

1 **Title:**

2 The impact of National Centralized Drug Procurement policy on the use of policy-related
3 original and generic drugs in public medical institutions in China: A difference-in-difference
4 analysis based on national database

5 **Authors:**

6 Jing Wang^{1, †}, Ying Yang^{2, 3, †}, Luxinyi Xu^{2, 3}, Yuan Shen¹, Xiaotong Wen^{2, 3}, Lining Mao^{2, 3},
7 Quan Wang^{2, 3, *}, Dan Cui^{2, 3, *}, Zongfu Mao^{2, 3}

8 **Affiliation:**

9 ¹ Department of Drug Information Management, Statistical Information Center, National
10 Health Commission of the People's Republic of China, Beijing 100044, China.

11 ² School of Health Sciences, Wuhan University, No. 115 Donghu Road, Wuhan 430071,
12 China.

13 ³ Global Health Institute, Wuhan University, No. 8 Donghu South Road, Wuhan 430072,
14 China.

15 **Corresponding author:**

16 * Quan Wang, School of Health Sciences, Wuhan University, No. 115 Donghu Road, Wuhan
17 430071, China; E-mail: wangquan73@whu.edu.cn; Tel.: (+86) 139 7100 8150

18 * Dan Cui, School of Health Sciences, Wuhan University, No. 115 Donghu Road, Wuhan
19 430071, China; E-mail: alyssazz@126.com; Tel.: (+86) 133 1715 0755

20 † Jing Wang and Ying Yang contributed equally to this work.

21 **E-mail address:**

22 wangjing@nhc.gov.cn (J.W.), yangying@whu.edu.cn (Y.Y.), 2020203050034@whu.edu.cn

23 (L.X), shenyuan@nhc.gov.cn (Y.S.), 2020103050014@whu.edu.cn (X.W.),

24 2020283050077@whu.edu.cn (L.M.), wangquan73@whu.edu.cn (Q.W.), alyssazz@126.com

25 (D.C.), zfmao@whu.edu.cn (Z.M.)

1 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 2 ➤ The “4+7” policy is the first policy attempt of volume-based drug procurement work at the
3 national level in China, and is a pioneering work in the reform of Drug Supply and
4 Guarantee System in China. This study aimed to explored the effect of this policy on
5 original and generic drug use in China.
- 6 ➤ This study used data of national database – China Drug Supply Information Platform
7 (CDSIP). The monthly drug purchase data of nine pilot cities and twelve non-pilot
8 provinces in mainland China were analyzed.
- 9 ➤ This study used Difference-in-Difference analysis to evaluate the policy effect.
- 10 ➤ The findings based on drug purchase data rather than drug use data in the present study
11 might limit the interpretation and extrapolation of research results.

12

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objective:** To evaluate the impact of the first round of the National Centralized Drug
3 Procurement (NCDP) pilot (referred to as "4+7" policy) on the use of policy-related original
4 and generic drugs.

5 **Methods:** Drug purchase data from the China Drug Supply Information Platform (CDSIP)
6 database were used, involving nine "4+7" pilot cities and 12 non-pilot provinces in China.
7 "4+7" policy-related drugs were included, which consisted of 25 "4+7" List drugs and 97
8 alternative drugs that have an alternative relationship with "4+7" List drugs in clinical use.
9 "4+7" List drugs were divided into bid-winning and non-winning products according to the
10 bidding results. Purchase volume, purchase expenditures, daily costs were selected as
11 outcome variables, and were measured using Defined Daily Doses (DDD_s), Chinese Yuan
12 (CNY), and Defined Daily Drug cost (DDD_c), respectively. Difference-in-Difference (DID)
13 method was employed to estimate the net effect of policy impact.

14 **Results:** After policy intervention, the DDD_s of original drugs among "4+7" List drugs
15 significantly reduced by 124.59%, while generic drugs increased by 52.12% (all *p*-values
16 <0.01). 17.08% of the original drugs in DDD_s were substituted by generic drugs. Prominent
17 reductions of 121.69% and 80.54% were observed in the expenditure of original and generic
18 drugs, with a total cost-saving of 5036.78 million CNY for "4+7" List drugs. The DDD_c of
19 bid-winning original and generic drugs, as well as non-winning original drugs, significantly
20 decreased by 33.20%, 75.74%, and 5.35% (all *p*-values <0.01), while the DDD_c of
21 non-winning generic drugs significantly increased by 73.66% (*p*<0.001). The use proportion
22 of bid-winning products and non-winning original drugs raised prominently from 39.66% to
23 91.93%

24 **Conclusions:** "4+7" policy promoted the substitution use of generic drugs against original
25 drugs, which conducive to drug costs saving. The overall quality level of drug use of public
26 medical institutions significantly increased after "4+7" policy, especially in primary medical
27 institutions.

