reported, more often related to PTU than MMI (17, 18).

A high prevalence of birth defects in children exposed to anti-thyroid drugs in early pregnancy has been reported (19). It is not clear whether MMI and CMZ lead to a higher prevalence of fetal malformations compared to PTU. Some studies have shown similar rates of fetal defects with both drugs (12). However, this rate may not be higher than the rate of malformations in the control population (20). In contrast, a recent metaanalysis showed an increased risk of neonatal congenital malformations associated with MMI, but not PTU when compared to no ATD exposure (21). However, the fetal malformations associated with PTU may be less severe and easier to correct than those associated with MMI and CMZ.

**Additional evidence:**

(Not in the application)

N/A

**WHO Guidelines:**

There are no WHO Guidelines currently available for the management of Graves’ disease.

The 2018 European Thyroid Association guidelines for management of Graves’ disease recommend MMI as preferred treatment for newly diagnosed patients (both adults and children). The Guidelines further recommend that MMI-treated women should be switched to PTU when planning pregnancy and during the first trimester (22).

The 2016 American Thyroid Association Guidelines also recommend use of MMI in almost all patients. PTU is recommended for patients during the first trimester of pregnancy, in the treatment of thyroid storm, and in patients with minor reactions to MMI who refuse radioactive iodine therapy or surgery (23).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**

Costs of PTU, MMI and CMZ vary considerably between countries. The application compared the calculated costs for one month of treatment with PTU, MMI or CMZ. For the induction treatment period, costs ranged from US$ 7-37 per month for MMI, US$ 18-27 per month for CMZ and US$ 3.5-68 per month for PTU. For the core treatment period, costs ranged from US$ 3.50-18.50 per month for MMI, US$ 9-13.50 per month for CMZ and US$ 1.80-34 per month for PTU.

**Availability:**

Usually, only one of CMZ or MMI is available in a given country reflecting differences in regulatory approval in different jurisdictions.

PTU is available globally.

**Other considerations:**

N/A
The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee

Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of methimazole with a square box to the core list of the EML and to the complementary list of the EMLc for use as first-line therapy for hyperthyroidism. The square box listing should specify carbimazole as a therapeutically equivalent alternative.

The Committee recommended that propylthiouracil should remain on the core list of the EML for use in patients during the first trimester of pregnancy, and for other patients in whom alternative first-line treatment is not appropriate or available. The square box should be removed from the listing. The Committee also recommended that propylthiouracil should remain on the complementary list of the EMLc for use in patients for whom alternative first-line treatment is not appropriate or available.

The Committee considered that the available evidence indicated that efficacy of methimazole is at least equivalent to propylthiouracil. Compared to propylthiouracil however, methimazole demonstrated a more favourable safety profile with fewer reported major adverse events. The Committee noted that propylthiouracil remains the treatment of choice in some patients and therefore should remain available.

References:
### Section 22: OXYTOCICS AND ANTI-OXYTOCICS

#### 22.1 Oxytocics

**Carbetocin (heat stable) – addition – EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbetocin</th>
<th>ATC Code: H01BB03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of heat-stable carbetocin on the EML for the prevention of postpartum haemorrhage (PPH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>WHO Department of Reproductive Health and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Reproductive Health and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>22.3 Uterotonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Injection (heat stable): 100 micrograms/mL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**

Carbetocin has not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML for prevention of PPH. Oxytocin, misoprostol and ergometrine are currently included on the EML for the prevention of PPH.

**Public health relevance:**

Obstetric haemorrhage, especially PPH, is responsible for more than a quarter of all maternal deaths worldwide (1). In most low-income countries, PPH is the leading cause of maternal deaths. PPH is commonly defined as a blood loss of 500 mL or more within 24 hours after birth, and affects about 5% of all women giving birth around the world (2, 3). Uterine atony is the most common cause of PPH and a leading cause of PPH-related maternal mortality worldwide (1). PPH can be prevented if prophylactic uterotonics are administered during the third stage of labour, and by timely and appropriate management (4). Oxytocin is the first choice uterotonic drug recommended by the WHO. However, oxytocin is sensitive to heat exposure and must be transported and stored at 2-8 °C continuously. This represents a problem in low resource settings where the cold chain is difficult to maintain. Carbetocin, in its heat stable formulation, does not require cold chain transport and storage and can stay at room temperature for a long period of time (30°C for 3 years, 40°C for 6 months, 50°C for 3 months and 60°C for 1 month) (5). Based on the WHO CHAMPION trial results and on the updated WHO recommendations on uterotonics for the prevention of PPH, carbetocin is recommended for PPH prevention, especially in those settings where the cold storage of oxytocin is not possible.

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

The application presented the findings of a Cochrane systematic review and network meta-analysis of seven uterotonic options (6), and GRADE tables extracted from the WHO recommendations on uterotonics for prevention of PPH (4). Carbetocin compared with placebo or no treatment was investigated in two randomized controlled trials involving 169 women in the network meta-analysis. There was moderate certainty evidence that carbetocin was associated with a substantial reduction in PPH ≥500 mL (RR 0.42, 95% CI 0.31 to 0.57), PPH ≥1000 mL (RR 0.52, 95% CI from 0.38 to 0.72), blood transfusion (RR 0.48, 95% CI from 0.26 to 0.89), and use of additional uterotonics (RR 0.19, 95% CI from 0.13 to 0.27) when compared with placebo or no treatment. Evidence on whether the prophylactic use of carbetocin during the third stage of labour reduces maternal death when compared to placebo was of very low certainty. It was uncertain whether carbetocin reduced maternal intensive care admissions due to the very low number of events. There was moderate certainty evidence that the use of prophylactic carbetocin probably reduces average blood loss compared with women receiving placebo or no treatment (Mean difference: 138.37 ml, 95% CI 193.24 ml lower to 83.50 ml lower).

There is moderate certainty evidence that carbetocin has similar effects to oxytocin for the outcomes of maternal death, blood transfusion and ICU admissions. Carbetocin may be superior to oxytocin for the outcomes of PPH ≥500 mL (41 fewer events per 1000 women – moderate certainty evidence), use of additional uterotonics (74 fewer per 1000 women – low certainty evidence).
The Selection and Use of Essential Medicines  
Report of the 22nd WHO Expert Committee

<p>| Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) | The application presented the findings of a Cochrane systematic review and network meta-analysis of seven uterotonics options (6), and GRADE tables extracted from the WHO recommendations on uterotonic use for prevention of PPH (4). Compared to placebo or no treatment, carbetocin was associated with little or no difference to the risk of experiencing adverse effects (nausea, vomiting, headache, abdominal pain, hypertension, shivering, fever and diarrhoea). Compared to oxytocin, there was no clear difference in terms of adverse effects. The certainty of the evidence ranged from very low to moderate. |
| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | The 2018 WHO recommendations for uterotonic use for the prevention of PPH (4) recommend use of an effective uterotonic during the third stage of labour for all births. Recommended uterotonic are oxytocin, carbetocin, misoprostol, ergometrine/methylergometrine and oxytocin + ergometrine in fixed-dose combination. The Guidelines Development Group made a context-specific recommendation for carbetocin and recommended its use in contexts where its cost is comparable to other effective uterotonic, noting that the current cost of using carbetocin for PPH prevention was greater than the cost of using other effective uterotoniaics. |
| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | Ex-factory prices of carbetocin vary globally and range from EUR 8 to EUR 40 per unit (100 micrograms). In 2013, WHO was approached by Merck for Mothers (a philanthropic initiative of Merck, known outside the USA as Merck Sharpe &amp; Dohme [MSD]) and Ferring Pharmaceuticals to explore the potential value of heat-stable carbetocin for reducing the incidence of maternal death. WHO convened an international panel of stakeholders who identified the need for demonstration of non-inferiority of heat-stable carbetocin before a change in guidance and practice could be considered. If non-inferior to oxytocin, the heat-stable formulation of carbetocin would be made available in public-sector health care facilities in high-burden countries at an affordable and sustainable “access price” (comparable to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] price of oxytocin), according to a memorandum of understanding (MoU) signed by representatives of WHO, Ferring Pharmaceuticals and Merck (7). This price is a subsidized price of $0.31 +/- 10% per ampoule of 100 µg heat-stable carbetocin (the UNFPA current price of Oxytocin is $0.27 per unit (10 I.U.)). It was noted that the cost-effectiveness of carbetocin varies across settings (6, 8-12). The WHO recommendations for uterotonic use state that “carbetocin would probably be cost-effective if the unit cost is comparable to other effective uterotonic and in settings where the cost of PPH care is substantial” (4). |
| Availability: | Carbetocin is approved in more than 80 countries worldwide, not including US and Japan. In most countries carbetocin is approved for prevention of uterine atony following delivery of the infant by caesarean section. In a few countries, primarily in Latin America and recently in Australia, it is also approved for prevention of uterine atony following vaginal delivery. The currently approved product is manufactured in Germany. The product Ferring will make available in LIC/LMIC countries at access price will be manufactured in China and India. Ferring began the registration process in September 2018, where the first application was submitted to Swissmedic, via their procedure for Global Health Products (MAGHP). The approval by Swissmedic is anticipated in 2020, whereafter Ferring will pursue registrations in the LIC/LMIC and seek WHO prequalification. |
| Other considerations: | The heat-stable formulation of carbetocin does not need to be transported under cold-chain conditions, nor does it require refrigerated storage. This may make carbetocin a preferred choice in settings where cold-chain transport and storage of oxytocin is not possible. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Recommendations:</th>
<th>The Expert Committee recommended the addition of heat-stable carbetocin injection to the core list of the EML for the prevention of postpartum haemorrhage on the basis of similar effects compared to oxytocin for efficacy and safety outcomes. The Committee agreed that heat-stable carbetocin may offer advantages over oxytocin in some settings as it does not require cold-chain transport or refrigerated storage. The Committee noted the current higher cost of carbetocin compared to other uterotonics and agreed with the context-specific recommendation in WHO guidelines for the prevention of PPH, that carbetocin be used where its cost is comparable to other effective uterotonics. The Expert Committee also recommended that WHO facilitate increased access and affordability of carbetocin through inclusion in the WHO Prequalification of medicines programme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### References:

