



6. Is the evidence adequate to distinguish the net health benefit between treatment with CGRP inhibitors and oral preventive therapies (e.g., amitriptyline, topiramate, or propranolol)?

Yes

No

7. For patients who have no other options for preventive therapy, is the evidence adequate to demonstrate a net health benefit for treatment with CGRP inhibitors compared with no treatment?

Yes

No

### **Contextual Considerations/Other Benefits**

***Patient population for questions 8-9: Adult patients with migraine for whom other preventive treatments have failed.***

8. Does treating patients with CGRP inhibitors offer one or more of the following “other benefits?” (select all that apply)

- a. This intervention offers reduced complexity that will significantly improve patient outcomes.
- b. This intervention will reduce important health disparities across racial, ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, or regional categories.
- c. This intervention will significantly reduce caregiver or broader family burden.
- d. This intervention offers a novel mechanism of action or approach that will allow successful treatment of many patients for whom other available treatments have failed.
- e. This intervention will have a significant impact on improving patients’ ability to return to work and/or their overall productivity.
- f. There are other important benefits or disadvantages that should have an important role in judgments of the value of this intervention: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Are any of the following contextual considerations important in assessing CGRP inhibitors’ long-term value for money? (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. This intervention is the first to offer any improvement for patients with this condition.
- d. There is significant uncertainty about the long-term risk of serious side effects of this intervention.
- e. There is significant uncertainty about the magnitude or durability of the long-term benefits of this intervention.
- f. There are additional contextual considerations that should have an important role in judgments of the value of this intervention: \_\_\_\_\_.

## Long-term Value for Money

***Patient population for question 10: Adult patients with 15 or more headache days per month (i.e., chronic migraine) for whom other preventive therapies have failed.***

10. 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 erenumab versus no treatment?

a. Low

b. Intermediate

c. High

***Patient population for question 11: Adult patients with 14 or fewer migraine days per month for whom other preventive therapies have failed.***

11. 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 erenumab versus no treatment?

a. Low

b. Intermediate

c. High