

# ESMO-MCBS

ESMO-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale

Evaluation form 2b: For therapies that are not likely to be curative with primary endpoint PFS

Name of study:		
Study medicine:	Indication:	
First author:	Year:	Journal:
Name of evaluator:		

IF median PFS with standard treatment >6 months

Grade 3	Mark with ✓ if relevant
HR $\leq 0.65$ <u>AND</u> gain $\geq 3$ months	
Grade 2	
HR $\leq 0.65$ BUT gain <3 months	
Grade 1	
HR >0.65	

Preliminary magnitude of clinical benefit grade (highest grade scored)

3	2	1

# ESMO-MCBS

ESMO-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale

## Toxicity assessment

Is the new treatment associated with a statistically significant incremental rate of:

	Mark with ✓ if relevant
«Toxic» death >2%	
Cardiovascular Ischemia >2%	
Hospitalization for «toxicity» >10%	
Excess rate of severe CHF >4%	
Grade 3 neurotoxicity >10%	
Severe other irreversible or long lasting toxicity >2% please specify:	

Note: Incremental rate refers to the comparison versus standard therapy in the control arm

## Quality of Life/Grade 3-4 toxicities\* assessment

	Mark with ✓ if relevant
Was QoL evaluated as secondary outcome?	
Does secondary endpoint QoL show improvement?	
Are there statistically significantly less grade 3-4 toxicities impacting on daily well-being*?	

\*This does not include alopecia, myelosuppression, but rather chronic nausea, diarrhoea, fatigue, etc.

## Adjustments

- Downgrade 1 level if there is one or more of the above incremental toxicities associated with the new medicine
- Upgrade 1 level if improved QoL or if less grade 3-4 toxicities that bother patients are demonstrated
- When OS as secondary endpoint shows improvement, it will prevail and the new scoring will be done according to form 2a
- Downgrade 1 level if the medicine ONLY leads to improved PFS, QoL assessment does not demonstrate improvement

Final, toxicity adjusted, magnitude clinical benefit grade

4	3	2	1

Highest magnitude clinical benefit grade that can be achieved grade 4.