




Ranibizumab

REFUSÉE

Le Comité d'experts, après évaluation, refuse d'inscrire le médicament proposé dans la demande. La Liste Modèle des Médicaments Essentiels fait état des raisons que les membres du Comité ont identifiées pour refuser l'inscription.

Section: [21. Ophthalmological preparations](#) > [21.6. Ophthalmological preparations > Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor \(VEGF\) preparations](#)

Codes ATC: **S01LA04**

Indication	Retinal venous occlusions Code ICD11: 9B74.1
INN	Ranibizumab
Type de médicament	Biological agent
Type de liste	Liste complémentaire
Formulations	.
Historique des statuts LME	Demande refusée en 2015 (TRS 994)
Sexe	Tous
Âge	Adolescents et adultes
Équivalence thérapeutique	La recommandation concerne ce médicament spécifique
Renseignements sur le brevet	Lire la suite sur les brevets . 
Wikipédia	Ranibizumab 
DrugBank	Ranibizumab 

Résumé des preuves et recommandation du comité d'experts

An application was submitted by Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland for inclusion in the WHO Model List of Essential Medicines of ranibizumab for the treatment of neovascular (wet) age-related macular degeneration (nAMD), visual impairment due to diabetic macular oedema (DME), visual impairment due to macular oedema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO), visual impairment due to macular oedema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) and visual impairment due to choroidal neovascularization (CNV) secondary to pathological myopia (PM). Expert reviews of the application were prepared by two members of the Expert Committee. Public comments on the application were received from the European Alliance for Access to Safe Medicines, from Professor Andrzej Stankiewicz, President of AMD Association Poland, from the Hellenic Retina Society, from Professor Wojciech Omulecki, Head of the Department of Ophthalmology, Medical University of Lodz, Poland, and from the Chairmen of the Polish Ophthalmological Society, Retina Hong Kong and the Irish Patients' Association. At its 19th meeting, the Expert Committee, while noting the absence of stringent regulatory authority approval for use for the indication of nAMD, recommended inclusion of bevacizumab (an alternative vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) inhibitor) in the EML for treatment of nAMD on the grounds of public health need, demonstrated safety and effectiveness, and favourable cost-effectiveness (1). The pooled prevalence of nAMD, a progressive and chronic disease of the retina, at any stage is 8.7% (95% credible interval (CrI): 4.3–17.4%) and the prevalence of late-stage nAMD is 0.4% (95% CrI: 0.2–0.8%). Higher prevalence is observed in European than in Asian or African populations (2). The condition is the leading cause of irreversible blindness in people over 50 years of age in developed countries (3). As a result of increased life expectancy and the growth of the elderly population, the number of cases of nAMD is expected to increase drastically by 2020 (4). Diabetic retinopathy is one of the most frequent and

