How to Handle Payer Objections in the U.S. Oncology Market: A Comprehensive Guide

By IntuitionLabs • 4/17/2025 • 35 min read

payer-objections oncology market-access pharmaceutical life-sciences healthcare reimbursement formulary value-assessment evidence-based real-world-evidence cost-effectiveness payer-relations medical-affairs

How to Handle Payer Objections in the U.S. Oncology Market: A Comprehensive Guide

Introduction:
Navigating payer objections is a critical skill for Market Access teams and field representatives in oncology. With cancer drugs often carrying very high costs and evolving evidence, payers have become more proactive in managing oncology therapies (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT). No longer are cancer treatments "untouchable" by insurers – in fact, by 2022 major payers and PBMs had excluded nearly 100 oncology drugs from formularies (even some with no generic or biosimilar alternatives) in favor of preferred options (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT). Payers such as Medicare, commercial insurers, and PBMs rely on stringent evidence reviews, value frameworks, and policies (e.g. NCCN guidelines, compendia listings, ICER reports) when making coverage decisions. This guide provides a practical how-to for handling common payer objections in U.S. oncology, with strategies for both in-person discussions and written communications. We include real-world examples, response frameworks, and up-to-date references to help you effectively address objections and secure access for oncology therapies.

Common Types of Payer Objections in Oncology

Oncology payers typically raise several recurring objections to new therapies. Below are the most common types of objections and their context:

- **High Cost and Budget Impact:** Many new cancer drugs exceed $10,000 per month (Payers' Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology), which payers see as unsustainable. Payers may object that a therapy's price is too high relative to its benefits or that its budget impact is unacceptable. As oncology spending grows, payers increasingly use tools like formulary exclusions and preferred drug contracts to control costs (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT).

- **Limited Clinical Benefit or Trial Data Concerns:** Payers scrutinize the clinical trial evidence. Objections arise if trials show only modest survival gains, use surrogate endpoints (like progression-free survival without proven overall survival benefit), or have small patient populations. **Example:** Many recent drugs won FDA approval with surrogate endpoints, but **"US payers are challenged with using surrogate endpoints for coverage decisions, particularly with high cost drugs"** (Microsoft PowerPoint - AMCP Webinar Accelerated Approval 2-20-18). If data are seen as immature or not compelling, payers may say the drug has "no added value" over existing therapies.

- **Lack of Real-World Evidence (RWE):** Especially soon after launch, payers might hesitate if there's no real-world outcomes data beyond clinical trials. They may object that **"real-world performance and long-term safety aren't proven."** Payers increasingly value RWE from claims, registries, and EHR data to inform oncology coverage (Payer Perceptions and Trends of Real-World Evidence in Oncology - PM360). RWE can fill knowledge gaps left by limited trials and reassure payers about effectiveness in broader populations.

- **Restricted Population or Labeling:** If the FDA indication is narrow (e.g. only in a specific biomarker-positive subset or later-line therapy), payers may limit coverage to that population or object to any use beyond the label. A common payer stance is: **"We will only cover the drug for its FDA-approved population."** Off-label use objections are frequent if the drug isn't yet compendia-listed. (Medicare, for instance, *must* cover off-label cancer uses only if supported by an approved compendium ("Off-Label" Indications for Oncology Drug Use and Drug Compendia: History and Current Status - PMC).)

- **Biosimilar or Generic Alternatives:** Payers often favor lower-cost alternatives. In oncology, objections may sound like: **"Why not use the biosimilar or older generic instead of this expensive brand?"** Payers may prefer biosimilars for biologics like trastuzumab or supportive care drugs. In one recent survey, over 90% of oncology practices had shifted to payer-preferred biosimilars for drugs like bevacizumab and rituximab (Oncology Practices Made Shifts Toward Biosimilar Use, but Payer Challenges Remain). Availability of generics or biosimilars is a top reason payers impose restrictions (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT).

- **Guideline or Policy Misalignment:** Payers rely on policies (internal or external guidelines) and may object if a drug isn't aligned with them. Examples: **"The drug isn't on NCCN guidelines/compendia"** (thus not recognized as standard of care), or **"Our pathway protocol uses a different preferred agent."** While most payers consult NCCN guidelines, they don't always follow them blindly – in fact, over half of oncology drug exclusions by payers have been for drugs that *did* have the highest NCCN recommendation, when a competitor was preferred instead (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT). This means even a drug supported by guidelines can face objections if payer policies or value assessments differ.

