

**December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023**

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

Dear ICER,

I have schizophrenia, and I am submitting this public comment to provide you with my real-world perspective about existing treatments for schizophrenia and the need for new and better treatments.

Schizophrenia has completely changed my day-to-day life. I am unable to hold a job because of the hallucinations and delusions I experience. I also experience restless motion disorder from the medications I take. This makes staying still in on place impossible. I had to leave a senior director position in the philanthropy space, a career I loved and earned, because of this disease.

My most challenging schizophrenia symptoms are the restless motion disorder and the auditory hallucinations. Hearing voices for long periods of time make it had to identify what is real and what is not. It's a constant feeling that can alter my mood significantly.

It took over 20 different drugs and hospital stays to find a drug that works for me. The most difficult drug side effect is my constant movement and my limbs twitching at any time. This has contributed to my inability in holding a job.

I hope new treatments will include less side effects. Patients like me need something to work day-to-day and something we can rely on with fewer breakthrough symptoms.

It can be very difficult to find a schizophrenia treatment that works, especially one that works without causing severe side effects. Please consider the needs of the people who live every day with schizophrenia as you review this potential new treatment.

**December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023**

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

Dear ICER,

I have schizophrenia, and I am submitting this public comment to provide you with my real-world perspective about existing treatments for schizophrenia and the need for new and better treatments.

Schizophrenia has had an impact on my day to day life as well as my life trajectory. I sometimes find being in public and related activities such as going to the grocery store or going to work to be difficult due to anxiety and paranoia related to my condition. In regards to my life path, schizophrenia forced me to drop out of college twice, however I was able to eventually graduate in eight years instead of four. It has certainly been a life altering condition for me. My most challenging symptom is auditory hallucinations although over time I have learned to cope with them and they are much less of a challenge than they once were because I no longer identify them either as external such as someone talking about me or internal but real such as experiencing telepathy. Still, my thought processes and thought content is much different than during my adolescence in the prodromal stage. I was put on many medications once first diagnosed but my symptoms didn't fully remit. Eventually I was put on Clozapine, and my symptoms more or less abated, however to this day I find the side effects to be somewhat onerous. I experience heavy sedation in the morning as well as some involuntary movements throughout the day. The sedation and general feeling of tiredness makes it difficult for me to do things I enjoy such as exercise and make music. Additionally, I feel the effects the next day when I take my dose of medication later in the evening, I am excessively sedated early in the day. This makes it so that I am less social and have less outings than I might otherwise because I am cognizant of the fact that ending my evening earlier will help me manage my medication side effects better the next day. My hope for a new treatment for schizophrenia is that it will provide more efficacy than existing atypical antipsychotics with a less difficult to handle side-effect burden than the current gold standard of Clozapine.

It can be very difficult to find a schizophrenia treatment that works, especially one that works without causing severe side effects. Please consider the needs of the people who live every day with schizophrenia as you review this potential new treatment.

**December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023**

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

Dear ICER,

I have schizophrenia, and I am submitting this public comment to provide you with my real-world perspective about what it is like to have schizophrenia and treatments for schizophrenia.

The symptoms of schizophrenia have affected my life because of my delusions and hallucinations, especially my auditory hallucinations. When I'm very stressed, my auditory hallucinations become more pronounced. My hallucinations make me very anxious. I start to have negative thoughts, and this makes me question my abilities. I'm actually very good at my job, but the negative thoughts can manifest and get in the way of me doing my job effectively. I wish that there were medications that were there to help level this off better. At this point my medication helps me to manage my auditory hallucinations, but I have to be on more than one medication. I wish I could be on only one medication and not have to take so many, because when you have to take more medication, there are side effects for each of them.

It was difficult to find a medication that works for me especially in terms of side effects. I took one medication that led to significant amount of weight gain. They had to wean me off that medication and put me on my current medication to help me control my weight gain. This makes me self-conscious because I've always had issues with weight. As I get older, it's going to get more difficult to take the weight off. It doesn't help that weight gain is one of the side effects of these medications.

I also have a lot of lethargy. I'm sure that my medications contribute to this. I have some other conditions as well, but my medications don't make the lethargy any easier. In my job, I go into the community and present to people. My lethargy makes it very difficult. I don't want to seem to my audience that I'm presenting to that I'm sleeping, because I think that's disrespectful. I have to keep moving, stand up, and do other things to make sure that I don't fall asleep. The lethargy is one thing that it affects very much in my life. It's put my job at jeopardy. I've had to ask for accommodations. My job is pretty supportive, but I would like to be able to have a medication that makes it able for me to do my job without asking for accommodations.

I don't know if any medications could make my symptoms and side effects go away completely. That would be a miracle. If my symptoms could be put in complete remission that would be wonderful. But even a medication that helped more with the above symptoms and side effects would be valuable. Also, it would be nice to have medications that help people in taking their medications. For example, if there were more medications that we could take once a month or every other month, instead of every day, to manage symptoms.

**December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023**

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

Dear ICER,

We (I) have schizophrenia, and We are submitting this public comment to provide you with our real-world perspective about existing treatments for schizophrenia and the need for new and better treatments. Note that We are 51 years old, Caucasian, married and have 3 children. Also, We used plural pronouns most of the time, even when referring to ourself.

Schizophrenia has affected our (my) day-to-day life in a multitude of ways. Our earliest indicators began when We were 18 and away at college. We started having intrusive thoughts, severe paranoia, and audible hallucinations. This became so debilitating that We had to quit school and move back in with our parents, at which time We broke off almost all contact with friends from college.

After years of treatment which included some 1-on-1 psychiatric talk therapy and medication We were feeling better again. We met someone and fell deeply in love, married and had children. However, several stressors caused us to start experiencing the paranoia and hallucinations, We began to self medicate, and started having suicidal ideations. We were admitted to a hospital for treatment 3 times within a year. We eventually got divorced and almost lost our children.

Fortunately, upon receiving better treatment and \*group\* therapy that time, We recovered, eventually fell in love again, and have now been married almost 20 years. However, although the paranoia is largely controllable due to our daily meditation practices, We do still have the hallucinations and intrusive thoughts. They are not harmful and We have not attempted any self-harm in a very long time.

One major way all this has had a negative impact on our life is by making it very difficult to handle multiple tasks at once in a public setting. For example, We can no longer hold a job where there is a lot of other background noise or too many instructions given at once. While such situations are usually not a problem, our condition can make each day a different challenge, and sometimes our symptoms can flare up unexpectedly. Some days We may wake up in a severe enough state of agitation or depression and find it extremely difficult to go about even some of our most routine daily tasks.

Our most challenging symptom is intrusive thoughts. These add to feelings of isolation and/or loneliness due to many of these thoughts causing us to doubt ourself and what We want to accomplish. We tend to minimize the positive things in our life and find our focus drawn too much to the things We think We are doing “wrong”.

Overall, our experience with pharmaceutical treatments has been negative primarily because We feel they suppress our emotions too much, or that We cannot fully express ourself because We feel too mentally numb. Our current treatment has worked best so far, but this is after 20+ years

of being on and off multiple medications. And even this treatment still has us feeling like We are not as in touch with our emotions as We possibly could be. Other side effects that cause us distress are fatigue and weight gain.

Our number one hope with new treatments would be to not suffer emotional suppression. While the other side effects are more than just an inconvenience, they are manageable at least.

It can be very difficult to find a schizophrenia treatment that works, especially one that works without causing severe side effects. Please consider the needs of the people who live every day with schizophrenia as you review this potential new treatment.

**December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023**

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

Dear ICER,

I have schizophrenia, and I am submitting this public comment to provide you with my real world perspective about existing treatments for schizophrenia and the need for new and better treatments.

1) Schizophrenia has affected my day to day life activities in many ways. I have a B.A in secondary education. I was asked to leave early in the school year because of my illness. I tried to get a teaching job in another city for 3 years following my dismissal, but failed. I had to give up my life long dream. I settled for menial jobs in other fields. Some successful, some not.

2) My most challenging symptom is my paranoia. I believe in such simple pleasures as taking a shower. But, when I am taking a shower I believe my brother is rearranging my clothes in my dresser. How can I enjoy a shower when thinking this is happening?

3) My experiences with my current treatment is simple. My medicine regimen helps control my symptoms. It does not erase them. So, I can function while doing my day to day activities. If ever a drug arrives which can do away with my symptoms completely I will take it. How soon can I expect this? In my current life time?

4) My hopes for a new treatment may be in my current life time. But my real hope is to find a treatment for people in the next generation to experience no side affects at all.

**To the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Public comment to the Draft Evidence Report on KarXT**

**Dear ICER,**

**I have schizophrenia, and I am submitting this public comment to provide you with my real-world perspective about existing treatments for schizophrenia and the need for new and better treatments.**

How has schizophrenia affected your day-to-day life (activities you find difficult or unable to do, having to leave school or your job/career, etc.)?

**Schizophrenia has made finding meaningful sustainable work challenging. Unless I want to put my interests aside and take any job that I can manage with my diminished health, it is a struggle to keep pace with other people at my level and age in any given industry.**

What are your most challenging schizophrenia symptoms?

**Disorganization, paranoia, and diminished frustration tolerance.**

What is your experience with current treatments?

My experiences have been mixed. Here is a blog that discusses over a decade of treatment that I think others can relate to: <https://www.madinamerica.com/2021/06/treatment-providers-power-recovery/>.

Was it difficult to find one that works for you?

**A decade.**

Do you suffer from specific side effects? If so, what are they?

**Weight gain. Lethargy.**

What are your hopes for a new treatment?

**Fewer metabolic complications.**

**Signed,**

**J. Peters**

Hello,

I wanted to write to highlight the importance of new schizophrenia medication. I believe current medication is flawed, not addressing killers associated with schizophrenia:

- 1) weight gain/diabetes
- 2) isolation/loneliness
- 3) suicide

My hope for new medication would be to keep delusional thoughts away while not making me tired and causing weight gain. I strive to be a productive member of society and to raise a family. I have dropped out of college, been hospitalized three times, and arrested due to my illness. I still believe I have a lot going for me, and would appreciate your help with any positive strides with medication.



## **Karuna Therapeutics' comments and recommendations for ICER's Draft Evidence Report "KarXT for Schizophrenia: Effectiveness and Value"**

On behalf of Karuna Therapeutics, the manufacturer of KarXT, we submit this letter in response to ICER's Draft Evidence Report. We provide recommendations to ICER that we strongly believe will improve the rigor and relevance of ICER's cost-effectiveness analysis. These recommendations will in turn help key stakeholders to be better informed about the clinical benefits and economic value of KarXT as a possible treatment for adults living with schizophrenia.

### **Key areas of recommendation for revision or addition**

1. Contemporary cost to treat and the disutility of tardive dyskinesia (TD).
2. Agranulocytosis risk, cost, and disutility associated with clozapine treatment.
3. Scenario analysis where clozapine is a singular third treatment.

### **Recommendation 1: Include contemporary cost and disutility of tardive dyskinesia as base case.**

ICER has included a scenario analysis where KarXT exhibits no risk of TD while the other modeled comparators have a 0.5% risk in each model cycle. Karuna believes this scenario is warranted in the base case analysis due to the unique target product profile and mechanism of action for KarXT and the absence of TD observed in the acute trials.