28 **Keywords:** National Centralized Drug Procurement (NCDP); volume-based procurement;
29 "4+7" policy; generic drugs; original drugs.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Worldwide, the substitution use of generic drugs against original drugs is an important
3 practice for drug costs control ¹. Generic drugs with quality assurance can provide patients
4 with alternative treatment options that are safe, effective, and economical ². China is the
5 largest developing country in the world, the generic drugs of high quality and low price are still
6 the important source and means of satisfying the essential drug needs of the Chinese public.
7 However, in China, there are a large number of generic pharmaceutical companies, but the
8 quality level of generic drugs produced is quite uneven ³. Coupled with the slow progress of
9 generic consistency evaluation, the substitution rate of generic drugs has been low, and
10 Chinese patients rely heavily on imported original drugs ⁴. The use proportion of original
11 drugs ranged from 44% to 95% by expenditures in China ⁵⁻⁸. Besides, expired patented drugs
12 had not experienced a "patent cliff" in China ⁹, which still hold much higher prices in the
13 Chinese market than those in the international market, showing that the Chinese public does
14 not get low prices that match the world's largest markets ^{5,6}.

15 Since 2012, the Chinese government has successively introduced a series of policies to
16 promote the consistency evaluation of generic drugs ³. In 2018, significant progress was
17 made in the generic consistency evaluation work, with 57 drugs passed evaluation ¹⁰. The
18 promotion of generic consistency evaluation work provided an important basis for the drug
19 quality assurance of drug procurement ¹¹. In January 2019, the General Office of the State
20 Council of the People's Republic of China (PRC) issued the National Centralized Drug
21 Procurement (NCDP) policy ¹², which is the first volume-based drug procurement work at the
22 national level in China. In the NCDP policy, original drugs, as well as generic drugs that have
23 passed the consistency evaluation of quality and efficacy are assigned as the drug
24 participation criteria. The National Healthcare Security Administration (NHSA) gathered the
25 purchase needs of all public medical institutions in the pilot cities, and conducted price
26 negotiation with pharmaceutical enterprises. The first round of the NCDP pilot was
27 implemented in 4 municipalities (Beijing, Tianjin, Shanghai, and Chongqing) and 7
28 sub-provincial cities (Shenyang, Dalian, Xiamen, Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Chengdu, and
29 Xi'an) in mainland China, thus, this pilot is also known as "4+7" policy. The "4+7" policy
30 adopted the rule of a single company winning bid, 25 drugs (by generic name) in the "4+7"
31 List were successfully purchased, of which three original products won the bid (gefitinib,
32 fosinopril, and flurbiprofen) ¹³.

33 One of the original intentions of the NCDP policy is to promote the healthy development of
34 China's pharmaceutical industry. Wang et al. ¹⁴ investigated 11 drugs (by generic name) in a
35 tertiary hospital in Shanghai and found that the ratio of the daily cost of generic drugs to

1 original drugs significantly decreased (from 0.87 to 0.39) after “4+7” policy, and the proportion
2 of the volume and expenditures of generic drugs raised prominently, increasing by 26.2 and
3 7.86 percentage points respectively. Zou et al.’s study¹⁵ conducted in a tertiary hospital in
4 Guangzhou pointed out that the NCDP policy effectively promoted the use of domestic
5 generic drugs, thereby saving drug costs by substituting original drugs. The implementation
6 of the NCDP policy might play a positive role in increasing the market share of domestic
7 generic drug enterprises. Worldwide, it is a common practice to achieve the reduction of drug
8 costs by encouraging the substitution use of generic drugs against original drugs^{1,16}. In China,
9 previous studies have found that, through the drug price reduction at the direct level and the
10 increasing use of generic drugs at the indirect level, “4+7” policy was conducive to reducing
11 the pharmaceutical expenditures^{14,15,17,18}.

