

Lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab for untreated advanced renal cell carcinoma: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Nigel Fleeman,^{1*} Rachel Houten,¹ Sarah Nevitt,¹
James Mahon,² Sophie Beale,³ Angela Boland,¹
Janette Greenhalgh,¹ Katherine Edwards,¹
Michelle Maden,¹ Devarshi Bhattacharyya,¹
Marty Chaplin,¹ Joanne McEntee,⁴
Shien Chow⁵ and Tom Waddell⁶

¹Liverpool Reviews and Implementation Group, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

²Coldingham Analytical Services, Berwickshire, UK

³Hare Research, North Yorkshire, UK

⁴North West Medicines Information Centre, Liverpool, UK

⁵The Clatterbridge Cancer Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK

⁶The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK

*Corresponding author nigel.fleeman@liverpool.ac.uk

Published August 2024

DOI: 10.3310/TRRM4238

Plain language summary

Lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab for untreated advanced renal cell carcinoma: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Health Technology Assessment 2024; Vol. 28: No. 49

DOI: 10.3310/TRRM4238

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain language summary

What was the problem?

Renal cell carcinoma is the most common type of kidney cancer. Several drug treatment options are available for NHS patients with advanced or metastatic disease, and the choice of treatment varies depending on a patient's risk of disease progression. A new drug combination, lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab, may soon become available to treat NHS patients. This review explored whether treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab offered value for money to the NHS.

What did we do?

We reviewed the effectiveness of treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab versus other NHS treatment options. We also estimated the costs and benefits of treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab versus current NHS treatments for patients with higher and lower risks of disease progression.

What did we find?

Compared with current NHS treatments, treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab may increase the time that people with a higher risk of disease progression (i.e. worsening disease) were alive. However, for patients with a lower risk of disease progression, the available evidence is limited and only shows that treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab may prolong the time that patients have a stable level of disease.

For all patients, compared to all current NHS treatments, treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab is very expensive.

What does this mean?

Compared with current NHS treatments for untreated renal cell carcinoma, using published prices (which do not include any discounts that are offered to the NHS), treatment with lenvatinib plus pembrolizumab may not provide good value for money to the NHS.

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.6

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the [NIHR Journals Library website](#)

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 3.6 and is ranked 32nd (out of 105 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), Embase (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta.

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was commissioned and funded by the Evidence Synthesis Programme on behalf of NICE as award number NIHR134985. The contractual start date was in November 2021. The draft manuscript began editorial review in June 2022 and was accepted for publication in February 2023. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2024 Fleeman *et al.* This work was produced by Fleeman *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).