TD is believed to result from the chronic blockade of dopamine D2 and possibly D3 receptors, a common mechanism of action shared by all antipsychotics. While the second-generation antipsychotics (SGAs) are associated with a lower risk of developing TD than first-generation treatments, 21% of patients treated with SGAs are nonetheless reported to experience TD.<sup>1</sup> People with schizophrenia who develop TD have significantly worse health-related quality of life and social withdrawal compared to those without TD. TD can also persist for years or even decades; with only 33% or less of patients experiencing remission, and the associated patient impact and financial burden therefore persisting through the patient's lifetime.<sup>2</sup> These impacts also extend to caregivers and payers. The cost of an initial event of TD has a significant financial burden of \$12,732 based on the latest data from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)<sup>3</sup> and patients with TD have significantly worse health related quality of life compared to those without.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the pharmaceutical interventions for TD such as deutetrabenazine extended release (AUSTEDO<sup>®</sup> XR) and valbenazine (INGREZZA<sup>®</sup>) are costly. The cost of deutetrabenazine ranges from \$2,360 to \$7,081 for a 30 day supply while valbenazine ranges from \$7,302 to \$8,022 for a 30 day supply.<sup>5</sup> The monthly acquisition costs for TD drugs underscore the related financial burden faced by payers and patients for what is often a long-term, irreversible condition resulting from currently utilized treatments for schizophrenia. ICER has previously documented the cost burden associated with TD treatments in its 2016 assessment of valbenazine and deutetrabenazine. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios were calculated at \$752,000 and \$1.1 million per quality-adjusted life year (QALY), respectively, over a lifetime horizon.

TD was not observed in the acute setting for patients receiving KarXT, and due to KarXT's unique muscarinic, non-dopaminergic mechanism of action, it is recommended that ICER assume in the base case analysis that TD will not be associated with KarXT treatment during neither the acute nor the maintenance treatment phases.

**Recommendation 2: Introduce risk and impact of agranulocytosis associated with clozapine.**

Due to the variation between response of prior first- and second-treatments in the model and most patient time being spent in the third treatment health state where they may receive clozapine, the risk of neutropenia, risk of death associated with neutropenia, cost of routine blood testing, disutility of neutropenia, and associated monitoring and treatment costs for severe neutropenia associated with clozapine should be included in the model base case analysis to ensure a comprehensive and relevant base case assessment.

Clozapine's FDA-approved label includes a Boxed Warning for severe neutropenia due to agranulocytosis, which can lead to serious and fatal infections. According to Li et al., the overall prevalence of agranulocytosis and associated death are 0.4% (95% CI 0.3–0.6%) and 0.05% (95% CI 0.03–0.09%) for patients treated with clozapine, respectively.<sup>6</sup> All patients receiving clozapine must undergo routine blood testing while on treatment and for 4 weeks after treatment discontinuation.

While all patients in the model eventually reach third-line treatment with clozapine in a market basket during the modeled lifetime time horizon, the time spent on this treatment varies based on the performance of the preceding first-line and second-line treatment regimens included in the model. The clinical importance of this is highlighted by the two models, Davies and Park, cited by ICER for the maintenance phase structure of the model, which included increased mortality associated with clozapine use. The inclusion by both Davies and Park<sup>7, 8</sup> in their published models and the FDA Boxed Warning for severe neutropenia due to agranulocytosis associated clozapine treatment support the relevance and importance to include these costs and outcomes in the ICER base case analysis.

**Recommendation 3: Make third treatment basket clozapine only, as a scenario analysis.**

The third treatment sequence in the model consists of a treatment basket of 36% risperidone, 34% olanzapine, and 30% clozapine. ICER cites Kane et al.,<sup>9</sup> for the 30% clozapine uptake, and states that 30% of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia are treatment-resistant and therefore clozapine is a suitable treatment if they discontinued two prior antipsychotics.

Based on Kane et al.,<sup>9</sup> the model assumes that of those who discontinue two prior treatments, only 30% of these patients would be considered treatment-resistant. However, this application is inconsistent with the data presented by Kane et al., which states 30% of patients are treatment-resistant and to establish this classification, patients must demonstrate inadequate response to two different antipsychotics.<sup>9</sup> Since ICER's model is a treatment sequencing model, upon second-line treatment discontinuation, all patients would be classified as treatment-resistant and

eligible for treatment with clozapine. This would also be consistent with the Davies and Park models<sup>7,8</sup> cited by ICER.

In summary, Karuna recommends reassessing how the Kane et al.,<sup>9</sup> reference is being applied to the third-line treatment assumption. The current method employed implicitly assumes that 70% of patients remain on second-line treatment when transitioning to this health state, until 18.2% go off treatment at 20 years or death. This method also allows for patients to initiate therapy they did not adequately respond to. Therefore, Karuna recommends that third-line treatment in the model should include only clozapine as a scenario analysis along with recommendation 2; this would be more aligned to treatment guidelines, consistent with prior economic evaluations, in line with ICER's acute response methods, and may be a better representative as the last treatment in a lifetime treatment sequencing model for schizophrenia.

Sincerely,

Ken Kramer, PhD

Vice President, Medical Affairs

Karuna Therapeutics

## References

1. Ricciardi L, Pringsheim T, Barnes TRE, et al. Treatment Recommendations for Tardive Dyskinesia. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2019; 64(6):388-99.
2. Waln O and Jankovic J. An update on tardive dyskinesia: from phenomenology to treatment. *Tremor Other Hyperkinet Mov (N Y)*. 2013; 3.
3. AHRQ. HCUPnet data tool. 2023. Available at: [https://datatools.ahrq.gov/hcupnet/?\\_gl=1%2A1s067v4%2A\\_ga%2AMzI1NjU2MTE4LjE2OTY2MTcxNTc.%2A\\_ga\\_1NPT56LE7J%2AMTY5Nzc1ODYxMC4yLjEuMTY5Nzc1ODYyNy40My4wLjA](https://datatools.ahrq.gov/hcupnet/?_gl=1%2A1s067v4%2A_ga%2AMzI1NjU2MTE4LjE2OTY2MTcxNTc.%2A_ga_1NPT56LE7J%2AMTY5Nzc1ODYxMC4yLjEuMTY5Nzc1ODYyNy40My4wLjA). Accessed: 10/19/2023.
4. McEvoy J, Gandhi SK, Rizio AA, et al. Effect of tardive dyskinesia on quality of life in patients with bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder, and schizophrenia. *Qual Life Res*. 2019; 28(12):3303-12.
5. Micromedex. REDBOOK. 2023. Available at: <https://www.micromedexsolutions.com/micromedex2/librarian/PFDefaultActionId/redbook.ModifyRedBookSearch>. Accessed: 10/19/2023.
6. Li XH, Zhong XM, Lu L, et al. The prevalence of agranulocytosis and related death in clozapine-treated patients: a comprehensive meta-analysis of observational studies. *Psychol Med*. 2020; 50(4):583-94.
7. Davies A, Vardeva K, Loze JY, et al. Cost-effectiveness of atypical antipsychotics for the management of schizophrenia in the UK. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2008; 24(11):3275-85.
8. Park T and Kuntz KM. Cost-effectiveness of second-generation antipsychotics for the treatment of schizophrenia. *Value Health*. 2014; 17(4):310-9.
9. Kane JM, Agid O, Baldwin ML, et al. Clinical Guidance on the Identification and Management of Treatment-Resistant Schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2019; 80(2).



December 20, 2023

*Submitted electronically to [publiccomments@icer.org](mailto:publiccomments@icer.org)*

**RE: ICER Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions: KarXT for Schizophrenia**

Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Inc. (Otsuka) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review's (ICER's) Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions for its review of KarXT for schizophrenia.<sup>i</sup>

Otsuka and its affiliates oversee research and development and commercialization activities for innovative products in North America. At Otsuka, our driving philosophy is to defy limitation, so others can too. We seek to serve those with unmet medical needs in three important treatment areas: nephrology, central nervous system, and digital therapeutics. Otsuka is proud to be at the forefront of the research and development of new therapies designed to help patients with Alzheimer's disease, mental illness, and chronic kidney disease. We respect the value within every mind—whether it's a grand idea that changes the world, a simple human connection that changes someone's life, or something in between.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions, and thank you for your consideration of our comments as you continue to review KarXT for schizophrenia. We offer, for your consideration, substantive and technical comments on the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions below. As ICER continues to develop this review or more information becomes available, we may be interested in providing additional commentary beyond those comments in this letter, and reserve the ability to do so in the future.

**A. Substantive Comments on the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions**

After reviewing the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions, we provide the following comments.

First, we generally agree with the assumptions made by ICER to compensate for the lack of long-term safety and efficacy data to date. Given that the current efficacy and safety data is for a five week acute treatment only, assumptions based on published data for other second-generation antipsychotic drugs for longer term efficacy and safety seem appropriate.<sup>ii</sup>

Finally, the Draft Evidence Report notes that participants in ICER’s patients and caregivers focus groups expressed “great hope that KarXT’s novel mechanism of action” would better treat cognitive symptoms than current medications. The Draft Evidence Report also acknowledges cautious comments on these claims. We agree with the need to be cautious about these claims given the lack of data. We suggest that ICER include any evidence supporting this hope in the Draft Evidence Report and address how it plans to incorporate cognitive data and findings in the event it later becomes available for KarXT.

## **B. Technical Comments on the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions**

After reviewing both the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions, we recommend a few technical changes to the documents.

In the Draft Evidence Report:

- On page 15 of the document (“Patient and Caregiver Perspective”), we suggest revising the language “Side effects of currently available therapies can be severe including significant weight gain and movement disorders. Because of this, people with schizophrenia often discontinue their medication, which leads to suicide, incarceration, or involuntary hospitalization” to instead read “Side effects of currently available therapies can be severe including significant weight gain and movement disorders. Because of this, people with schizophrenia often discontinue their medication, which **may lead to** suicide, incarceration, or involuntary hospitalization.”

In the Voting Questions:

- Under the “Contextual Considerations and Potential Other Benefits or Disadvantages”, the first three contextual considerations are numbered 3, 4, 5; we wanted to confirm that these should instead be numbered 1, 2, 3.

\* \* \* \* \*

Otsuka appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Draft Evidence Report and Voting Questions. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Heidi Waters at [Heidi.Waters@Otsuka-us.com](mailto:Heidi.Waters@Otsuka-us.com)

Sincerely,

Kaan Tunceli, PhD  
VP Global Value & Real-World Evidence  
Otsuka Pharmaceutical Development & Commercialization, Inc.

<sup>i</sup> Tice JA, Whittington MD, McKenna A, Wright A, Richardson M, Pearson SD, Rind DM. *KarXT for Schizophrenia: Effectiveness and Value; Draft Evidence Report*. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, November 28, 2023. <https://icer.org/assessment/schizophrenia2024/#overview>

<sup>ii</sup> *See id* at E5, E6.

December 19, 2023

Steven D. Pearson, MD, President  
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Two Liberty Square, Ninth Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

**Re: Draft Evidence report for KarXT treatment of Schizophrenia**

Dear Dr. Pearson,

As a practicing psychiatrist, I have vast experience treating patients with schizophrenia. As a clinical professor of psychiatry at the University of California, Irvine for the last 33 years, schizophrenia has been my area of expertise over this time period. I have been involved in firsthand observing the developing medications that have improved the lives of people with schizophrenia. Things are moving in the right direction, but we still have a long way to go, to continue to improve the lives of patients that are afflicted with this illness, to ensure their lives can improve.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment regarding ICER's Draft Evidence Report on the assessment of xanomeline tartrate/trospium chloride (KarXT) for schizophrenia. As ICER moves toward the Final Evidence Report and Presentation, I urge you to consider several points from a provider perspective.

