tions on epidemiological data, 12 specified that the uncertainty surrounding epidemiological data was addressed, especially in terms of the traditional clinical international data. The party responsible for the conduct of the analysis (therefore responsible for providing the epidemiological data) was named by 20 guidelines, of which 14 explicitly referred to the marketing authorization holder. Furthermore, an acceptable level of evidence was mentioned only by 4 guidelines (Australia, Australia (oral and parenteral)), and included 17 databases and 12 experts’ opinions. The relevance of epidemiological data for final reimbursement decisions was explicitly mentioned by 5 guidelines (Australia, Israel, Russia, Scotland, and South Africa). However, consequences for unacceptable epidemiological evidence (cases not following recommendations or requirements) were only indicated by Russia and Scotland in the form of refraining from giving positive reimbursement advice. CONCLUSIONS: Population-level epidemiological data is mentioned 77% of the guidelines, but those focus mostly on issues of data transferability. Only few countries (19%) address the role of population-level epidemiological data for reimbursement decisions. To reduce decision uncertainty, approaches to address the often occurring paucity of epidemiological evidence should preferably be part of all pharmacoeconomic guidelines.
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ENSURING THAT PHASE III PROGRAMS ARE DESIGNED TO MEET THE EVOLVING HTA REQUIREMENTS ACROSS THE EU
Lucas F1, Secker-Johnson R2
1Peppe Woodhead and Associates, St. Ives, UK, 2Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK
OBJECTIVES: We investigated commonalities and significant differences in HTA evidence requirements in the EU (Germany, France, UK, Italy and France) and the implications on phase III programmes, focusing on three key, rapidly evolving elements of HTA: choice of the comparator, Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQL) and effectiveness. METHODS: In-depth, semi-structured 60-min telephone interviews were conducted with 34 HTA experts in the EU (17 from HTA bodies and 17 from pharma). RESULTS: An active comparator in phase III is mandated or clearly preferred in all EU5 countries for HTA/payer purposes. It tends to be the therapy most commonly used in clinical practice, although best practice or cheapest therapy may be selected. Countries vary in the degree of flexibility in the approach to comparative evidence. UK appears to be the most flexible in the choice of comparator and acceptance of indirect evidence. Germany is the most demanding (e.g. head-to-head data vs. multiple, specific comparators for multiple sub-populations). HRQL is increasingly important in HTA, yet all respondents agreed that, in practice, HRQL is still only supportive to ‘hard’ end-points such as sub-populations. HRQL is increasingly important in HTA, yet all respondents agreed that, in practice, HRQL is still only supportive to ‘hard’ end-points such as morbidity and mortality. Challenges in capturing HRQL as a measure of clinical benefit and/or a way to derive utilities, were discussed. Demonstrating effectiveness is becoming increasingly relevant to HTA, although efficacy data from phase III trials still have the major role – the greatest challenge is the generalisation of results to the wider, real-world patient population. Countries differ in their flexibility to address the demonstration of effectiveness. CONCLUSIONS: Increased, and sometimes contradictory, HTA-driven demands for evidence place strain on phase III trials. Hopefully, as Germany, the UK and France adapt their processes, and Spain and Italy develop fuller capability, harmonisation of core HTA requirements will enable pharma to design more efficient evidence programmes. SuggestionS derived from this research will be presented.
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TIME TO MARKET ACCESS FOR INNOVATIVE DRUGS IN THE UK, FRANCE, AND BELGIUM
Maervoet J1, Toumi M2
1University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Lyon, France, 2Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK
OBJECTIVES: It is often considered that the UK grants access to new medicines upon marketing authorisation (MA) approval, while patients in countries such as France or Belgium gain access only after significant delays. The objective is to quantify differences in time to market access between the UK (excluding Scotland), France and Belgium and to identify contributing factors. METHODS: We reviewed submission and approval dates for all new chemical or biological entities that were granted a MA by the European Commission (EC) between August 2006 and July 2011. Genérics, fixed dose combinations, new formulations, and vaccines were excluded. Information was collected from official health authority sources (i.e., regulatory, health technology assessment, and pricing agencies; official journals; national formalities). Results are presented as median days post- and post-market authorisation (MA was defined as day 0). RESULTS: For the 111 drugs we identified, the time from approval to a median of 428 days after submission of the application and 64 days after the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use issued a positive opinion. A first analysis suggested more drugs were marketed in England (n=97), than in France (n=74) or Belgium (n=62). NICE guidance, however, was only issued for 96 products (21 positive opinions) after a median of 399 days following MA. In France and Belgium, ministerial reimbursement decisions were published in the Official Journal after 279 and 348 days, respectively. The time needed for Belgian companies to submit a reimbursement dossier was variable (median: 1 year; range: 5-3 years). CONCLUSIONS: As products up to 3 years are not yet reimbursed, there is a long waiting period for approval. The impact of this is most pronounced in Belgium, where it can take up to 5 years for a medicine to be reimbursed. In the longer run, this might slow down the market access of new medicines.
