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Theory: Optimal Reimbursement Rules to Create Efficient R&D Incentives

- Optimal R&D incentives require that payer(s) in each country pay:
  - A consistent price per unit health (e.g. € per QALY gain) for all drugs
    - Possible higher price for priority classes e.g. end-of-life-care
  - This price reflects the willingness-to-pay (WTP) for health of payer, as agent for enrollees in private healthplans or taxpayers in public systems
  - Differences in WTP for health => different price levels across countries
    - WTP and therefore prices likely increase with per capita income
US: Manufacturers Set Prices; Payer Reimbursement not Based on WTP: 1. Pharmacy-dispensed Drugs

- Health plans try to negotiate rebates off mfr. list price in return for putting drug on preferred formulary tier with lower patient co-pay
  - Competitive rebating if close substitute drugs or generics in class
  - For differentiated, specialty drugs, health plans lack leverage =>
  - Most specialty drugs are on 4th tier with 20-30% co-insurance
    - Would be unaffordable for most patients …. but few pay, due to:
      - Stop-loss limits on patient cost-sharing
      - Medicare and Medicaid low-income subsidies, Medigap supplements
      - Manufacturer coupons
  - Full coverage makes patients price-insensitive => What limits price?

US: Free pricing + Reimbursement Not Based on WTP (2): Infusions and Inpatient Drugs

2. Infused biologics: Physicians “buy and bill” for infusions etc., reimbursed at Manufacturer’s Average Sales Price (ASP)_{Q-2} + 6%
  - Higher ASP => larger margin for provider
  - Pres. Trump has proposed reimbursement at external reference price + flat fee…….TBD
    - Previous proposals to change/limit ASP+6% were defeated

3. Inpatient drugs: Bundled (DRG) payments to hospitals include drugs => hospitals as price-sensitive customers constrain prices for inpatient drugs
  - Pricing Bias: inpatient (e.g. antibiotics) vs. infused biologics and specialty
US Free Pricing with Few Constraints =>
US Prices Diverge from ex-US Prices

- US Brand price growth exceeds GDP growth
- Launch price growth exceeds health gain of new drugs
- Post-launch price increases ~ 5-10% p.a.
- Ex-US: Most payers target stable health budget as % of GDP and constrain price vs. incremental value

Implications/Predictions:
- Divergence of US vs. ex-US prices
- Bias across classes within US pricing

Average Foreign-to-Canadian Price Ratios, 2005, 2016: US has Diverged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Foreign-to-Canadian Price Ratios, Patented Drugs, and GDP Per Cap. 2016. OECD Countries


Orphan Drugs (ODs): Price Premium Necessary or Distortionary?

- 1983 US Orphan Drug Act: R&D tax credits + grants; 7yr market exclusivity (no competitors) for each OD indication; user fee waivers
- Informally, ODs also command much higher prices
- 2016 Av. Cost per patient year: $140,443 OD vs. $27,756 non-OD
  - (Evaluate Pharma, *Orphan Drug Report 2017*)
  - Highest priced ODs > $500,000 and rising
- Rationalization for OD price premium is based on few patients
  - “Producers need to recoup (fixed) R&D cost over few patients”
  - “Budget impact on payers is modest”
Given ODA, OD Price Premium may be Unnecessary and Distorts R&D

- **Phase III cost is 50% lower (75% lower with tax credit) for ODs**
  - (Evaluate Pharma, *Orphan Drug Report 2017*)
- **Many ODs have multiple indications**: some non-OD; ODs also get off-label use
- => Total patients treated often exceeds OD threshold of 200,000
- **Expected ROI now higher on OD vs. non-OD R&D investment**
  - This excludes blockbusters with OD indications (*Evaluate Pharma*)
- **OD sales growth 2017-22 projected at 2X non-OD growth**, and
- By 2022, ODs ~21% of global Rx sales (*Evaluate Pharma*)
- **OD indications now account for > 30-40% of NDAs at FDA**

Conclusions and Implications for R&D

- US reimbursement system do not tie prices to value created or WTP
- Inconsistent reimbursement across pharmacy/infused biologics/inpatient => bias towards biologics + bias against inpatient drugs
- This pricing bias exacerbates bias in data exclusivity protection:
  - 5 years for chemical drugs
  - 12 years for biologics
- ODs get OD premium pricing + pro-biologics reimbursement bias
  - *On top of* statutory ODA (tax credits, market exclusivity) + FDA provisions
- Do we now have an R&D bias towards biologics and especially ODs?
  - => relative neglect of non-biologics + some non-OD disease classes?