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Breaking Barriers
For many patients with cancer, immune checkpoint inhibitors represent a game-changing innovation. Each year approximately 270,000 cancer patients are treated with immuno-oncology (IO) agents, and today a majority of community oncologists are using IO agents in clinical practice. Since the first United States (U.S.) Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for ipilimumab in 2011, six checkpoint inhibitor agents are now approved for a range of indications, and two chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR T-cell) therapies are approved for hematological malignancies. As these exciting advances move into mainstream clinical practice, the Association of Community Cancer Centers (ACCC) member survey data show that it remains complex for cancer care teams to integrate biomarkers into practice, select patients for IO therapy, and monitor treatment response and the emergence of immune-related adverse effects (irAEs).

Although IO therapies produce durable benefit for many patients, immunotherapy response entails a multi-step process that includes initial immunotherapy administration, immune cell activation and proliferation, and the effect of treatment on the tumor.1,2 Response patterns pose monitoring challenges for clinicians, especially since patients can respond weeks to months following initial treatment and even modest response is often associated with overall survival benefit. At the same time, IO agents have unique immune-related toxicities. While these are relatively infrequent, irAEs can be potentially fatal and can occur up to two years after the last IO treatment dose. Many irAEs are challenging to recognize, in part because they were under-reported in clinical trials (e.g., musculoskeletal and cardiac adverse effects),3 and in part because the presentation of some autoimmune irAEs (e.g., nephritis or diabetes) is often distinct from how these conditions present outside of the immunotherapy setting. Adding to the complexity, new indications are emerging and combination therapy continues to expand, bringing fresh challenges for identifying patients that would benefit from combination approaches over single agent therapy. Combination approaches also increase the potential for irAEs and reinforce the importance of developing sound monitoring strategies, as well as the need for biomarkers to determine irAE risk.

As immuno-oncology is increasingly integrated into community practice, experience with and knowledge of effective management of patients receiving IO therapies continue to grow. Thus, there is a clear need for ongoing education for clinicians and the entire multidisciplinary oncology care team. In response, the ACCC Immuno-Oncology Institute developed a multidisciplinary curriculum workshop bringing together faculty experienced in delivery of immunotherapy with cancer program staff in the earlier stages of IO integration. Over the past two years, these IO Visiting Experts Programs were hosted by ACCC Cancer Program Members nationwide. Faculty and participants engaged in discussions on the
nuances and complexities of IO delivery, with a focus on advancements, operations, and effective practices.

To expand the reach of this highly successful IO Visiting Experts Program, key discussion points were distilled into a virtual interactive webinar presented in July 2018 by a multidisciplinary oncology faculty—comprised of an oncologist, administrator, nurse, and pharmacist. This article summarizes top-line takeaways from the webinar along with frequently asked questions on integrating immunotherapy into practice from Visiting Expert Program participating sites. Access the full webinar on demand at accc-cancer.org/io-breaking-barriers

Exploring Solutions
Effective Strategies for Monitoring and Managing irAEs
Monitoring patients’ irAEs demands clinical vigilance by a broad multidisciplinary team that includes an expanded range of specialists with experience in the unique characteristics and management of irAEs. During his presentation, Dr. Vamsidhar Velcheti emphasized the value of identifying champions in each relevant specialty who can provide oversight, ensure staff and patient education, and implement locally relevant strategies that have potential to prevent adverse event escalation and reduce hospital admissions, which is ultimately key to reducing costs of care (Figure 1).4

Patients with emergent irAEs may seek care in a variety of settings [e.g., primary care, emergency room (ER), urgent care]; therefore, it is crucial to educate a wide range of staff about IO treatment and recognition of adverse events, including not only infusion nurses and internists or hospitalists, but also primary care physicians and ER providers, through tried and tested education strategies such as:

• “Lunch and Learn” sessions that partner with pharmaceutical companies or grand rounds and nursing rounds;
• Biweekly institutional tumor boards that encourage participation from regional oncologists and encourage active discussion of complex cases—this can be especially relevant for treating patients with IO who have pre-existing conditions for which there may be no data as yet; and
• IO sessions targeting ER fellows to provide an overview of irAE signs and symptoms in the first-line emergency setting.