Understanding these objection categories allows teams to prepare focused responses. Next, we discuss how to handle these objections in practice – both in face-to-face meetings and in written communications like formulary dossiers.

Strategies for Handling Objections in Verbal and Written Communications

Effectively addressing payer objections requires both **real-time communication skills** (for live meetings) and **thorough written evidence** (for submissions and follow-ups). Below we outline strategies tailored to each format:

In Live Payer Meetings (Verbal Communication)

When field account managers or medical liaisons meet with payer decision-makers (medical directors, pharmacy directors, P&T committee members), they should use a tactful, well-prepared approach:

- **Active Listening and Acknowledgment:** Allow the payer to fully voice their concern. Listen carefully and **acknowledge their viewpoint** to show understanding. For example, *"I understand your team is concerned about the budget impact."* This diffuses tension and shows respect for the payer's challenges.

- **Clarify and Probe:** Ensure you truly understand the objection by asking clarifying questions. *"Is the main concern the upfront cost, or uncertainties about long-term outcomes?"* This helps pinpoint the core issue so you can address it directly.

- **Respond with Evidence and Value:** Once the objection is clear, respond with targeted **evidence** and **value messages**. Tie your answer to the payer's specific concern. For a cost objection, emphasize pharmacoeconomic data or budget impact models (if available) showing the therapy's value. For efficacy doubts, summarize key clinical results or ongoing studies. Always keep the response concise and rooted in data – payer meetings are typically time-constrained and data-driven.

- **Bridge to Your Value Story:** Use objections as an opportunity to reinforce the product's overall **value proposition**. For example, if a payer says "The trial didn't show overall survival," you might acknowledge that OS data are pending but highlight that the drug significantly improved progression-free survival and quality of life, which matters for patients (Microsoft PowerPoint - AMCP Webinar Accelerated Approval 2-20-18) (Payers' Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology). Then bridge to how these benefits align with the payer's goals (e.g. reducing hospitalizations, enabling patients to continue work, etc.). This reframes the discussion toward the drug's value.

- **Employ Frameworks (Listen-Align-Answer-Confirm):** A useful verbal framework is **LAARC** – *Listen, Acknowledge, Address, Resolve, Confirm*. For example: Listen and acknowledge ("I hear you on the trial size concern…"), **address** with evidence ("…the study, while small, showed a strong hazard ratio and we have Phase 3 trials ongoing"), propose a resolution or next step if needed ("…we can share interim real-world usage data from our patient support program as it becomes available"), and **confirm** that the payer's concern is addressed ("Does this information help alleviate your concern about the data?"). This structured approach ensures the objection is fully handled and that you check for remaining questions.

- **Leverage Analogies and KOL Support:** In conversation, it can help to reference third-party validations. For clinical objections, mention if **NCCN or expert oncologists support the therapy's use** (especially if guidelines inclusion is expected soon). For example: *"While NCCN is updating its guidelines, leading cancer centers are already adopting this drug, indicating clinician confidence in the data."* External endorsements can lend credibility beyond what's in your own materials.

- **Stay Calm and Professional:** Some objections (especially about pricing or "no added value") can feel like criticism of your product. It's crucial to stay non-defensive. Maintain a tone of partnership – you and the payer **share a goal** of improving patient outcomes affordably. Express commitment to work with them (e.g., *"We want to find a solution that works for your plan and your patients"*). This collaborative attitude can turn an adversarial situation into a problem-solving discussion.

In Written Formulary Submissions (Dossiers and Letters)

Written communication is equally important for handling objections, particularly during formulary reviews or reimbursement submissions. Market Access and medical teams should craft documents that preempt and address payer concerns:

- **Develop a Comprehensive AMCP Dossier:** The AMCP Formulary Dossier (version 5.0 as of 2024) is the industry-standard package to communicate clinical and economic evidence to payers (The New AMCP Dossier Format Version 5.0: Key Implications for Strategic Approach - EVERSANA). A well-prepared dossier will explicitly tackle potential objections in its sections:
  - *Clinical Evidence:* Include head-to-head data if available, subgroup analyses (to show if certain patients benefit more), and any surrogate-to-outcome justifications (e.g. why PFS is a valid predictor of OS) to mitigate "limited data" objections.
  - *Economic Model:* Provide cost-effectiveness analyses or budget impact models that demonstrate value for money, addressing cost objections. If the drug is expensive upfront, show any downstream cost offsets (reduced hospitalizations, less need for other treatments).
  - *Real-World Evidence:* If available, incorporate RWE or health outcomes data from early use, expanded access programs, or analogous treatments. Payers find such data increasingly relevant (Payer Perceptions and Trends of Real-World Evidence in Oncology - PM360), and its inclusion shows you are tackling the "lack of RWE" issue head-on.
  - *Comparative Effectiveness:* A clear comparison of your drug to existing standards (including cheaper alternatives) should be in the dossier. If a payer claims "no added value," your dossier's comparative section should highlight **incremental benefits** – whether in efficacy, safety/tolerability, convenience (e.g., oral vs IV), or even patient-reported outcomes. For instance, if your drug has similar efficacy to a competitor but fewer severe side effects or less frequent dosing, document that advantage.
  - *Supporting Resources:* Appendices can include key published studies, guidelines excerpts, and **compendia references**. If an objection is "not on compendia," note any submissions made to compendia or any off-label journal evidence (Medicare can consider peer-reviewed literature for off-label uses if compendia are absent (Recent Developments in Medicare Coverage of Off-Label Cancer Therapies - PMC)). Demonstrating that you're working to meet compendia/guideline requirements can reassure payers that alignment is forthcoming.
- **Tailor Formulary Submission Letters:** Along with dossiers, manufacturers often submit a cover letter or executive summary to each payer or PBM. Use that letter to **proactively address likely objections** in a narrative form. For example:
  - *Cost:* Acknowledge budget impact concerns and mention any **pricing programs** (rebates, value-based agreements) you are offering. Payers appreciate when manufacturers show flexibility or

creative contracting. If you are open to outcomes-based contracts or indication-based pricing, state that willingness upfront.

- *Value Story:* Reiterate the drug's core value proposition in the letter – how it improves patient outcomes or fills an unmet need. Link this to payer priorities (quality metrics, total cost of care, etc.). For instance, if the payer's population has high hospitalization rates for a cancer complication that your drug prevents, emphasize that.
- *Evidence Updates:* If new data will soon resolve an objection (e.g., an overall survival update coming at a conference, or an ongoing real-world study), mention the timeline and your commitment to provide those results. This can persuade a P&T committee to give a provisional approval or at least reconsider later.
- *Success in Similar Systems:* Briefly note if other payers or health systems have adopted the drug, especially if they initially had the same concern. For example, *"XYZ Insurance initially had the same question about real-world use, but after reviewing our outcomes program data, they included the therapy as a preferred agent."* Payers often benchmark against each other, so showing that the objection has been overcome elsewhere can be powerful.

- **Use a Clear, Structured Format:** Written responses should be **concise and easy to scan**. Use headings or bullet points to organize responses to each objection category. For example, if responding to a denial or a request for more information, break your document into sections labeled "Clinical Value", "Cost-Effectiveness", "Guideline Support", etc., so the payer can quickly find the answer to their specific concern.

- **Provide Templates for Field Follow-up:** Market Access teams can equip field reps with **written FAQs or one-pagers** on common objections. For instance, a one-page brief on "Handling 'Not on NCCN Guidelines' Objections" might list the current guideline status, expected update, and key publications supporting the drug's use. Reps can leave behind these concise documents with medical directors or pharmacy leads. Such written summaries reinforce verbal discussions and give the payer something concrete to consult or share with colleagues.

- **Ensure Compliance and Medical Accuracy:** All written communications must be medically accurate and non-misleading. Have Medical Affairs or Legal review response documents, especially if they include off-label discussions (e.g., a section addressing an off-label compendia request should be carefully worded and referenced). Use **credible, up-to-date sources** (peer-reviewed journals, authoritative guidelines, real-world study data) to support every claim. This builds payer trust in your information. As noted, payers consider multiple factors including FDA label, quality of evidence, available alternatives, and guidelines when making decisions (Payers' Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology) – your written submission should cover all these angles with evidence.

By combining empathetic, evidence-backed dialogue in meetings with comprehensive, well-structured written materials, you address objections on all fronts. Next, we will look at some real-world examples where objection handling made a difference, and then provide specific templates for tough objections like "no added value" or "not on compendia."