### Mifepristone - misoprostol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>The application requested the following changes to the current listing on the EML of mifepristone-misoprostol:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• transfer from the complementary to the core list;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• removal of the note stating “Requires close medical supervision;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• removal of the boxed text stating “Where permitted under national law and where culturally acceptable”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• addition of a co-packaged presentation of mifepristone and misoprostol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Applicant: | WHO Department of Reproductive Health and Research |
| WHO Technical Department: | Reproductive Health and Research |
| EML / EMLc | EML |
| Section: | 22.3 Uterotonics |
| Dose form(s) & strengths(s): | Tablet 200 mg – tablet 200 micrograms |
| Core / Complementary: | Core |
| Individual / Square box listing: | Individual |

**Background:**
Mifepristone-misoprostol has been included on the EML for use in medical abortion since 2005. The Expert Committee recommended listing on the complementary list with the note regarding the requirement for close medical supervision. In reviewing the recommendation by the Expert Committee, the Director-General sought clarification from the Expert Committee regarding the risks and benefits of mifepristone-misoprostol. The Director-General subsequently made the decision to approve listing mifepristone-misoprostol on the EML with an additional note: “Where permitted under national law and where culturally acceptable”.

**Public health relevance:**
Despite the major advances in management of abortion over the last two decades, of the 55.7 million abortions that occurred worldwide each year between 2010-2014, 30.6 million (54.9%) were considered safe, 17.1 million (30.7%) are classified as less safe and 8.0 million (14.4%) were considered least safe according to new safety classifications. 24.3 million (97%) of unsafe abortions occur in developing countries (1). In developing countries, around 7 million women are admitted to hospitals annually as a result of unsafe abortion (2). Globally, between 4.7% and 13% of maternal deaths have been attributed to unsafe abortion (3).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**
Evidence for the clinical effectiveness of mifepristone-misoprostol was evaluated at the time of original listing in 2005 (4). Updated evidence was considered as part of the development process for the 2018 WHO guidelines for medical management of abortion and continues to support the effectiveness, safety and acceptability of mifepristone-misoprostol (5). Support for less medicalized service delivery of mifepristone-misoprostol exists in a number of WHO Guidelines, clinical guidance and systematic reviews (5-11). Specifically, the WHO 2015 Health worker roles in providing safe abortion care and post-abortion contraception (7) and the 2018 Medical management of abortion guidance (5), state that administration of mifepristone-misoprostol does not require direct medical supervision or specialized care. The WHO recommends that pregnant persons should be provided information and access to healthcare providers if they are experiencing signs of ongoing pregnancy or for any other medical reasons (5, 7, 8, 12). One health worker can provide the entire package, but it is equally possible for subtasks to be performed by different health workers and at different locations. The application states that specialized diagnostics or treatment are not needed (6). Provision of care generally requires access to quality mifepristone and misoprostol in the correct dosages, instructions on how to use them (including dating of gestational age) and information about how to recognize complications (e.g. in the event of very heavy and/or prolonged bleeding) and where to seek help. Ultrasound scanning is not routinely required (5-8), and routine use of antibiotics and testing for sexually transmitted infections is not recommended. In the event of undiagnosed ectopic pregnancy, manual evacuation is the preferred method.
Evidence supports safe and effective provision of medical abortion for pregnancies less than 12 weeks uterine size by the following health care cadres: auxiliary nurses, auxiliary nurse midwives, nurses, midwives, associate and advanced associate clinicians, non-specialist and specialist doctors (5-9, 13-17). It is recommended that every primary care health-service delivery point have staff (regardless of their cadre) trained and competent to take a medical history, perform a bimanual and abdominal examination and establish a referral network with higher level facilities and/or providers who are available to manage complications in the rare event that they may arise.

The application stated that desired benefit of co-packaged mifepristone-misoprostol is to ensure availability of quality-assured products with consistent dosing and clear. A recent study of the provision of medical abortion and post-abortion contraception by midlevel health care providers in Kyrgyzstan involved training midwives and family nurses to provide medical abortion with co-packaged mifepristone-misoprostol (18). Results demonstrated that trained midwives and nurse can provide medical abortion safely and effectively. Although the study did not compare co-packaged mifepristone-misoprostol with individually packaged drugs, the authors recommended registration and market availability of high quality co-packaged mifepristone-misoprostol as a strategy to facilitate the scale up of safe abortion in Kyrgyzstan.

**Summary of evidence: harms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(from the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evidence for the safety of mifepristone-misoprostol was evaluated at the time of original listing in 2005 (4). Recently published safety data from the United States reported an estimated mifepristone-associated mortality rate of 0.00063% (19). Studies including mifepristone-misoprostol medical abortions among more than 423,000 persons globally reported very low rates (0.01 to 0.7%) of non-fatal serious adverse events such as hospital admission, blood transfusion or serious infection after use of mifepristone (19). In addition, a pooled analysis of serious adverse reactions including data from 30,966 clinical study participants presenting for mifepristone-misoprostol medical abortion through 70 days gestation found no differences in rate or type of serious adverse reaction by geographical location (20). Serious adverse reaction rates were reported in <0.5% of study participants and include atypical presentation of infection, sepsis and prolonged heavy bleeding/hemorrhage (20). These events were most always treatable without permanent sequelae.

The 2015 WHO recommendations on health worker roles in providing safe abortion care and post-abortion contraception highlight that the most commonly experienced non-life threatening side effects can be managed in primary care and outpatient settings by various cadres of healthcare providers (7). Evidence suggests that the provision of medical abortion by mid-level providers has no impact on the safety or efficacy of the abortion process (21). Self-management of medical abortion with mifepristone-misoprostol without the direct supervision of a health care provider is recommended in specific circumstances, in which pregnant persons have the appropriate information and access to health services should they be wanted or required (5-7, 22). |

**Additional evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(not in the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHO Guidelines:**

- **WHO Safe Abortion: Technical and Policy guidance** (6) was first issued in 2003 and updated in 2012. It includes recommendations for clinical care, while also addressing policy, programmatic and health systems considerations in the provision of safe abortion.
- **WHO Clinical Practice Handbook for Safe Abortion** (8) was issued in 2014. It provides guidance to providers with requisite skills and training necessary to provide safe abortion and/or treat complications of unsafe abortion.
- **WHO Health Worker Roles in providing safe abortion and post-abortion contraception** (7) was issued in 2015 and contains recommendations on the roles of various health workers in the provision of abortion care, as well as self-management of medical abortion.
- **WHO Medical Management of Abortion** (5) guidelines issued in 2018 includes the following recommendations on medical abortion regimens for management of induced abortion:
For the medical management of induced abortion at less than 12 weeks gestation, the 2018 WHO guidelines recommend the use of 200 mg mifepristone administered orally, followed 1-2 days later by 800 micrograms misoprostol administered vaginally, sublingually or buccally. The minimum recommended interval between use of mifepristone and misoprostol is 24 hours. (strong recommendation, moderate certainty evidence)

For the medical management of induced abortion at ≥ 12 weeks of gestation, the 2018 WHO guidelines suggest the use of 200 mg mifepristone administered orally, followed 1-2 days later by repeat doses of 400 micrograms misoprostol administered vaginally, sublingually or buccally every 3 hours. The minimum recommended interval between use of mifepristone and misoprostol is 24 hours. (weak, conditional, discretionary or qualified recommendation, moderate certainty evidence).

**Costs / cost-effectiveness:**
The price of individual and co-packaged mifepristone and misoprostol varies globally. The legal status of abortion, willing marketers and distributors and a perceived sustainable market all impact the cost to the buyer. Market flexibility is being regulated by the increasing number of new products in markets – both individual and co-packaged products. It is hoped that increasing access to quality co-packaged medicines for medical abortion will drive prices down.