**The Cost of Schizophrenia**

The cost of treating a patient with schizophrenia, as noted in your Background and Scoping document, is estimated to be \$343 billion in the United States.<sup>1</sup> However, this report fails to review the totality of the economic impact of schizophrenia by leaving out indirect costs of the disease such as housing costs, ancillary costs spent by caregivers, costs related to reduced quality of life, and other non-medical costs associated with this chronic disease. The economic impact could be far greater than quantified here in 2021. A study from The Schizophrenia and Psychosis Action Alliance about the Economic Impact of Schizophrenia in 2020 was \$282 billion, demonstrating an approximate 22% increase in cost from 2020 to 2021.<sup>2</sup> The impact of schizophrenia is only expected to grow as prices increase, with the majority of the costs being associated with indirect health care expenses.<sup>3</sup> Without an accurate financial consideration, the impact of a potential new treatment option may be inadequate.

While the economic burden on society is notable, the impact on individual patients is equally valuable. In my experience working with patients with schizophrenia, loss of quality of life,

---

<sup>1</sup> Karxt for schizophrenia - icer.org. An assessment of xanomeline tartrate/trospium chloride (KarXT). (n.d).

[https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER\\_Schizophrenia\\_Draft\\_Report\\_For-Publication\\_112823.pdf](https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER_Schizophrenia_Draft_Report_For-Publication_112823.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Societal Costs of Schizophrenia & Related Disorders. Schizophrenia & Psychosis Action Alliance website. Alexandria, VA. [https://sczaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/571-012\\_WhitePaper\\_Report\\_FINAL\\_updated\\_11.09.21.pdf](https://sczaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/571-012_WhitePaper_Report_FINAL_updated_11.09.21.pdf). 2021.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid



inability to find and adhere to treatment options, and access barriers to treatment are some of the most difficult issues patients face. The ability to access treatments in a timely manner without access barriers is critical to helping patients with schizophrenia live healthy and productive lives. Health insurers often use cost-effectiveness evaluations to negatively determine formulary placement or place barriers to treatments. An unfavorable or inconclusive review will only enhance the barriers already in place that prevent patients with schizophrenia from seeking and receiving treatment.

### **Societal Impact**

It is also important to recognize the disproportionate impact of schizophrenia on minoritized communities. As mentioned in the Scoping Document, Black Americans are more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia and are more likely to go untreated.<sup>4</sup> However, the societal impacts continue to be left out of the economic evaluation. Additionally, one in three people experiencing homelessness have a serious mental illness like schizophrenia and one in seven people in prison have a serious mental illness.<sup>5</sup> The final cost analysis fails to include any consideration of the impact on the criminal justice system. Instead, since trials are still in process, any meaningful impact that treatment for patients would have on the criminal justice system is dismissed.

### **Importance of Treatment Options**

A diagnosis of schizophrenia can be extremely hard on patients and can come after many years of misdiagnoses, stigma, and access barriers to treatment. As noted, some treatments for schizophrenia can develop unwanted side effects. The possibility of new treatment options should not be stifled by access barriers. Patients deserve the right to work with their providers to find the best treatment option for them without unneeded hindrances. Such a conversation can only occur after FDA approval which is not likely until 2024.

Xanomeline tartrate/trospium chloride is an innovative treatment that has a different mechanism of action and throughout early trials has been shown to reduce side effects commonly associated with antipsychotics. This treatment is unique from other antipsychotics because rather than targeting D2 dopamine and serotonin receptors, it targets muscarinic receptors. Muscarinic receptors indirectly affect dopamine transmitters involved in mediating SMI symptoms. This treatment is the first potential medicine that can stimulate muscarinic receptors to help mediate schizophrenia while simultaneously combating undesirable side effects that can be found with psychotherapeutic drugs (weight gain, agitation, tardive dyskinesia, diabetes, sedation).

No medication comes without the possibility of side effects, however, the ability to lessen or eliminate side effects such as those commonly associated with antipsychotic drugs would be extremely important for patients with schizophrenia. Often, it is difficult for patients with SMI to

---

<sup>4</sup> Karxt for schizophrenia - icer.org. An assessment of xanomeline tartrate/trospium chloride (KarXT). (n.d.). [https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER\\_Schizophrenia\\_Draft\\_Report\\_For-Publication\\_112823.pdf](https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER_Schizophrenia_Draft_Report_For-Publication_112823.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Fazel, S., Hayes, A. J., Bartellas, K., Clerici, M., & Trestman, R. (2016). Mental health of prisoners: prevalence, adverse outcomes, and interventions. *The Lancet. Psychiatry*, 3(9), 871–881. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(16\)30142-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30142-0)

adhere to treatments because of the side effects.<sup>6</sup> Adherence to treatment releases pressure from the health care system, as patients are less likely to need emergency care and are more likely to hold employment and stay healthier longer.<sup>7</sup> Each patient responds to treatments differently, hence why there is a need to consider each patient's personal experience with treatments rather than a collective. What works for one patient might not work for another, but the possibility of options without onerous restrictions- that place barriers not only on patients but providers- is of utmost importance.

### **The Misuse of Quality-Adjusted Life Years**

ICER's continued reliance on the quality-adjusted life year is of great concern. As mentioned throughout these comments, schizophrenia is a wide-ranging chronic disease that has unique impacts on each individual patient. Attempting to utilize a metric that fails to capture individual impacts on a person living with this disease can potentially be harmful.

There has been significant criticism of the QALY and similar metrics. In 1992 the United States Department of Health and Human Services found that the state of Oregon's cost-effectiveness ratios derived from the use of the QALY was discriminatory and violated the Americans with Disabilities Act. There are also efforts at the federal level to eliminate the use of the QALY and QALY like metrics from federal programs. As the health care system continues to progress towards one prioritizing personalized medicine, I'd encourage ICER to prioritize methods that also place an emphasis on how emerging and innovating treatments can prove value for the individual patient.

There is no way to capture what progress means for all patients, but rather the individual experience is far more important. Any formula that attempts to evaluate perfect health will fall short for patients with schizophrenia and ultimately ignores what treatment can mean for an individual. No improvement is too small and should be celebrated rather than dismissed because it does not fit into the equation.

While ICER notes that the QALY and the evLYG are commonly used metrics in cost-effectiveness analyses, it's important to recognize that these metrics do not evaluate clinical analysis. It also fails to incorporate factors such as disease severity, equity of access, or unmet need and I urge you to recognize its limitations.

### **Conclusion**

As indicated in the Draft Evidence Report, around 3.9 million people are living with schizophrenia, with numbers growing every year. Cost effectiveness evaluations that provide inaccurate estimates can erect unnecessary barriers that make it more difficult for patients to access treatment options that are important to their quality of life and management of their

---

<sup>6</sup> Dibonaventura, M., Gabriel, S., Dupclay, L., Gupta, S., & Kim, E. (2012). A patient perspective of the impact of medication side effects on adherence: results of a cross-sectional nationwide survey of patients with schizophrenia. *BMC psychiatry*, 12, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-12-20>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

disease. Worse, given the demographic realities, these barriers will disproportionately harm minorities and could widen health care disparities.

I urge you to consider input from clinicians, patients and caregivers who directly work with disease daily to understand what the value of treatment options would mean for this community.

If I can provide further details or aid please contact me at 714-456-6898.

Sincerely,

Rimal Bera, MD  
Clinical Professor of Psychiatry  
University of California, Irvine

12/20/2023

Steven D. Pearson, MD, President  
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Two Liberty Square, Ninth Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

**Re: Draft Evidence report for KarXT treatment of Schizophrenia**

Dear Dr. Pearson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ICER's Draft Evidence Report of xanomeline tartrate/trospium chloride (KarXT) for schizophrenia.

As a practicing board-certified neuropsychologist, I have extensive experience in the evaluation of patients with schizophrenia and the complex treatment planning required for neuropsychiatric symptom management. A core obstacle to clinical care for this clinical population is the lack of pharmacological treatment options that provide symptomatic relief from the perspective of the patient in addition to the objective and functional outcome measurements. Thus, I feel particularly strongly about sharing my opinions on KarXT.

Before the release of the Final Evidence Report, I have several comments on the structure of this review and its effect on patients with schizophrenia.

**Protecting the Clinician-Patient Relationship**

As a neuropsychologist, I work to garner a relationship and build trust with my patients experiencing serious mental illnesses. Often due to societal stigma, barriers to care and workforce shortages, patients with serious mental illness can be hesitant about receiving a diagnosis. As acknowledged in the Draft Evidence report, anosognosia is also a prevalent barrier to care for patients. My research and presentation of managing anosognosia in clinical practice at the Clinical Neurological Society of America Time demonstrates that I understand firsthand how important it is to build a relationship to create a diagnosis and find a treatment plan that works for their individual needs.

Patients with serious mental illnesses often step through medication after medication to find which works best for them. Antipsychotic treatments often are accompanied by a host of side effects. Additional options allow the patient and provider to identify which treatment best satisfies the needs of the individual patient. As noted in the Draft Evidence Report, serious mental illnesses such as schizophrenia can be challenging and isolating, but that does not mean patients cannot find meaningful outcomes with treatments.<sup>1</sup>

Due to the slow development of treatments for patients with schizophrenia, the opportunity to find the best treatment option can be limited. The current onslaught of treatment options comes

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER\\_Schizophrenia\\_Draft\\_Report\\_For-Publication\\_112823.pdf](https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ICER_Schizophrenia_Draft_Report_For-Publication_112823.pdf)

with varying unwanted side effects including weight gain, hypertension, increased thoughts of suicide, agitation, or tardive dyskinesia.

KarXT has clinically demonstrated the possibility of treating the symptoms associated with schizophrenia without producing unwanted side effects. Through my extensive background working with patients with movement disorders such as TD at Vanderbilt University, I understand the impact of what a treatment option that eliminates such side effects would mean for a patient's success, adherence, and quality of life. If an option such as KarXT were to become available, it would allow clinicians and patients another tool to try to manage schizophrenia.

As it stands, an unfavorable or inconclusive analysis of KarXT could limit the ability of prescribers to use this tool if FDA approval occurs. As you proudly state on your website more than 75% of private insurers PBMs, and multiple employer coalitions use ICER's assessments to inform formulary decisions, coverage criteria and price negotiations.<sup>2</sup> A hasty review that lacks adequate data can undermine the relationship clinicians spend so long cultivating by placing a barrier between what patients deserve and what they will face at the pharmacy.

### **Incomplete Data**

KarXT is a novel treatment for schizophrenia that has demonstrated efficacy and safety in its preliminary clinical trials. This treatment will now face the FDA for further review and long-term impact. Without this additional data, no true assessment can be made of the effectiveness of this treatment compared to others.

The analysis relies heavily on assumptions because the timing of the review is premature. This review must make significant presumptions on the long-term efficacy, side effects, and adherence because of the lack of data that can only come during the FDA review. Simply put, additional data on the long-term impact of this treatment, specifically regarding the incidence of tardive dyskinesia, would allow for a more comprehensive assessment. I urge the committee to wait until further data is presented to make a comparison between KarXT and any antipsychotic.

