



Oral Semaglutide for Type 2 Diabetes: Effectiveness and Value

Draft Questions for Deliberation and Voting: November 14, 2019 Public Meeting

These questions are intended for the deliberation of the New England CEPAC voting body at the public meeting.

Patient Population for all questions: Adults with Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) with inadequate glycemic control despite current treatment with antihyperglycemic agent(s).

Clinical Evidence

1. Is the evidence adequate to demonstrate that adding **oral semaglutide** to ongoing background therapy provides a positive net health benefit?

Yes No

2. Is the evidence adequate to demonstrate that the net health benefit of adding **oral semaglutide** is superior to that provided by adding **sitagliptin** (Januvia®)?

Yes No

3. Is the evidence adequate to demonstrate that the net health benefit of adding **oral semaglutide** is superior to that provided by adding **liraglutide** (Victoza®)?

Yes No

4. Is the evidence adequate to distinguish the net health benefit of adding **oral semaglutide** from that provided by adding **empagliflozin** (Jardiance®)?

Yes No

If yes:

- 4a. Which treatment provides greater net health benefit?
 - a. Oral semaglutide
 - b. Empagliflozin

Potential Other Benefits and Disadvantages and Contextual Considerations

Potential Other Benefits and Disadvantages

5. For patients currently receiving ongoing background therapy, does adding treatment with **oral semaglutide** offer one or more of the following potential “other benefits or disadvantages.” (select all that apply)¹
 - a. This intervention offers reduced complexity compared to liraglutide that will significantly improve patient outcomes.
 - b. There are other important benefits or disadvantages that should have an important role in judgments of the value of this intervention: _____

Contextual Considerations

6. Are any of the following contextual considerations important in assessing the long-term value for money of **oral semaglutide**? (select all that apply)
 - a. This intervention is intended for the care of individuals with a condition of particularly high severity in terms of impact on length of life and/or quality of life.
 - b. This intervention is intended for the care of individuals with a condition that represents a particularly high lifetime burden of illness.
 - c. There is significant uncertainty about the long-term risk of serious side effects of this intervention.
 - d. There is significant uncertainty about the magnitude or durability of the long-term benefits of this intervention.
 - e. There are additional contextual considerations that should have an important role in judgments of the value of this intervention: _____.

¹ Votes will be taken on an abbreviated list of potential other benefits and contextual considerations. Although ICER’s value framework identifies a broader list, the omitted options were determined not to apply to the treatment in question.

Long-term Value for Money²

7. Given the available evidence on comparative effectiveness and incremental cost-effectiveness, and considering other benefits, disadvantages, and contextual considerations, what is the long-term value for money of treatment with **oral semaglutide** versus **ongoing background therapy alone**?
 - a. Low long-term value for money at current pricing
 - b. Intermediate long-term value for money at current pricing
 - c. High long-term value for money at current pricing

² Value votes for oral semaglutide (Novo Nordisk) will not be taken without a known price.