The application stated that when purchased individually, the average cost of mifepristone and misoprostol for one medical abortion ranges from US$ 4.19 to US$ 10.03, while costs for the co-packaged product range from US$ 3.75 to US$ 11.75.

**Availability:**
Mifepristone and misoprostol, both individually and co-packaged are available globally.

**Other considerations:**
The Committee noted the large number of letters of support received in relation to this application.

**Committee Recommendations:**
The Expert Committee recommended moving mifepristone-misoprostol from the complementary to the core list of the EML, and removal of the note that states that close medical supervision is required, on the basis of the strong evidence presented that close medical supervision is not required for its safe and effective use.

The Committee also recommended the addition of a co-packaged presentation of mifepristone and misoprostol to the core list of the EML.

Recalling that their role and responsibility is to provide WHO with technical guidance in relation to the selection and use of essential medicines, the Expert Committee noted that its mandate does not extend to providing advice on the statement “Where permitted under national law and where culturally acceptable”.

---

**References:**


**Misoprostol – deletion of prevention of PPH indication - EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misoprostol</th>
<th>ATC Code: G02AD06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested the deletion of misoprostol from the EML for the indication of prevention of postpartum haemorrhage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Petra Sevcikova, Allyson Pollock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>The WHO Department of Reproductive Health and Research provided comments on the application and advised that it did not support the proposal to delete misoprostol from EML for PPH prevention indication. In December 2018, WHO updated its recommendations on uterotonics based on a Cochrane systematic review and a network meta-analysis (NMA) that included 196 trials (and 135,559 women) (1). The updating of these recommendations followed WHO Guidelines Review Committee procedures as well as internationally accepted guideline development methods and standards that included not only the synthesis of evidence of effects of uterotonics but also incorporated evidence regarding values of key stakeholders, resource use, cost effectiveness, equity, acceptability, and feasibility. The technical department stated that the use of NMA for evidence of effects of available uterotonics offered additional advantages over pairwise meta-analyses used in conventional systematic reviews. It allowed a consistent and systematic assessment of eligibility, risk of bias and outcome reporting of all trials of uterotonic agents, including misoprostol. The evidence assessed and synthesized for misoprostol during this update included all eligible studies published as at May 2018. The NMA showed that when used for PPH prevention, misoprostol is associated with a substantial reduction in PPH (≥ 500 ml), severe PPH (≥ 1000 ml), blood transfusion and the use of additional uterotonics when compared with placebo or no uterotonics. It is noteworthy that the evidence of effects of misoprostol versus placebo or no uterotonics on the critical outcomes PPH ≥1000 ml (RR 0.71, 95% CI 0.59–0.85) and blood transfusion (RR 0.52, 95% CI 0.35–0.80) were of high certainty according to GRADE assessment (i.e. we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect). Based on high certainty evidence of efficacy regarding priority PPH outcomes, which clearly outweighs the side effects of misoprostol, and considerations of evidence across other important domains of GRADE evidence-to-decision framework, RHR advised that there was no scientific justification for the removal of misoprostol for its PPH indication from the EML. The WHO 2018 PPH guideline panel reaffirmed the recommendation of misoprostol as an alternative option to oxytocin in settings where injectable uterotonics are not available having fully considered the most up-to-date body of scientific evidence, and implementation and regulatory issues raised in the proposal by Dr Sevcikova and Dr Pollock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>22.3 Uterotonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</td>
<td>Tablet 200 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background:</td>
<td>Misoprostol was added to the EML in 2011 for prevention of PPH in settings where parenteral uterotonics are not available or feasible. It was, and remains listed with a conditional note specifying that its use in PPH is limited to circumstances where oxytocin is not available or cannot be safely used. This was the fourth application from Drs Sevcikova and Pollock requesting deletion of misoprostol from the EML for prevention of PPH. Most recently in 2017, the Expert Committee did not recommend deletion, noting that very few new clinical data were included in the application. The Committee considered that the evidence presented was insufficient to support deletion. The Expert Committee once again acknowledged that misoprostol is less effective than oxytocin infusion and is associated with adverse events, particularly vomiting and shivering. The circumstances of use have not changed; misoprostol remains an alternative for the prevention of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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PPH in resource-poor, community and rural settings where intravenous oxytocin is not available or cannot be safely administered (2).

Public health relevance: (burden of disease)

Obstetric haemorrhage, especially PPH, is responsible for more than a quarter of all maternal deaths worldwide (3). In most low-income countries, PPH is the leading cause of maternal deaths.

Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

The same evidence presented in the 2017 application was included in the current application. Only evidence not previously considered by the Expert Committee is presented here. To update the evidence base presented and considered in previous applications, the current application undertook a literature search for randomized controlled trials assessing misoprostol use in community and home birth settings in low- and middle-income countries published between November 2016 and November 2018. This search identified two systematic reviews (1, 4), one of which was excluded as it included trials conducted in hospitals (4). No additional RCTs conducted in low-resource settings were identified.

The application presented results extracted from a sub-group analysis from the Cochrane systematic review by Gallos et al for the comparison of misoprostol versus placebo or no treatment from three trials conducted in the community setting (5-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy outcomes</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>RR 1.00 [95% CI 0.10, 0.959]</td>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>RR 1.12 95% CI [0.74, 1.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH &gt;= 1000 ml</td>
<td>RR 0.59 [95% CI 0.39, 0.88]</td>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>RR 1.27 [95% CI 0.80, 2.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood transfusion</td>
<td>RR 0.14 [95% CI 0.02, 1.15]</td>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>RR 0.94 [95% CI 0.32, 2.77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe maternal</td>
<td>RR 1.00 [95% CI 0.14, 7.05]</td>
<td>Shivering</td>
<td>RR 2.71 [95% CI 2.33, 3.15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH &gt;= 500 ml</td>
<td>RR 0.73 [95% CI 0.56, 0.96]</td>
<td>Fever</td>
<td>RR 2.87 [95% CI 0.90, 9.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional uterotonic</td>
<td>RR 0.50 [95% CI 0.12, 1.98]</td>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>RR 3.11 [95% CI 1.28, 7.51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood loss</td>
<td>MD -43.79 [95% CI -58.09, -29.49]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in haemoglobin</td>
<td>MD -2.12 [95% CI -3.46, -0.77]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RR: risk ratio, MD: mean difference

Gallos et al reported no important differences were identified in the sub-group analysis by hospital or community setting (1).

Commenting on the quality of available evidence, the application noted that all community studies have important shortcomings either due to small numbers; use of alternative uterotonic in the control arm; confounding due to management practice and subjective assessment; and with one exception (6) (in which the numbers were very small), exclusion of high-risk women. PPH incidence fell in both the control and intervention groups in both the trials (5, 7) that informed the 2011 decision to add misoprostol to the EML. This suggests factors other than misoprostol use are crucial in determining outcomes.

Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)

No new safety data (beyond that presented above) were included in the current application.

Additional evidence: (not in the application)

N/A

WHO Guidelines:

The 2018 WHO recommendations for uterotonic for the prevention of PPH (8) recommend use of an effective uterotonic during the third stage of labour for all births. Misoprostol 400 µg or 600 µg, orally is a recommended option for all births.

Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The 2018 WHO recommendations state that as misoprostol is inexpensive and can also be used by lay health workers in community settings, it is associated with moderate savings and is probably cost-effective, especially when implemented in settings with a shortage of skilled health personnel (8).

Availability:

N/A

Other considerations:

N/A
Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee did not recommend the deletion of the indication for prevention of PPH from the listing of misoprostol from EML. The Committee considered that the new evidence presented in this re-submission was insufficient to support any change to the current listing.

The Committee reiterated that misoprostol remains an effective alternative for prevention of PPH in resource-poor, community and rural settings where oxytocin is unavailable or cannot be safely administered. The listing of misoprostol on the EML supports its appropriate use in such settings and is consistent with the 2018 WHO recommendations for uterotonic drugs for the prevention of PPH.

References:
## Tranexamic acid – new indication - EML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tranexamic acid</th>
<th>ATC Code: B02AA02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>The application requested inclusion of tranexamic acid (TXA) on the core list of the EML for the new indication of treatment of post-partum haemorrhage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants:</td>
<td>WHO Department of Reproductive Health and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Technical Department:</td>
<td>Reproductive Health and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML / EMLc:</td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>22.5 Other medicines administered to the mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose form(s) &amp; strengths(s):</td>
<td>Injection: 100 mg/mL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core / Complementary:</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / Square box listing:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background:
(If relevant, e.g. resubmission, previous EC consideration)

Tranexamic acid had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML for the treatment of PPH. In 2009, an application requesting EML listing of tranexamic acid to reduce blood loss during cardiac surgery was rejected as the indication was considered to be of uncertain public health relevance (1). Tranexamic acid was recommended for inclusion on the EML in 2011 for treatment of adult patients with trauma and significant risk of ongoing haemorrhage (2).