### **Limitations of the QALY and evLYG**

The continued usage of the QALY and evLYG remains a concern in an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of any treatment. These measurements are discriminatory in nature and diminish the improvements that patients experience. The goal of the cost-effectiveness analysis is to help inform policy decisions that affect patients' lives, yet things that are often deemed "valuable" from patients are inadequately represented through metrics like the QALY. The overreaching decisions based on an unattainable perfect health score impact patients' access to treatments regardless of what the treatment could mean for the patient. To say that dismissing cost-effectiveness is rejecting patients' lived experience is contradictory to the stated purpose of the QALY and evLYG which works to evaluate an entire patient population, not their individual experiences.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://icer.org/who-we-are/history-impact/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/cost-effectiveness-the-qaly-and-the-evlyg/>

Furthermore, the use of the QALY is considered an inappropriate metric by many state and federal entities. The United States Department of Health and Human Services found that certain states use of the QALY was discriminatory and violated the Americans with Disabilities Act. Currently, there is federal legislation to stop the use of the QALY and similar metrics from federal programs, as well as a number of states that are working to enact similar legislation. This demonstrates the changing tide moving away from the metrics used in this review.

### **Conclusion**

I recognize and understand the need to ensure that resources are spent wisely and effectively. However, this particular review fails to capture data that may have a significant impact on the final determination. The potential for additional treatment options provide value to millions of individuals living with schizophrenia. Cost-effectiveness evaluations that lack significant data ultimately may serve as a barrier for patients. Additionally, I oppose the use of the QALY to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of this treatment. Lack of data aside, the individual experience is often left out of this equation. I urge you to consider the limitations of the QALY and find other ways to explore the importance of treatment options for patients.

Sincerely,

Ciaran Michael Considine, PhD, ABPP  
Board Certified Clinical Neuropsychologist  
Associate Professor, Department of Neurology  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center

Date: December 22, 2023

To: Jeffrey A. Tice MD and co-authors of  
KarXT for Schizophrenia draft report dated November 28 2023

From: Peter J. Weiden, M.D.  
Voluntary Clinical Professor of Psychiatry  
Renaissance School of Medicine at Stony Brook University

Re: Public comment on draft document dated November 28

Dear Dr. Tice and colleagues,

I am commenting on the ICER document as a schizophrenia disease expert since completing my residency training in 1985. I have been focused on this patient population during an era where only conventional antipsychotics “neuroleptics” were available, to the introduction of clozapine and then the post clozapine atypical antipsychotics. In other words, I have seen the evolution of new treatments as they become available and will be referring to the lessons learned over the course of 40+ years of specialization.

For transparency and disclosure, you should be aware I was a full-time employee of Karuna for about 3 years until April of this year, and I do occasional consulting for the company but have no equity or related interest in the company. I would also mention that the reason I joined Karuna in the first place in 2020 is that in my entire career, with the notable exception of clozapine, I had never seen any investigational medication show the kind of potential efficacy benefits both in terms of consistency and quality of response as I did with the KarXT program.

**The analysis is speculative which is not reflected in the tone of the document**

I was surprised, to say the least, that ICER has taken the position that such a review is even possible in the first place. As stated in the document, this was written with no data information about the long-term effectiveness or tolerability. To me that makes absolutely no sense because of the long-term nature of the illness. While I suppose this ship has sailed, I am puzzled that the document does not really inform the reader that this analysis is speculative. While there are caveats throughout, there is no cogent discussion tackling why this was done in the first place. There should be a more transparent limitations section, in my opinion, and ICER might want to provide some examples as to how optimal understanding of antipsychotics can take years after approval (see later section). Likewise, the limitations of the current treatments are somewhat woodenly recited and there is no sense of urgency that it has taken drug development over 50 years to come up with a non-dopaminergic treatment of schizophrenia that seems every bit as effective as current therapies. ICER may wish to mention other disease areas (hypertension; AIDS; cancer, MS) where the introduction of different mechanisms of treatment has provided dramatic benefits to patients in ways that were not, and could not, be fully understood at the time of FDA approval.

### **The uncertainty assumptions are skewed to unknown risks and ignore unknown benefits**

The documents tone emphasizes fear of unknown problems , for example, just looking at one page in the executive summary, we find on page 2 of the executive summary:

- *“The major source of uncertainty is the lack of data on the efficacy of KarXT for longer than five weeks.”* Page ES2 Paragraph 2, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence followed by
- *“...In addition, KarXT has a new mechanism of action, which may lead to unanticipated adverse events over the long run”* ES2 Paragraph 2 second sentence.

Two paragraphs later this is repeated almost verbatim from paragraph 2

- *Given the lack of data on the long-term benefits and harms of KarXT, which **has a novel mechanism of action and thus the possibility of unanticipated long term adverse events** [emphasis added].”* Page ES2, paragraph 4

Any statement of lack of evidence is followed by negative inferences only

- *“Given no evidence for superiority in the acute setting and the lack of long-term data, we find the evidence to be insufficient (I) to judge the comparative clinical effectiveness of KarXT compared with aripiprazole.”* [page ES2 bottom of last paragraph]
- *Making the **highly favorable assumption** [emphasis added] that KarXT does not increase the risk of metabolic syndrome and associated consequences beyond that seen in the general population..”* Page ES3 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of paragraph 2
- *In contrast, **we assumed no reduction in the risk of tardive dyskinesia with KarXT** [emphasis added] compared with other second-generation antipsychotic medications.* ES3 towards the end of paragraph 2

I agree with the ICER review that there are unknown efficacy and safety risks associated with KarXT. I disagree with the tone and feel that there is a rigging of assumptions biased against KarXT. Here is what I mean. For better or worse, you have embarked on an analysis of an investigational medication without even having the complete data set needed for an FDA review for its approval. Because of this, assumptions are made. But in fairness, if you are embarking on assumptions (some might say speculation) why do these assumptions seem to stack against KarXT? Would it not be a better approach to be dispassionate about this, drop the dramatic tone and provide what if scenarios, some including unanticipated problems and other anticipated strengths. Why was tardive dyskinesia a secondary analysis whereas lack of metabolic risk was grudgingly put into the model? It seems to me that, if anything, a stronger theoretical case can be made that KarXT will not cause TD and that to be fair the document should add it to the primary model. For tardive dyskinesia risk, it would seem very appropriate for the authors to review and summarize / cite the preclinical literature that in my opinion is a strong indicator that KarXT will not cause tardive dyskinesia within the limits of signal detection in clinical populations.



### **Unknown value is as important as unknown risks**

There is a similar bias that the long-term efficacy assumption of equivalence to current antipsychotics is a best case for KarXT. Why warn the reader that long-term relapse prevention might not be as effective as current antipsychotics without mentioning the possibility be better for relapse prevention? My reaction to the tone of the draft report is that it comes across as biased with a kind of rigged “Heads I Win, Tails is a Tie” feel to the assumptions review.

To me, the tone makes me wonder about why ICER chose to review KarXT right now. There is no way that any new psychiatric treatment can realistically show its true value at the time of approval, let alone before approval. It makes me wonder whether ICER is signaling its opposition to innovation in a disease like schizophrenia despite the known problems with current therapies. To me, this draft’s tone and biased assumptions ignores the enormous *potential* value of KarXT.

### **Examples of antipsychotics whose value unfolded over time**

As the ICER report correctly reminds us, the risks of any new treatment might not be understood right away and might therefore lead to overvaluation of relative safety benefits of the new treatment relative to its predecessors. The classic example in treatment of schizophrenia is the long lag time between the introduction of first-generation antipsychotics (“neuroleptics”) and tardive dyskinesia.

But I will conclude this commentary by providing examples of antipsychotics whose benefits were not known at the time of approval.

- Clozapine for treatment-resistant symptoms  
Clozapine was initially considered to be equivalent to the other neuroleptics and only after it was approved did it become apparent that it had unique efficacy for treatment-resistant schizophrenia. To state the obvious, an imaginary ICER evidence review of clozapine at an equivalent time as KarXT is now would miss clozapine’s future.
- Lower relapse risk associated with olanzapine and risperidone relative to first generation  
The first post-clozapine atypical antipsychotics were risperidone and olanzapine. Both risperidone and olanzapine were shown to be more effective for relapse prevention than first generation medications such as haloperidol. This efficacy finding was not anticipated or understood until some time after their respective FDA approval.
- The specific benefits of some antipsychotics for bipolar depression came after approval  
At the time quetiapine was approved for schizophrenia, to my knowledge no one would have thought that it might specific efficacy for bipolar depression. But it did, and eventually opened up a new therapeutic class of treatment for bipolar depression.

**Summary and some recommendations**

It seems that if this document invokes unknown safety risks as a potential unknown risk associated with KarXT (and I think it should), the document should also consider the possibility that KarXT will provide additional efficacy in ways that we can't predict. My recommendation to you as ICER authors is to provide examples of how future value may occur in ways that are unknown at the time of the immediate review, and that it seems likely that a new, non-dopaminergic MOA might provide benefits related to persistent symptoms, relapse prevention, other symptom domains, subgroups, in ways that are not predictable with of course the caveat that the current analysis cannot include these as estimates but this certainly is a potential future value that needs to be recognized.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Weiden, M.D.



**Institute for  
Patient Access**

December 22, 2023

*Submitted electronically to:* [publiccomments@icer-review.org](mailto:publiccomments@icer-review.org)

Steven D. Pearson, MD, President  
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Two Liberty Square, Ninth Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

*Re: Draft Evidence Report on KarXT for Schizophrenia*

Dear Dr. Pearson:

On behalf of the Institute for Patient Access, I thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding ICER's November 28 draft evidence report, "KarXT for Schizophrenia."

### **About the Institute for Patient Access**

The Institute for Patient Access (IfPA) is a physician-led policy research organization dedicated to maintaining the primacy of the physician-patient relationship in the provision of quality health care. To further that mission, IfPA produces educational materials and programming designed to promote informed discussion about patient-centered care. IfPA was established in 2012 by the leadership of the Alliance for Patient Access, a national network of health care providers committed to shaping a patient-centered health care system. IfPA is a 501(c)(3) public charity nonprofit organization.

### **Draft Evidence Report Comments**

The draft evidence report rightly emphasizes the large burdens that patients living with schizophrenia endure. As you noted, this disease imposes \$343 billion in annual economic costs on patients, society and the broader health care system.

Consistent with the 2020-2023 Value Assessment Framework, ICER evaluated KarXT's cost effectiveness from a "health care sector perspective." When it comes to diseases such as schizophrenia, a health care perspective grossly underestimates the value of efficacious treatments.

### **A Health Care Framework Ignores the Larger Societal Costs of Schizophrenia**

Schizophrenia is associated with many societal costs, including disproportionate rates of incarceration, lost educational opportunities, lost economic opportunities, lower productivity, premature mortality and caregiver burden. While acknowledging they exist, the base case analysis ignores these societal costs. Consequently, the report underestimates KarXT's value.

As the draft evidence report notes, the majority of the \$343 billion in economic costs “are societal, not medical.” According to Kadakia et al. (2022), the direct health care costs from this disease are a bit more than \$62 billion, while the total societal costs are nearly \$281 billion.<sup>1</sup> The breakdown of these societal costs include a \$112.3 billion annual burden on caregivers, \$61.6 billion in unemployment and lost productivity costs, and \$35 billion in law enforcement, homeless and income support costs. The higher premature mortality rates impose another \$77.9 billion annually in economic burden.

By ignoring more than four-fifths of schizophrenia's costs, the analysis significantly underestimates KarXT's potential benefits. In fact, an accurate understanding of the treatment's cost effectiveness cannot be obtained within the constraints of ICER's current methodological approach. Unless the final report incorporates societal considerations into the base case analysis, the evaluation will underestimate KarXT's value.