12 In China, the use structure of original and generic drugs differs remarkably between regions
13 with different economic levels and different types or levels of medical institutions⁵. However,
14 previous relevant pieces of evidence mainly came from a single hospital, and the methods
15 were mainly descriptive analysis, indicating that the representativeness of existing research
16 evidence is insufficient. In this study, we obtained the data of nine “4+7” pilot cities and twelve
17 non-pilot provinces from a national database – China Drug Supply Information Platform
18 (CDSIP), and applied Difference-in-Difference (DID) analysis to assess the effect of “4+7”
19 policy on the use of policy-related original and generic drugs in public medical institutions in
20 China.

21 **METHODS**

22 **Data sources**

23 Data in the study was obtained from the CDSIP database. The CDSIP is a national drug
24 database constructed and operated by the Statistical Information Center of the National
25 Health Commission of the PRC, and was officially launched on October 22, 2015. The CDSIP
26 database covered drug purchase order data of all provincial drug centralized procurement
27 platforms in mainland China. In the CDSIP database, each drug purchase order record
28 included the name of the medical institution, purchase date, drug YPID (Yao Pin Identifier)
29 code, drug generic name, dosage form, specification, conversion factor, pharmaceutical
30 manufacturer, price per unit, purchasing unit (by box, bottle, or branch), purchase volume,
31 purchase expenditures, etc.

32 Under the zero-markup drug policy in China¹⁹, the drug purchase prices in public medical
33 institutions are the same as the prices used by patients. Since 2015, it was required that all
34 drugs used by public medical institutions should be purchased through the provincial-level

1 drug centralized procurement platform²⁰. Therefore, in mainland China, the drug purchase
2 data of public medical institutions in the CDSIP database is generally consistent with the drug
3 use data.

4 **Sample selection**

5 In this study, the inclusion criteria of samples were as follows: (a) The drug scope was “4+7”
6 policy-related drugs, including 25 drugs (by generic name) in the “4+7” List and the
7 alternative drugs (**APPENDIX A**). The alternative drugs referred to drugs that have an
8 alternative relationship with “4+7” List drugs in clinical use, and was determined according to
9 the *Monitoring Plan for the Pilot Work of National Centralized Drug Procurement and Use*
10 issued by the NHTA²¹. The “4+7” List drugs were then divided into bid-winning products and
11 non-winning products according to the “4+7” city centralized drug procurement bid-winning
12 results¹³. (b) The time period covered 23 months from January 2018 to November 2019. (c)
13 The scope of regions included pilot cities (pilot group) and non-pilot provinces (control group).
14 The pilot group involved nine “4+7” pilot cities, including Beijing, Shanghai, Chongqing,
15 Tianjin, Chengdu, Xi'an, Shenyang, Dalian, and Xiamen. Two (Guangzhou and Shenzhen) of
16 the eleven “4+7” pilot cities were not included in this study, because their purchase order data
17 in the CDSIP database was incomplete. The control group involved 12 provinces that did not
18 implement the “4+7” pilot policy, including Hubei, Hunan, Guizhou, Inner Mongolia, Jilin,
19 Heilongjiang, Anhui, Hainan, Gansu, Qinghai, Ningxia, and Xinjiang. (d) The scope of medical
20 institutions was all the public medical institutions in the pilot group and control group. Public
21 medical institution was divided into tertiary public hospital, secondary public hospital, and
22 government-run primary medical institution. Purchase order records with incomplete
23 information were excluded.

24 Finally, a total of 122 policy-related drugs (by generic name) were included in this study,
25 including 25 “4+7” List drugs and 97 alternative drugs. The flow chart of the sample selection
26 process is shown in **Figure 1**.

27 **<Figure 1 Here>**

28 **Figure 1. Flow chart of sample screening.**

29 **Outcome variables**

30 Three outcome variables were measured in this study: purchase volume, purchase
31 expenditures, and daily drug costs. Purchase expenditure data was reported in Chinese Yuan
32 (CNY). Purchase volume was measured using Defined Daily Doses (DDDs), which is a
33 measurement for comparing drug consumptions developed by the WHO Collaborating Centre
34 for Drug Statistics Methodology²². In this study, the DDD value of each medication was

1 determined according to the *Guidelines for ATC classification and DDD assignment 2021*²³.
2 Daily costs of drugs was assessed by Defined Daily Drug cost (DDDc), which was calculated
3 by the ratio of expenditures and DDDs.