### Public health relevance:
(Burden of disease)

PPH is defined as blood loss of 500 mL or more within 24 hours after birth. Globally, nearly one quarter of all maternal deaths are associated with PPH, and in most low-income countries, it is the main cause of maternal mortality (3). Improving health care for women during childbirth to prevent and treat PPH is a necessary step towards achievement of the health targets of the Sustainable Development Goals.

### Summary of evidence: benefits
(From the application)

The application presented the findings of a Cochrane systematic review on antifibrinolytic drugs for treating primary PPH (4) which included two trials - WOMAN and Ducloy-Bouthors (5, 6), and GRADE tables extracted from the WHO recommendation on tranexamic acid for the treatment of PPH (7).

For the comparison of TXA (plus standard care) versus standard care alone, there was moderate certainty evidence that TXA was associated with slightly reduced all cause maternal mortality (RR 0.88, 95% CI 0.74 to 1.05, not statistically significant) and maternal mortality due to PPH (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.65 to 1.00).

For maternal morbidity outcomes, moderate certainty evidence suggested little or no difference between treatment groups for any outcomes reported (respiratory failure: RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.67 to 1.12; seizure: two studies; RR 0.76, 95% CI 0.49 to 1.20; hepatic failure RR 0.96, 95% CI 0.58 to 1.60; cardiac failure: RR 0.95, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.23; renal failure: two studies; RR 1.09, 95% CI 0.85 to 1.39).

Moderate certainty evidence suggests little or no difference between treatment groups for most surgical interventions to control bleeding (hysterectomy (all): two studies; RR 1.01, 95% CI 0.97 to 1.03). Ducloy-Bouthors 2011 reported additional blood loss > 500 mL or > 1000 mL. Low-quality evidence suggests TXA probably reduces blood loss > 500 mL (RR 0.50, 95% CI 0.27 to 0.93, 151 women). Although the direction of effect was the same for loss > 1000 mL, the study was insufficiently powered to demonstrate a difference between groups (4/77 women versus 8/74). There was high certainty evidence of no difference between treatment groups in the use of additional uterotonic agents (99.3% vs 99.1%, two studies; RR 1.00, 95% CI 1.0 to 1.0).

High or moderate certainty evidence suggests there is probably little difference between treatment groups for most surgical interventions to control bleeding (hysterectomy (all): two studies; RR 1.01, 95% CI 0.88 to 1.17; ligature: RR 0.88, 95% CI 0.74 to 1.05; embolization: RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.42 to 1.62). High certainty evidence suggests laparotomy to control bleeding is reduced for women in the TXA group (0.8% vs 1.3%) (RR 0.64, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.85) while brace sutures are increased (RR 1.19, 95% CI 1.01 to 1.41).
High certainty evidence suggests there is probably little or no difference in intrauterine tamponade (one study; RR 0.96, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.06) or manual removal of placenta: (one study; RR 0.95, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.04).

Subgroup analysis examining treatment effect by mode of birth (vaginal or caesarean) suggests no clear difference in effect on maternal death (all causes) and maternal death due to PPH for type of birth (moderate certainty evidence).

A subgroup analysis of the WOMAN trial investigated the effects of timing of TXA administration. There was a reduced risk of maternal mortality due to bleeding in women given TXA within 3 hours of delivery (RR 0.69, 95% CI 0.52–0.91; p=0.008) compared with women given TXA more than 3 hours after delivery (RR 1.07, 95% CI 0.76–1.51; p=0.70).

Compared to the control group, women who received TXA within 1 hour of delivery had a similar risk of death (any cause) (RR 0.98, 95% CI 0.72 to 1.33), as did women receiving TXA more than 3 hours after delivery (1.00, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.33). However, women receiving TXA between 1 and 3 hours after delivery were at reduced risk of death from all causes (RR 0.69, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.96).

There were similar findings for the composite outcome of death or hysterectomy: within 1 hour: RR 1.08, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.28, more than 3 hours: RR 1.01, 95% CI 0.82 to 1.25) and between 1 and 3 hours: RR 0.80, 95% CI 0.63 to 1.00.

Compared to the control group, women receiving TXA within 1 hour of delivery had reduced risk of laparotomy for bleeding (RR 0.48, 95% CI 0.29 to 0.79), as did women receiving TXA at 1 to 3 hours after birth (RR 0.54, 95% CI 0.31 to 0.95). Women receiving TXA more than 3 hours after birth were not at reduced risk of laparotomy for bleeding (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.35).

In summary, there is evidence that TXA is associated with benefits in reducing maternal deaths due to bleeding and reducing the need for laparotomy to stop bleeding. Treatment within 3 hours of delivery appears to optimize benefits.

### Summary of evidence: harms
(from the application)

The application presented the findings of a Cochrane systematic review on antifibrinolytic drugs for treating primary PPH (4) which included two trials – WOMAN and Ducloy-Bouthors (5, 6), and GRADE tables extracted from the WHO recommendation on tranexamic acid for the treatment of PPH (7).

Moderate certainty evidence suggests there is probably little or no difference between treatment groups for thromboembolic events (any maternal thromboembolic event: RR 0.88, 95% CI 0.54 to 1.43; deep venous thrombosis: two studies; RR 0.62 95% CI 0.20 to 1.88; pulmonary embolism RR 0.85, 95% CI 0.44 to 1.61; myocardial infarction: RR 0.66, 95% CI 0.11 to 3.97; stroke: RR 1.33, 95% CI 0.46 to 3.82).

Available neonatal outcome data were limited (data from WOMAN trial only). There were no neonatal thromboembolic events and no clear differences in deaths in breastfed neonates (eight deaths with TXA vs seven deaths with placebo) in the WOMAN trial.

Available data on longer-term outcomes was limited (data from the WOMAN trial only).

Outcomes in the WOMAN trial were measured up to hospital discharge or 42 days if still in hospital. There was no information on longer term outcomes in women or babies. On balance, there does not appear to be evidence of maternal or newborn harms, or significant side-effects. While no difference in newborn thromboembolic events were seen, in the WOMAN trial most women and babies were followed until discharge from the health facility, thus this evidence is more likely representative of the first few days after birth.

### Additional evidence:
(not in the application)

N/A

### WHO Guidelines:

In 2012, WHO published 32 recommendations for the prevention and treatment of PPH, including a weak recommendation on the use of TXA for treatment of PPH if oxytocin and other uterotonic fail to stop bleeding if it is thought that bleeding may be partly due to trauma (8).

In 2017, in response to important new evidence, the existing WHO recommendation on the use of TXA for PPH treatment was updated to recommend early use of intravenous TXA within 3 hours of birth in addition to standard care for women with clinically diagnosed PPH following vaginal birth or caesarean section (strong recommendation, moderate quality of evidence) (7).

In making this updated recommendation, the Guideline Development Group also made the following remarks (7):

- “Based on the dosing regimen used in the WOMAN trial, the GDG supports the administration of tranexamic acid (TXA) at a fixed dose of 1 g (100 mg/mL) intravenously (IV) at 1 mL per minute (i.e. administered over 10 minutes), with a second dose of 1 g IV if
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bleeding continues after 30 minutes, or if bleeding restarts within 24 hours of completing the first dose;

- The WOMAN trial defined “clinically diagnosed postpartum haemorrhage” as clinically estimated blood loss of more than 500 mL after a vaginal birth or 1000 mL after caesarean section, or any blood loss sufficient to compromise haemodynamic stability;

- Based on evidence from the WOMAN trial, the reference point for the start of the 3-hour window for starting TXA administration is time of birth. If time of birth is unknown, the best estimate of time of birth should be used as the reference point. As most deaths due to PPH occur within the first 2 to 3 hours after birth, it is critical that TXA is given as soon as possible to achieve clinical benefits;

- Analysis of the effects of timing of administration in the WOMAN trial, as well as an individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis of 40,138 bleeding patients (including WOMAN trial participants), indicates that TXA administration beyond 3 hours does not confer any clinical benefit. Furthermore, the point estimates of effect of TXA use beyond 3 hours on death for trauma or after PPH were both in the direction of harm, albeit not statistically significant for women with PPH. In view of this evidence, the GDG does not support the use of TXA more than 3 hours after birth.