severe complications of diabetes mellitus. DME is caused by the exudation and accumulation of extracellular fluid and proteins in the macula and is associated with blindness in the working-age population in developed countries (5). Visual impairment due to DME has been reported to affect approximately 1–3% of the diabetic population (6). Retinal vein occlusion involves the narrowing or blockage of a retinal vein. It is classified by the site of venous occlusion as either central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) or branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO). Approximately 16.4 million adults are affected worldwide, 13.9 million with BRVO and 2.5 million with CRVO; annual incidences of BRVO and CRVO are 0.12% and 0.03–0.04%, respectively (7–9). Pathological myopia is a leading cause of vision loss, especially in a younger population (<50 years of age). Population-based studies reported the prevalence of PM to be 0.9–3.1% and of visual impairment attributable to PM to range from 0.1% to 0.5% in European studies and 0.2% to 1.4% in Asian studies (10). The prevalence of choroidal neovascularization in individuals with PM has been reported to be 5.2–11.3%; development of CNV is associated with visual impairment. Numerous studies document the efficacy of ranibizumab for the treatment of nAMD, DME, BRVO, CRVO, CNV and PM. In nAMD, the MARINA (11), ANCHOR (12) and FOCUS (13) trials reported mean increases in visual acuity in the subgroups receiving intravitreal injections of 0.5 mg ranibizumab compared with sham photodynamic therapy (PDT), sham intravitreal injections and active verteporfin PDT. The results of a Cochrane review of 12 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) including a total of 5496 participants with nAMD indicate that anti-VEGF agents (ranibizumab, bevacizumab and pegaptanib) are effective in terms of maintaining visual acuity; ranibizumab and bevacizumab were also shown to improve visual acuity (14). Comparative efficacy for visual acuity (gain of 15 letters or more of visual acuity at one year) of ranibizumab compared with the currently EML-listed bevacizumab, expressed as risk ratio (RR), was 0.90 (95% CI: 0.73–1.11). The RESOLVE and RESTORE studies assessed the efficacy and safety of ranibizumab in patients with visual impairment due to DME. The RESOLVE study showed that ranibizumab is effective in improving best corrected visual acuity (BCVA) and is well tolerated (15). In the RESTORE study, ranibizumab monotherapy and ranibizumab combined with laser therapy proved to be superior to standard laser therapy in improving visual acuity (16). Over three years, BCVA was maintained and the occurrence of ocular and non-ocular adverse events was limited (17). The results of a Cochrane review of 18 RCTs indicate that anti-VEGF agents (ranibizumab, aflibercept, bevacizumab and pegaptanib) are effective in terms of maintaining and improving visual acuity in patients with DME when compared with control treatments (i.e. no anti-VEGF agents) (18). Regarding absolute benefit, 100 participants need to be treated with antiangiogenic therapy to allow 20 more people (95% CI: 13–29) to have markedly improved vision after one year. No significant subgroup difference between bevacizumab, ranibizumab and aflibercept was demonstrated. The comparative efficacy for visual acuity (a gain of three or more lines at one year) of ranibizumab compared with the currently EML-listed bevacizumab, expressed as relative odds ratio (OR), was 1.15 (95% CI: 0.67–2.08). This analysis was based on direct and indirect comparisons, taking advantage of all available evidence. More recently, a multicentre RCT of 660 patients with DME found aflibercept to be more effective than ranibizumab and bevacizumab at improving vision in patients with lower visual-acuity letter scores at baseline (19). The Expert Committee considered that the results of this trial are of interest and that the comparative effectiveness of aflibercept in comparison with other anti-VEGF agents needs to be further explored. The BRAVO study, a multicentre RCT of 397 patients with macular oedema secondary to BRVO, compared monthly intravitreal ranibizumab injections (0.3 mg and 0.5 mg) with sham injections (20). The study reported that ranibizumab appears to have a favourable effect on visual function. However, approximately 50% of the ranibizumab 0.3 mg group and 45% of the ranibizumab 0.5 mg group in the trial also received rescue laser photocoagulation therapy, which may have had a significant effect on the primary outcome (21). The CRUISE RCT followed a similar design to BRAVO, randomizing 392 patients with macular oedema secondary to CRVO to monthly intravitreal ranibizumab injections (0.3 mg and 0.5 mg) or sham injections (20). The proportions of patients gaining three lines or more in BCVA were 46.2% in the 0.3 mg ranibizumab group, 47.7% in the 0.5 mg ranibizumab group, and 16.9% in those receiving sham injections. The ROCC study of 32 patients with macular oedema secondary to CRVO, randomized to monthly intravitreal ranibizumab (0.5 mg/0.05 mL) or sham injections for three consecutive months, also reported increased BCVA in the ranibizumab group compared with the sham injection group (22). The results of a Cochrane review of six RCTs including a total of 937 patients with CRVO indicated that anti-VEGF agents (ranibizumab, aflibercept, bevacizumab and pegaptanib) are effective in maintaining and improving visual acuity (23). There were no statistically significant differences between the anti-VEGF agent subgroups. This comparison is limited by the paucity of studies and – in the absence of head-to-head randomized studies – the lack of direct comparison of anti-VEGFs. However, the Expert Committee considered that differences between bevacizumab and ranibizumab for this indication are unlikely, given the contextual evidence in similar diseases and the lack of a biological rationale for differences. The 12-month randomized RADIANCE trial, including 277 patients with myopic CNV, assessed the efficacy and safety of ranibizumab, administered under two different schedules, guided by visual acuity stabilization or disease activity, compared with verteporfin PDT. Ranibizumab treatment provided superior BCVA gains compared with verteporfin PDT in the first three months (24); patients

