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Government expenditure on medicines has increased substantially due to ↑ utilisation and prices → concerns regarding sustainability.

Total expenditure on medicines represented ~ 12.3% of all health spending in 2014-15.

Most Australians have used a medicine for self-medication in the past month, including over-the-counter (OTC) medicines and complementary medicines.
Background

CURRENT REGULATORY APPROACH TO OTC IN AUSTRALIA

The *Poisons Standard* sets out the degree of control over the availability of medicines to the public.

Initially patients require a prescription to access most new medicines (i.e. **Schedule 4 (Prescription only)** or **8 (Controlled)**)

Later regulators may ‘switch’ or ‘down-schedule’

- **Schedule 3 (Pharmacist Only)**: Available behind the pharmacy counter. A pharmacist must be consulted before dispensing
- **Schedule 2 (Pharmacy Medicine)**: May be available on the shelf at pharmacies. If required, advice from a pharmacist or pharmacy assistant should be available

Some medicines are also “unscheduled”
- Available in pharmacies + other distributional channels (e.g. supermarkets, online stores and health food stores)
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Who decides?
An advisory committee of the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) provides advice regarding under which schedule should a medicine be listed.

Factors considered?
Largely focus on patient risk, especially:
- The need for advice from a medical practitioner or pharmacist
- The risk of inaccurate or delayed diagnosis
- The risk of inappropriate use
- The incidence and severity of adverse events (including contraindications and interactions)
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But there are also benefits from listing a medicine on a lower schedule:

Reduced barriers to treatment
- ↓ time to symptom relief
- ↑ treatment rates
- ↑ adherence
- Change treatments used

↑ quality of life
↓ disease onset
↓ disease progression

↓ GP visits
↓ diagnostic tests
↓ hospitalisations

↑ treatment of other patients
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Consideration of the benefits
These benefits may be considered by the advisory committee BUT given less importance as not included in the formal list of factors to be considered.
• Scheduling Policy Framework for Medicines and Chemicals

Risk aversion
Gauld et al (2014 and 2015) found that while Australia was initially previously active in down-scheduling vs rest of the world, in recent years Australia has adopted a more conservative and risk-adverse approach.
An external review of medicines and medical devices regulation was conducted for the Australian Federal Minister for Health in 2015.

The review recommended that:

*the Scheduling Policy Framework be reviewed, in consultation with State and Territory Governments to provide for the development and adoption of a formal risk-benefit methodology to assess scheduling applications, and opportunities to enhance input from interested parties into the scheduling process (Recommendation 11).*
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HOW CAN IT HELP?

Not possible to conduct a randomised controlled trial (RCT) to explore the impact of down-scheduling on health outcomes.

**Economic modelling** can synthesise evidence from a variety of sources, enabling:

- Consideration of a broad range of benefits and risks
- Estimation of the impact on health outcomes and resource use
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HOW CAN IT HELP?

Down-scheduling is likely to result in a wide range of different health outcomes:
• Symptoms reduced or duration shortened
• Different diseases avoided
• Incidence and severity of different adverse events

Can be aggregated to a single measure – Quality Adjusted Life Years.
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HOW CAN IT HELP?

Quality adjusted life years (QALYs)

• Incorporate survival and quality of life

• Utility values = strength of preference between health states, anchored at perfect health (1) and death (0)

• Utility values reflect strength of community preferences across survival and quality of life

• Measured using approaches that ask respondents to trade off survival and quality of life (e.g. standard gamble or time trade-off)
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HOW CAN IT HELP?

Inappropriate scheduling decisions result in:
• Poorer health outcomes
• Wastage of health care resources

Presence of uncertainty ≠ inappropriate scheduling decision.
• If decision is unchanged regardless of the parameter value, then decision is likely to be appropriate regardless of the presence of uncertainty.
• But if there is a risk that scheduling decision is inappropriate, then there may be value in waiting and collecting more evidence.
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HOW CAN IT HELP?

Sensitivity analyses can help assess whether the presence of uncertainty in the evidence = uncertainty in the regulatory decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of uncertainty analysis</th>
<th>Questions answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate sensitivity analysis and threshold analysis</td>
<td>How important is an attribute?  Is further research is required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-group analysis</td>
<td>Should access differ by patient group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario analysis</td>
<td>Impact of different regulatory scenarios (e.g. require screening questionnaire, or require 1st GP visit)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probabilistic sensitivity analysis</td>
<td>What is the probability that down-scheduling is cost-effective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Project

To develop an extended framework using an economic evaluation approach that could be used by sponsors and decision makers to inform whether a medicine should be down-scheduled from prescription only (Schedule 4 in Australia) to Pharmacist Only (Schedule 3 in Australia), and vice versa.
The economic framework was based on current best practice guidelines, but with some adjustment to scheduling decisions.

It’s application was illustrated using 2 case studies:
• Down-scheduling triptans for the treatment of migraines
• Down-scheduling the oral contraceptive pill to avoid unintended pregnancies

→ demonstrated that an economic evaluation approach is possible and can be insightful for regulators.

Report will be launched in Canberra in early 2018.
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APPLICATION

Clearly our framework is not the final version.

Final framework would need to be driven by the TGA following extensive consultation with:

• TGA and committee members
• Industry
• Patient groups
• Medical practitioners
• Pharmacists
• Health researchers
• Health economists
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The results of economic evaluations should be considered by regulators as part of the broader body of evidence regarding:

• Expected health impacts
• Extent of the available evidence
• Who will be affected
• The role of medical practitioners and pharmacists
Summary

An economic framework to inform down-scheduling decisions can assist regulators:

• Synthesise a wide variety of evidence
• Consider a broader range of benefits and risks
• Ensure consistency across submissions
• Assess the uncertainty and whether further research is required

→ help reduce some of the recent conservatives shown by regulators regarding down-scheduling drugs in Australia.
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