- Administration of TXA should be considered as part of the standard PPH treatment package. Standard care in the context of this recommendation includes routine care for PPH treatment, including fluid replacement, medical (uterotonics), monitoring of vital sighs, nonsurgical (e.g. bimanual compression, intrauterine balloon tamponade, nonpneumatic antishock garment, aortic compression) and surgical interventions (e.t., brace sutures, arterial ligation, or hysterectomy) in accordance with WHO guidelines or adapted local PPH treatment protocols;

- TXA should be used in all cases of PPH, regardless of whether the bleeding is due to genital tract trauma or other causes;

- The use of TXA should be avoided in women with a clear contraindication to antifibrinolytic therapy (including TXA) (e.g. a known thromboembolic event during pregnancy);

- This recommendation applies only to IV use. The evaluation of benefits and potential harms of other routes of TXA administration is a research priority;

- Regardless of the level of health system resources, TXA should be recognized as a life-saving intervention and be made readily available for the management of PPH in settings where emergency obstetric care is provided.”

| Costs / cost-effectiveness: | Research evidence on cost-effectiveness of TXA can be extrapolated from cost-effectiveness analysis of TXA for bleeding trauma patients (9). The study found that administering TXA to bleeding trauma patients within 3 hours of injury saved an estimated 372, 315 and 755 life-years (LYs) per 1 000 trauma patients in Tanzania, India and the UK respectively. The cost of giving TXA to 1 000 patients was USD 17 483 in Tanzania, USD 19 550 in India and USD 30 830 in the UK. The incremental cost of giving TXA versus not giving TXA was USD 18 025 in Tanzania, USD 20 670 in India and USD 48 002 in the UK. The estimated incremental cost per LY gained of administering TXA is USD 48, USD 66 and USD 64 in Tanzania, India and the UK respectively. Early administration of TXA to bleeding trauma patients is likely to be highly cost effective in low-, middle- and high-income settings. The cost of TXA varied between settings, with an approximated range of USD 1.00 to USD 5.70 per gram. The use of TXA may also reduce subsequent costs related to surgical procedures for PPH treatment (such as laparotomy) as well as any complications associated with surgery. Out-of-pocket costs to individual women might be higher when TXA is added to standard care for PPH in settings where women incur financial costs for birth. |
| Availability: | Tranexamic acid 100 mg/mL injection is available from multiple generic manufacturers. |
| Other considerations: | N/A |
| Committee Recommendations: | The Expert Committee recommended listing of tranexamic acid (TXA) intravenous injection on the core list of the EML for the new indication of treatment of post-partum haemorrhage. While the evidence presented in the application supporting the effectiveness of TXA for this indication was limited and came primarily from a single trial, the Committee considered there was benefit associated with the use of TXA in addition to standard care, when administered |
within 3 hours of childbirth. The Committee also considered that the use of different medicines with different pharmacological mechanisms of action may be useful in the management of PPH.

The Committee noted that there did not appear to be significant harms or adverse events associated with use of TXA in mothers or newborns, but that evidence was limited. The committee considered that further evidence of safety would be desirable.

References:

**Section 24: MEDICINES FOR MENTAL AND BEHAVIOURAL DISORDERS**

*Methylphenidate – addition – EML and EMLc*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methylenidate</th>
<th>ATC Code: N06BA04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of methylphenidate on the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Patricia Moscibrodzki and Craig L Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Mental Health and Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>24 Medicines used in behavioural disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Tablet (immediate-release): 10 mg, 20 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**

Methylphenidate had not previously been considered for inclusion on the Model List.

**Public health relevance:**

The mental disorders that methylphenidate is approved to treat have a high global disease burden. In 2010, mental neurological and substance use disorders accounted for 10.4% of global disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) and 28.5% of years of life lost due to disability, illness, or premature death (YLDs), making them the leading cause of YLDs. The Global Burden of Disease Study 2010 (GBD 2010) is the first to include conduct disorder (CD) and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) for burden quantification. Globally, CD was responsible for 5.75 million YLDs/DALYs with ADHD responsible for a further 491,500. Collectively, CD and ADHD accounted for 0.80% of total global YLDs and 0.25% of total globalDALYs.

The prevalence of ADHD is a controversial issue with varying estimates across populations, using different diagnostic criteria and reporting. A 2015 systematic review and meta-analysis of 175 studies reporting point prevalence estimates of ADHD estimated the pooled prevalence to be 7.2% (95% CI 6.7%-7.8%) (4).

A 2007 systematic review and metaregression analysis of 102 studies (171,756 subjects) investigating the prevalence rates of ADHD/HD worldwide found large variability of ADHD/HD prevalence rates worldwide resulting mainly from methodological differences across studies. When adjusted for methodological differences, prevalence rate variability was only detected between studies conducted in North America and those conducted in Africa and the Middle East.

**Summary of evidence: benefits**

A literature review undertaken by the applicants included 28 studies and review articles as evidence for the comparative effectiveness of methylphenidate for the treatment of ADHD versus placebo or other stimulants (6-15), versus second-line non-stimulant therapies (16-25), and in patients with ADHD comorbid with other conditions (26-31) in children, adolescents and adults. The large majority of the trials and reviews were conducted in children and adolescents and were of short duration (3 months). Summaries of the findings of the included trials were presented.

Based on this review, the applicants concluded that in the treatment of ADHD, methylphenidate has shown similar efficacy to amphetamine-based drugs with varying results on different psychometric scales. Some individual studies have demonstrated superiority of methylphenidate over amphetamine-based medicines, some have found superiority of amphetamine-based medicines over methylphenidate, and others have shown no difference between the two treatments. Given the currently available evidence, it has not been demonstrated that one stimulant is more efficacious than any other at a population level. In the comparison of methylphenidate with non-stimulant medications for treatment of ADHD, non-stimulant medications appear to have a lower efficacy though some studies show equivalent efficacy with atomoxetine. The application stated that methylphenidate is effective
in reducing fatigue in palliative care patients when compared to placebo and that there is also
evidence of methylphenidate being effective in reducing symptoms in patients with ADHD
comorbid with Oppositional Defiant Disorder and Aggression. No assessment was made in the
application regarding the quality of the evidence or confidence in the estimates of benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of evidence: harms (from the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A literature review undertaken by the applicants included 29 studies and review articles as evidence for the comparative safety of methylphenidate for the treatment of ADHD versus placebo (6, 32-34), versus other stimulants and non-stimulants (9, 11, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 35-38), and in patients with ADHD comorbid with other conditions (26, 27, 30, 39-43). The large majority of the trials and reviews were conducted in children and adolescents and were of short duration. Summaries of the findings of the included trials were presented. Based on this review, the applicants concluded that there is considerable overlap in the adverse event profiles of methylphenidate- and amphetamine-based ADHD medications. Both have been associated with insomnia and appetite suppression as the most common adverse events. Overall, studies suggest that the frequency and severity of adverse events may be somewhat greater with amphetamine-based products. In comparison to other non-stimulant medications, methylphenidate was associated with less sleep problems and higher tolerability. No assessment was made in the application regarding the quality of the evidence or confidence in the estimates of harm. As methylphenidate is a controlled Schedule II substance under the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, the application addressed the issue of potential misuse. Methylphenidate-specific misuse data generally mimic results of studies looking at stimulant medication misuse in general. While there are limited data on malingering specifically for methylphenidate, studies of malingering for stimulants in general are likely generally applicable (44). Overall, the misuse of methylphenidate raises legitimate safety concerns for overdose and drug interactions with other medications or nonmedical use drugs, particularly since illicit users are generally unaware of these issues and often use methylphenidate with other recreational drugs. However, studies suggest that amphetamine-based drugs are being used more often than methylphenidate for nonmedical use, particularly in immediate-release formulations (45-48).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional evidence: (not in the application)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2014 Cochrane systematic review of immediate-release methylphenidate for treatment of adults with ADHD was withdrawn in 2016 following failure by the authors to satisfactorily address a number of criticisms of the methodology used and conclusions drawn (49, 50). A commentary on the withdrawn review summarized the criticisms, which primarily focussed on the methodological flaws and “misleading conclusions that gave a false sense of certainty of the benefits and the absence of harms, when this in fact could not be concluded” (51).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2016 WHO mhGap intervention guide for mental, neurological and substance use disorders in non-specialized health settings (version 2.0) includes a recommendation to refer children (aged 6 years and above with a diagnosis of ADHD in whom other treatment approaches have failed) to a specialist for methylphenidate treatment (52).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The median buyer price of immediate release methylphenidate 10 mg, according to the International Medical Products Price Guide is US$ 0.067 per tablet/capsule (53). A literature review undertaken by the applicants included 11 articles as evidence for the comparative cost-effectiveness of methylphenidate (54-65). Summaries of economic evaluations of methylphenidate for ADHD were presented, and the application concluded that the identified literature favoured methylphenidate as cost-effective or cost-neutral relative to stimulant and non-stimulant treatments. The Committee considered that while methylphenidate appeared to be low cost and affordable, no conclusions could be drawn regarding the cost-effectiveness of the medicine given the considerable uncertainty in the estimates of benefit and harms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methylphenidate immediate release tablets are available internationally in innovator and generic brands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other considerations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public comments on the application were received from Professor Ole Jakob Storebø and Dr Christian Gluud, authors of a 2015 Cochrane systematic review of methylphenidate use in children and adolescents (6) included in the application. They expressed concern in relation to limitations in the reporting and summary of the evidence in the application, with particular regard to the quality of the evidence, duration of trials, misplacement of evidence, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suspected selective biases. They stated that their assessment of the evidence supporting methylphenidate for ADHD (and other disorders) was more critical than that of the applicants, noting that the high risk of bias in the randomized trials likely overestimates positive intervention effects and underestimates risk of harms.

Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee did not recommend the addition of methylphenidate to the complementary list of the EML and EMLc for the treatment of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) due to concerns regarding the quality and interpretation of the evidence for benefits and harms.

References:


24.2 Medicines used in mood disorders

24.2.1 Medicines used in depressive disorders

**Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>ATC Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escitalopram</td>
<td>N06AB10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>N06AB03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**
Two applications regarding the listing of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) were received:
- Application 1: requested the inclusion of escitalopram on the core list of the EML for the treatment of adults with major depressive disorder.
- Application 2: requested the addition of a square box symbol to the current listing of fluoxetine on the core list of the EML for treatment of depressive disorders.

**Applicant:**
- Application 1: Dr Iona Machado, Dr Csilla Lippert, Dr Ricardo Lozano, Dr Michael J Ostacher
- Application 2: Kavitha Kolappa, Corrado Barbui

**WHO Technical Department:**
Mental Health and Substance Abuse

**Section:**
24.2.1 Medicines used in depressive disorders

**Dose form(s) & strength(s):**
- Application 1: Escitalopram: Tablet 10 mg
- Application 2: Fluoxetine: Solid oral dosage form 20 mg

**Core / Complementary:**
Core

**Individual / Square box listing:**
- Application 1: Individual
- Application 2: Square box to include citalopram, escitalopram, and sertraline.

**Background:**
Fluoxetine was added to the core list of the EML in 2007. The Expert Committee considered that the available evidence supported the public health need, comparable effectiveness and generally more favourable tolerability of fluoxetine compared to amitriptyline. A square box was not recommended as the Committee felt there may be significant within-class differences among SSRIs in relation to safety (1).

**Public health relevance:**
The public health relevance of depressive disorders is well established and has been previously accepted by the Expert Committee. However, the global burden of disease due to depressive disorders is increasing over time. In 2017, depressive disorders were estimated to affect over 260 million people globally, including 160 million with major depressive disorder. According to the 2017 Global Burden of Disease study, depressive disorders were responsible for over 43 million disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) annually, accounting for 1.7% of total estimated DALYs due to any disease. Depressive disorders were also responsible for over 43 million years lived with disability (YLD), accounting for 5.0% of the total YLD globally (2).

**Summary of evidence: benefits**
Both applications presented the findings of a 2018 systematic review and network meta-analysis of 522 randomized controlled trials involving 117,477 participants that evaluated the comparative efficacy and tolerability of 21 antidepressant medicines compared to each other and to placebo for the treatment of depression in adults (3). Compared to placebo, all SSRIs were associated with statistically significantly greater response rates. The greatest response rate seen was for paroxetine (odds ratio (OR) 1.75, 95% CI 1.61 to 1.90). With regard to acceptability, as measured by dropout rates, all SSRIs except for fluvoxamine showed an advantage over placebo, however this was only statistically significant for fluoxetine (OR 0.88, 95% CI 0.80-0.96). In comparisons between SSRIs, there was moderate level GRADE evidence of statically significant superior efficacy of escitalopram compared to citalopram, fluoxetine, and fluvoxamine, and of paroxetine compared to fluoxetine. Other comparisons were not statistically significant.
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| Summary of evidence: harms (from the application) | In the above-mentioned Cochrane review, 14 RCTs compared escitalopram to another SSRI (4). Escitalopram did not have significantly different rates of mild to severe adverse events than citalopram (n = 1802 in 6 RCTs), fluoxetine (n = 804 in 4 RCTs), or paroxetine (n = 784 in 2 RCTs). Also, there was no significant difference in serious adverse events for escitalopram compared to sertraline (n = 483 in 2 RCTs); however, escitalopram had a decreased incidence of diarrhoea. Overall, escitalopram and other SSRIs had similar rates of agitation, anxiety, constipation, diarrhoea, dry mouth, hypotension, insomnia, nausea, urinary complaints, drowsiness, vomiting, deaths, suicide, suicidality, and other adverse events. With respect to acceptability as measured by dropout rates, in the above-mentioned NMA, escitalopram was associated with moderate level GRADE evidence of superiority compared to fluvoxamine. There were no other statistically significant differences between SSRIs with regard to acceptability (3). A 2006 meta-analysis using patient level data from published and unpublished clinical trials based on mandatory reporting by pharmaceutical companies assessed the risk of suicidality (ideation or worse) amongst antidepressants (5, 6). Half of the treatment indications were related to depression, with the remaining 50% for other psychiatric or non-psychiatric indications. Among SSRIs, considering only data for adults with psychiatric diagnoses, suicidality risk was found to be lowest for sertraline and fluoxetine (low quality evidence). Suicidality risk was greatest for citalopram and escitalopram although the differences did not reach statistical significance (very low quality evidence). A 2014 meta-analysis examined the association between SSRI antidepressants and QTc (corrected QT) prolongation (7). Citalopram and escitalopram were associated with the greatest amount of QTc prolongation, while sertraline was associated with the least. Fluvoxamine was associated with shortened QTc. Results for fluoxetine and paroxetine were not statistically significant. With regard to sexual dysfunction, escitalopram and paroxetine have been associated with a higher risk of sexual dysfunction than fluoxetine. Pairwise comparisons of other SSRIs have not shown statistically significant differences (8). The pharmacokinetic properties of individual SSRIs differ considerably. Considering potential for drug-drug interactions, many SSRIs are inhibitors of cytochrome P450 enzymes and may interact with other drugs that are metabolized by these enzymes. Fluoxetine and paroxetine are potent inhibitors of CYP2D6, fluvoxamine is a potent inhibitor of CYP1A2. Fluoxetine and fluvoxamine are also moderate inhibitors of CYP2C19. Citalopram, escitalopram and sertraline are considered to have the lowest potential for CYP enzyme mediated interactions (9). Fluoxetine has a half-life of 1-4 days and an active metabolite (norfluoxetine) with a half-life of 7-15 days. The half-lives of the other SSRIs are considerably shorter. Therefore, fluoxetine will take longer to reach steady-state concentrations and will remain in the body for longer following discontinuation of therapy. As a result, adverse reactions and drug-interactions with fluoxetine may persist for some time following cessation of treatment (10). Paroxetine has the shortest half-life among the SSRIs (1 day) and has been found to have a higher potential for withdrawal symptoms following discontinuation (11). |

| Additional evidence: (not in the application) | N/A |
| WHO Guidelines: | WHO's Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) Guidelines make the following recommendations in relation to antidepressants for treatment of adults with depression (12): |

319
Antidepressants should not be considered for the initial treatment of adults with mild depressive episode. (Strength of recommendation: CONDITIONAL; Quality of evidence: LOW);

- Tricyclic Antidepressants or fluoxetine should be considered in adults with moderate to severe depressive episode/disorder. (Strength of recommendation: CONDITIONAL; Quality of evidence: LOW);
- If drug treatment is required in older people, tricyclic antidepressants should be avoided if possible. (Strength of recommendation: CONDITIONAL; Quality of evidence: LOW);
- If drug treatment is required in women with depressive episode who are planning a pregnancy or pregnant or breastfeeding, tricyclic antidepressants or fluoxetine should be considered. (Strength of recommendation: CONDITIONAL; Quality of evidence: LOW).

SSRIs are also recommended as first-line treatment choices in numerous international guidelines (13-17). The choice of individual SSRI should be made after taking into consideration the differing safety and tolerability profiles, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic factors, price, and individual patient factors and patient preferences.

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:
SSRIs vary in price globally, but are generally inexpensive, with multiple generic brands available. Cost-effectiveness analyses in different settings have shown SSRIs to be cost-effective interventions (18-27).

### Availability:
SSRIs are widely available globally, with off-patent generic formulations available.

### Other considerations:
Letter of support for escitalopram application from Ministry for Health and Welfare, National Centre for Mental Health Korea. “more than one SSRI should be considered as essential drugs. It is an important point that patients may respond to specific SSRIs differently and it is difficult to predict which agent will be the most effective for each patient”

### Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of a square box symbol to the current listing of fluoxetine on the core list of the EML for treatment of depressive disorders. The Committee noted that medicines within the pharmacological class of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors all have demonstrated efficacy, but can differ in terms of pharmacokinetics, adverse events and drug-interaction profiles. The availability of different SSRIs as essential medicines may be beneficial at country level to expand therapeutic alternatives for patients and support better procurement.

As a consequence of the recommendation for the square box with fluoxetine, the Expert Committee did not recommend the separate addition of escitalopram to the core list of the EML. Escitalopram, and other SSRIs should be considered therapeutically equivalent alternatives to fluoxetine for selection at national level.