Real-World Examples of Successful Objection Handling

Learning from real cases can illustrate how the above strategies come together. Below are a few examples and case studies demonstrating effective payer objection handling in oncology:

- **Case 1: Addressing High Cost via Outcomes-Based Contracting** – A new CAR-T cell therapy launched with an unprecedented price (~$375,000 for a one-time treatment). Several payers balked at the cost, an objection that could limit patient access. The manufacturer overcame this by negotiating **outcomes-based contracts (OBCs)** with payers: if patients did not respond adequately within a certain time frame, the payer would receive a refund or price adjustment. Over **58% of U.S. payers reported having at least one outcomes-based contract in 2022**, with oncology being the most common area (58% of Payers Use Outcomes-Based Contracts for Prescription Drugs). In this case, an outcomes-based arrangement aligned the drug's cost with the value delivered. One high-profile example was Novartis's CAR-T (tisagenlecleucel) contract where CMS would only pay if the patient responded by 1 month (The Use of Innovative Payment Mechanisms for Gene Therapies in ...). These agreements eased payer fears by sharing risk, leading several insurers to cover the therapy who initially had been skeptical. **Key lesson:** For ultra-high-cost therapies, be prepared to propose innovative payment models to counter cost objections.

- **Case 2: Overcoming Data Limitations with Real-World Evidence** – A targeted oncology drug was initially approved based on a single-arm trial in a small population, leaving payers uneasy about its real-world effectiveness (objection: "trial data is too limited"). The manufacturer launched a post-approval patient registry and worked with oncology networks to collect outcomes. Within a year, emerging **real-world evidence** showed similar or even improved response rates in routine practice. For example, Pfizer's palbociclib (Ibrance) faced the challenge of a narrow trial population (mostly women with HR+ breast cancer). By gathering RWE on men treated off-label, they demonstrated safety and efficacy in men; the FDA even expanded the drug's indication to men in 2019 based solely on real-world data (Payer Perceptions and Trends of Real-World Evidence in Oncology - PM360). This supported payers in covering the drug for the new subgroup. **Key lesson:** When trial evidence is questioned, supplement it with robust RWE or registry data. Sharing interim real-world outcomes with payers can turn skepticism into confidence over time.

- **Case 3: "No Added Value" Objection – Differentiation and Contracting** – In tumor types with multiple similar drugs, payers may exclude one as "redundant." For instance, by 2022 there were multiple PD-1 inhibitors for advanced lung cancer. Some PBMs made formulary decisions to favor one PD-1 therapy and exclude others, essentially saying the others added no unique value. Manufacturers who faced this had to **differentiate their product and offer competitive contracts** to regain access. One company emphasized that their drug had an additional FDA-approved indication (in a cancer subtype the competitor didn't cover) and offered deeper rebates for that population. They also highlighted subtle differences in safety profile and dosing convenience. Meanwhile, data showed payers were indeed willing to exclude even highly-rated drugs if a preferred alternative existed (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate. How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT), underscoring that differentiation was needed. By presenting a compelling **value story** (e.g., unique patient subsets who benefit from their drug) and negotiating rebate improvements, the manufacturer was able to get their therapy back on at least one major payer's formulary the next year. **Key lesson:** When confronted with "no added value" comparisons, find and emphasize any differentiators (indications, patient sub-populations, safety/tolerability, delivery method) and be prepared to improve the economic value (rebate/discount) to the payer. A combination of medical differentiation and contracting can counter the "no added value" claim.

- **Case 4: Handling "Not on Compendia/Guidelines" – Rapid Evidence Update and Expert Advocacy** – A newly approved oncology drug for a rare cancer faced a coverage roadblock: some payers declined coverage because the drug was not yet listed in the NCCN guidelines or compendia (which can happen if approval came after the latest guideline update). The manufacturer's Market Access team took a multi-pronged approach. They immediately submitted the drug for NCCN Drugs & Biologics Compendium listing and engaged with the guideline panel experts, providing additional subgroup analyses to support a strong recommendation. Simultaneously, medical science liaisons (MSLs) worked with key oncology opinion leaders to generate supportive commentary in the field. Within a few months, NCCN updated its guideline to include the drug (with a Category 2A recommendation), and the compendium listing followed. Payers, including Medicare (which relies on compendia for off-label coverage decisions ("Off-Label" Indications for Oncology Drug Use and Drug Compendia: History and Current Status - PMC)), then began covering the drug. In one instance, a regional Blue Cross plan that had initially said "no, it's not on compendia" reversed its decision after these endorsements were in place. **Key lesson:** If a coverage objection is based on absence from guidelines or compendia, focus efforts on accelerating those endorsements. Provide any new evidence or analyses needed by guideline bodies, and keep payers informed (through medical liaison communications) about anticipated guideline updates. Bridging a temporary evidence gap with expert support can persuade payers to grant interim coverage or quickly approve once formal listings are in place.

