



Tirzepatide for Type 2 Diabetes

Draft Questions for Deliberation and Voting: January 20th 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 with inadequate glycemic control despite ongoing background antihyperglycemic agent(s).

Clinical Evidence

1. Is the currently available evidence adequate to demonstrate that the net health benefit of **tirzepatide added to background therapy** is superior to that provided by **background therapy alone**?

Yes No

2. Is the currently available evidence adequate to distinguish a difference in net health benefit between adding **tirzepatide** and adding injectable **semaglutide** (Ozempic[®]) to background therapy?

Yes No

- a. Is the currently available evidence adequate to demonstrate that the net health benefit of adding **tirzepatide** is superior to that provided by adding injectable **semaglutide** (Ozempic[®]) to background therapy?

Yes No

3. Is the currently available evidence adequate to distinguish a difference in net health benefit between adding **tirzepatide** and adding **empagliflozin** (Jardiance[®]) to background therapy?

Yes No

- a. Is the currently available evidence adequate to demonstrate that the net health benefit of adding **tirzepatide** is superior to that provided by adding **empagliflozin** (Jardiance[®])?

Yes No

Contextual Considerations and Potential Other Benefits or Disadvantages

Please vote on the following contextual considerations:

When making judgments of overall long-term value for money, what is the relative priority that should be given to any effective treatment for type 2 diabetes on the basis of the following contextual considerations:

1= Very low priority; 2 = Low priority; 3 = Average priority; 4 = High priority; 5= Very high priority

4. Acuity of need for treatment of individual patients based on short-term risk of death or progression to permanent disability
5. Magnitude of the lifetime impact on individual patients of the condition being treated
6. Other (as relevant):

Please vote on the following potential other benefits or disadvantages:

What are the relative effects of tirzepatide added to background therapy versus background therapy alone on the following outcomes that inform judgment of the overall long-term value for money of tirzepatide?

1= Major negative effect; 2 = Minor negative effect; 3 = No difference; 4 = Minor positive effect; 5 = Major positive effect

7. Patients' ability to achieve major life goals related to education, work, or family life
8. Caregivers' quality of life and/or ability to achieve major life goals related to education, work, or family life
9. Patients' ability to manage and sustain treatment given the complexity of regimen
10. Society's goal of reducing health inequities
11. Other (as relevant): New treatment option for patients with type 2 diabetes

Long-term Value for Money

12. 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 at current pricing with **tirzepatide added to background therapy** versus **background therapy alone**?
 - a. Low long-term value for money at assumed pricing
 - b. Intermediate long-term value for money at assumed pricing
 - c. High long-term value for money at assumed pricing