### References:
Section 25: MEDICINES ACTING ON THE RESPIRATORY TRACT

25.1 Antiasthmatic and medicines for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

**Tiotropium – addition – EML**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiotropium bromide</th>
<th>ATC Code: R03BB04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of tiotropium with a square box as representative of the pharmacological class of long-acting muscarinic agents (LAMA) to the EML for use in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Forum of International Respiratory Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Comments on the application were received from the Department of Management of Noncommunicable Diseases, Disability, Violence and Injury Prevention. The technical unit supports the inclusion of tiotropium on the EML, stating that it is an effective formulation to control COPD symptoms and the frequency and severity of exacerbations. It’s inclusion on the EML may improve equity by making it more accessible to patients who need prolonged bronchodilator effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>25.1 Antiasthmatic and medicines for COPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Powder for inhalation in capsules 18 mcg Inhalation solution 2.5 mcg per dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Square box listing incorporating tiotropium bromide, glycopyrronium bromide, aclidinium bromide and umeclidinium bromide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Single agent LAMAs had not previously been considered for inclusion on the EML. The short-acting muscarinic agent ipratropium has been included on the EML since 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong> (burden of disease)</td>
<td>COPD affects approximately 300 million people worldwide and was responsible for over 3 million deaths globally in 2017 (1). In 2017, it was the third leading cause of death worldwide, after ischaemic heart disease and stroke (2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application):** | Data were presented from systematic reviews and network meta-analyses identified through a literature search conducted for the application. A 2018 Cochrane systematic review and network meta-analysis of 99 studies (101,311 participants) compared the efficacy and safety of LAMA and long-acting beta agonist (LABA) monotherapy and LABA/LAMA and LABA/inhaled corticosteroid (ICS) dual combination therapy for COPD (3). The quality of the included studies was considered by the authors to be generally good. Results of the NMA suggested that the LABA/LAMA combination was the highest ranking treatment for reducing COPD exacerbations, followed by LAMA monotherapy in patients at both high- and low-risk for COPD exacerbations, although there was some uncertainty in the results. The authors also concluded that dual combination therapies appeared more effective than LABA or LAMA monotherapy for improving symptom and quality of life scores. For the comparison of LAMA versus LABA (6 studies, 11,943 participants), LAMAs were associated with decreased moderate to severe exacerbations compared to LABA (odds ratio (OR) 0.86, 95% CI 0.79-0.93). A 2014 Cochrane systematic review and NMA of 71 studies (73,062 participants) assessed the efficacy of long-acting therapies for COPD (beta-agonists, anticholinergics and corticosteroids) (4). The efficacy outcomes evaluated with St George’s Respiratory Questionnaire (SGRQ) total score, and trough forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1). Results from pairwise comparisons for the efficacy outcome of SGRQ total score indicated LABA/ICS as the highest ranked intervention, with a mean improvement over placebo of -3.89 units at six months (95% credible interval (CrI) -4.70 to -2.97) and -3.60 at 12 months (95% CrI -4.63 to -2.34). LAMAs and LABAs were ranked second and third at six months, with mean differences of -2.63 (95% CrI -3.53 to -1.97) and -2.29 (95% CrI -3.18 to -1.53), respectively. Inhaled corticosteroids were ranked fourth (MD -2.00, 95% CrI -3.06 to -0.87). Results from pairwise comparisons for the outcome of FEV1 also indicated LABA/ICS to be the highest ranking intervention, followed by
LAMAs and LABAs with essentially equivalent results, with ICS ranking fourth. The authors concluded that quality of life and lung function were improved most with LABA/ICS combination therapy. LAMA and LABA monotherapy demonstrated similar effects to each other. A 2014 Cochrane systematic review of 12 randomized controlled trials (9,547 participants) evaluated the efficacy and safety of the LAMA aclidinium bromide in patients with stable COPD (5). Compared to placebo, aclidinium was associated with improvements in quality of life as measured by SGRQ total score(mean difference -2.34 (95% CI -3.18 to -1.51). Aclidinium also reduced the number of hospitalizations due to severe exacerbations compared to placebo (OR 0.64; 95% CI 0.46 to 0.88; corresponding to 4 to 20 fewer per 1000 in absolute terms). However, the authors concluded that overall, aclidinium did not significantly reduce mortality, serious adverse events, or exacerbations requiring oral steroids and/or antibiotics. The available data were insufficient and of very low quality for efficacy comparisons of aclidinium versus tiotropium.

A 2018 Cochrane systematic review of seven randomized controlled trials (5,921 participants) evaluated the efficacy and safety of combination therapy with aclidinium bromide and LABAs in patients with stable COPD (6). Compared to individual monotherapy or placebo, aclidinium/LABA combination therapy was associated with improved dyspnoea, lung function and quality of life. The authors found no evidence of a difference between combination therapy and monotherapy or placebo for exacerbations, hospital admissions, mortality, non-fatal SAEs or adverse events.

A 2015 Cochrane systematic review of 10 trials (10,894 participants) compared the relative effects of treatment with LABA plus tiotropium versus tiotropium or LABA monotherapy in patients with COPD (7). The authors concluded that LABA/tiotropium combination therapy was associated with a small mean improvement in health-related quality of life and FEV1 compared to either agent alone. There was no observed difference in hospital admissions or death between treatment groups.

The application also presented the results of systematic reviews and individual trials that compared monotherapy with aclidinium (5, 8), glycopyrronium (9-11), tiotropium (12-18) and umeclidinium (19, 20) versus placebo, other short- and long-acting LAMAs, and LABAs. These findings suggested that aclidinium/LABA combination therapy was associated with improved dyspnoea, lung function and quality of life. The authors concluded that overall, aclidinium did not significantly reduce mortality, serious adverse events, or exacerbations requiring oral steroids and/or antibiotics. The available data were insufficient and of very low quality for efficacy comparisons of aclidinium versus tiotropium.
Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee recommended the inclusion of tiotropium with a square box as representative of the pharmacological class of long-acting muscarinic agents (LAMA) to the core list of the EML for use in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) based on the evidence presented for efficacy in reducing COPD exacerbations, safety and cost-effectiveness.

Availability:
Tiotropium has wide international availability and is available in generic brands.

Other considerations:
N/A

References:
Section 27: VITAMINS AND MINERALS

**Iodine – change to listing – EML and EMLc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iodine</th>
<th>ATC Code: H03CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested a correction to the strength of iodine capsules listed on the EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Guerbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc</strong></td>
<td>EML and EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>27. Vitamin and Minerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dose form(s) &amp; strength(s):</strong></td>
<td>Capsule 190 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core / Complementary:</strong></td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual / Square box listing:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> (if relevant, eg. resubmission, previous EC consideration)</td>
<td>Iodine capsules 200 mg and iodized oil were added to the EML in 1990 for the prophylaxis of goitre in areas where severe iodine deficiency is endemic and where dietary intake of iodine, including iodized salt, is inadequate (1). The same formulations were included on the first EMLc in 2007 (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public health relevance:</strong> (burden of disease)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: benefits</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of evidence: harms</strong> (from the application)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional evidence:</strong> (not in the application)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Guidelines:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs / cost-effectiveness:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability:</strong></td>
<td>A discrepancy exists between the listed strength of iodine capsules on the EML and EMLc and the marketing authorization of the product. The marketing authorization and Summary of Product Characteristics (SmPC) for the product marketed by Guerbet report the qualitative and quantitative composition as 500 mg ethyl esters of iodised fatty acids from poppy seed oil, corresponding to 190 mg iodine (38% w/w).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other considerations:</strong></td>
<td>The requested amendment was supported by Médecins Sans Frontières.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>The Expert Committee recommended that the strength of iodine capsules in the EML and EMLc be corrected to 190 mg, to accurately reflect the quantitative composition as described in the marketing authorization and Summary of Product Characteristics (SmPC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**

Multiple micronutrient powders - addition –EMLc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple micronutrient powders</th>
<th>ATC Code:  B03AE10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>The application requested the inclusion of multiple micronutrient powders (MNP) for the prevention of anaemia in infants and children on the core list of the EMLc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Dr Stanley Zlotkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO Technical Department:</strong></td>
<td>Nutrition for Health and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EML / EMLc:</strong></td>
<td>EMLc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>27. Vitamins and minerals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Dose form(s) & strengths(s):** | Oral powder sachet 1 g containing:  
- elemental iron 12.5 mg  
- elemental zinc 5 mg  
- vitamin A 300 mcg  
- with or without other micronutrients at recommended daily values |
| **Core / Complementary:**     | Core |
| **Individual / Square box listing:** | Individual |
| **Background:**               | Multiple micronutrient powders have not previously been considered for inclusion on the EMLc. |
| **Public health relevance:**  | The global prevalence of anaemia worldwide for preschool children in 2011 was 43% or an estimated 273 children, of which about 42% is attributable to iron deficiency (1). Anaemia in early childhood reduces cognitive ability and causes developmental delays and disability (1). Currently, epidemiological and experimental data suggest that in order to minimize these risks, prevention of anaemia is preferred over treatment because the physiological impairments due to deficiency start at an early age and they may be irreversible, even after repletion of iron stores (2). There are no direct estimates for prevalence of zinc deficiency; however, it is believed to be as prevalent as iron deficiency affecting approximately 293 million children under five and is responsible for 13% of lower respiratory tract infections (primarily pneumonia and influenza) (3). Amongst children under five globally, an estimated 190 million have vitamin A deficiency. The prevalence of vitamin A deficiency is about 44% amongst children in Africa and about 50% in children in South-East Asia. Vitamin A deficiency associated with prevalence of night blindness is around 2% in African children, and about 0.5% in children in parts of South-East Asia (3). Deficiencies of vitamins and minerals such as iron, zinc, vitamin A and others, often occur simultaneously in children due to factors such as poor nutritional status (3). The effects of these deficiencies in neonates can result in serious adverse events including mortality. Furthermore, the effects of these deficiencies in childhood may result in long-term, life-long irreversible physical and cognitive problems that lead to negative consequences for health and economic opportunities. Mineral and vitamin deficiencies particularly in iron, zinc and vitamin A, among other nutritional risk factors are determined to be responsible for 3.9 million deaths (35% of total deaths) in children under the age of five annually. These deficiencies are also responsible for 144 million disability-adjusted life years in the same population (3). |
### Summary of evidence: benefits (from the application)

Evidence for the effectiveness of MNP comes from two systematic reviews that informed the development of the 2016 WHO Guidelines for use of multiple micronutrient powders for point-of-use fortification of foods consumed by infants and young children 6-23 months and children 2-12 years (4).

