NICE first. Nineteen of the 46 submissions were appraised by NICE; 10% of the cases were first assessed by NICE, 60% were appraised by NICE second, and in 30% of the cases, NICE were the last in the sequence to appraise. It is interesting to note that the rate of acceptance by the SMC was approximately 63% regardless of whether the intervention was appraised by the SMC or CADTH first. In contrast, the acceptance rate for CADTH was observed to be much higher when interventions were appraised by the SMC first compared to when CADTH conducted the first appraisal; 76% and 20% respectively. CONCLUSIONS: The SMC have generally received submissions before NICE and CADTH. In comparison, NICE were rarely the first to appraise an intervention. Reviewing the sequence in which submissions are appraised by each of these bodies and the influence of this on the guidance issued may inform future strategic planning of submissions.
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**THE IMPACT OF AN ELECTRONIC PRESCRIBING SOLUTION ON THE SELECTION AND PRESCRIBING OF COST-EFFECTIVE THERAPEUTIC OPTIONS**

Hutchins DS, Liberman JN, Berger JE, Jan SA, Johnson MM
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OBJECTIVES: To assess the impact electronic prescribing system the use of an has on a provider’s prescribing of low cost generic drugs through lower costing channels. METHODS: Generic/brand, mail/retail, and cost-per-day (costs) for over nine million adjudicated prescriptions dispensed between July 2002 and December 2005 were incorporated into independent multivariate logistic and general linear models to compare prescriptions from 468 providers prescribed before and after using an electronic prescribing system and 28,500 for mail/retail. Separate models for ACE Inhibitors, ARB and ARB Combinations, HIV Antagonists, HMG Inhibitors, NSAIDs, PPIs, and SSRIs classes included independent variables for: provider, specialty, and electronic prescribing system use (no, low and regular use prescribed >50 prescriptions/month), patient sex, age (continuous), and regimen status; claim month and distribution channel (except in mail/retail model). Significance was a p-value ≥0.01. RESULTS: Generic and mail prescriptions were generally more likely to be prescribed from providers with regular use (OR: 0.85/0.82) and less likely from those with little or no use (OR: 0.67/0.73) than prescriptions from the pre-period of providers who became regular users (OR = 1.00), with most significant and few exceptions. Costs were generally lower for providers with regular use (CES: $-0.33/$0.04) and higher for providers with little or no use (CES: $-0.14) than prescriptions from the pre-period of providers who became regular users (CES = $0.00), with some significant and some exceptions. CONCLUSIONS: Similar underlying patterns found across multiple classes provide support for linking regular use of electronic prescribing systems to providers being more even likely to prescribe generics drugs and having them dispensed through mail, both of which likely lower overall costs. Additional research should be performed to better assess the robustness of these findings as participation expands and in more therapeutic classes.
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**MEDI nCE PART D’S EFFECT ON PRESCRIBING VOLUME: AVERAGE MONTHLY UTILIZATION OF SELECTED HIGH USE DRUGS IN THE PROTECTED CLASSES BY DIFFERENT SPECIALTIES**
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OBJECTIVES: To determine whether the implementation of Medicare Part D coverage affected trends in average per physician prescription volume of select drugs in the six classes deemed by CMS/Medicare Part D to be medically necessary for reimbursement. To assess these trends over the 2005-2008 period, including the January 1, 2006 implementation of Medicare Part D. To investigate whether prescribers of different specialties were affected to a greater or lesser extent than their peers. METHODS: For each of the six protected classes defined by CMS (Antineoplastics, Anti depressants, Anticonvulsants, Immunosuppressants, Antipsychotics, Antiepileptics) a comparative market basket consisting of the top 2 prescribed anticonvulsants (clonazepam, gabapentin), antidepressants (escitalopram, fluoxetine), antipsychotics (quetiapine, risperidone), HIV/AIDS (emtricitabine/tenofovir, ritonavir) and immunosuppressants (azathioprine, mycophenolate) were selected based on total prescriptions (TRx) between January 2005 and June 2008. For that timeframe, prescription volume, by individual physician, were collected monthly using SDV Versipan’s VONA and VOPA databases. RESULTS: Of 103 physician specialty/molecule prescription pairs, average monthly prescription volume for the 12 month period after implementation of Medicare Part D (January 2006 – December 2006) coverage increased significantly (p < 0.05) versus the prior 12 months (January 2005-December 2005) for 79% (34/43) of combinations examined, and conversely, a significant (p < 0.05) decrease was observed for 8% (4/60) combinations. CONCLUSIONS: The introduction of Medicare Part D had significant impact on utilization for the majority of high volume drugs in the Medicare Part D designated protected classes. A possible explanation is the reorganization of formulary structures and tier placement for many of these drugs led to pricing changes for patients, which in turn were observed by physicians and led to subtle but significant changes in prescribing behavior. In addition to changes for specialty physicians, significant changes in volume were also noted for GF/PFFIM generalists. Ongoing investigation into drug pricing and tier placement may lead to greater clarity.
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**IDENTIFYING KEY DECISION PATHWAYS IN HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT AROUND THE WORLD**
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OBJECTIVES: Health technology assessment (HTA) is a process tool to evaluate emerging and emerging technologies (e.g., pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and diagnostics), and to determine how these technologies will impact health care service delivery and society. Despite the growing importance of HTA as a tool to develop the guidance for emerging technologies, a systematic and hierarchical approach to characterize the decision-making process used by various countries and regions has not been developed. The objective of this study was to model the decision pathways that describes the underlying decision-making process and structure for HTA in eight selected countries. METHODS: Members of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research Special Interest Group for HTA performed research online to identify resources that described health systems and decision pathways for the following countries: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, UK, and the United States. Once proposed decision structures were reviewed by committee and finalized, the same committee responsible for key decision pathways and maintained detailed processes for HTA input to the final decision maker. Decision pathways for HTA in the countries examined continue to evolve in response to societal needs for emerging technologies.
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**APPLES AND ORANGES? COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES**
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OBJECTIVES: Health technology assessment (HTA) started in the United States (US) to quantify the benefits, harms and costs associated with new technologies. Parallel methodological advances, applied HTA processes were instituted in many countries to inform decisions about adopting new technologies. Within the context of discussions regarding a new center for comparative effectiveness in the US, we compared HTA of medications in six jurisdictions: Australia, Canada, England and Wales, the Netherlands, Scotland and Sweden. The objective was to identify characteristics of HTA processes and agencies that may inform the structure and operation of a US center for comparative effectiveness. METHODS: We identified characteristics of each health care system and HTA processes, including: the medications reimburse- ment processes; whether recommendations are mandatory; and structure and transparency of the process using the accountability for reasonableness framework. RESULTS: For Australia, England and Wales and the Netherlands, reimbursement decisions are made nationally, while in Canada, Scotland, and Sweden, formularies are maintained regionally. HTA processes range from manufacturer-prepared single product submissions to comprehensive assessments based on de novo analyses. While six jurisdictions have quasi-governmental HTA agencies, the Netherlands relies largely on a reference-pricing system. Sweden has two HTA agencies: one for rapid assessment of single medications and another which undertakes multiple-health assessments involving other funding silos. Scotland, and to lesser extents England and Wales and the Netherlands, have implemented transparent pricing processes, e.g., by posting transparent minutes and the reasoning for recommendations. CONCLUSIONS: The US health care system is fragmented and characterized by insured populations with different health needs. Characteristics directly relevant to a US centre include: mandatory recommendations, and transparent two-tiered processes. Collecting better evidence on real-world treatment effects – as is being done in some jurisdictions – would increase the number and types of stakeholders who could apply the information for decision-making.
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