### **Relegating Societal Costs to a Scenario Analysis Does Not Address the Problem**

Incorporating societal cost considerations into a scenario analysis does not solve this fundamental problem. Instead, it relegates most of the costs that patients bear to a secondary analysis. Even if this secondary analysis were accurately estimated, the more comprehensive assessment of the medicine's cost effectiveness is portrayed as a less important estimate. The base case estimates, which account for only a portion of the costs, will inevitably drive subsequent discussions about value, coverage and access.

### **The Scenario Analysis Excludes Many Potential Benefits for Patients**

For the societal cost scenario, the report makes assumptions about KarXT's long-term efficacy, side effects and adherence because that data does not yet exist (a topic discussed further below). These assumptions are mostly biased toward undervaluing KarXT; consequently, there are concerns regarding how the scenario analysis evaluated societal costs.

The draft evidence report summarizes the results of the societal costs scenario, which accounted for productivity losses, caregiver time spent caregiving, and the costs to the criminal justice system, by stating

Caregiver time spent caregiving was greater for KarXT-treated patients due to the longer duration of caregiving requirements. Productivity losses and costs to the criminal justice

---

<sup>1</sup> Kadakia A, Catillon M, Fan Q, Williams GR, Marden JR, Anderson A, Kirson N, Dembek C. The Economic Burden of Schizophrenia in the United States. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2022 Oct 10;83(6):22m14458. doi: 10.4088/JCP.22m14458. PMID: 36244006.

system were marginally lower for KarXT-treated patients due to the marginally fewer relapses that occurred due to the marginally longer time on antipsychotic treatment.

These conclusions raise several concerns. The above quote from the draft evidence report indicates that the authors are assuming KarXT will reduce the amount of premature mortality from schizophrenia – that is why the assessment states that more caregiver time is spent caring for patients due to “longer duration of caregiving requirements.”

Despite assuming that there are reduced mortality benefits (i.e., a reduction in the annual economic costs of nearly \$78 billion caused by higher premature mortality), these benefits are not considered in the societal cost scenario. From a patient perspective, improved mortality is perhaps the most valuable benefit an effective medication can offer. The exclusion of these mortality benefits grossly underestimates the societal benefits from KarXT.

Other assumptions are also troubling. For instance, the authors simply assume that the additional caregiving requirements from a longer lifespan are larger than any potentially reduced caregiving requirements because patients’ schizophrenia is better controlled. This random assumption drives the results but is not grounded in actual data. Should this assumption prove wrong, a definite possibility, then the arbitrary assumptions of the report may have supported unnecessary obstacles that make it more difficult for patients to access medication that could benefit them.

From a patient perspective, the implication of these assumptions is troubling. Since the analysis ignores the reduced premature mortality benefits, while also assuming that longer lifespans impose a greater burden on caregivers, the draft evidence report assumes that longer lifespans for schizophrenia patients are a net cost. This conclusion is clearly wrong and inappropriate.

The final report should, at bare minimum, change these assumptions to correctly account for the benefits that reduced premature mortality provides.

### **Arbitrary Assumptions Drive the Evaluation’s Health Care Perspective Results**

Misguided assumptions used in the health care sector analysis also plague the draft evidence report. The analysis relies heavily on poorly founded assumptions because the timing of the review is premature. The FDA has only accepted KarXT’s new drug application as of September 28, 2023. Consequently, only data from the drug’s clinical trials are available.

The trial data is promising. Thus far, KarXT has been effective in reducing schizophrenia symptoms with minimal adverse events.<sup>2</sup> As with all new drugs, however, more research is needed. Over time, this data will become available, enabling a better understanding of the medicine’s impact, particularly with respect to the longer-term cognitive benefits and potential side effects of KarXT. But this lack of data, which is to be expected at this stage of the drug

---

<sup>2</sup> Neporent, L “Emergent Trial Data For KarXT Shows Promise in Schizophrenia” Psychiatrist.com, May 30, 2023, <https://www.psychiatrist.com/news/emergent-trial-data-for-karxt-shows-promise-in-schizophrenia/>.

development process, severely limits the validity of any cost-effectiveness analysis. There is simply not enough data to derive meaningful results.

To overcome this obstacle, the draft evidence report makes assumptions regarding fundamental clinical outcomes, such as KarXT's impact on diabetes, tardive dyskinesia (TD) and adherence. For example, the analysis assumes that the "three-month probability of relapse in the maintenance phase" of the drug is the average of the other medications used as comparators. Like the caregiver assumptions used in the societal costs section, this assumption meaningfully alters the results. In this case, the assumption biases the cost-effectiveness results toward the average impact of the current medicines. There is no reason to believe that the relapse probability is the average of the comparator medicines.

As another example, the report makes disconcerting assumptions regarding TD. KarXT has a novel mechanism of action, and one potential benefit expected from this novel mechanism is a lower rate of TD. The draft evidence report acknowledges that there is insufficient data with respect to TD and uses that lack of data as an excuse to ignore the potential benefits from reducing its incidence. Assuming away one of KarXT's potential benefits could be particularly troubling should the expectation of lower TD incidence be fulfilled once sufficient time to evaluate this benefit has passed.

The amount of misinformation these assumptions introduce into the report are currently unknown. Consequently, whether the draft evidence report's estimated cost effectiveness of KarXT accurately reflects the medicine's actual cost effectiveness is unknown. The data availability problem will not be resolved prior to publishing the final report based on the current publication schedule. This constraint justifies a delay in publishing any cost-effectiveness analysis until more data regarding the medication's benefits and side effects (particularly the long-term benefits and side effects) has been published.

### **QALYs Are Inappropriate Metrics for Evaluating Mental Illness**

There are well known flaws with the QALY that create serious accuracy concerns when applied to mental illnesses such as schizophrenia. The QALY metric attempts to create a consistent standard from which the value of medications can be judged. This standard incorporates quality-of-life considerations and mortality impacts into one value.

One of several problems plaguing the QALY metric is that many quality-of-life considerations are difficult to accurately measure. While this problem can affect many diseases, it is especially significant for diseases, such as mental health disorders, where improvements are often subjective.

The QALY is a significantly less reliable measure when applied to medications that provide patients with subjective improvements in health outcomes because the calculation requires impacts to be transparent and easily observable. Unlike diseases such as cancer, meaningful improvements for patients living with schizophrenia are often subtle and difficult to quantify.

The inability to easily measure potential improvements does not mean that patients are not experiencing meaningful benefits. Patients with schizophrenia can often experience significant improvements in their quality of life even though researchers may find it difficult to measure these improvements.

This reality indicates that the QALY methodology is likely providing an inaccurate assessment of KarXT's quality-of-life improvements.

## **Conclusion**

As indicated in the draft evidence report, around 3.9 million people are living with schizophrenia – a disproportionate share being African American. Cost-effectiveness evaluations that provide inaccurate estimates can erect unnecessary barriers that make it more difficult for patients to access medicines that are potentially efficacious for them. Worse, given the demographic realities, these barriers will disproportionately harm minorities and could widen health care disparities.

Considering these costs, IfPA urges ICER to delay the final report until sufficient data exists to perform an accurate assessment. At the very least, the final report should include societal costs, which include the benefits from reduced premature mortality, in the base case analysis. Further, the societal costs should ensure that patients longer lifespans are not considered a cost but the undeniable benefit that they are. Finally, the analysis should recognize the weakness of the QALY measure when evaluating mental illnesses.

If IfPA can provide further details or aid the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review in incorporating any of the above recommendations into its report, please contact us at 202-951-7088.

Sincerely,

Josie Cooper  
Interim Executive Director  
Institute for Patient Access

**Donald M. Kreis, Esq.**  
292 Pleasant Street  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
donald.maurice@gmail.com  
603.277.0330

December 22, 2023

Steven D. Pearson, MD, MSc  
President  
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
14 Beacon Street, Suite 800  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

via e-mail to: [publiccomments@icer.org](mailto:publiccomments@icer.org)

Re: KarXT for Schizophrenia  
Draft Evidence Report

Dear Dr. Pearson:

As you know, I am a member of the New England Comparative Effectiveness Public Advisory Council (CEPAC), in my personal capacity as a representative of the patient/family advocacy community. Because I plan to participate in the New England CEPAC's February 9 virtual public meeting concerning KarXT for Schizophrenia, I have reviewed ICER's draft evidence report on this treatment. This letter responds to ICER's invitation for public comments on the draft report by today's deadline.

I offer my comments as an interested lay person who has no background in medicine, scientific research, or economics. My interest in the subject of drug pricing arises out of my experience raising a daughter who has cystic fibrosis. As such, I have no prior experience with schizophrenia or its treatment, either directly or through a loved one. Accordingly, my suggestions about the draft report on KarXT are offered with the sole purpose of improving the clarity of the document from the perspective of concerned laypeople of goodwill who want emerging treatments for a serious disease like schizophrenia to be widely available and fairly priced. My comments here are intended to express no opinion on the merits of the report. Please be assured that I approach the February 9 virtual public meeting, and the questions the New England CEPAC will vote on at that meeting, with an open mind and heart.

My specific comments, with page references, are as follows:

Page 1 – The “Background” section of the draft report makes the very salient point that “Black Americans are diagnosed with schizophrenia at about twice the rate of White Americans and have worse outcomes.” Later in the report, at pages 28-29 of the section on “Contextual Considerations and Potential Other Benefits,” the draft report refers to “uncertainty about whether the higher rates of diagnosis of schizophrenia in Black people in the US represents true higher prevalence or a tendency for psychosis to be attributed to affective psychotic disorders (such as bipolar mania) in a White population and to schizophrenia in a Black population.” This



strikes me as a startling and significant hypothesis that merits a somewhat more detailed discussion in the report, given that ICER recognizes the reduction of health inequities as an important societal goal that is germane to the report's ultimate conclusions. It would, for example, be helpful to have more insight into the basis of the referenced uncertainty. Put simply, if Black Americans are being misdiagnosed in large numbers with schizophrenia then the widespread use of KarXT in that population would be both wasteful and harmful, whereas it most assuredly would advance society's goal of reducing health inequities if KarXT is widely available to a racial minority that truly suffers from schizophrenia at a significantly higher rate than the general population.

Page 3 – The section on “Patient and Caregiver Perspectives” includes an interesting and obviously important observation that anosognosia – lack of awareness and acceptance of the disease – occurs in more than half of people with schizophrenia and thus serves as a significant barrier to high quality care. The draft report notes that “[w]hen considering the best medication for a person with schizophrenia, it is always the one they are willing to take.” Missing, however, is any insight from patients and caregivers about whether KarXT would make any difference or, perhaps, whether no treatment can ever overcome this barrier.

Page 5 – The abbreviation “RCT” appears on this page, but nowhere in the draft report (e.g., in the list of acronyms and abbreviation) is it explained that RCT means “randomized control trial.” Obviously, every medical researcher on the planet knows what an RCT is, but it is probably not in the common lexicon of the patient and caregiver community for schizophrenia.

Page 9 – The discussion labeled “Harms: Acute Treatment” notes that, across three trials of KarXT, 5.3 percent of patients receiving the drug and 11.4 percent of patients receiving the placebo reported a weight gain of greater than seven percent, identified as a commonly reported threshold in acute trials of schizophrenia treatments. Perhaps related to the discussion of metabolic syndrome, below, it seems counter-intuitive that treatment with a placebo would trigger any weight gain unless it is normal and expected for all schizophrenia patients to experience weight gain of that magnitude over any random five-week period in their lives. Perhaps I am the only reader who finds this perplexing. Also, it would appear (at least to someone whose graduate training is in law and journalism) that this disparity – 5.3 percent vs. 11.4 percent – is inconsistent with the observation at page 20 that “[t]here was no significant difference in weight gained between patients treated with KarCT and patients treated with placebo reported in the KarXT clinical trials.”

