

**COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS AND  
PHARMACEUTICAL INNOVATION**

# **COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS AND PHARMACEUTICAL INNOVATION**

## **Practice and experience in the British National Health Service**

**Presentation at American Enterprise Institute Conference:**

**“Does the U.S. need a NICE ?-  
Perspectives on the UK Model for Drug Reimbursement”**

Washington, D.C., 28<sup>th</sup> June 2006

by

**HEINZ REDWOOD**

Pharma and Health Policy Consultant

# NICE

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

**“responsible for providing national guidance on promoting good health and preventing and treating ill health in England and Wales”**

[[www.nice.org.uk](http://www.nice.org.uk)].

***FOCUS IN THIS PRESENTATION***

**ONLY on one of NICE's functions:**

**Technology Appraisal of medicines**

**especially on products that are internationally recognised as innovative.**

## **NICE GUIDANCE**

### **MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS MEDICINES :**

**“neither beta-interferon nor glatiramer acetate is recommended for the treatment of multiple sclerosis [MS] in the NHS in England and Wales”**

**[Technology Appraisal No. 32].**

### **NICE APPEAL PANEL ruling:**

**“ international opinion on clinical and cost effectiveness was not one of the criteria that the Institute was required to take into account when appraising health technologies.”**

**[NICE, “Appraisal of the use of beta interferons and glatiramer acetate in the treatment of multiple sclerosis – Decision of the Appeal Panel”, January 2002]**

# **COST-UTILITY ANALYSIS**

**measures**

**QUALITY-ADJUSTED LIFE YEARS**

**[QALYs]**

**LENGTH OF SURVIVAL  
combined with  
QUALITY OF LIFE**

**RELATIVE TO COST**

# **INNOVATIVE MEDICINES FOUR CASE STUDIES**

## **1. The 'MS CASE'**

**Beta-interferons and glatiramer acetate for  
MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS**

## **2. The 'CML CASE'**

**Imatinib for  
CHRONIC MYELOID LEUKAEMIA**

## **3. The 'PHOTODYNAMIC CASE'**

**Verteporfin for  
WET AGE-RELATED MACULAR DETERIORATION**

## **4. The 'OSTEOPOROSIS CASE'**

**Bisphosphonates, raloxifene and teriparatide for  
SECONDARY PREVENTION of osteoporosis**

## FOUR CASE STUDIES

### DURATION OF NICE PROCESS from REFERRAL to issuing of GUIDANCE

CASE	DURATION	
	Years	Months
<b>MS</b>	2	6
<b>CML</b>	1	5
<b>Photodynamic</b>	2	6
<b>Osteoporosis*</b>	2	10

[\* Secondary prevention.  
Primary prevention not yet concluded]

# FOUR CASE STUDIES

## RECOMMENDED NICE GUIDANCE

<b>CASE</b>	<b>GUIDANCE: MAIN POINTS</b>
<b>MS</b>	<b>Against use in NHS except optionally for patients already on treatment or in clinical trials</b>
<b>CML</b>	<b>Recommended first-line treatment in chronic phase CML</b>
<b>Photodynamic</b>	<b>Recommended only for treatment of a small segment of patients</b>
<b><u>Osteoporosis</u> Bisphosphonates</b>	<b>Recommended with restrictions for age segments among patients</b>
<b>Raloxifene</b>	<b>Recommended as second-line treatment for patients for whom bisphosphonates are unsuitable</b>
<b>Teriparatide</b>	<b>Recommended as second-line treatment at age 65+ with additional restrictions</b>

# QUESTIONS

**NICE: PERFORMANCE?**

**Strong**

**NICE: CONCEPT?**

**MANDATORY NATIONAL GUIDANCE ON COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF INNOVATIVE MEDICINES:**

**Valid or unsound?  
Helpful or burdensome?  
Necessary or dispensable?**

## **For INNOVATIVE MEDICINES**

**....coming to terms with the  
UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE  
in industry and health care**

**The place of  
COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS  
as a useful analytical tool is limited:**

- **Clinical limits**
- **Industrial limits**
- **Practical limits**

**U.S. HEALTH CARE –**  
**Pluralistic, competitive**

**EUROPEAN HEALTH CARE –**  
**Public sector**  
**‘Single Payer’ dominates**

**Both have advantages and weaknesses**

**If pharmaceutical innovation is to remain  
a major objective  
in industrial and health policy:**

**USE COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS**

**as an optional decision-making tool**

**NOT WITH MANDATORY STATUS  
for centralised national guidance**

# THE BRITISH HEALTH CARE SYSTEM IN OUTLINE

## NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE [NHS]

= public sector

### Share of total health expenditure (2002)

	%
Public sector	83.4
Private health insurance, est.	3.2
Patient out-of-pocket, est.	10.7
Other, est.	<u>2.7</u>
	100

Funding of pharmaceuticals	%
Public sector, est.	74
Private sector, est.	26 *

[\*of which >20 = otc/non-prescription]

### NHS Prescription charge

April 2006: £6.65 [approx. \$12] per item prescribed

Exemptions: about 84% of all NHS prescriptions

Prescription charge receipts = approx. 4% of NHS pharma expenditure

**Thank you**

**HEINZ REDWOOD**