These examples show that successful objection handling often involves **both scientific strategy and collaboration**. Companies that anticipate objections early – and proactively gather evidence or craft solutions – tend to fare better in securing payer acceptance. Finally, we will outline some actionable frameworks and even template language that can be used when responding to common objections, to ensure consistency and effectiveness in your communications.

Actionable Frameworks and Templates for Objection Responses

Having a go-to framework or response template can standardize how your team handles frequent objections. Below are some practical frameworks and example responses for two particularly challenging objections ("no added value" and "not on compendia"), followed by a summary table covering all objection types:

- **Framework for "No Added Value" Objection:** This objection means the payer perceives your drug as similar in outcome to existing therapy but at higher cost. A proven approach is the **Acknowledge–Differentiate–Evidence–Value** framework:

  1. **Acknowledge** the payer's point: *"I understand you feel Drug X may not add significant benefit over current options."* This shows you take their concern seriously.
  2. **Differentiate** your product on any meaningful aspect: *"However, Drug X is the only therapy to show a response in patients with [Mutation Y] – a subgroup that doesn't respond well to*

standard treatment." Identify a niche or advantage (efficacy in a subset, better safety, dosing convenience, etc.).

3. Provide supporting **Evidence** for that differentiation: *"In the trial, even though the overall population benefit was similar to competitors, the subset of Mutation Y patients had a 5-month longer median survival (Payers' Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology). No other drug has proven benefit in that genetically defined group."* Always tie claims to data.
4. Reinforce the **Value**: *"By helping those patients, Drug X can reduce subsequent chemo use and hospital stays, potentially offsetting costs. We've also positioned its price comparable to other therapies on a net basis after rebates."* Here you remind the payer that even if gross cost is high, the *value* (in outcomes and net cost) justifies it. This could include mention of rebate offers or outcome guarantees as needed.

Template Example (No Added Value):
Payer: "Your drug hasn't shown any added benefit over what we already have. It's hard to justify covering it."
Manufacturer Response: "*We appreciate that concern – it's true that the overall survival was comparable to Drug B in the trial. That said, Drug X offers a unique benefit for a certain patient population. For patients with the XYZ biomarker, Drug X's response rate was 60% vs ~20% on other therapies, which is a significant improvement (Payers' Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology). These are patients who currently have very limited options. By helping them achieve better outcomes, Drug X can actually reduce downstream costs like ICU admissions for complications. We also understand budget pressures, so we're providing rebates to make sure the net cost aligns with the value delivered. In fact, when you factor in those rebates and fewer complications, the overall cost-per-successful outcome with Drug X is favorable. Does this address your concern about its value relative to current treatments?*"

This response followed the framework: acknowledged the point, highlighted a differentiation (biomarker subgroup efficacy), backed it with evidence, and tied it to value (cost offsets and rebates). It also ends by checking if the concern is resolved.

- **Framework for "Not on Compendia/Guidelines" Objection:** When a payer says they cannot cover a use because it's not formally listed, the approach should be **Educate–Assure–Bridge**:

  1. **Educate** on the latest status and evidence: *"It's true that the NCCN guideline update is pending. However, the expert panel has publicly discussed the data, and we have strong Phase II results published that support this use."* Essentially, fill the knowledge gap – the payer may not be aware of data beyond the compendium.
  2. **Assure** them that you are taking actions to resolve the formal listing: *"We have already submitted an application to the NCCN Compendium with all supporting publications. Medicare recognizes NCCN and other compendia for coverage ("Off-Label" Indications for Oncology Drug Use and Drug Compendia: History and Current Status - PMC), and we expect an update by the next quarter."* This shows the objection is likely temporary and being addressed.
  3. **Bridge** to patient impact and interim solutions: *"Meanwhile, patients in need shouldn't have to wait. We are offering an expanded access program and supporting case-by-case exceptions with detailed physician letters. We can also provide peer-reviewed journal evidence (from **Journal X**) that your medical policy team can use to justify coverage in absence of compendia listing."* Here you bridge the gap by providing a path for the payer to cover the drug even before

official guideline listing – through medical policy exception with literature support, for example. Noting that a significant portion of oncology use is off-label in practice (often 50% (Recent Developments in Medicare Coverage of Off-Label Cancer Therapies - PMC)) can also remind them that mechanisms exist to cover medically necessary off-label therapy when evidence is strong.