4 **Statistical analysis**

5 Descriptive statistics were used. We first described the change of purchase volume,
6 purchase expenditures, and DDDc of the included original and generic drugs in the
7 corresponding period before (March to November 2018) and after (March to November 2019)
8 the implementation of "4+7" policy. Besides, we described the change of composition ratio
9 between original and generic drugs in the volume and expenditures before and after "4+7"
10 policy.

11 This study employed the Difference-in-Difference method. DID is a method commonly used
12 for the quantitative effect evaluation of public policies or projects. By effectively combining
13 "the difference before and after intervention" with "the difference with or without intervention",
14 this method to a certain extent can control the influence of some factors other than
15 intervention, so as to estimate the net impacts of the intervention on the outcome variable²⁴⁻²⁶.
16 In this study, we constructed DID models by using the time series data in the pilot group and
17 control group, to eliminate the net effect of the "4+7" policy on the use of original and generic
18 drugs. The DID model is expressed as follows:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_t + \beta_2 G_t + \beta_3 (T_t * G_t) + \varepsilon_t$$

19 Where, Y refers to the outcome variables in this study. T_t refers to "4+7" policy intervention
20 with the value of 0 and 1, and 0 represents the pre-"4+7" policy period (from January 2018 to
21 February 2019) and 1 represents the post-"4+7" policy period (from March 2019 to November
22 2019). G_t represents groups with the value of 0 and 1, and 0 represents the control group and
23 1 represents the pilot group. ε_t is the error term, representing random errors that cannot be
24 explained by variables in the model. β_0 represents the constant term. β_1 estimates the change
25 of the outcome variable in the post-"4+7" policy period compared with the pre-"4+7" policy
26 period. β_2 estimates the change of the outcome variable in the pilot group compared with the
27 control group. β_3 is the interaction item between intervention measures and groups, which
28 represents the net effect of the "4+7" policy. The relative change of the outcome variable after
29 "4+7" policy was expressed as β_3/β_0 ²⁷. In this study, we observed the monthly trends of each
30 outcome variable between the pilot group and control group before the policy intervention, to
31 verify if the DID model met the parallel trend conditions (**APPENDIX C**)²⁸. Stata version 16.0
32 was used to perform the analyses above. A p -value <0.05 was considered statistically
33 significant.

1 RESULTS

2 The change of volume, expenditures, and DDDc

3 **Table 1** demonstrates the changes in the volume, expenditures, and DDDc of original and
4 generic drugs. Among the bid-winning products, the volume of original and generic drugs
5 increased by 79.04% and 583.76%, the expenditures of generic drugs increased by 43.61%,
6 and the DDDc of original and generic drugs decreased by 44.44% and 79.00% after “4+7”
7 policy. Among the non-winning products, the decline of 37.77% and 81.12% in volume and
8 47.17%% and 68.88% in expenditures were observed for original and generic drugs
9 respectively. The DDDc of non-winning original drugs decreased by 15.10%, while generic
10 drugs increased by 64.81%. As for the alternative drugs, both original and generic drugs
11 increased in purchase volume (7.10% and 19.09%), purchase expenditures (23.49% and
12 20.68%), and DDDc (15.30% and 1.33%). In terms of the overall “4+7” policy-related drugs,
13 the volume of original drugs declined by 9.95%, while generic drugs increased by 33.24%.
14 Both original and generic drugs decreased in purchase expenditures (16.83% and 13.97%)
15 and DDDc (7.64% and 35.43%).

16 The change of composition ratio between original and generic drugs

17 After the implementation of “4+7” policy, the volume proportion of generics among
18 bid-winning products slightly increased from 92.98% to 98.06%, generics among non-winning
19 products significantly decreased from 56.08% to 27.93%. Among the “4+7” List drugs, the
20 volume proportion of generic drugs increased from 60.73% to 77.80%, and the expenditure
21 proportion increased from 49.45% to 52.30% (**Figure 2**).

22 <Figure 2 Here>

23 **Figure 2.** Changes in the volume proportion and expenditure proportion of original drugs and
24 generic drugs in the pilot cities. Note: Pre-intervention period refers to March to November
25 2018; Post-intervention period refers to March to November 2019.

26 **Figure 3** presents the use proportion of generics among “4+7” List drugs in each pilot city.
27 After policy intervention, the volume proportion of generic drugs increased in all of the nine
28 pilot cities, with the increasing value ranging from 10.88% (Shanghai) to 47.18% (Xiamen). In
29 the post-“4+7” period, with the exception of Beijing (61.67%), the volume proportion of
30 generics in the remaining 8 cities exceeded 80%.