ACCC has also developed resources to support community cancer programs in developing multi-specialty toxicity teams focused on irAEs. Additionally, patients need to be engaged participants in their care, educated on and aware of immediate, as well as, late-emerging or chronic side effects. Patients and caregivers need consistent education and reinforcement on the importance of reporting irAEs to their oncology care team and of having a contingency plan for managing adverse effects.
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Figure 1. Effective Strategies for Monitoring and Managing irAEs

**QUICK CLINICS**
Develop specialized clinics to treat patients with emergent irAEs and staff clinics with specialists who have expertise in irAEs.

**VIRTUAL TUMOR BOARDS**
Educate staff by engaging a broad range of specialist experts (e.g., dermatologists, endocrinologists, gastroenterologists, neurologists, ophthalmologists).

**IO PATIENT IDENTIFICATION CARD**
Equip patients with an IO patient ID card that has drug/biologic-related information and a 24/7 oncologist’s contact number.

**MANAGEMENT RESOURCES**
Staff the infusion clinic with a core group of nurses who are well educated about IO treatment and irAEs and can conduct comprehensive clinical assessment of patient and close follow-up.

**IN-SERVICE EDUCATION**
Educate non-oncology staff (e.g., ER physicians, nurses, hospitalists, intensivists).

**PATIENT EDUCATION**
Ensure patients and caregivers understand how IO differs from traditional cytotoxic chemotherapy agents.

**irAE WORKING GROUP/TOXICITY TEAM**
Develop a list of knowledgeable “go-to” specialists for questions regarding irAEs and as a mechanism to expedite referral/consult when needed.
Finally, published guidelines on irAE management from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), and the Society for Immunotherapy in Cancer (SITC), and information from pharmaceutical companies are available in downloadable formats for phones and tablets.

**Clinical Trials and Biomarkers**
Several biomarkers currently exist to identify response to checkpoint inhibitors including expression of programmed death ligand-1 (PD-L1), microsatellite instability (MSI), and tumor mutational burden (TMB). Currently, clinicians have little capacity to predict the onset of serious irAEs and autoimmune events. Thus, new classes of biomarkers and biomarker combinations to determine patients at high risk for irAEs are an active area of research. Among these biomarkers are targets such as auto-antibodies and canonical disease auto-antibodies, T-cell epitope spreading and auto-reactive T-cells, and the effects of microbiome diversity on immune repertoire and tolerance. Until these and other biomarkers are approved, the toxicity profiles of checkpoint inhibitors provide a useful decision-making resource to guide individualized therapy selection.

**Improving Patient Outcomes**

**Financial Access, Reimbursement Processes, and Budgeting**
Financial toxicity remains a significant operational barrier to IO treatment. For Una Hopkins, RN, FNP-BC, DNP, overcoming this hurdle means that individualized care must include allocating resources to support financial navigation for patients. While employing financial advocates or medication assistance coordinators is a significant investment for community cancer programs—as these services are not reimbursable—establishing this role within a cancer program mitigates the patient’s distress, expands awareness of financial resources, and helps to ensure the sustainability of treatment. Dr. Hopkins also recommends identifying a point person from the financial or reimbursement staff to focus on IO agents and build expertise on the nuances of the various patient support programs, including manufacturer replacement programs, co-pay support programs, co-pay foundations, and patient assistance programs, in order to identify and liaise effectively with pharmaceutical partners.

These new agents are costly, so careful attention to reimbursement is an imperative operational concern. For example, new-to-market IO agents often lack a specific J Code (or in the case of drugs paid under the Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System, a C Code). To ensure accurate reimbursement, the financial team should establish clear approval, reimbursement, and billing processes (Figure 2), and designate a reimbursement specialist to liaise with pharmacy and regularly review approvals and denials (Figure 3).