Template Example (Not on Compendia):
Payer: "Our policy is to deny coverage because this use isn't in the compendia or guidelines yet."
Manufacturer Response: "Understood. The NCCN guideline hasn't updated since the FDA approved this drug for that indication, so it's not listed there yet. However, the NCCN panel members have indicated support based on the Phase II study in refractory patients (which showed a 30% response rate where standard therapy is basically 0%). We've submitted all this data to the NCCN Compendium; Medicare and others rely on that, and we anticipate a category 2A recommendation in the next NCCN update cycle. In the interim, we don't want suitable patients to miss out. We can provide your team with published articles and even a letter from an academic expert supporting use in this setting. Many payers will grant exceptions in this kind of scenario with physician documentation. We're happy to assist with any coverage exception process. Rest assured, we are doing everything to get the formal guideline endorsement, but in the meantime, the evidence is strong that this is the best option for those patients."

In this answer, the rep educates the payer on data they might not have known, assures that compendia listing is in progress (with a timeline), and offers a bridge for interim coverage (peer-reviewed evidence and expert support for exceptions). This both respects the payer's reliance on formal process and provides a medically justified workaround until the process catches up.

Using such frameworks ensures your team responds consistently and thoroughly. It can be helpful to role-play these scenarios with field reps so they are comfortable delivering these messages. Now, as a quick reference, we summarize the major oncology payer objections and recommended response approaches in the table below.

Summary Table: Common Payer Objections and Handling Approaches

Objection Type	Example Objection	Recommended Response Approach
High Cost / Budget Impact	"The drug's cost is too high for our budget."	Acknowledge cost concern; present **pharmacoeconomic data** or budget impact analysis showing value (e.g. cost per QALY or offsets like fewer hospitalizations). Emphasize any **rebates or outcomes-based contracts** to mitigate cost (Payers and PBMs Are Excluding Cancer Drugs at a Growing Rate.

Objection Type	Example Objection	Recommended Response Approach
		How Can Manufacturers Prepare? - MMIT). Reiterate patient benefits that justify the investment.
Limited Clinical Benefit	"Trial only showed a small benefit."	Agree the improvement was modest on average, **highlight specific strengths**: e.g. meaningful benefit in a subset or better safety profile. Provide additional **data or ongoing study info** to bolster confidence (such as interim survival data, real-world trends). Explain how the drug meets an unmet need despite the modest overall result.
Surrogate Endpoints	"No proven OS benefit – only PFS."	Acknowledge OS is the gold standard. Explain **clinical rationale** for the surrogate: e.g. PFS is accepted by FDA and often correlates with OS in this disease (Microsoft PowerPoint - AMCP Webinar Accelerated Approval 2-20-18). Cite **expert opinions or guidelines** that accept the endpoint. If confirmatory OS data is pending, give timeline and express commitment to share outcomes.
Lack of RWE	"Need to see real-world effectiveness first."	Recognize desire for RWE. Share any **early real-world data** (registry or post-market studies) available or analogous evidence from similar drugs. Outline your **RWE generation plan** (ongoing registries, etc.) (Payer Perceptions and Trends of Real-World Evidence in Oncology - PM360). Reassure that you will provide data updates. Possibly suggest a pilot with the payer's own data once some patients have used the drug.
Restricted Label Only	"We'll only cover within the	Confirm you are **promoting on-label** use. If discussing off-label scenario, present