31 <Figure 3 Here>

32 **Figure 3.** The volume and expenditure proportion of generics among “4+7” List drugs in nine

1 “4+7” pilot cities. Note: Pre-intervention period refers to March to November 2018;
2 Post-intervention period refers to March to November 2019.

3 Furtherly, we calculated the proportion of generic product in each “4+7” List drug (**Table 2**).
4 For 20 of the 25 “4+7” List drugs, the volume proportion of generics increased after policy
5 intervention, with the increased value ranging from 0.64% (pemetrexed disodium) to 27.42%
6 (montelukast). Three drugs appeared the decreased volume proportion of generic drugs:
7 olanzapine (-2.33%), fosinopril (-26.57%), and gefitinib (-10.39%). In the post-“4+7” policy
8 period, the overall volume proportion of generics among “4+7” List drugs was 77.80%, and 11
9 of them demonstrated a proportion of more than 90%.

10 Besides, we calculated the use proportion of bid-winning drugs and non-winning original
11 drugs, since they represent a relatively high level of drug quality. After policy intervention, the
12 volume proportion of bid-winning products and non-winning original drugs raised prominently
13 from 39.66% to 91.93%, and the expenditure proportion increased from 63.52% to 80.19%.

14 **The results of DID analysis**

15 **Table 3** shows the DID results of original and generic drugs in volume, expenditures, and
16 DDDc. After “4+7” policy, the volume of both bid-winning original (*coef.* = 0.95 million DDD,
17 *p* < 0.001) and generic drugs (*coef.* = 134.01 million DDD, *p* < 0.001) increased significantly,
18 with the relative change of 102.25% and 901.20% respectively. The volume of non-winning
19 original (*coef.* = -40.06 million DDD, *p* < 0.001) and generic drugs (*coef.* = -93.58 million DDD,
20 *p* < 0.001) significantly decreased. Among the “4+7” List drugs, the volume of original drugs
21 prominently decreased by 124.59% (*coef.* = -39.10 million DDD, *p* < 0.001), while generic
22 drugs increased by 52.12% (*coef.* = 40.43 million DDD, *p* < 0.01). DID analysis showed that
23 the volume change of original and generic drugs in the alternative drugs had no significance
24 (all *p*-values >0.05). Among the overall policy-related drugs, the volume of original drugs
25 decreased by 43.46% (*coef.* = -37.43 million DDD, *p* < 0.001), and generic drugs increased by
26 22.54% (*coef.* = 44.79 million DDD, *p* < 0.05).

27 As for purchase expenditures, after the “4+7” policy, the expenditures of bid-winning original
28 drugs decreased 63.62% (*coef.* = -12.14 million CNY, *p* < 0.01), and bid-winning generic
29 drugs increased 3.26% (*coef.* = 57.11 million CNY, *p* < 0.01). Among the non-winning products,
30 a prominent decline of 125.33% and 127.30% were observed in the expenditures of original
31 drugs (*coef.* = -380.87 million CNY, *p* < 0.001) and generic drugs (*coef.* = -390.50 million CNY,
32 *p* < 0.001). Among the “4+7” List drugs, the expenditures of original drugs (*coef.* = -393.01
33 million CNY, *p* < 0.001) and generic drugs (*coef.* = -333.39 million CNY, *p* < 0.01) significantly
34 decreased by 121.69% and 80.54%. DID analysis showed that the expenditures change of

1 original and generic drugs in the alternative drugs had no significance (all p -values >0.05).
2 Among the overall policy-related drugs, the expenditures of original drugs ($coef. = -352.98$
3 million CNY, $p < 0.001$) and generic drugs ($coef. = -301.49$ million CNY, $p < 0.001$), with the
4 relative change of -68.25% and -43.30% .
5 In terms of the DDDc, after the “4+7” policy, the DDDc of bid-winning original drugs ($coef. =$
6 -6.85 CNY, $p < 0.001$) and bid-winning generic drugs ($coef. = -5.49$ CNY, $p < 0.001$) significantly
7 declined compared with the pre-“4+7” period. The DDDc of non-winning original drugs
8 significantly decreased by 5.35% ($coef. = -0.54$ CNY, $p < 0.01$), and non-winning generic drugs
9 significantly increased by 73.66% ($coef. = 3.64$ CNY, $p < 0.001$). In terms of the DDDc of “4+7”
10 List drugs, both original drugs ($coef. = -0.78$ CNY, $p < 0.001$) and generic drugs ($coef. = -3.00$
11 CNY, $p < 0.001$) significantly declined, with the relative change of -7.60% and -55.60% . DID
12 analysis showed that the DDDc change of original and generic drugs in the alternative drugs
13 had no significance (all p -values >0.05). For the DDDc of the overall policy-related drugs,
14 both original drugs ($coef. = -0.92$ CNY, $p < 0.001$) and generic drugs ($coef. = -1.69$ CNY,
15 $p < 0.001$) significantly declined, with the relative change of -15.18% and -47.64% .