Page 10 – I respectfully suggest brief parenthetical explanations of “gynecomastia,” “galactorrhea,” and “[e]xtrapyramidal symptoms,” given that these are among the listed “Other Patient-Important Harms” and there will be patients reading the final report.

Page 14 – Two seemingly important assertions on this page would, I think, benefit from elaboration or perhaps a clearer explanation. A sentence I cannot understand is: “We heard from experts that controlling the positive symptoms in a patient who is acutely psychotic will confound any assessment of changes in cognitive function and negative symptoms.” A sentence that arguably cries out for elaboration (based on insights from the cited authority) is: “Studies

suggest that as many as 80% of patients with schizophrenia would be excluded from current randomized trial designs.”

Page 16 – At this point in the “Summary and Comment” section, there is much discussion of the incidence of “metabolic syndrome” in schizophrenia patients as a serious adverse effect of existing treatments. The report should explain what “metabolic syndrome” is, even though the term is presumably a well-known one among those who treat, or live with, schizophrenia. A forthright and explicit description of what metabolic syndrome is would communicate to schizophrenia patients, and their loved ones, that ICER well understands what is obviously a significant and unwelcome reality for those struggling to overcome this disease.

Page 23 – Section 4.3 of the report, describing the “Base-Case Results” of the long-term cost effectiveness analysis, is obviously a key element of the draft report. It would, therefore, be desirable if this discussion were as comprehensible as possible to people who are not healthcare economists and, potentially, primed to be skeptical about ICER assessments of cost effectiveness. I fear this sentence will be completely opaque to such readers: “Using a placeholder annual cost of \$20,000 per year, the intervention costs are greater, but there are fewer non-intervention costs resulting from fewer relapses and treatment-emergent adverse events.” The final report should explain why ICER selected a placeholder price of \$20,000, and what “fewer non-intervention costs” means. (In other words, “intervention” vs. “non-intervention” costs are, arguably, jargon – deployed at a critical juncture in the draft report.) Moreover – and here I forthrightly confess I might just be a victim of my own brain fog – I do not understand why the draft employs a placeholder cost of \$20,000 while Table 4.3 lists the cost of KarXT as \$42,000.

Page 26 – I have no suggestions about this section of the draft report, labeled “Uncertainties and Controversies.” Rather, I want to single it out for praise as a lucid explanation of the distinction between the lived experience of any individual patient versus average population-wide effects versus the “enormous societal impact of schizophrenia.”

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft report. It seems likely that some of my comments and suggestions will be helpful while others will miss the mark. Please consider, or disregard, as appropriate. I look forward to carefully reviewing the final report and to participating actively and attentively in the February 9 virtual public meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'DKreis', is written over a light blue rectangular background.

Donald M. Kreis

December 22, 2023

Dr. Steven D. Pearson  
President  
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review  
Two Liberty Square, Ninth Floor  
Boston, MA 02109

Dear Dr. Pearson,

The Partnership to Improve Patient Care (PIPC) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER) assessment of KarXT for schizophrenia.

Schizophrenia is a rare and serious mental disease that impacts how a person thinks, feels, and behaves. It can be an incredibly challenging disease for the person living with it as well as their caregivers, and, if not well controlled, it can impact an individual's ability to work and live independently. As ICER conducts its assessment of treatments for schizophrenia, PIPC urges it to consider the following comments.

**The EQ-5D is an inappropriate PRO tool to use in this assessment as it is insensitive to changes in QOL in mental health.**

The generic EQ-5D is a tool known to be insensitive to changes in quality of life (QOL) for psychiatric conditions. In general, generic preference-based measures do not correlate well with symptoms for psychiatric conditions or with clinician-assessed outcomes. This can be challenging for economic evaluation since interventions typically target positive symptom reduction that would be missed by measures such as the EQ-5D.<sup>1</sup> A specific example of this is a study of chronic schizophrenia using measures of psychopathology and functioning to establish change in which the EQ-5D did not have a significant correlation with negative symptoms, disorganization, depression, excitement and general symptoms.<sup>2</sup> These points have also been found in subsequent studies on the use of generic preference based measures in most areas of mental health.<sup>3</sup>

As a general rule, disease specific tools, are stronger and do a better job reporting true patient outcomes. PIPC would recommend these always be used over the EQ-5D, but for this assessment specifically, the EQ-5D is a particularly poor choice.

**ICER's assessment presents a dangerous oversimplification of a complex disease.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Saarni SI, Härkänen T, Sintonen H, Suvisaari J, Koskinen S, Aromaa A, Lönnqvist J. The impact of 29 chronic conditions on health-related quality of life: a general population survey in Finland using 15D and EQ-5D. *Quality of life Research*. 2006 Oct;15:1403-14.

<sup>2</sup> van de Willige, G, Wiersma, D, Nienhuis, FJ, Jenner, JA. Changes in quality of life in chronic psychiatric patients: a comparison between EQ-5D and WHOQoL. *Qual Life Res* 2005; 14: 441–51

<sup>3</sup> Brazier J. Is the EQ-5D fit for purpose in mental health?. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2010 Nov;197(5):348-9.

ICER chooses to drastically simplify the disease by over-categorizing many health states into only two – with and without severe symptoms. There are many problems with over-categorizing of diseases by using too few health states, which PIPC has pointed out to ICER in the past. If ICER’s actual goal is to show true efficacy of a treatment, this practice hinders that goal. If a treatment is represented by movement of patients from a worse state to a better state, if the number of states is small – or classification too crude - the number of people transitioning between states may result in an underestimate of the true effect of the treatment. Doing so tends to rely on the assumption of a similar distribution of severity within states as the distribution of severity across states. This over-categorization of outcomes has been shown to lead to underestimation of treatment effects.<sup>4,5</sup>

### **ICER’s modified societal perspective calculations seem to rely on illogical assumptions.**

Before getting into the weeds on this topic, it should be noted that ICER should always, particularly in the case of a disease with deep societal implications like schizophrenia, be using the societal perspective as its base case versus the health care perspective.

In ICER’s draft assessment, it chose to use a health care perspective as its base case and then presented a modified societal perspective. The report suggests that the modified societal perspective estimates of cost-effectiveness of KarXT are close to identical to that of the base-case. The argument for this is that the *“the cost savings resulting from productivity gains and fewer criminal justice encounters [are] being offset by additional time required of the caregiver.”* This is illogical, as the source of any reduction in criminal costs and increase in productivity would be a patient spending more time in milder disease states, which would also indicate lower caregiver needs. This inconsistency calls into question the validity of ICER’s data, and PIPC would urge ICER to work more closely with the patient groups representing individuals with schizophrenia to understand more clearly the burden of disease as well as the societal and caregiver impact.

### **ICER must move away from the assumption that all patients are average.**

ICER continues to conduct its assessments to show benefit to the “average” patient. Ultimately this does not provide valid information to help inform decision making in a way that provides high quality patient care. A population average is not a proxy measure that represents all patients. An average doesn’t represent all patients – even as a proxy. An average patient acts as a proxy solely for a handful of patients who happen to land in the middle of a random distribution of patients. These patients are not the majority, they aren’t the most needy, and they aren’t even those for whom the intervention itself would necessarily be most effective.

If ICER wishes to provide helpful information with the aim of informing a decision-maker as to what value a new therapy might have for any patients, it should focus on producing an estimate – or a range of estimates - for as many of that wide range of patients, or patient types, as is possible. It is well

---

<sup>4</sup> Altman DG, Royston P. The cost of dichotomising continuous variables. *Bmj*. 2006 May 4;332(7549):1080.

<sup>5</sup> Royston P, Altman DG, Sauerbrei W. Dichotomizing continuous predictors in multiple regression: a bad idea. *Statistics in medicine*. 2006 Jan 15;25(1):127-41.

established that generating and reporting of differential value assessment estimates across subgroups leads to substantial health gains, both through treatment selection and coverage.<sup>6,7</sup> If ICER is to take seriously its role of informing health policy decision makers about the value of new therapies, it needs to move away from the assumption that all patients are the same, and the value to each can be determined by the estimation of the average value to a patient archetype.

## Conclusion

PIPC urges ICER to reconsider some of its modeling choices to ensure it is providing an accurate picture of value to the patient and society.

Sincerely,



Tony Coelho  
Chairman  
Partnership to Improve Patient Care

---

<sup>6</sup> Basu A. Economics of individualization in comparative effectiveness research and a basis for a patient-centered health care. *Journal of health economics*. 2011 May 1;30(3):549-59.

<sup>7</sup> Espinoza MA, Manca A, Claxton K, Sculpher MJ. The value of heterogeneity for cost-effectiveness subgroup analysis: conceptual framework and application. *Medical Decision Making*. 2014 Nov;34(8):951-64.

Upon review of ICER’s Draft Report for KarXT in schizophrenia, the **Schizophrenia & Psychosis Action Alliance (S&PAA) continues to have significant concerns about the quality, accuracy, and transparency of ICER’s methodology, as detailed below. Moreover, as detailed on pages 2-3, we are dismayed by ICER’s dismissal of the societal costs and lived experience perspectives of those with schizophrenia.**

S&PAA has had continuous interactions with ICER since June 2023 and has provided public comments on the Draft Scope, as well as private comments on the Model Analysis Plan, and an earlier version of the Draft Report. Much of the feedback below has been summarized to ICER in previous communications but has been left unaddressed without justification about ICER’s decision-making process. Given that ICER is not subject to peer review, this lack of transparency is deeply concerning.

**First, we reiterate our stance that this review is being conducted prematurely. This undermines almost every single aspect of this report, resulting in a model that lacks rigor and accurate data on pivotal inputs.**

The only currently available data for KarXT are for short-term clinical trials limited to hospitalized patients experiencing acute psychotic episodes. Despite not having long-term data, ICER has created a lifetime model including relapse, adherence, adverse events, and maintenance treatment for KarXT. This approach is problematic given that KarXT employs a novel mechanism of action and such projections cannot be scientifically justified without comprehensive long-term data.

Throughout the draft report, there are multiple references to the lack of available data necessary to reach conclusions about the cost-effectiveness of KarXT. As examples, the Background section states that the *“major source of uncertainty is the lack of data on the efficacy of KarXT for longer than five weeks.”* The Comparators section discloses, *“Due to the lack of available long-term data for KarXT at the time of this review, we were unable to compare the long-term efficacy and safety of KarXT to the three comparators”*. The report also states, *“there is hope that KarXT may improve the cognitive and negative symptoms better than currently available antipsychotic medications... However, these symptoms can only be fairly evaluated in the maintenance phase of therapy.”* Negative and cognitive symptoms are potentially transformative treatment targets of KarXT that have not been adequately addressed by current antipsychotic medications.