in the verteporfin PDT arm of the study were switched to ranibizumab thereafter. Three additional RCTs compared ranibizumab and bevacizumab in patients with myopic choroidal neovascularization (mCNV) (25–27). Significant improvements in visual acuity were observed in both ranibizumab and bevacizumab groups. The differences in the final mean BCVA between the groups was not significant, although these studies had limited power. In a recent meta-analysis, the comparative efficacy for visual acuity (a gain of three or more lines at one year) of ranibizumab compared with the currently EML-listed bevacizumab, expressed as risk ratio, was 0.95 (95% CI: 0.67–1.32) (28). With regard to safety, the meta-analyses conducted for all antiangiogenic drugs compared with either sham therapy or photocoagulation showed no significant difference regarding all serious systemic adverse events, specific serious systemic adverse events such as arterial thromboembolic events (including myocardial infarction, stroke or cerebral infarction, ischaemic cardiomyopathy), and overall mortality (14, 18, 23). Ocular inflammation and increased intraocular pressure after intravitreal injection were the most frequently reported serious ocular adverse events. Endophthalmitis was reported in less than 1% of anti-VEGF treated participants. The occurrence of serious systemic adverse events was comparable across anti-VEGF-treated groups and control groups. In addition, a recent Cochrane systematic review assessing the systemic safety of intravitreal bevacizumab compared with ranibizumab in patients with nAMD in non-industry-sponsored RCTs found no relevant difference for deaths, serious adverse events, or specific subsets of serious adverse events, with the exception of gastrointestinal disorders, in the first two years of treatment (29). Based on the event rates in the studies, the risk of death with ranibizumab is 3.4% and with bevacizumab 3.7% (95% CI: 2.7–5.3%), and the risk of serious adverse events with ranibizumab is 22.2% and with bevacizumab 24% (95% CI: 20–29.1%). These results suggest that if a difference does exist, it is likely to be small. In consideration of costs, the Expert Committee noted that the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) considers ranibizumab to be cost-effective for nAMD (20 000 – 25 000 patients/year in the United Kingdom) but not affordable for DME (100 000 patients/year) (30). Ranibizumab is more expensive than bevacizumab, with each injection costing several hundred US dollars and less than US\$ 100 US respectively (31). In a large independent RCT based in the United Kingdom, the mean total cost per patient over the 2-year trial ranged from £18 590 (US\$ 29 119) for monthly ranibizumab to £3002 (US\$ 4702) for as-needed bevacizumab (32). Drug cost accounted for 80–88% of the total cost for patients randomized to ranibizumab and 21–30% of the cost for patients randomized to bevacizumab. Recent economic analyses investigated the cost-effectiveness of as-needed ranibizumab versus monthly bevacizumab: as-needed ranibizumab was more costly and produced negligible or no health gains compared with monthly bevacizumab (31, 32). Ranibizumab is currently registered in more than 100 countries worldwide for nAMD, DME, BRVO and CRVO and in more than 80 countries for mCNV. It is recommended by NICE as a possible treatment for these conditions (30, 33–35). Ranibizumab must be administered under aseptic conditions by a qualified ophthalmologist experienced in intravitreal injections. Adequate anaesthesia and a broad-spectrum topical microbicide to disinfect the skin, eyelid and ocular surface should be administered before the injection. Following intravitreal injection, patients should be monitored for elevation in intraocular pressure and for endophthalmitis. Monitoring may consist of a check for perfusion of the optic nerve head immediately after the injection and tonometry within 30 minutes following the injection. Patients should be monitored during the week following the injection to permit early treatment if an infection occurs. Monitoring for disease activity may include clinical examination, functional testing or imaging techniques (e.g. optical coherence tomography or uorescein angiography) (36). The Expert Committee noted that currently available formulations of bevacizumab are not specifically formulated for intravitreal injection. Bevacizumab is available as a sterile solution of 25mg/mL (i.e. 1.25mg per 0.05 mL) and therefore does not need to be diluted or reconstituted in any way for intravitreal injection. The Committee considered that reports of adverse events (such as endophthalmitis) resulting from compounding of doses from the currently available bevacizumab vial sizes for multiple intravitreal injections had been traced to inadequate sterility in the compounding process. The Committee therefore noted that safe use of bevacizumab as currently formulated requires that use may need to be restricted to a single patient per vial, notwithstanding the wastage. Any alternative approach to using a single vial for multiple patients would have to comply with appropriate safe and sterile injection practices, including any requirements for storage of the product, to ensure that there would be no possibility of contamination. Bevacizumab is already included in the EML. The Expert Committee noted that the evidence resulting from well-conducted independent studies comparing ranibizumab and bevacizumab, critically appraised in several independent systematic reviews, is substantial. Overall, the evidence shows ranibizumab and bevacizumab to be similarly effective in nAMD, DME and mCNV. There was no direct comparative evidence for bevacizumab and ranibizumab in BRVO and CRVO, but the Expert Committee considered that differences have not been demonstrated, as the contextual evidence in similar diseases supports similar effectiveness and safety of the two medicines. In cost-effectiveness analyses, as might be expected, bevacizumab is the preferable option since ranibizumab costs significantly more but offers no greater benefits. The Committee was also concerned that inclusion of ranibizumab on the Model List for treatment of eye diseases might divert relevant resources from other interventions at country