Objection Type	Example Objection	Recommended Response Approach
	FDA-approved use."	**supportive evidence** and note that Medicare and many plans do cover off-label uses if compendia-supported ("Off-Label" Indications for Oncology Drug Use and Drug Compendia: History and Current Status - PMC). Emphasize you are pursuing expanded indications or compendia listings. In the meantime, focus on the value for the labeled population to **reinforce the core use case**.
"No Added Value" vs Competitor	"We have Drug Y; your drug adds no value."	**Differentiate** your drug on any point: efficacy in specific subgroups, unique MOA, better side-effect profile, dosing convenience, etc. Provide comparative data if available. **Quantify the advantage** (e.g., "30% fewer grade 3 toxicities than Drug Y"). Also, consider **contracting**: offer a rebate or price parity so the payer sees no financial downside to adding your drug. Frame your drug as complementary if applicable (patients who fail Drug Y could try yours).
Biosimilar or Generic Alternative	"We prefer the biosimilar version."	Acknowledge cost advantage of the biosimilar. **Differentiate on value**: if your product is the reference brand, highlight any new data or real-world usage that might not apply to the biosimilar yet (or patient support programs you offer). If your drug is new and an older generic exists, emphasize **outcome improvements** or specific patients who benefit more from your drug. Ultimately, be prepared to **competitively price or rebate** to get on parity with the alternative. Payers often make decisions on net cost – showing

Objection Type	Example Objection	Recommended Response Approach
		willingness to negotiate can keep you in consideration.
Guideline/Policy Misalignment	"Not recommended in guidelines or our pathway."	Show **latest guideline evidence** (maybe the guideline is lagging recent data). If NCCN or other guidelines do support the drug, point that out clearly. If not yet, describe efforts underway to get guideline inclusion. Emphasize support from experts and published studies. If the payer uses internal pathways, align your data with their **outcomes goals** (e.g. "our drug can help you meet your oncology quality metrics by reducing ER visits"). Essentially, connect the drug to the payer's policy objectives. Once formal guideline updates occur, immediately communicate that to the payer.
External Value Assessment (e.g. ICER)	"ICER said this drug isn't cost-effective."	Acknowledge the ICER report if they bring it up. Note any areas where you **disagree or have new data** (e.g., ICER used an old price or didn't consider a certain benefit). Highlight if **patient perspectives or recent discounts** change the equation. Some payers use ICER as one input (HTA51 Impact of ICER Assessments on Payer Decision Making in ...), but they will listen to manufacturer input. Emphasize your commitment to fair value – if needed, mention willingness to discuss pricing to meet value thresholds. Provide your own health economic model results if they differ, along with transparent assumptions.

References to Payer Decision-Making: In crafting responses, remember how decisions are made. Payer P&T committees consider the **FDA label and trial evidence, guidelines (e.g. NCCN), available alternatives, line of therapy, and even political/public pressures** (Payers'

Views on the Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect in Oncology). Influential stakeholders include **Medicare**, which sets coverage standards (e.g. recognizing compendia for off-label uses), **PBMs** that manage formularies and utilize tools like tiering, prior authorization, and exclusions to control cost, and expert bodies like **NCCN** and **ICER** that provide guidance on efficacy and value. It's notable that payers increasingly look for a **clear understanding of clinical and economic value** in oncology decisions (Microsoft PowerPoint - AMCP Webinar Accelerated Approval 2-20-18). Manufacturers should therefore communicate a balanced value story – not just clinical benefits but also cost-effectiveness and budget impact.

By using the strategies and examples in this guide, Market Access and field teams can confidently handle payer objections. The key is preparation: anticipate concerns, back up every claim with strong evidence, and communicate with empathy for the payer's perspective. With a patient-centric and value-focused approach, you can turn payer objections into productive dialogues that ultimately secure access for life-saving oncology treatments.

DISCLAIMER

The information contained in this document is provided for educational and informational purposes only. We make no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, about the completeness, accuracy, reliability, suitability, or availability of the information contained herein.

Any reliance you place on such information is strictly at your own risk. In no event will IntuitionLabs.ai or its representatives be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation, indirect or consequential loss or damage, or any loss or damage whatsoever arising from the use of information presented in this document.

This document may contain content generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence technologies. Despite our quality control measures, AI-generated content may contain errors, omissions, or inaccuracies. Readers are advised to independently verify any critical information before acting upon it.

All product names, logos, brands, trademarks, and registered trademarks mentioned in this document are the property of their respective owners. All company, product, and service names used in this document are for identification purposes only. Use of these names, logos, trademarks, and brands does not imply endorsement by the respective trademark holders.

IntuitionLabs.ai is an innovative AI consulting firm specializing in software, CRM, and Veeva solutions for the pharmaceutical industry. Founded in 2023 by Adrien Laurent and based in San Jose, California, we leverage artificial intelligence to enhance business processes and strategic decision-making for our clients.

This document does not constitute professional or legal advice. For specific guidance related to your business needs, please consult with appropriate qualified professionals.