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OBJECTIVES: Describe and analyze the impact of the recognition of the Economic and Public Health Assessment Committee (CEESP) as an official committee, part of the French National Authority for Health (HAS), within the new code of social security and the drug market access. METHODS: We browsed website of French government, reviewed grey literature relating to the introduction of health economic criteria in the recommendations of the CEESP and interviewed decision makers. RESULTS: The remit of CEESP is to determine efficient strategies and edit recommendations to support price negotiations. Products eligible for economic assessment are selected based on criteria to be defined and some areas of uncertainty remain to be addressed. (1) Criteria for product selection: all products that state innovative improvement, product with sales above €10 million per year, new mode of action and products with potential extension of target population are likely to be assessed. (2) Criteria for designation are not. At time of writing, no decision of CEESP will be clear, that a clear process is established to clarify the resolution of divergent opinion. (3) Methodology used for economic assessment: HAS published guidelines for economic analysis. They remain very flexible even if some specific recommendations were made (e.g. no cost benefit analysis, loss of productivity not included in reference case, determinstic and probabilistic sensitivity analysis required). Finally no information is available to inform how CEESP opinion will impact pricing negotiation. CONCLUSIONS: Although application decree are still to be issued, there are important areas of uncertainty surrounding introduction of health economics in market access of drugs in France.
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Biosimilar Pricing: Past, Present and Future
Wild L, Forster L
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OBJECTIVE: Compared to small molecule generics, biosimilars have different pricing drivers due to greater manufacturing complexity and stronger regulatory hurdles. We looked to investigate historic trends in biosimilars pricing and assess what may change in the future. In addition, we aimed to understand how the recent FDA guidelines will shape pricing of biosimilars in the US. METHODS: In order to understand the historic trends shaping biosimilars pricing, we conducted secondary research into the pricing of 14 biosimilars in EU5 markets. Focusing on qualitative analysis, we assessed three potential factors that shape current pricing: 1) Launch date; 2) Number of biosimilars available; and 3) Therapy area. Primary research was conducted by surveying a selection of payers in order to understand the current price drivers and how these will potentially change in the future. We also assessed their expectations on how FDA pathway regulations will affect pricing in the US. RESULTS: Historical analysis of biosimilars pricing indicated similar pricing across the sample, with average pricing at a 20-30% discount relative to the originator. These results indicated no significant correlation between the number of biosimilars available, launch date or therapy area, suggesting that common drivers such as development and manufacturing costs shape pricing across therapy areas. Payers noted that future manufacturing costs (e.g., biologic costs, production and biologic costs), regulatory hurdles, and phase IV trial requirements will maintain upward pressure on biosimilar prices, but increasing competition over time would likely bring down prices relative to originators. CONCLUSIONS: Historically, biosimilars have driven above the date of launch and therapy area, in addition to the high R&D costs of manufacturing. Predictions for the future indicate that biosimilars pricing will maintain current levels due to competing pressures. Payers in the US foresee similar pricing trends, but did not expect as great a level of discounting seen in the EU.
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STAKEHOLDER’S VIEWS OF THE SOCIAL INSURANCE REFORM IN GREECE
Mylonas K, Skroumpelas A, Tsianitou V, Karampli E, Pavi E, Kyriopoulos J
National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece
OBJECTIVE: The social security system in Greece was characterized complex and fragmented and unlike other countries, the existence of many insurance agencies did not create any competition in the health system. In March 2011, the National Organization for the Provision of Health Care (EOPYY) was established. The aim of the study was to highlight stakeholder’s insights on the establishment of EOPYY and their perceptions for the applicability of the reform. METHODS: A qualitative study, using the method of semi-structured interviews was conducted using an open-ended questions guide. In order to identify stakeholders at the very top of the power list (decision makers) as well as people and groups whose opinion matters in shaping reform policies (opinion leaders), we undertook a stakeholder mapping and identification process. In total 17 interviews, tape recorded, transcribed and content analyzed. RESULTS: According to the interviewees, the setting-up of EOPYY was considered necessary and valuable, taking into consideration that it will contribute to the consolidation of the benefits and the enhancement of the Welfare system. CONCLUSIONS: Although, the stated objectives of the implementation of EOPYY appear positive and ambitious, the