Introduction

Around two-thirds of breast cancers express the estrogen receptor (ER) alpha protein. These ER-positive tumors are dependent on the ER and its cognate ligand, estrogen, for their growth, survival, and progression. Selective estrogen receptor modulators (SERMs) and selective estrogen receptor down-regulators (SERDs) are two major classes of endocrine therapy drugs used for the treatment and/or prevention of ER-positive breast cancers. These therapies are all designed in one way or another to block ER function and signaling. Some SERMs also have estrogen activity in bone and, therefore, prevent bone loss, improve bone mineral density (BMD), and decrease the risk of vertebral fracture. This policy discusses when the use of brand SERMs and SERDs may be considered medically necessary.

Note: The Introduction section is for your general knowledge and is not to be taken as policy coverage criteria. The rest of the policy uses specific words and concepts familiar to medical professionals. It is intended for providers. A provider can be a person, such as a doctor, nurse, psychologist, or dentist. A provider also can be a place where medical care is given, like a hospital, clinic, or lab. This policy informs them about when a service may be covered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Medical Necessity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arimidex® (anastrozole) oral</td>
<td><strong>Arimidex® (anastrozole) may be considered medically necessary for:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjuvant treatment of postmenopausal women with hormone receptor-positive early breast cancer OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of postmenopausal women with hormone receptor-positive or hormone receptor-unknown locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women with disease progression following tamoxifen therapy OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of recurrent or metastatic endometrial or uterine cancer OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of recurrent ovarian cancer OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk reduction for breast cancer in postmenopausal women AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The patient has tried generic anastrozole first and had an inadequate response or intolerance to generic anastrozole AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dose is \leq 1 mg per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aromasin® (exemestane) oral</td>
<td><strong>Aromasin® (exemestane) may be considered medically necessary for:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjuvant treatment of postmenopausal women with estrogen-receptor positive early breast cancer who have received two or three years of tamoxifen and are switched to Aromasin® for completion of a total of five consecutive years of adjuvant hormonal therapy OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women whose disease has progressed following tamoxifen therapy OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk reduction for invasive breast cancer in postmenopausal women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Medical Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evista® (raloxifene) oral</td>
<td>Evista® (raloxifene) may be considered medically necessary for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment and prevention of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduction in risk of invasive breast cancer in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduction in risk of invasive breast cancer in postmenopausal women at high risk for invasive breast cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The patient has tried generic raloxifene first and had an inadequate response or intolerance to generic raloxifene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dose is ≤ 60 mg per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareston® (toremifene) oral</td>
<td>Fareston® (toremifene) may be considered medically necessary for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of metastatic breast cancer in postmenopausal women with estrogen receptor positive or unknown tumors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The patient has tried generic toremifene first and had an inadequate response or intolerance to generic toremifene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dose is ≤ 60 mg per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faslodex® (fulvestrant) IM</td>
<td>Faslodex® (fulvestrant) may be considered medically necessary for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of HR-positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-negative advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women not previously treated with endocrine therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Medical Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of hormone-receptor (HR)-positive advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women with disease progression following endocrine therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of HR-positive, HER2-negative advanced or metastatic breast cancer in combination with ribociclib in postmenopausal women as initial endocrine-based therapy or following disease progression on endocrine therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of HR-positive, HER2-negative advanced or metastatic breast cancer in combination with palbociclib or abemaciclib in women with disease progression following endocrine therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The patient has tried generic fulvestrant first and had an inadequate response or intolerance to generic fulvestrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femara® (letrozole) oral</td>
<td><strong>Femara® (letrozole) may be considered medically necessary for:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjuvant treatment of postmenopausal women with hormone receptor positive early breast cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extended adjuvant treatment of postmenopausal women with early breast cancer who have received prior standard adjuvant tamoxifen therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of postmenopausal women with hormone receptor positive or unknown advanced breast cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treatment of recurrent ovarian cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The patient has tried generic letrozole first and had an inadequate response or intolerance to generic letrozole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dose is ( \leq 2.5 ) mg per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Length of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial authorization</td>
<td>Drugs listed in policy may be approved up to 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-authorization criteria</td>
<td>Future re-authorization of drugs listed in policy may be approved up to 12 months as long as the drug-specific coverage criteria are met and chart notes demonstrate that the patient continues to show a positive clinical response to therapy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Documentation Requirements

The patient’s medical records submitted for review for all conditions should document that medical necessity criteria are met. The record should include the following:

- Office visit notes that contain the diagnosis, relevant history, physical evaluation, and medication history

### Coding

N/A

### Related Information

### Benefit Application

This policy is managed through the Pharmacy benefit.

### Evidence Review
Background

Breast cancer is the second most commonly diagnosed cancer worldwide. It is also the leading cause of cancer death in women worldwide. In the United States, breast cancer accounts for over 260,000 cases each year and is responsible for over 40,000 deaths. The incidence rates decreased from 1999 to 2007 by 1.8% per year.