level. The Committee considered the option of adding a square box to the existing listing of bevacizumab, thereby allowing selection of ranibizumab as a pharmacological alternative VEGF inhibitor. However, given the difference in current prices of the two products and the legislation relating to “off-label” use of medicines in many countries, the Committee decided that indicating interchangeability could well result in considerable additional expenditure at country level, without additional clinical benefit. The Committee considered that inclusion only of the less expensive bevacizumab on the EML might serve to facilitate its use (albeit off-label) for this indication. While recognizing the importance of effective management strategies for neovascular eye diseases, and that ranibizumab is registered in many countries for these indications while bevacizumab is used off-label, the Expert Committee decided not to add ranibizumab to the EML. References: 1. The selection and use of essential medicines. Report of the WHO Expert Committee, 2013 (including the 18th WHO Model List of Essential Medicines and the 4th WHO Model List of Essential Medicines for Children). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014. (WHO Technical Report Series, No. 985). 2. Wong WL, Su X, Li X, Cheung CM, Klein R, Cheng CY, et al. Global prevalence of age-related macular degeneration and disease burden projection for 2020 and 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2014;2(2):e106-16. 3. Patel RD, Momi RS, Hariprasad SM. Review of ranibizumab trials for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Semin Ophthalmol*. 2011;26(6):372-9. 4. Klein R, Chou CF, Klein BE, Zhang X, Meuer SM, Saaddine JB. Prevalence of age-related macular degeneration in the US population. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2011;129(1):75-80. 5. Williams R, Airey M, Baxter H, Forrester J, Kennedy-Martin T, Girach A. Epidemiology of diabetic retinopathy and macular oedema: a systematic review. *Eye (Lond)*. 2004;18(10):963-83. 6. Ling R, Ramsewak V, Taylor D, Jacob J. Longitudinal study of a cohort of people with diabetes screened by the Exeter Diabetic Retinopathy Screening Programme. *Eye (Lond)*. 2002;16(2):140-5. 7. Cugati S, Wang JJ, Rochtchina E, Mitchell P. Ten-year incidence of retinal vein occlusion in an older population: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2006;124(5):726-32. 8. Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, Meuer SM. The epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc*. 2000;98:133-41; discussion 41-3. 9. Klein R, Moss SE, Meuer SM, Klein BE. The 15-year cumulative incidence of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2008;126(4):513-8. 10. Wong TY, Ferreira A, Hughes R, Carter G, Mitchell P. Epidemiology and disease burden of pathologic myopia and myopic choroidal neovascularization: an evidence-based systematic review. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2014;157(1):9-25.e12. 11. Rosenfeld PJ, Brown DM, Heier JS, Boyer DS, Kaiser PK, Chung CY, et al. Ranibizumab for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355(14):1419-31. 12. Brown DM, Michels M, Kaiser PK, Heier JS, Sy JP, Ianchulev T. Ranibizumab versus verteporfin photodynamic therapy for neovascular age-related macular degeneration: Two-year results of the ANCHOR study. *Ophthalmology*. 2009;116(1):57-65.e5. 13. Antoszyk AN, Tuomi L, Chung CY, Singh A. Ranibizumab combined with verteporfin photodynamic therapy in neovascular age-related macular degeneration (FOCUS): year 2 results. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2008;145(5):862-74. 14. Solomon SD, Lindsley K, Vedula SS, Krzystolik MG, Hawkins BS. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;8:CD005139. 15. Massin P, Bandello F, Garweg JG, Hansen LL, Harding SP, Larsen M, et al. Safety and efficacy of ranibizumab in diabetic macular edema (RESOLVE Study): a 12-month, randomized, controlled, double-masked, multicenter phase II study. *Diabetes Care*. 2010;33(11):2399-405. 16. Mitchell P, Bandello F, Schmidt-Erfurth U, Lang GE, Massin P, Schlingemann RO, et al. The RESTORE study: ranibizumab monotherapy or combined with laser versus laser monotherapy for diabetic macular edema. *Ophthalmology*. 2011;118(4):615-25. 17. Schmidt-Erfurth U, Lang GE, Holz FG, Schlingemann RO, Lanzetta P, Massin P, et al. Three-year outcomes of individualized ranibizumab treatment in patients with diabetic macular edema: the RESTORE extension study. *Ophthalmology*. 2014;121(5):1045-53. 18. Virgili G, Parravano M, Menchini F, Evans JR. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor for diabetic macular oedema. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;10:CD007419. 19. Wells JA, Glassman AR, Ayala AR, Jampol LM, Aiello LP, Antoszyk AN, et al. Aibercept, bevacizumab, or ranibizumab for diabetic macular edema. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(13):1193-203. 20. Varma R, Bressler NM, Suner I, Lee P, Dolan CM, Ward J, et al. Improved vision-related function after ranibizumab for macular edema after retinal vein occlusion: results from the BRAVO and CRUISE trials. *Ophthalmology*. 2012;119(10):2108-18. 21. Mitry D, Bunce C, Charteris D. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor for macular oedema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;1:CD009510. 22. Kinge B, Stordahl PB, Forsaa V, Fossen K, Haugstad M, Helgesen OH, et al. Efficacy of ranibizumab in patients with macular edema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion: results from the sham-controlled ROCC study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2010;150(3):310-4. 23. Braithwaite T, Nanji AA, Lindsley K, Greenberg PB. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor for macular oedema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;5:CD007325. 24. Wolf S, Balciuniene VJ, Laganovska G, Menchini U, Ohno-Matsui K, Sharma T, et al. RADIANCE: a randomized controlled study of ranibizumab in patients with choroidal neovascularization secondary to pathologic myopia. *Ophthalmology*. 2014;121(3):682-92.e2. 25. Iacono P, Parodi MB, Papayannis A, Kontadakis S, Sheth S, Cascavilla ML, et al. Intravitreal ranibizumab versus bevacizumab for treatment of myopic choroidal neovascularization. *Retina*. 2012;32(8):1539-46.