Per ICER’s own report, these are stark limitations that compromise the quality of the model. Regardless, ICER concludes, *“given the lack of long-term data, we rate the net health benefit of KarXT as promising, but inconclusive (P/I) compared with both olanzapine and risperidone.”* ICER’s rating of the net health benefit as “promising but inconclusive” is significant because it impacts how policymakers, insurers, and healthcare providers may perceive the value and effectiveness of a new treatment. Insurance companies often rely on ICER’s evaluations when determining coverage policies, and a rating that suggests uncertainty can lead to restrictive measures such as limited coverage, stringent prior authorization processes, or prohibitive guideline adjustments for this medication. Consequently, this premature analysis, conducted in the absence of complete clinical data, could inadvertently underestimate KarXT's long-term effectiveness, and limit patient access to a potentially life-altering treatment.

**Second, we have concerns about the comprehensiveness and quality of the references throughout this report.**

While a systematic literature review was conducted for the Network Meta-Analysis (NMA), outdated trials were included. For example, 69% (n=22) of 32 studies used to input data for the primary outcome (PANSS) were published more than 15 years ago, in 2008 or earlier. Some citations used for

other outcomes in the NMA are from the 1990s. Publications from the 1990s and 2000s do not reflect the current standard of care, and it is likely that increased awareness, expanded mental health support teams, and newer agents make these trial publications less relevant to current decision making. Moreover, some of the references are from studies conducted outside of the US, which may not be applicable to a US-based model due to differences in regulatory environments, healthcare systems, or population health profiles. ICER has not justified their inclusion of older and potentially non-representative publications in their NMA.

**Third, ICER's societal scenario model is overly reductive and insufficiently supported.** ICER selected productivity, caregiver impacts, and criminal justice impacts as the key outcomes, and concluded that *“cost-effectiveness stayed nearly the same from the modified societal perspective due to the cost savings resulting from productivity gains and fewer criminal justice encounters being offset by additional time required of the caregiver.”* In dialogues with ICER, they have indicated that the limited data on KarXT only permits the inference that this medication might offer a more favorable side effect profile compared to existing antipsychotics, rather than a marked difference in symptom alleviation, and that this would not have a substantial impact on the societal costs associated with schizophrenia. As such, they have not invested their resources in thoroughly exploring the potential societal impact of KarXT. We strongly oppose this approach. Especially in the context of extrapolation and assumptions made throughout the rest of this report, ICER could feasibly explore the consequences of a more tolerable side effect profile on productivity, caregiver burden, and other metrics of societal costs<sup>1,2</sup>. They have opted not to do so, as further indicated by the sparse references for this section of the report. As such, included costs are vastly underestimated and lack elaboration or justification, as described below.

- **Productivity impacts are underestimated.** The impact of schizophrenia on productivity was modeled by assuming that each relapse results in 65 missed workdays for 37% of employed people with schizophrenia, with the financial cost calculated using an average hourly wage of \$33.82. This approach fails to account for the potential increase in the employment rate among those with schizophrenia who could return to work or increase their productivity given more effective symptom management and fewer side effects. Notably, the majority of people with schizophrenia express a desire to work, despite facing high unemployment rates. Moreover, the model does not consider the economic burden of disability benefits (e.g., SSI/SSDI) provided to individuals with schizophrenia, nor does it address the prevalence of part-time employment, underemployment, and the associated loss of productivity in this population.
- **Similarly, caregiver cost estimates lack breadth and depth.** The current methodology primarily focuses on uncompensated caregiving hours, overlooking extensive costs borne by caregivers<sup>2-7</sup>. These include not only out-of-pocket expenses related to hospitalization and daily care needs but also substantial financial burdens associated with major life events and legal matters<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, there is a notable omission of lost productivity costs for caregivers, who often sacrifice their employment opportunities or face reduced working hours to provide care. A more inclusive and realistic approach should be adopted to quantify these often substantial yet overlooked economic and personal sacrifices made by caregivers, and the impact of fewer side effects on caregiver burden. This would provide a more accurate reflection of the true economic and social burden of schizophrenia on caregivers.
- **Criminal justice impacts are confusing and underestimate costs.** ICER appears to have calculated costs to the criminal justice system resulting from psychiatric hospitalizations associated with schizophrenia. Given the number of people who are incarcerated with schizophrenia, such a calculation would make more sense to use within the primary model should all appropriate settings have been included. The societal scenario should include not just psychiatric hospitalization costs, but costs related to long-term incarceration and legal fees, as

well as services provided by police, sheriffs, deputies, judicial staff, and institutions (e.g., local and county jails; paid legal guardians).

- This approach disregards several known societal costs of schizophrenia, including supportive housing services and the cost of homelessness.

If, as stated in informal discussions, ICER considers a detailed societal scenario analysis to be unnecessary, this stance should be overtly stated in the report and no such analysis should be conducted.

**It is worse to conduct a cursory review of societal costs and then conclude that KarXT is unlikely to have a meaningful societal impact than it is to conduct no analysis at all.**

Moreover, the *Patient and Caregiver Perspectives* section, along with focus group data from those with schizophrenia and their caregivers, is ineffectively integrated into the model's overall inputs. It lacks depth, as well as connection to established literature on the lived experience of schizophrenia, reflecting a perfunctory acknowledgment of these perspectives by ICER rather than a substantive inclusion. The *Contextual Considerations* section similarly fails to convey the full extent of the schizophrenia's impact due to insufficient detail. Additionally, the scarcity of data prevents the completion of three out of four *Potential Other Benefits and Disadvantages* sections, a predicament resulting from ICER's premature review process.

We emphasize that ICER has asked for feedback from our patient advocacy group throughout this review process, ostensibly to show that they are invested in capturing the lived experience perspective. Our community has engaged in good faith that ICER will seriously consider their perspectives, including by participating in focus groups and sharing personal and painful stories with ICER staff. **ICER's manner of engagement has involved requesting lived experience input for an extended period of time, only to later provide a cursory summary of these perspectives while implying that a comprehensive societal scenario analysis is not merited. This does an injustice to those with schizophrenia and their caregivers, and has been a drain on our small non-profit's financial and personnel resources.** At best, this method of engagement is unhelpful for our population. At worst, it is harmful and undermines ICER's credibility in our eyes.

**Third, the model does not reflect the reality of the medication experience for those with schizophrenia.**

We have previously summarized feedback regarding the structure of the model analytic plan, including concerns about extrapolation of short-term data, use of outdated data, choice of comparators, consideration of common comorbid conditions that may impact cost, adverse events and side effects, and oversimplification of health states. ICER has not explained their decision-making process in regard to these concerns. We highlight our most pressing concerns below.

In our discussions, ICER has stated that they do not want to make assumptions about costs and consequently have excluded some of these key illness aspects. However, ICER has made several other assumptions throughout their modeling process (e.g., that it is appropriate to use the maintenance data from other antipsychotic medications for KarXT). We urge ICER to consider our feedback in order to fully model the lived experience of those with schizophrenia, ensure credibility of their work, and avoid making flawed conclusions that can result in barriers to medications for those most in need.

1. **Short-term data for pivotal data inputs have been over-extrapolated.** Given that QALYs are primarily derived from the maintenance phase of this lifetime model, the assumptions around efficacy, tolerability, and relapse rates in the maintenance phase (based on 5-week data only) introduce large uncertainty in the results. Assuming that relapse rates are likely to be midpoint



of comparator rates presents some risk, as this is likely to be a pivotal input to the model. We recommend that scenarios be explored with alternative assumptions, such as relapse rates for KarXT at 5%, 10%, 15%. Alternatively, ICER may choose to wait until maintenance data is available for KarXT and simply present an acute model at this time. Otherwise, ICER risks reaching incorrect conclusions about cost-effectiveness.

2. **ICER has not justified their choice of comparators (aripiprazole, risperidone, and olanzapine).** Comparators should not be selected based on prescribing patterns or because they are second- generation antipsychotics, as ICER has done. Prescription patterns are not based on the clinical profile of the products and may not reflect optimal treatments in terms of clinical effectiveness and tolerability. Moreover, the distinction between first- and second-generation antipsychotics (FGAs and SGAs) is complicated and may not be the most meaningful way to approach this analysis<sup>9</sup>. We previously proposed that ICER should group comparator antipsychotic medications by tolerability (side effect) and efficacy profiles as has generally been suggested by research experts<sup>10,11</sup>.
3. **The health states included in the model (stable without adverse events, metabolic syndrome without diabetes or cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, relapse, death) fail to reflect the full spectrum of schizophrenia experiences.** The model's current extremes—either an ideal condition without adverse events or a severe relapse requiring hospitalization—oversimplify the reality of the illness. The term "stable" encompasses a wide range, from individuals who manage symptoms effectively and live independently to those who, despite controlled positive symptoms, struggle with negative symptoms, cognitive impairments, and dependency on disability support and caregiving<sup>12–14</sup>. The "relapse" state should also be differentiated into "acute" and "chronic" to capture that some individuals experience brief hospitalizations, while others face prolonged inpatient care, homelessness, or incarceration, all of which have profound implications for healthcare costs<sup>15</sup>. We strongly urge ICER to include more granular health states to accurately model the economic burdens and relevant outcomes for schizophrenia.
4. **The proposed model fails to consider the effects of reduced weight gain on life expectancy for individuals with schizophrenia.** Given that weight gain and its related health complications are among the leading predictors of premature mortality in this population—where death occurs approximately 15 years earlier than in the general population<sup>17</sup>—this oversight could significantly affect the accuracy of the model's long-term outcomes and cost projections.
5. **The placeholder price of \$20,000/year is high.** Wholesale acquisition costs for other branded products are \$17,028/year (Rexulti)<sup>18</sup>, \$16,532/year (Vraylar)<sup>19</sup>, \$18,830/year (Calypta)<sup>20</sup>. The mean of these branded treatments is \$17,463. Unless Karuna has told ICER that \$20,000 is the expected price, the base case would be more credible if it were based on real-world comparators on the market. Given that this model already makes a slew of assumptions, the addition of anything credible is important. This is a simple update that could make this report more credible for stakeholders.
6. **Core model assumptions made by ICER are questionable.** As one example, ICER writes on page 20 that "*without evidence on the risk of metabolic syndrome for adults with schizophrenia who are not on an antipsychotic, we assumed the same risk of metabolic syndrome as the general population.*" However, there is evidence that those with schizophrenia are at increased risk of metabolic syndrome even if they are antipsychotic-naïve, as indicated by recent literature<sup>21</sup>.
7. **ICER inaccurately states that the proposed model considers "all relevant settings" but only includes inpatient, outpatient/clinic, home, and unhoused settings.** Those with schizophrenia dwell in varied settings that are both a consequence of treatment effectiveness and directly impact healthcare and societal costs. These include emergency rooms<sup>22</sup>, homeless shelters or the street<sup>23</sup>, jails and prisons<sup>24</sup>, and supported living facilities such as group or nursing homes<sup>25</sup>. At the very least, ICER should transparently state that they are not able to consider all relevant settings in which people with schizophrenia receive care.