Breast cancer mortality rates have been decreasing since the 1970s. This decrease in mortality is due to improved breast cancer screening and improvements in adjuvant therapy. Therapy saves lives when breast cancers are treated earlier, as demonstrated in a landmark article in which women 40 to 69 who participated in organized mammography screening had a 60% lower risk of dying from breast cancer within 10 years after diagnosis and a 47% lower risk of dying from breast cancer within 20 years after diagnosis compared with women who did not participate in screening.

Once a diagnosis of breast cancer is established, it is important to accurately define the initial extent of disease since this information will affect treatment recommendations.

Summary of Evidence

Arimidex® (anastrozole)

Efficacy

The first analysis of the ATAC (Arimidex, Tamoxifen Alone or in Combination) trial (median follow-up, 33 months) demonstrated that in adjuvant endocrine therapy for postmenopausal patients with early-stage breast cancer, anastrozole was superior to tamoxifen in terms of disease-free survival (DFS), time to recurrence (TTR), and incidence of contralateral breast cancer (CLBC). DFS estimates at 4 years remained significantly more favorable (86.9% vs. 84.5%, respectively) for patients receiving anastrozole compared with those receiving tamoxifen (hazard ratio [HR], 0.86; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.76-0.99; P = 0.03). The benefit generated by anastrozole in terms of DFS was even greater in patients with hormone receptor-positive tumors (HR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.70-0.96; P = 0.014). The HR for TTR also indicated a significant benefit for patients receiving anastrozole compared with those receiving tamoxifen (HR, 0.83; 95% CI, 0.71-0.96; P = 0.015), with additional benefit for patients with hormone receptor-positive tumors (HR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.65-0.93; P = 0.007). CLBC incidence data also continued to favor anastrozole (odds ratio [OR], 0.62; 95% CI, 0.38-1.02; P = 0.062), and statistical significance was achieved in the hormone receptor-positive subgroup (OR, 0.56; 95% CI, 0.32-0.98; P = 0.042).
Two double-blind, controlled clinical studies of similar design (0030, a North American study and 0027, a predominately European study) were conducted to assess the efficacy of Arimidex compared with tamoxifen as first-line therapy for hormone receptor positive or hormone receptor unknown locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer in postmenopausal women. A total of 1021 patients between the ages of 30 and 92 years old were randomized to receive trial treatment. Patients were randomized to receive 1 mg of Arimidex once daily or 20 mg of tamoxifen once daily. The primary endpoints for both trials were time to tumor progression, objective tumor response rate, and safety. For the primary endpoints, trial 0030 showed that Arimidex had a statistically significant advantage over tamoxifen (p=0.006) for time to tumor progression; objective tumor response rates were similar for Arimidex and tamoxifen. Trial 0027 showed that Arimidex and tamoxifen had similar objective tumor response rates and time to tumor progression.

Anastrozole was studied in two controlled clinical trials (0004, a North American study; 0005, a predominately European study) in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer who had disease progression following tamoxifen therapy for either advanced or early breast cancer. In both studies there were no significant differences between treatment arms with respect to any of the efficacy parameters.

**Safety/Tolerability**

Adverse reaction data for adjuvant therapy are based on the ATAC trial. The median duration of adjuvant treatment for safety evaluation was 59.8 months and 59.6 months for patients receiving Arimidex 1 mg and tamoxifen 20 mg, respectively.

In women with pre-existing ischemic heart disease, an increased incidence of ischemic cardiovascular events was observed with Arimidex in the ATAC trial (17% of patients on Arimidex and 10% of patients on tamoxifen).

Results from the ATAC trial bone substudy at 12 and 24 months demonstrated that patients receiving Arimidex had a mean decrease in both lumbar spine and total hip bone mineral density (BMD) compared to baseline. Patients receiving tamoxifen had a mean increase in both lumbar spine and total hip BMD compared to baseline.

During the ATAC trial, more patients receiving Arimidex were reported to have elevated serum cholesterol compared to patients receiving tamoxifen (9% versus 3.5%, respectively).
Based on findings from animal studies and its mechanism of action, Arimidex can cause fetal harm when administered to a pregnant woman. Anastrozole caused embryo-fetal toxicities in rats at maternal exposure that were 9 times the human clinical exposure, based on area under the curve (AUC). In rabbits, anastrozole caused pregnancy failure at doses equal to or greater than 16 times the recommended human dose on a mg/m² basis.

