Do higher drug costs lead to better health? - A rebuttal

March 11, 2005

Dear Editor:

The authors Mintzes and Lexchin¹ in their commentary to our paper titled *The Value of Medicines in Canada*, have cultivated a theme to which we both agree – the need for efficient use of drug therapy. It is our original position that innovative pharmaceuticals, when used appropriately as part of overall disease management, offer value-for-money by increasing both the global quality and quantity of life.

Roughly two cents of every dollar consumed by Canadians is spent on pharmaceuticals³, yet drug therapy offers Canadians one of the most powerful tools to minimize disease burden (estimated to be \$159.4 billion in 1998)⁴. In order to bridge the care gap between the results achieved in clinical trial setting (efficacy) and the results achieved when medications are used in the 'real-world' (effectiveness), steps must be taken to improve the early detection, treatment and adherence with prescribed therapy. The authors Mintzes and Lexchin have misinterpreted our position on primary prevention as the need to treat "healthy" people with new drugs – a point of contention we continue to remain mystified by. We only need to look at our multi-disciplinary colleagues, who have embraced the importance of primary prevention to minimize disease burden.^{5,6}

In addition, Mintzes and Lexchin have mistakenly used the Patented Medicines Pricing Review Board (PMPRB) classification system as a measure of a drug's therapeutic benefit. The PMPRB uses the categorization system for pricetesting purposes, not for determining the additional value provided by incremental The authors innovation. dismiss pharmaceuticals that offer smaller benefits, minor improvements in efficacy and/or side effect profile. In contrast, evidence exists as to the nuances in patient metabolism pharmacodynamics amongst drugs within the same therapeutic class and the incremental value they offer. 8,9

Drug development has always been a very high-risk enterprise that requires years of dedicated studies and the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars. In addition, the marketing of pharmaceuticals remains one of the most highly regulated industries. The comments raised by Mintzes and Lexchin give little if any attention to the risks and benefits of conducting large-scale effectiveness research with scarce social and economic resources.

Donald Han, BSc Pharm
Edward C. Y. Wang, PharmD, MBA
Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Markham, Ontario,
Canada

The comments are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Wyeth Pharmaceuticals.

Correspondence: Donald Han: hando@wyeth.com

References

1. Mintzes B, Lexchin J. Do Higher Drug Costs Lead to Better Health? Can J Clin Pharmacol 2005;12(1):e22-e27.

- 2. Han D, Wang ECY. The Value of Medicines in Canada. Can J Clin Pharmacol 2005;12 (1):e10-e21.
- 3. Canadian Institute for Health Information. National health expenditure trends, 1975-2002. Ottawa, ON: CIHI, 2002.
- 4. Policy Research Division, Strategic Policy Directorate, Population and Public Health Branch, Health Canada. Economic burden of illness in Canada, 1998.2002.
- 5. Guide to Community Preventive Services. http://www.thecommunityguide.org Accessed December 15, 2003.
- 6. Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. http://www.ctfphc.org. Accessed January, 2005.
- 7. Patented Medicines Pricing Review Board. Annual Report 2003. Available at

- http://pmprb.com/english/View.asp?x=302&mp=9
 1 Accessed January, 2005
- 8. Calfee, JE. Prices, Markets, and the Pharmaceutical Revolution. Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute Press, 2000.
- 9. DiMasi J, Paquette C. The Economics of Followon Drug Research and Development Trends in Entry Rates and the Timing of Development. Pharmacoeconomics 2004;22(Suppl.2):1-14.
- 10. DiMasi JA, Hansen RW, Grabowski HG. The price of innovation: new estimates of drug development costs. Journal of Health Economics 2003;22(2):151-185