26. Gharbiya M, Giustolisi R, Allievi F, Fantozzi N, Mazzeo L, Scavella V, et al. Choroidal neovascularization in pathologic myopia: intravitreal ranibizumab versus bevacizumab--a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2010;149(3):458-64.e1. 27. Lai TY, Luk FO, Lee GK, Lam DS. Long-term outcome of intravitreal anti-vascular endothelial growth factor therapy with bevacizumab or ranibizumab as primary treatment for subfoveal myopic choroidal neovascularization. *Eye (Lond)*. 2012;26(7):1004-11. 28. Lout M, Siddiqui MR, Dhedhi A, Kamal A. A systematic review and meta-analysis comparing intravitreal ranibizumab with bevacizumab for the treatment of myopic choroidal neovascularisation. *Saudi J Ophthalmol*. 2015;29(2):147-55. 29. Moja L, Lucenteforte E, Kwag KH, Bertele V, Campomori A, Chakravarthy U, et al. Systemic safety of bevacizumab versus ranibizumab for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;9:CD011230. 30. Ranibizumab and pegaptanib for the treatment of age-related macular degeneration. NICE technology appraisal guidance [TA155]. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2008. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta155>. 31. Stein JD, Newman-Casey PA, Mrinalini T, Lee PP, Hutton DW. Cost-effectiveness of bevacizumab and ranibizumab for newly diagnosed neovascular macular degeneration (an American Ophthalmological Society thesis). *Transactions of the American Ophthalmological Society*. 2013;111:56-69. 32. Dakin HA, Wordsworth S, Rogers CA, Abangma G, Raftery J, Harding SP, et al. Cost-effectiveness of ranibizumab and bevacizumab for age-related macular degeneration: 2-year findings from the IVAN randomised trial. *BMJ open*. 2014;4(7):e005094. 33. Ranibizumab for treating choroidal neovascularisation associated with pathological myopia. NICE technology appraisal guidance [TA298]. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2013. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta298>. 34. Ranibizumab for treating diabetic macular oedema. NICE technology appraisal guidance [TA274]. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2013. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta274>. 35. Ranibizumab for treating visual impairment caused by macular oedema secondary to retinal vein occlusion. NICE technology appraisal guidance [TA283]. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2013. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta283>. 36. Lucentis: EPAR product information London: European Medicines Agency; 2014. Available from: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/000715/WC500043546.pdf.