**Aromasin® (exemestane)**

**Efficacy**

The Intergroup Exemestane Study 031 (IES) was a randomized, double-blind, multicenter, multinational study comparing exemestane (25 mg/day) vs. tamoxifen (20 or 30 mg/day) in postmenopausal women with early breast cancer. Patients who remained disease-free after receiving adjuvant tamoxifen therapy for 2 to 3 years were randomized to receive an additional 3 or 2 years of Aromasin or tamoxifen to complete a total of 5 years of hormonal therapy. Disease-free survival in the intent-to-treat population was statistically significantly improved [Hazard Ratio (HR) = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.58, 0.82, P = 0.00003] in the Aromasin arm compared to the tamoxifen arm. In the hormone receptor-positive subpopulation representing about 85% of the trial patients, disease-free survival was also statistically significantly improved (HR = 0.65, 95% CI: 0.53, 0.79, P = 0.00001) in the Aromasin arm compared to the tamoxifen arm. Consistent results were observed in the subgroups of patients with node negative or positive disease, and patients who had or had not received prior chemotherapy. An overall survival update at 119 months median follow-up showed no significant difference between the two groups, with 467 deaths (19.9%) occurring in the Aromasin group and 510 deaths (21.5%) in the tamoxifen group.

Exemestane 25 mg administered once daily was evaluated in a randomized double-blind, multicenter, multinational comparative study and in two multicenter single-arm studies of postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer who had disease progression after treatment with tamoxifen for metastatic disease or as adjuvant therapy. In the comparative study, 769 patients were randomized to receive Aromasin (exemestane tablets) 25 mg once daily (N = 366) or megestrol acetate 40 mg four times daily (N = 403). The objective response rates observed in the two treatment arms showed that Aromasin was not different from megestrol acetate. Response rates for Aromasin from the two single-arm trials were 23.4% and 28.1%. There were too few deaths occurring across treatment groups to draw conclusions on overall survival differences.
**Safety/Tolerability**

Aromasin tolerability in postmenopausal women with early breast cancer was evaluated in two well-controlled trials: the IES study and the 027 study (a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, parallel group study specifically designed to assess the effects of exemestane on bone metabolism, hormones, lipids, and coagulation factors over 2 years of treatment).

The median duration of adjuvant treatment was 27.4 months and 27.3 months for patients receiving Aromasin or tamoxifen, respectively, within the IES study and 23.9 months for patients receiving Aromasin or placebo within the 027 study. Median duration of observation after randomization for Aromasin was 34.5 months and for tamoxifen was 34.6 months. Median duration of observation was 30 months for both groups in the 027 study.

Certain adverse reactions, which were expected based on the known pharmacological properties and side effect profiles of test drugs, were actively sought through a positive checklist. Signs and symptoms were graded for severity using CTC in both studies. Within the IES study, the presence of some illnesses/conditions was monitored through a positive checklist without assessment of severity. These included myocardial infarction, other cardiovascular disorders, gynecological disorders, osteoporosis, osteoporotic fractures, other primary cancer, and hospitalizations.

Within the IES study, discontinuations due to adverse reactions occurred in 6.3% and 5.1% of patients receiving Aromasin and tamoxifen, respectively, and in 12.3% and 4.1% of patients receiving exemestane or placebo respectively within study 027.

**Evista® (raloxifene)**

**Efficacy**

The effects of Evista on fracture incidence and BMD in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis were examined at 3 years in a large randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, multinational osteoporosis treatment trial (MORE). All vertebral fractures were diagnosed radiographically; some of these fractures also were associated with symptoms (i.e., clinical fractures). The study population consisted of 7705 postmenopausal women with osteoporosis as defined by: a) low BMD (vertebral or hip BMD at least 2.5 standard deviations below the mean value for healthy young women) without baseline vertebral fractures or b) one or more baseline vertebral fractures. Women enrolled in this study had a median age of 67 years (range 31 to 80) and a median time since menopause of 19 years. Evista, 60 mg administered once daily, increased spine and hip BMD by 2 to 3%. Evista decreased the incidence of the first vertebral fracture from 4.3% for placebo to 1.9% for Evista (relative risk reduction = 55%) and subsequent
vertebral fractures from 20.2% for placebo to 14.1% for Evista (relative risk reduction = 30%). All women in the study received calcium (500 mg/day) and vitamin D (400 to 600 IU/day). Evista reduced the incidence of vertebral fractures whether or not patients had a vertebral fracture upon study entry. The decrease in incidence of vertebral fracture was greater than could be accounted for by increase in BMD alone. The mean percentage change in BMD from baseline for Evista was statistically significantly greater than for placebo at each skeletal site. Bone biopsies for qualitative and quantitative histomorphometry were obtained at baseline and after 2 years of treatment. There were 56 paired biopsies evaluable for all indices. In Evista-treated patients, there were statistically significant decreases in bone formation rate per tissue volume, consistent with a reduction in bone turnover. Normal bone quality was maintained; specifically, there was no evidence of osteomalacia, marrow fibrosis, cellular toxicity, or woven bone after 2 years of treatment. Endometrial thickness was evaluated annually in a subset of the study population (1781 patients) for 3 years. Placebo-treated women had a 0.27 mm mean decrease from baseline in endometrial thickness over 3 years, whereas the Evista-treated women had a 0.06 mm mean increase. Patients in the osteoporosis treatment study were not screened at baseline or excluded for pre-existing endometrial or uterine disease. This study was not specifically designed to detect endometrial polyps. Over the 36 months of the study, clinically or histologically benign endometrial polyps were reported in 17 of 1999 placebo-treated women, 37 of 1948 Evista-treated women, and in 31 of 2010 women treated with raloxifene HCl 120 mg/day. There was no difference between Evista- and placebo-treated women in the incidences of endometrial carcinoma, vaginal bleeding, or vaginal discharge.

