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Introduction

Studies in literature have shown that the rates of awareness of HPV vaccines & HIV preventive therapies, the rates of intent to use these and the rates of use of these therapies rose during the first few years of their introduction, but have fallen in subsequent years.

Various factors combine to determine the long term market access of any such service or therapies. Some of these factors are the societal beliefs, values and perceptions existing among the various stakeholders in that society.

The objective of this study is to assess the impact of social and behavioral factors on the acceptance and usage of HPV vaccines & HIV preventive therapy options such as Truvada for PrEP HIV.

Methodology

We conducted extensive literature review to gather the views from various stakeholders (Physicians, Beneficiaries, Press, Payers, Community including parents and community activists).

Case Study 1 – Societal views impacting market access of HPV vaccine in Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Summary view</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
<th>No promiscuity concerns</th>
<th>No adherence issues</th>
<th>Cost of vaccine on HPV vaccines’ access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supportive views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study 2– Societal views impacting market access of HIV preventive therapies in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Summary view</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
<th>No promiscuity concerns</th>
<th>No adherence issues</th>
<th>Cost of vaccine on HPV vaccines’ access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supportive views:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Insurance and Medicaid are covering Truvada, still the adoption is low…

Truvada costs about $1,300 per month

Private Payers are not willing to pay for Truvada

- Many payers place Truvada in Tier 2 (such as Cigna, Anthem) or 3, i.e. higher co-pay tier
- Many payers place Truvada on a list of drugs that require pre-certification (for eg. Aetna, United Healthcare). In that case, the drug may not be covered by the plan
- Some payers make the claim process difficult by requiring re-authorization for drugs that patients have been taking for many years.

Even under the Affordable Care Act, Truvada remains unaffordable

- Bronze plans, like the $5,000 deductible, 2014, usually put Truvada out of reach
- Gold and platinum plans, with no deductible and low copays can make Truvada affordable but the monthly premium could be very high

Conclusion

The market access of Truvada has been impacted due to mixed and unclear views among the various stakeholders in society. These views have, in turn, impacted the payers who are not willing to pay in spite of FDA’s approval and recommendation for Truvada. The payers’ unwillingness to pay has resulted in high co pays, shifting the cost towards the patients, and hence impacting access.

Overall Inference

The utilization of any medical service results from a number of related societal values and perceptions. This is especially relevant for drugs which challenge these well-held societal views. There are many and varied stakeholders and viewpoints to consider, e.g. deep seated beliefs, religious standpoints, social, economical and cultural view points of the stakeholders in society, as well as controversies over efficacy and safety, all having the ability to impact the acceptance and usage of any new therapy.

As evident from the studied cases, in spite of the regulatory approval and national recommendations (often supported by strong clinical evidence), low adoption and high co-pays reflect that market access and uptake can be significantly driven by strong prevailing societal views that are not always grounded in a strong evidence base.