16 **Subgroup analysis**

17 Subgroup analysis was conducted towards different levels of public medical institution. As
18 expressed in **Table 4**, after “4+7” policy, the volume proportion of generics among “4+7” List
19 drugs increased by 25.27% , 15.08% , and 12.00% in tertiary, secondary, and primary medical
20 institutions. Among the overall policy-related drugs, the volume proportion of generics
21 increased by 13.84% , 8.84% , and 6.64% in tertiary, secondary, and primary medical
22 institutions. In addition, we calculated the use proportion of bid-winning products and
23 non-winning original drugs in different types of medical institutions, tertiary hospitals
24 increased from 67.29% to 93.21% , secondary hospitals increased from 43.44% to 91.43% ,
25 and primary medical institutions increased from 41.57% to 91.09% .

26 The results of DID analysis (**Table 5**) indicated that, after the implementation of “4+7” policy,
27 the volume of non-winning original drugs dropped significantly in tertiary ($coef. = -19.51$
28 million DDD, $p < 0.001$), secondary ($coef. = -8.63$ million DDD, $p < 0.001$), and primary ($coef. =$
29 -11.92 million DDD, $p < 0.001$) medical institutions. Similarly, the volume of non-winning
30 generic drugs declined by 103.08% , 91.95% , and 241.51% in tertiary ($coef. = -21.31$,
31 $p < 0.001$), secondary ($coef. = -17.99$, $p < 0.001$), and primary ($coef. = -54.27$, $p < 0.001$) medical
32 institutions. Among the “4+7” List drugs, the volume of original drugs prominently decreased
33 by 93.17% (tertiary), 92.82% (secondary), and 659.21% (primary) in all three types of medical
34 institutions (all p -values < 0.001), and the volume of generic drugs significantly increased by
35 78.50% and 54.51% in tertiary and primary medical institutions (all p -values < 0.05). In terms

1 of the overall policy-related drugs, the volume of original drugs significantly decreased by
2 37.94%, 36.45%, and 100.85% in all three types of medical institutions (all p -values <0.05),
3 and the volume of generic drugs markedly increased by 40.13% in the tertiary hospitals
4 (p -value <0.001).

5 **DISCUSSION**

6 In this study, a significant drop of 33.20% and 75.74% were observed in the DDDc of
7 bid-winning original and generic drugs, indicating that the “4+7” policy greatly reduced the
8 price of bid-winning drugs. According to the cross-price elasticity theory, in a group of drugs
9 with a substitution relationship, the percentage change in quantity demanded for one product
10 in response to a percentage change in the price of another product ^{29,30}. Wang et al. ³¹
11 reported that the Fisher Price index of non-winning drugs dropped significantly in Shenzhen
12 after the 4+7 policy, which well verified this theory. In the present study, the DID analysis
13 reported a significant reduction of 0.54 CNY in the DDDc of non-winning original drugs,
14 indicating that there might be a linkage price reduction effect for non-winning original drugs
15 under NCDP policy, which might be conducive to restrain the long-term unreasonable high
16 prices of drugs in China ³². However, the DDDc of non-winning generic drugs markedly
17 increased by 3.64 CNY, leading to an increase of 17.89% in the DDDc of the overall
18 non-winning drugs after policy intervention. Besides, the further subgroup analysis found that
19 an increase of DDDc for non-winning generic drugs mainly occurred in tertiary (100.77%) and
20 secondary public hospitals (54.01%). The NHTA of the PRC clearly stipulated that the
21 winning bid price is used as the medical insurance payment standard, and encourages the
22 clinical use of bid-winning drugs. However, in China, the financial relationship between
23 pharmaceutical companies and hospitals/prescribers has not been completely cut off ^{33,34},
24 and Chinese physicians still have the motivation to prescribe non-winning drugs. Therefore,
25 the increase in DDDc of non-winning generic drugs may be related to the increase in the
26 average daily dose of related drugs.