The effects of Evista on BMD in postmenopausal women were examined in three randomized, placebo controlled, double-blind osteoporosis prevention trials: (1) a North American trial enrolled 544 women; (2) a European trial, 601 women; and (3) an international trial, 619 women who had undergone hysterectomy. In these trials, all women received calcium supplementation (400 to 600 mg/day). Women enrolled in these trials had a median age of 54 years and a median time since menopause of 5 years (less than 1 year up to 15 years postmenopause). The majority of the women were White (93.5%). Women were included if they had spine BMD between 2.5 standard deviations below and 2 standard deviations above the mean value for healthy young women. The mean T scores (number of standard deviations above or below the mean in healthy young women) for the three trials ranged from -1.01 to -0.74 for spine BMD and included women both with normal and low BMD. Evista, 60 mg administered once daily, produced increases in bone mass versus calcium supplementation alone, as reflected by dual-energy x-ray absorptiometric (DXA) measurements of hip, spine, and total body BMD. Compared with placebo, the increases in BMD for each of the three studies were statistically significant at 12 months and were maintained at 24 months. The placebo groups lost approximately 1% of BMD over 24 months. Evista also increased BMD compared with placebo in the total body by 1.3% to
The effects of EVISTA on forearm BMD were inconsistent between studies. In Study EU, Evista prevented bone loss at the ultradistal radius, whereas in Study NA, it did not.

In placebo-controlled osteoporosis prevention trials, endometrial thickness was evaluated every 6 months (for 24 months) by transvaginal ultrasonography (TVU). A total of 2978 TVU measurements were collected from 831 women in all dose groups. Placebo-treated women had a 0.04 mm mean increase from baseline in endometrial thickness over 2 years, whereas the EVISTA-treated women had a 0.09 mm mean increase. Endometrial thickness measurements in raloxifene-treated women were indistinguishable from placebo. There were no differences between the raloxifene and placebo groups with respect to the incidence of reported vaginal bleeding. The effect of Evista on the incidence of breast cancer was assessed as a secondary safety endpoint in a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, multinational osteoporosis treatment trial in postmenopausal women. After 4 years, Evista, 60 mg administered once daily, reduced the incidence of all breast cancers by 62%, compared with placebo (HR 0.38, 95% CI 0.22-0.67). Evista reduced the incidence of invasive breast cancer by 71%, compared with placebo (ARR 3.1 per 1000 women-years); this was primarily due to an 80% reduction in the incidence of ER-positive invasive breast cancer in the Evista group compared with placebo.

The effects of Evista 60 mg/day versus tamoxifen 20 mg/day over 5 years on reducing the incidence of invasive breast cancer were assessed in 19,747 postmenopausal women in a randomized, double-blind trial conducted in North America by the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project and sponsored by the National Cancer Institute. Women in this study had a mean age of 58.5 years (range 35-83), a mean 5-year predicted invasive breast cancer risk of 4.03% (range 1.66-23.61%), and 9.1% had a history of lobular carcinoma in situ (LCIS). More than 93% of participants were White. As of 31 December 2005, the median time of follow-up was 4.3 years (range 0.07-6.50 years). Evista was not superior to tamoxifen in reducing the incidence of invasive breast cancer. The observed incidence rates of invasive breast cancer were Evista 4.4 and tamoxifen 4.3 per 1000 women per year. The results from a noninferiority analysis are consistent with Evista potentially losing up to 35% of the tamoxifen effect on reduction of invasive breast cancer. The effect of each treatment on invasive breast cancer was consistent when women were compared by baseline age, history of LCIS, history of atypical hyperplasia, 5-year predicted risk of breast cancer by the modified Gail model, or the number of relatives with a history of breast cancer. Fewer noninvasive breast cancers occurred in the tamoxifen group compared to the Evista group.
Safety/Tolerability

In clinical trials, Evista-treated women had an increased risk of venous thromboembolism (deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism).

In a clinical trial of postmenopausal women with documented coronary heart disease or at increased risk for coronary events, an increased risk of death due to stroke was observed after treatment with Evista. During an average follow-up of 5.6 years, 59 (1.2%) Evista-treated women died due to a stroke compared to 39 (0.8%) placebo-treated women (22 versus 15 per 10,000 women-years; hazard ratio 1.49; 95% confidence interval, 1.00-2.24; p=0.0499). There was no statistically significant difference between treatment groups in the incidence of stroke (249 in Evista [4.9%] versus 224 placebo [4.4%]). Evista had no significant effect on all-cause mortality.