A 2011 Cochrane systematic review of 15 randomized and quasi-randomized trials (12,239 participants) evaluated the effects and safety of point-of-use fortification of foods with MNP for infants and young children from 6 to 23 months of age. The trials were conducted in low- and middle-income countries in Asia, Africa and the Americas. Six studies were conducted in malaria-endemic areas. Most trials were assessed as having a low risk of bias (5).

The Guideline Development Group reported that infants and young children from 6 to 23 months of age who consumed foods fortified at the point-of-use with multiple micronutrients powders had a lower risk for the critical outcome of anaemia, with a 26% reduction compared to placebo or no intervention (risk ratio [RR]: 0.74; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.66 to 0.83; 10 studies; 2802 participants, high-quality evidence). They also had a lower risk for the critical outcome of iron deficiency, with a 52% reduction (RR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.36 to 0.62; 5 studies; 796 participants, moderate-quality evidence). Compared to no treatment or placebo, children receiving multiple micronutrient powders had a 5.12 g/L higher haemoglobin concentration at follow-up (mean difference [MD]: 5.12 g/L; 95% CI: 2.70 to 7.54 g/L; 12 studies; 3565 participants, low-quality evidence). With respect to iron status, compared to no treatment or placebo, children receiving multiple micronutrient powders had an average increase in serum ferritin concentration of 16.47 μg/L at follow-up (MD: 16.47 μg/L; 95% CI: 3.03 to 29.91 μg/L; 3 studies; 694 participants, very low-quality evidence). Regarding weight-for-age z-score, the mean difference was minimal (MD: 0.04 in z-score; 95% CI: −0.13 to 0.21; 4 studies; 606 participants, low-quality evidence) (4).

A second Cochrane systematic review of 12 randomized and quasi-randomized trials (5,720 participants) assessed the effects and safety of point-of-use fortification of foods with MNP for children aged from 2 to 12 years. The trials were conducted in low- and middle-income countries in Asia, Africa and the Americas. Most trials were assessed as having a low risk of bias (6). The Guideline Development Group reported that children aged 2–12 years receiving iron-containing multiple micronutrient powders for point-of-use fortification of foods were significantly less likely to have anaemia at follow-up than those children receiving no intervention or a placebo (prevalence ratio [PR]: 0.66; 95% CI: 0.49 to 0.88; 10 studies, 2448 participants, moderate-quality evidence). These children also had a 3.37 g/L higher haemoglobin concentration at follow-up (MD: 3.37 g/L; 95% CI: 0.94 to 5.80 g/L; 11 studies; 2746 participants, low-quality evidence). Also, children receiving iron-containing multiple micronutrient powders for point-of-use fortification of foods were significantly less likely to have iron deficiency at follow-up than those children receiving no intervention or a placebo (PR: 0.35; 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.47; 5 studies; 1364 participants, moderate-quality evidence). With respect to ferritin concentrations, children receiving iron-containing multiple micronutrient powders had, on average, 0.42 μg of ferritin more per litre at follow-up than those children receiving no intervention or a placebo (standardized mean difference [SMD]: 0.42 μg/L; 95% CI: −4.36 to 5.19 μg/L; 3 studies; 1066 participants, very low-quality evidence) (4).
In the systematic review on MNP in infants and young children, data on morbidity, other indicators of vitamin and mineral status and side-effects were scarce due to a lack of standardization; however, none of the trials reported deaths attributable to the intervention and there was no difference regarding the patterns of morbidity between children receiving placebo or no intervention and the ones receiving MNP. Only one of the studies conducted in malaria-endemic areas reported results related to malaria and found no difference in the presence of positive malaria smears between the groups (RR 0.24; 95% CI 0.05 to 1.12; 194 children). None of the trials reported on the outcome of all-cause mortality.

In the systematic review on MNP in older children, only one trial reported on the outcome of all-cause mortality and there were no deaths reported during this trial (MD: 0; 95% CI: −0.03 to 0.03; 1 study; 115 participants, low-quality evidence). Finally, diarrhoea (three liquid stools or more per day) was reported by two trials and children receiving iron-containing MNP were as likely to have diarrhoea at follow-up as those children receiving no intervention or a placebo (RR: 0.97; 95% CI: 0.53 to 1.78; 2 studies; 366 participants, moderate-quality evidence) (6). A 2016 Cochrane systematic review evaluated the effects and safety of iron supplementation (including MNP), with or without folic acid, in children living in areas with hyperendemic or holoendemic malaria transmission. The review found that overall, iron does not cause an excess of clinical malaria (risk ratio (RR) 0.93, 95% confidence intervals (CI) 0.87 to 1.00; 14 trials, 7168 children, high quality evidence). Iron probably does not cause an excess of clinical malaria in both populations where anaemia is common and those in which anaemia is uncommon. In areas where there are prevention and management services for malaria, iron (with or without folic acid) may reduce clinical malaria (RR 0.91; 95% CI 0.84 to 0.97; seven trials, 5586 participants, low quality evidence), while in areas where such services are unavailable, iron (with or without folic acid) may increase the incidence of malaria, although the lower CIs indicate no difference (RR 1.16, 95% CI 1.02 to 1.31; nine trials, 19,086 participants, low quality evidence). Iron supplementation does not cause an excess of severe malaria (RR 0.90, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.98; 6 trials, 3421 children, high quality evidence). Iron resulted in fewer anaemic children at follow up, and the end average change in haemoglobin from base line was higher with iron (7).

### WHO Guidelines:

The 2016 WHO Guidelines for use of multiple micronutrient powders for point-of-use fortification of foods consumed by infants and young children 6-23 months and children 2-12 years (4) make the following recommendations with regard to MNP:

- In populations where anaemia is a public health problem, point-of-use fortification of complementary foods with iron-containing micronutrient powders in infants and young children aged 6–23 months is recommended, to improve iron status and reduce anaemia (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).
- In populations where anaemia is a public health problem, point-of-use fortification of foods with iron containing micronutrient powders in children aged 2–12 years is recommended, to improve iron status and reduce anaemia (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

### Costs / cost-effectiveness:

The current listed price of the MNP provided by UNICEF Supply Catalogue website is US$ 0.62-US$ 0.65 per pack (30 sachets) (8). The composition of the UNICEF supplied product differs from the composition of MNP proposed for inclusion on the EMLc with regard to the amount of iron, vitamin A and zinc, and the inclusion of 12 additional micronutrients. The World Bank estimated the annual cost of MNP intervention at US$ 3.60 per child 12-23 months of age (9). A Copenhagen Consensus review found that micronutrient interventions were cost-effective in general (10). It has also been estimated that iron-containing MNP recover $37 for every $1 invested due to the positive effects of addressing childhood anaemia among children 6–23 months (11).

### Availability:

The following manufacturers were identified in 2016 by UNICEF Supply Division’s Multiple Micronutrient Powder Supply & Market Outlook as meeting standards (i.e. Good Manufacturing Practice) and having the capacity to provide suitable, age-appropriate dose forms and strengths of multiple micronutrient powders for administration to infants and children (12):

1. DSM Europe (Switzerland)
2. DSM (Malaysia)- formerly Fortitech
3. Renata (Bangladesh)
4. Piramal (India)
5. DSM (South Africa)

Other considerations:
The Expert Committee noted the information provided in the application regarding the submission for MNP to be included in the United States Pharmacopoeia (USP), including a draft of the approved product monograph, which will take effect in May 2019.

Committee Recommendations:
The Expert Committee recommended the addition of multiple micronutrient powders to the core list of the EMLc for the prevention of anaemia in infants and children in populations where anaemia is a public health problem. Use should be in line with the recommendations in current WHO Guidelines for point-of-use fortification of foods.
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