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## What are drugs worth?

- How should drugs be valued?
- What should we be prepared to pay?
- Evidence-based pricing


## The market for pharmaceuticals is flawed

The industry has chosen to ignore large markets
Lack of true competition
Informational asymmetry
Imbalance of market power - those who most need are least able to afford drugs
Divergence of interests of customers and investors
At prices offered new drugs often offer small marginal gains for large marginal costs (seldom seen in other technology and knowledge-based industries)

## Pharmacoeconomics

- Usually relates the net benefits to the net costs, and the price is a given
- cost-effectiveness ratios can be used to generate 'indicative' prices that represent 'value for money' in different communities/contexts
- the application of economic utility theory and consideration of social opportunity cost is consistent with marked variation in prices in different communities/contexts


## Pharmacoeconomics

- The argument that a drug 'does not represent value for money' is different

Pharmacoeconomics - an example
Drug $\mathbf{X}$ saves 1 life for every 10 treated
Each survivor lives 10 years
Drug $\mathbf{X}$ costs $\$ 2000$ (in Australia)
It costs $\mathbf{1 0}$ * $\$ 2000$ to gain 10 life years, so the cost/LYG is $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 0 0}$

Does Drug X offer 'value for money' in Australia?

## The same drug in another country

Drug X saves 1 life for every 10 treated
Each survivor lives 10 years
For every 10 persons treated we gain 10 life years (LYG)

Assume an 'acceptable' cost-effectiveness ratio in country 2 is $\$ 200 / \mathrm{LYG}$

Then the indicative 'value for money' price in that country is $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 0}$

## What does 'value for money' mean in country 2?

The 'acceptable' ratio in country 2 is $\$ 200 / \mathrm{LYG} v$ \$2000/LYG in Australia
The opportunity cost of $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 0 0}$ is too high in country 2
Committing \$200/LYG in country 2 is a good investment compared with other life-saving interventions

## A case study using ACE-inhibitors

Basic assumptions underlying the analysis:
Set 'value' of LYG as equivalent to a proportion of per capita GNP (A proxy measure of value) not a judgment of intrinsic worth

## Estimates of benefit of ACE-Is

Derived from systematic (Cochrane) reviews
In treatment of hypertension

- no evidence of benefit over diuretics / orblockers

In congestive heart failure

- clear benefit over placebo

In patients with left ventricular dysfunction after heart attack

- clear benefit over placebo


## Magnitude of the benefit

Mortality

| Indication | ACE-Inhibitor | Comparator |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| hypertension |  | Risk difference |
| $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |  |  |

## Other assumptions in the model

Use of ACE-s is $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ for hypertension, $\mathbf{8 \%}$ for CHF, $2 \%$ for post-MI (base case)

Treatment of hypertension requires one DDD, of CHF 2DDDs, post-MI 3DDDs

## Results

Base case: $90 \%$ hypertension, $8 \% \mathrm{CCF}, 2 \%$ post-MI

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | GNP per capita | Weight LYG | Incr.cost 1000 pt 3.5 yrs | Target Mthly Price |
| Armenia | $\$ 500$ | 7.83 | 3,670 | $\$ 0.20$ |
| Australia | $\$ 20,511$ | 7.83 | 150,547 | $\$ 8.07$ |
| Banglad | $\$ 359$ | 7.83 | 2,633 | $\$ 0.14$ |
| Belgium | $\$ 24,088$ | 7.83 | 176,808 | $\$ 9.47$ |
| Brazil | $\$ 4,541$ | 7.83 | 33,329 | $\$ 1.79$ |
| Canada | $\$ 20,000$ | 7.83 | 146,800 | $\$ 7.87$ |
| China | $\$ 826$ | 7.83 | 6,063 | $\$ 0.32$ |
| India | $\$ 461$ | 7.83 | 3,383 | $\$ 0.18$ |
| RSA | $\$ 3,112$ | 7.83 | 22,839 | $\$ 1.22$ |
| USA | $\$ 31,880$ | 7.83 | 233,998 | $\$ 12.54$ |

## Results (2) 80\% HT, 15\% CHF, 5\% post MI

| Country | Target Mthly Price (1) | Target Mthly Price (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Armenia | $\$ 0.20$ | $\$ 0.27$ |
| Australia | $\$ 8.07$ | $\$ 11.00$ |
| Bangladesh | $\$ 0.14$ | $\$ 0.19$ |
| Belgium | $\$ 9.47$ | $\$ 12.92$ |
| Brazil | $\$ 1.79$ | $\$ 2.44$ |
| Canada | $\$ 7.87$ | $\$ 10.73$ |
| China | $\$ 0.32$ | $\$ 0.44$ |
| India | $\$ 0.18$ | $\$ 0.25$ |
| RSA | $\$ 1.22$ | $\$ 1.67$ |
| USA | $\$ 12.54$ | $\$ 17.10$ |

## Limitations of the methodology

Per capita GNP as proxy measure of affordability is arbitrary (and probably not linear)
Method dependent on the quality/applicability of evidence

Any effect modifiers should be included
The present example takes no account of cost offsets

Must be supported by underlying data collection systems to inform the context

## Sources of evidence

Blood Pressure Lowering Triallists' Collaboration. Effect of ACE