Limited clinical data suggest that some women with a history of marked hypertriglyceridemia (>5.6 mmol/L or >500 mg/dL) in response to treatment with oral estrogen or estrogen plus progestin may develop increased levels of triglycerides when treated with Evista.

Fareston® (toremifene)

Efficacy

Three prospective, randomized, controlled clinical studies (North American, Eastern European, and Nordic) were conducted to evaluate the efficacy of Fareston for the treatment of breast cancer in postmenopausal women. The patients were randomized to parallel groups receiving Fareston 60 mg (FAR60) or tamoxifen 20 mg (TAM20) in the North American Study or tamoxifen 40 mg (TAM40) in the Eastern European and Nordic studies. The North American and Eastern European studies also included high-dose toremifene arms of 200 and 240 mg daily, respectively. The studies included postmenopausal patients with estrogen-receptor (ER) positive or estrogen-receptor (ER) unknown metastatic breast cancer. The patients had at least one measurable or evaluable lesion. The primary efficacy variables were response rate (RR) and time to progression (TTP). Survival (S) was also determined. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated for the difference in RR between FAR60 and TAM groups and the hazard ratio (relative risk for an unfavorable event, such as disease progression or death) between TAM and FAR60 for TTP and S. Two of the 3 studies showed similar results for all effectiveness endpoints. However, the Nordic Study showed a longer time to progression for tamoxifen. The high-dose groups, toremifene 200 mg daily in the North American Study and 240 mg daily in the Eastern European Study, were not superior to the lower toremifene dose groups, with response rates of 22.6% and 28.7%, median times to progression of 5.6 and 6.1
months, and median survivals of 30.1 and 23.8 months, respectively. The median treatment
duration in the three pivotal studies was 5 months (range 4.2-6.3 months).

**Safety/Tolerability**

Toremifene has been shown to prolong the QTc interval in a dose-and concentration-related
manner.

Hepatotoxicity, both increases in the serum concentration for grade 3 and 4 transaminitis and
hyperbilirubinemia, including jaundice, hepatitis, and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, have also
been reported in clinical trials and postmarketing with Fareston.

Endometrial cancer, endometrial hypertrophy, hyperplasia, and uterine polyps have been
reported in some patients treated with Fareston. Endometrial hyperplasia of the uterus was
observed in animals treated with toremifene.

**Faslodex® (fulvestrant)**

**Efficacy**

Efficacy of Faslodex was established by comparison to the selective aromatase inhibitor
anastrozole in two randomized, controlled clinical trials (one conducted in North America, Study
0021, NCT00635713; the other predominantly in Europe, Study 0020) in postmenopausal women
with locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer. All patients had progressed after previous
therapy with an antiestrogen or progestin for breast cancer in the adjuvant or advanced disease
setting. The effectiveness of Faslodex 250 mg was determined by comparing Objective Response
Rate (ORR) and Time to Progression (TTP) results to anastrozole 1 mg, the active control. The
two studies ruled out (by one-sided 97.7% confidence limit) inferiority of Faslodex to
anastrozole of 6.3% and 1.4% in terms of ORR. There was no statistically significant difference in
overall survival (OS) between the two treatment groups after a follow-up duration of 28.2
months in Study 0021 and 24.4 months in Study 0020.

The efficacy of Faslodex 500 mg in combination with palbociclib 125 mg was compared to
Faslodex 500 mg plus placebo in PALOMA-3. PALOMA-3 (NCT-1942135) was an international,
randomized, double-blind, parallel group, multi-center study of Faslodex plus palbociclib versus
Faslodex plus placebo conducted in women with HR-positive, HER2-negative advanced breast
cancer, regardless of their menopausal status, whose disease progressed on or after prior
endocrine therapy. Consistent PFS results were observed across patient subgroups of disease
site, sensitivity to prior hormonal therapy, and menopausal status. After a median follow-up time of 45 months, the final OS results were not statistically significant.

The efficacy of Faslodex in combination with ribociclib was compared to plus placebo in MONALEESA-3. MONALEESA-3 (NCT 02422615) was a randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled study of Faslodex plus ribociclib versus Faslodex plus placebo conducted in postmenopausal women with hormone receptor positive, HER2-negative, advanced breast cancer who have received no or only one line of prior endocrine treatment. Consistent results were observed in stratification factor subgroups of disease site and prior endocrine treatment for advanced disease.

The efficacy of Faslodex 500 mg in combination with abemaciclib 150 mg was compared to Faslodex 500 mg plus placebo in MONARCH 2. MONARCH 2 (NCT02107703) was a randomized, placebo-controlled, multi-center study conducted in women with HR-positive, HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer with disease progression following endocrine therapy treated with Faslodex plus abemaciclib versus Faslodex plus placebo. PFS assessment based on a blinded independent radiologic review was consistent with the investigator assessment. Consistent results were observed across patient stratification subgroups of disease site and endocrine therapy resistance for PFS and OS.