8. **The full spectrum of healthcare services for schizophrenia is not included.** This includes case management, emergency room visits, pharmacy costs, physical healthcare visits, assertive community treatment, crisis response teams, family psychoeducation, group therapy, home care, and others. ICER acknowledges some of these treatments in the clinical guidelines provided by the American Psychiatric Association in Appendix C, but these are not included in the actual model. The comprehensive nature of these costs is crucial to include given that the services received by those with schizophrenia after a relapse are more expensive and greater in magnitude than when one is stable.
9. **The proposed model neglects the full scope of psychiatric and medical comorbidities that occur with schizophrenia.** Common psychiatric comorbidities, such as anxiety, depression, and substance use disorders, which are all costly mental health conditions, are not included in this model<sup>26</sup>. Moreover, ICER has only included treatment-emergent health effects (e.g., weight gain) in their model, and underlying comorbidities that are not linked to treatment<sup>27</sup>. The consequence of neglecting these conditions is that ICER is underestimating healthcare and societal costs. For example, nearly half of those with schizophrenia (47%) are estimated to have substance use disorders, which significantly drives up healthcare and societal costs<sup>26</sup>.
10. **Years with diabetes is the only key medical model outcome included in the model.** Although diabetes is one of the leading causes of mortality in schizophrenia and can be a side effect of antipsychotic medication use<sup>28</sup>, this is a limited perspective of schizophrenia. ICER has not provided a clear justification as to why they have included only diabetes as the key medical outcome as opposed to other comorbid illnesses that are important in this same regard such as obesity, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia<sup>29</sup>.
11. **We urge ICER not to list any “low-value services” in their report.** We strongly advise that no services in this area should be reduced or eliminated at this time. The complex nature of schizophrenia, existing barriers to care, and the heterogenous presentation of individuals throughout their lifetimes require real-time shared decision- making and personalized approaches to care. Until more refined diagnostic and prognostic approaches are available to target treatments accurately, it is irresponsible to suggest any treatment is superior to another and limit access to any treatment in any way for any given individual.

We have strong concerns about the scientific rigor and neutrality of ICER’s current approach, which may do a grave disservice to a community that needs significant help and support. For these reasons, we have serious concerns about the impact of ICER’s proposed approach to the cost-effectiveness model, **as it does not reflect the lived experience of those with schizophrenia and their caregivers and may result in barriers to access to a potentially life-altering medication option for our community.**

If ICER is sincere about their mission to encourage fair access, support continued innovations, and remove barriers to how care is delivered to those in need, we urge them to delay their timeline in order to fully address the feedback provided by stakeholders, to genuinely include the societal perspective, and to increase the transparency of their modeling process.

Sincerely,  
Schizophrenia & Psychosis Action Alliance

## References

1. Taylor VH, Forhan M, Vigod SN, McIntyre RS, Morrison KM. The impact of obesity on quality of life. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2013;27(2):139-146. doi:10.1016/j.beem.2013.04.004
2. Millier A, Schmidt U, Angermeyer MC, et al. Humanistic burden in schizophrenia: A literature review. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2014;54:85-93. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2014.03.021
3. Cloutier M, Sanon Aigbogun M, Guerin A, et al. The Economic Burden of Schizophrenia in the United States in 2013. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2016;77(06):764-771. doi:10.4088/JCP.15m10278
4. Kamil SH, Velligan DI. Caregivers of individuals with schizophrenia: Who are they and what are their challenges? *Curr Opin Psychiatry.* 2019;32(3):157-163. doi:10.1097/YCO.0000000000000492
5. Csoboth C, Witt EA, Villa KF, O’Gorman C. The humanistic and economic burden of providing care for a patient with schizophrenia. *Int J Soc Psychiatry.* 2015;61(8):754-761. doi:10.1177/0020764015577844
6. Suro G, Weisman De Mamani AG. Burden, interdependence, ethnicity, and mental Health in caregivers of patients with schizophrenia. *Fam Process.* 2013;52(2):299-311. doi:10.1111/famp.12002
7. Jin H, Mosweu I. The societal cost of schizophrenia: A systematic review. *Pharmacoeconomics.* 2017;35(1):25-42. doi:10.1007/s40273-016-0444-6
8. Krasa HB, Birch K, Frangiosa T, Palsgrove A, Maravic MC. *Poster Presented at CNS Summit: Measuring the Impacts of Caregiving on Schizophrenia.*; 2022. [https://sczaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Krasa-et-al.-Caregiving-in-Schizophrenia\\_innovationscns\\_cns-summit-2022.pdf](https://sczaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Krasa-et-al.-Caregiving-in-Schizophrenia_innovationscns_cns-summit-2022.pdf)
9. American Psychiatric Association. *Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Patients with Schizophrenia, Third Edition*; 2021.
10. Leucht S, Cipriani A, Spineli L, et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 15 antipsychotic drugs in schizophrenia: a multiple-treatments meta-analysis. *The Lancet.* 2013;382(9896):951-962. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60733-3
11. Solmi M, Murru A, Pacchiarotti I, et al. Safety, tolerability, and risks associated with first- and second-generation antipsychotics: A state-of-the-art clinical review. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.* 2017;13:757-777. doi:10.2147/TCRM.S117321
12. Chang WC, Hui CLM, Tang JYM, et al. Persistent negative symptoms in first-episode schizophrenia: A prospective three-year follow-up study. *Schizophr Res.* 2011;133(1-3):22-28. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2011.09.006
13. Galderisi S, Bucci P, Mucci A, et al. Categorical and dimensional approaches to negative symptoms of schizophrenia: Focus on long-term stability and functional outcome. *Schizophr Res.* 2013;147(1):157-162. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2013.03.020
14. Ventura J, Subotnik KL, Gitlin MJ, et al. Negative symptoms and functioning during the first year after a recent onset of schizophrenia and 8 years later. *Schizophr Res.* 2015;161(2-3):407-413. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2014.10.043

15. Papakostas S, Dar A, Ratna L. Sociodemographic Factors and Medication Administration Factors Affecting Re – Hospitalization in Patients with Schizophrenia – Spectrum Disorders. *Psychiatr Q*. 2020;91(4):1363-1369. doi:10.1007/s11126-020-09756-z
16. Siskind D, Gallagher E, Winckel K, et al. Does Switching Antipsychotics Ameliorate Weight Gain in Patients With Severe Mental Illness? A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Schizophr Bull*. 2021;47(4):948-958. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbaa191
17. Hjorthøj C, Stürup AE, McGrath JJ, Nordentoft M. Years of potential life lost and life expectancy in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017;4(4):295-301. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30078-0
18. *Rexulti (Brexipiprazole): Savings and Cost*. <https://www.rexulti.com/savings-cost>
19. *Vraylar (Cariprazine): Cost and Savings*. <https://www.vraylar.com/cost-and-savings>
20. *Calypta (Lumateperone): Savings and Cost*. <https://www.calypta.com/schizophrenia/cost-savings>
21. Garrido-Torres N, Rocha-Gonzalez I, Alameda L, et al. Metabolic syndrome in antipsychotic-naïve patients with first-episode psychosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. 2021;51(14):2307-2320. doi:10.1017/S0033291721002853
22. Liffick E, Mehdiyoun NF, Vohs JL, Francis MM, Breier A. Utilization and cost of health care services during the first episode of psychosis. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2017;68(2):131-136. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201500375
23. Lemoine C, Loubière S, Boucekine M, Girard V, Tinland A, Auquier P. Cost-effectiveness analysis of housing first intervention with an independent housing and team support for homeless people with severe mental illness: A Markov model informed by a randomized controlled trial. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;272:113692. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113692
24. Lin I, Muser E, Munsell M, Benson C, Menzin J. Economic impact of psychiatric relapse and recidivism among adults with schizophrenia recently released from incarceration: a Markov model analysis. *J Med Econ*. 2015;18(3):219-229. doi:10.3111/13696998.2014.971161
25. Tsai J, Stroup TS, Rosenheck RA. Housing arrangements among a national sample of adults with chronic schizophrenia living in the United States: a descriptive study. *J Community Psychol*. 2011;39(1):76-88. doi:10.1002/jcop.20418
26. Buckley PF, Miller BJ, Lehrer DS, Castle DJ. Psychiatric comorbidities and schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009;35(2):383-402. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbn135
27. Crump C, Winkleby MA, Sundquist K, Sundquist J. Comorbidities and mortality in persons with schizophrenia: A Swedish national cohort Study. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2013;170(3):324-333. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12050599
28. Suvisaari J, Keinänen J, Eskelinen S, Mantere O. Diabetes and Schizophrenia. *Curr Diab Rep*. 2016;16(2):16. doi:10.1007/s11892-015-0704-4
29. Suvisaari J, Partti K, Perälä J, et al. Mortality and its determinants in people with psychotic disorder. *Psychosom Med*. 2013;75(1):60-67. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e31827ad512



The STARR Coalition  
11700 Kanis Road, Suite 2  
Little Rock, AR 72211

December 22, 2023

Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER)  
14 Beacon Street, Suite 800,  
Boston, MA 02108  
Via email: [publiccomments@icer.org](mailto:publiccomments@icer.org)

Re: Comments on ICER's Draft Evidence Report on KarXT for Schizophrenia

To Whom This Concerns:

I am writing to submit comments on ICER's Draft Evidence Report on KarXT for Schizophrenia.

The STARR Coalition is a non-profit organization that advocates for patient access to every available treatment option, including new, cutting-edge treatments for mental illnesses. We do this by supporting stakeholders involved in mental health clinical research and working to ensure that clinical research is a familiar and trusted part of the community healthcare ecosystem.

We are very excited about the possibility of a true novel treatment for (arguably) one of the most devastating of all mental illnesses, schizophrenia. In this case, the new treatment is for a condition that faces far greater barriers than any other condition, as schizophrenia has more stigma and fewer champions than almost any other illness.

Given that, it is our opinion that any pricing discussions on any novel mechanism for schizophrenia adds yet another hurdle in the innovation and investment in researching novel mechanisms and should be undertaken with that in mind.

That said, here are specific comments on the Draft Evidence Report:



1. Suggested Revision 1: Use the existing data on KarXT to extrapolate and populate the pricing model, noting the limitations in the assessment. KarXT relies on novel mechanisms for treatment and is therefore not comparable to the existing second-generation anti-psychotics. In the cases where there is not enough data or the existing data on KarXT was “promising but inconclusive (P?I)”, the assumptions are based on a “mid-point between the range of the other second-generation anti-psychotics.” Preliminary evidence does not support the assumption that KarXT would fall at the mid-point of the existing anti-psychotics, making this a faulty assumption.
2. Suggested Revision 2: Use the existing data on KarXT which suggests that TD would NOT be a side effect for inclusion in the pricing model, noting the limitations in the assessment. Consideration of the incidence of tardive dyskinesia (TD) and other long-term movement disorder side effects is listed as an ‘uncertainty’ and less weight is given this important side effect of existing anti-psychotics. Data from 2019 suggests that total health care costs were significantly greater for patients with TD than for those without TD and patients diagnosed with TD demonstrate significantly higher health care utilization and costs compared with non-TD patients.<sup>1</sup> There is no evidence that suggests that KarXT will cause TD in the long-term and therefore should be noted and assumed in the model.
3. Suggested Revision 3: Caregiver costs should be given adequate consideration in the model. Aside from the fact that the true burden of caring for a loved one with schizophrenia can hardly be calculated, there must be significant weight given to the caregiver burden, possibly equal to the cost of the annual QALY or evLY.
4. Suggested Revision 4: Build cost assumptions based on present-day data, encompassing the significant increases in the cost of living and inflationary adjustments.



Please include me and The STARR Coalition in future correspondence regarding this as well as any other assessments of mental health treatments.

Respectfully,

Erica Moore  
Director of Operations  
The STARR Coalition  
M: 610-613-3524  
E: [erica@thestarr.org](mailto:erica@thestarr.org)  
[www.thestarr.org](http://www.thestarr.org)

Reference:

1. Carroll B, Irwin DE. Health Care Resource Utilization and Costs for Patients with Tardive Dyskinesia. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*. 2019 Jul;25(7):810-816. doi: 10.18553/jmcp.2019.25.7.810. PMID: 31232207; PMCID: PMC10398273.