**The Role of the Oncology Pharmacy in Integrating IO Therapies to Clinical Practice**
As more combination therapies emerge and sequencing options expand, and as payer approval becomes increasingly dependent on the results of PD-L1 and other forms of testing, it will be important for pharmacists, whose role extends across clinical care (Figure 4), to work hand-in-hand with oncologists and other members of the oncology team to select treatment, determine dosing, incorporate testing panels into the workflow, and secure access to treatment with immunotherapy.

---

**Figure 2. Recommendations for Approval and Reimbursement Processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL PROCESS</th>
<th>PAYER APPROVAL PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Dollar Medication Approval Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Physician/Advanced Practice Provider</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full benefits investigation</td>
<td>• Identify patient who may benefit from IO therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize pharma services if allowed per program policy</td>
<td>• Participate in peer-to-peer conversations if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritize staff resources to enroll every viable patient into a support program, regardless of on or off-label use</td>
<td>• Discuss rationale for off-label use if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robust Off-Label Policy and Procedure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provide additional primary literature support if necessary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predetermine all off-label requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make patients aware of risks/benefits, including financial risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require patients to sign an Advance Beneficiary Notice or Notice of Non-Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use peer review process for appeal if needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacist Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retrieve supporting literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor and review CMS approved compendia and national/local coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Track off-label use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entry should trigger alerts to pharmacy director, P&amp;T Committee chair, and reimbursement specialist team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While such access in many other countries is highly regulated and determined by technology assessments and other mechanisms, in the U.S., institutional formulary review plays a larger role. In the U.S., hospital Pharmacy and Therapeutics (P&T) Committees are another crucial mechanism for weighing institutional costs against putative clinical benefits, especially if there are small efficacy differences between therapies but there are other differences that might be important to consider (e.g., dosing schedules, route of administration). Care pathways also are another mechanism that can be used to optimize decisions on which therapies to carry on formulary.

When integrating IO into practice, the oncology pharmacy is a key resource for other critical operational concerns, such as inventory management, medication preparation, dispensing and distribution, and managing drug waste (e.g., through rounding or flat-dosing). Oncology pharmacists also provide oversight for medication safety, electronic medical record use, and compliance with risk and mitigation strategies. Finally, the oncology pharmacy plays a key role in managing off-label IO use in circumstances where there are no other treatment options for patients or where therapies are supported by NCCN guidelines but not yet FDA-approved, through, for instance, drug replacement programs. The recently enacted Right to Try legislation also enables terminally ill patients who have exhausted all other treatment options to seek access to Phase 1 investigational therapies, including immunotherapies.

### Conclusion
Novel IO agents with differing mechanisms of action and combination immunotherapies will continue to improve overall outcomes for patients with cancer. As Dr. Tanguy Siewert observed: *survivorship is a good problem to have.* We didn’t have people in lung cancer who survived 3-5 years and now we see patients with dramatic benefit and so we need to start thinking about survivorship.

Yet the rapid pace of advancement and the volume of information in the IO arena remains challenging for cancer care teams to absorb. Ongoing education will continue to be critical for the entire cancer care team, including non-oncology specialists, patients and caregivers. And the “good problem to have,” survivorship, is also becoming an increasingly important issue in IO. As the number of survivors treated with IO grows, it is imperative to educate patients and their families not only about the potential benefits, but also the limitations of treatment. Finally, although the publication of evidence-based guidelines is a welcome development in irAE management, many questions remain about differences in irAEs among IO agents, the potential for prolonged duration of irAEs, and whether and how to re-challenge patients with immunotherapy following the development of irAEs. Therefore, toxicity teams and other strategies to manage irAEs are critical approaches to effectively managing irAEs and optimizing patient outcomes.
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