MONALEESA-3 (NCT 02422615) was a randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled study of Faslodex plus ribociclib versus Faslodex plus placebo conducted in postmenopausal women with hormone receptor positive, HER2-negative, advanced breast cancer who have received no or only one line of prior endocrine treatment. Consistent results were observed in stratification factor subgroups of disease site and prior endocrine treatment for advanced disease.

**Safety/Tolerability**

The most frequently reported adverse reactions in the Faslodex 500 mg group were injection site pain (11.6% of patients), nausea (9.7% of patients), and bone pain (9.4% of patients); the most frequently reported adverse reactions in the Faslodex 250 mg group were nausea (13.6% of patients), back pain (10.7% of patients), and injection site pain (9.1% of patients).
Femara® (letrozole)

Efficacy

In a multicenter study (BIG 1-98, NCT00004205) enrolling over 8,000 postmenopausal women with resected, receptor positive early breast cancer, one of the following treatments was randomized in a double-blind manner: Option 1: A. tamoxifen for 5 years, or B. Femara for 5 years, or C. tamoxifen for 2 years followed by Femara for 3 years, or D. Femara for 2 years followed by tamoxifen for 3 years. Option 2: A. tamoxifen for 5 years, or B. Femara for 5 years. The study in the adjuvant setting, BIG 1-98 was designed to answer two primary questions: whether Femara for 5 years was superior to Tamoxifen for 5 years (Primary Core Analysis) and whether switching endocrine treatments at 2 years was superior to continuing the same agent for a total of 5 years. The medians of overall survival for both arms were not reached for the MAA. There was no statistically significant difference in overall survival. The hazard ratio for survival in the Femara arm compared to the tamoxifen arm was 0.87, with 95% CI (0.75, 1.02). There were no significant differences in DFS, OS, SDFS, and Distant DFS from switch in the Sequential Treatments Analysis with respect to either monotherapy (e.g., [tamoxifen 2 years followed by] Femara 3 years versus tamoxifen beyond 2 years, DFS HR 0.89; 97.5% CI 0.68, 1.15 and [Femara 2 years followed by] tamoxifen 3 years versus Femara beyond 2 years, DFS HR 0.93; 97.5% CI 0.71, 1.22). There were no significant differences in DFS, OS, SDFS, and Distant DFS from randomization in the Sequential Treatments Analyses.

A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial (MA-17, NCT00003140) of Femara was performed in over 5,100 postmenopausal women with receptor-positive or unknown primary breast cancer who were disease free after 5 years of adjuvant treatment with tamoxifen. Disease-free survival was measured as the time from randomization to the earliest event of loco-regional or distant recurrence of the primary disease or development of contralateral breast cancer or death. DFS by hormone receptor status, nodal status and adjuvant chemotherapy were similar to the overall results. Data were premature for an analysis of survival.

Safety/Tolerability

Results of a safety study to evaluate safety in the adjuvant setting comparing the effect on lumbar spine (L2-L4) BMD of adjuvant treatment with letrozole to that with tamoxifen showed at 24 months a median decrease in lumbar spine BMD of 4.1% in the letrozole arm compared to a median increase of 0.3% in the tamoxifen arm (difference = 4.4%) (P <0.0001). Updated results from the BMD substudy (MA-17B) in the extended adjuvant setting demonstrated that at 2 years patients receiving letrozole had a median decrease from baseline of 3.8% in hip BMD compared
to a median decrease of 2.0% in the placebo group. The changes from baseline in lumbar spine BMD in letrozole and placebo treated groups were not significantly different. In the adjuvant trial (BIG 1-98) the incidence of bone fractures at any time after randomization was 14.7% for letrozole and 11.4% for tamoxifen at a median follow-up of 96 months. The incidence of osteoporosis was 5.1% for letrozole and 2.7% for tamoxifen. In the extended adjuvant trial (MA-17), the incidence of bone fractures at any time after randomization was 13.3% for letrozole and 7.8% for placebo at a median follow-up of 62 months. The incidence of new osteoporosis was 14.5% for letrozole and 7.8% for placebo.

In the adjuvant trial (BIG 1-98), hypercholesterolemia was reported in 52.3% of letrozole patients and 28.6% of tamoxifen patients. Grade 3-4 hypercholesterolemia was reported in 0.4% of letrozole patients and 0.1% of tamoxifen patients. Also in the adjuvant setting, an increase of greater than or equal to 1.5 x upper limit of normal (ULN) in total cholesterol (generally nonfasting) was observed in patients on monotherapy who had baseline total serum cholesterol within the normal range (i.e., less than = 1.5 x ULN) in 155/1843 (8.4%) patients on letrozole vs 71/1840 (3.9%) patients on tamoxifen Lipid lowering medications were required for 29% of patients on letrozole and 20% on tamoxifen.

Based on post-marketing reports, findings from animal studies and the mechanism of action, Femara can cause fetal harm and is contraindicated for use in pregnant women. In post-marketing reports, use of letrozole during pregnancy resulted in cases of spontaneous abortions and congenital birth defects. Letrozole caused embryo-fetal toxicities in rats and rabbits at maternal exposures that were below the maximum recommended human dose (MHRD) on a mg/m² basis. Advise pregnant women of the potential risk to a fetus. Advise females of reproductive potential to use effective contraception during therapy with Femara and for at least 3 weeks after the last dose.

**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**

The USPSTF recommends offering risk-reducing medications to women at increased risk for breast cancer and at low risk for adverse medication effects (B recommendation) and recommends against routine use of risk-reducing medications in women not at increased risk (D recommendation). The current recommendation now includes aromatase inhibitors among medications that can reduce risk of breast cancer.

Various methods are available to identify women at increased risk for breast cancer, including formal clinical risk assessment tools or assessing breast cancer risk factors without using a formal tool. The USPSTF does not endorse any particular risk-prediction tool. The National
Cancer Institute Breast Cancer Risk Assessment Tool and the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium Risk Calculator are based on models tested in US populations and are publicly available. There is no single cutoff for defining increased risk for all women.

Alternatively, clinicians may use combinations of risk factors to identify women at increased risk. Some examples of combinations of multiple risk factors in women at increased risk include (but are not limited to): age 65 years or older with 1 first-degree relative with breast cancer; age 45 years or older with more than 1 first-degree relative with breast cancer or 1 first-degree relative who developed breast cancer before age 50 years; age 40 years or older with a first-degree relative with bilateral breast cancer; presence of atypical ductal or lobular hyperplasia or lobular carcinoma in situ on a prior biopsy.

When considering prescribing breast cancer risk-reducing medications, the potential benefit of risk reduction of breast cancer must be balanced against the potential harms of adverse medication effects.

Tamoxifen, raloxifene, and aromatase inhibitors all reduce primary breast cancer risk in postmenopausal women. Use of raloxifene and aromatase inhibitors is indicated only in postmenopausal women; only tamoxifen is indicated for risk-reduction of primary breast cancer in premenopausal women.
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**Disclaimer:** This medical policy is a guide in evaluating the medical necessity of a particular service or treatment. The Company adopts policies after careful review of published peer-reviewed scientific literature, national guidelines and local standards of practice. Since medical technology is constantly changing, the Company reserves the right to review and update policies as appropriate. Member contracts differ in their benefits. Always consult the member benefit booklet or contact a member service representative to determine coverage for a specific medical service or supply. CPT codes, descriptions and materials are copyrighted by the American Medical Association (AMA). ©2020 Premera All Rights Reserved.

**Scope:** Medical policies are systematically developed guidelines that serve as a resource for Company staff when determining coverage for specific medical procedures, drugs or devices. Coverage for medical services is subject to the limits and conditions of the member benefit plan. Members and their providers should consult the member benefit booklet or contact a customer service representative to determine whether there are any benefit limitations applicable to this service or supply. This medical policy does not apply to Medicare Advantage.
Discrimination is Against the Law

Premera Blue Cross complies with applicable Federal civil rights laws and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex. Premera does not exclude people or treat them differently because of race, color, national origin, age, disability or sex.

Premera:
- Provides free aids and services to people with disabilities to communicate effectively with us, such as:
  - Qualified sign language interpreters
  - Written information in other formats (large print, audio, accessible electronic formats, other formats)
- Provides free language services to people whose primary language is not English, such as:
  - Qualified interpreters
  - Information written in other languages

If you need these services, contact the Civil Rights Coordinator.

If you believe that Premera has failed to provide these services or discriminated in another way on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex, you can file a grievance with:

Civil Rights Coordinator - Complaints and Appeals
PO Box 91102, Seattle, WA 98111
Toll free 855-332-4535, Fax 425-918-5592, TTY 800-842-5357
Email AppealsDepartmentInquiries@Premera.com

You can file a grievance in person or by mail, fax, or email. If you need help filing a grievance, the Civil Rights Coordinator is available to help you.

You can also file a civil rights complaint with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights Complaint Portal, available at

Getting Help in Other Languages

This Notice has Important Information. This notice may have important information about your application or coverage through Premera Blue Cross. There may be key dates in this notice. You may need to take action by certain deadlines to keep your health coverage or help with costs. You have the right to get this information and help in your language at no cost. Call 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Arabic (Amharic):
لا تزال تكون هذه الإشعار معلومات مهمة يمكن الحصول عليها من خلال مكتب بريمير أيموس. للحصول على هذه المعلومات والمساعدة في فهمها، يرجى الاتصال بالهاتف 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Chinese (Chinese):
本通知有重要的訊息。本通知可能有關於您透過 Premera Blue Cross 提交的申請或保險的重要訊息。本通知可能有重要日期。您可能需要在截止日期之前採取行動。以保留您的健康保險或費用補貼。您有權利免費以您的母語得到本訊息和幫助。請撥電話 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Italian (Italian):

Kreyòl ayisyen (Creole):

Deutsche (German):

Hmoob (Hmong):

Iloko (Ilocano):
Daytoy a Pakdaar ket naglaon iti Napateng nga Impormasion. Daytoy a pakdaar mabalin nga adda ket naglaon iti napateg nga impormasion maiapgapge iti aplikasyonono wenyong coverage babaen iti Premera Blue Cross. Daytoy ket mabalin dagiti importante a pelta iti daytoy a pakdaar. Mabalin nga adda rumbeng a ngamiendy nga addang sakbay dagiti particular a naituding iti aldaw nga tapao mapagtalaineyo ti coverage ti salun-atyo wenno tulong kadagit gastos. Adda karbenganayo a mangala iti daytoy nga impormasion ken tulong iti bukodyo a pagsasao nga awan ti bayadanyo. Tumawag iti numero nga 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Oromoo (Cushite):

Français (French):

Oromoo (Cushite):
Japanese (Japanese):
この通知には重要な情報が含まれています。この通知には、Premera Blue Crossの申請または補償範囲に関する重要な情報が含まれています。この通知には、記載されている情報が重要な日付をご確認ください。健康保険や保険サポートを維持するには、特定の期限までに行動を取る必要があります。この説明による情報とサポートが無料で提供されます。800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357)までお電話ください。

한국어 (Korean):
본 통지서에는 중요한 정보가 들어 있습니다. 즉 이 통지서는 귀하의 신청에 관하여 그리고 Premera Blue Cross를 통해 커버리지에 관한 정보를 제공하고 있습니다. 본 통지서는 특히 귀하에게 필요한 법적 및 행정적 사항을 포함하고 있을 수 있습니다. 귀하의 귀하의 신청에 관한 커버리지를 계속 유지하려고 하거나 절리거나 하여 임의한 마감일을 제한하지 않을 수 있는 권리가 있습니다. 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357)로 전화해주시오.

罗马尼亚 (Romanian):

Русский (Russian):
Настоящее уведомление содержит важную информацию. Это уведомление может содержать важную информацию о вашем заявлении или страховом покрытии через Premera Blue Cross. В настоящем уведомлении могут быть указаны ключевые даты. Вам, возможно, потребуется принять меры к определенным предельным срокам для сохранения страхового покрытия или помощи с расходами. Вы имеете право на бесплатное получение этой информации и помощи на вашем языке. Звоните по телефону 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Español (Spanish):
Este Aviso contiene información importante. Es posible que este aviso contenga información importante acerca de su solicitud de cobertura a través de Premera Blue Cross. Es posible que haya fechas clave en este aviso. Es posible que deba tomar alguna medida antes de determinadas fechas para mantener su cobertura médica o ayuda con los costos. Ud. tiene derecho a recibir esta información y ayuda en su idioma sin costo alguno. Llame al 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Tagalog (Tagalog):
Ang Paunawa na ito ay naglalaman ng mahalagang impormasyon. Ang paunawa na ito ay naglalaman ng mahalagang impormasyon tungkol sa iyong aplikasyon o pagpasok sa pamamagitan ng Premera Blue Cross. Maaaring maging mahalagang piliin dito sa paunawa. Maaring mangailangan ka na nagmagsagawa ng habang sa ilang mga tinakdang panahon upang mapanatili ang iyong pagpasok sa kalusugan o tulong na walang gastos may karapatan ka na makakuha ng ganitong impormasyon at tulong sa iyong wika ng walang gastos. Tumawag sa 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

ไทย (Thai):
ประกาศนี้มีข้อสำคัญเกี่ยวกับการขอรับการช่วยเหลือแก่ผู้ป่วยที่มีสัญญาประกัน Premera Blue Cross และมีความจำเป็นในการติดต่อของคุณควรติดต่อสถานการณ์ที่มีความจำเป็นเพื่อบรรลุการประกันสุขภาพของคุณหรือการช่วยเหลือที่มีสิทธิ์ให้คุณได้รับบริการและข้อมูลที่เป็นประโยชน์แบบไม่ผ่านช่องทางของ Premera Blue Cross.

Polski (Polish):

Português (Portuguese):
Este aviso contém informações importantes. Este aviso poderá conter informações importantes a respeito de sua aplicação ou cobertura por meio do Premera Blue Cross. Poderão existir datas importantes neste aviso. Talvez seja necessário que você tome providências dentro de determinados prazos para manter sua cobertura de saúde ou ajuda de custos. Você tem o direito de obter esta informação e ajuda em seu idioma e sem custos. Ligue para 800-722-1471 (TTY: 800-842-5357).

Tiếng Việt (Vietnamese):