27 This study included the non-centralized purchased drugs that had an alternative relationship
28 with the 25 centralized purchased drugs in clinical use, among which neither original drugs
29 nor generic drugs had a significant change in the DDDc after the implementation of “4+7”
30 policy. This finding is consistent with Wang et al.’s report in Shenzhen ³¹. As mentioned above,
31 NCDP policy triggered linkage price reduction effect, while the effect might still be very limited
32 and has not yet spread to the alternative drugs. In addition, subgroup analysis revealed that
33 the DDDc of alternative generic drugs increased in the primary medical institutions,
34 suggesting the need to strengthen the use management of non-centralized purchased drugs
35 in primary medical institutions.

1 It is known that, among the 25 “4+7” List drugs, only 3 drugs were original drug company won
2 the bid ¹³. The present study found that the use proportion of generic drugs in the “4+7” List
3 drugs increased from 60.73% to 77.80% under the policy intervention, that is, 17.08% of the
4 original drugs were replaced by generic drugs in the pilot cities. International experiences
5 reach an agreement that it is a feasible practice for developing countries to control drug costs
6 by encouraging the substitution use of generic drugs ¹. Meanwhile, it is an important mission
7 of China's pharmaceutical supply guarantee system reform to promote the development and
8 innovation of the Chinese pharmaceutical industry and improve the international
9 competitiveness of domestic enterprises ³⁵. This study found that the expenditures of “4+7”
10 List drugs dropped by 98.57% after the policy, and the expenditure proportion of generic
11 drugs slightly increased. It can be seen that, by guiding the adjustment of the use structure of
12 original and generic drugs, NCDP policy played positive effects on controlling drug costs and
13 forcing the development of domestic pharmaceutical enterprises ³⁶.

14 Nine pilot cities were involved in the present study, and they varied in the changes of use
15 structure between original and generic drugs under policy intervention. For example, in
16 Xiamen and Shenyang, 47.2% and 29.1% of the original drugs were substituted by generic
17 drugs, while the proportions were only 10.9% and 15.2% in Shanghai and Chongqing. Such
18 differences between pilot cities might be related to the initiative and effectiveness of local
19 governments in implementing the national bidding results. What's more, the baseline drug use
20 structure of a certain city should be considered ⁵⁻⁸, for the cities with a higher use proportion
21 of original drugs prior to policy implementation, there is naturally more space for generics
22 substitution.

23 In different types of public medical institutions, different changes were found in the use
24 structure between original and generic drugs. After “4+7” policy, the growth rate of generics in
25 the “4+7” List drugs showed a trend of tertiary (84.95%) > secondary (42.62%) > primary
26 medical institutions (29.17%), consistently, the increased value in the use proportion of
27 generics presented the same trend of tertiary (25.27%) > secondary (15.08%) > primary
28 medical institutions (12.00%). Clearly, the generic substitution induced by NCDP policy was
29 more widespread in large hospitals, which might be related to their higher baseline use
30 proportion of original drugs, as well as their greater space for generics substitution ^{5,6}.

31 Meanwhile, it is indicated that the policy management and implementation of large hospitals
32 might be better.

33 We also recognized that the changes of use structure between original and generics products
34 varied greatly for each “4+7” List drug (by generic name) under “4+7” policy. For example, the
35 top three drugs with the largest increment in the use proportion of generics were Montelukast

1 (27.42%), Atorvastatin (26.34%), and Levetiracetam (25.27%). Similarly, the baseline use
2 structure between original and generic products for each “4+7” List drug in different cities
3 should be taken into account. Meanwhile, it is suggested to strengthen the analysis and
4 evaluation regarding the differences between original drugs and generic drugs in quality and
5 efficacy², and provide decision-making support for the safe substitution of generic drugs.

6 According to the NHSA of the PRC, the use proportion of high-quality drugs, i.e. original
7 drugs and generics passed consistency evaluation, increased from 50% to more than 90% in
8 eleven “4+7” pilot cities after the implementation of “4+7 policy”³⁷. This data illustrates that the
9 policy is conducive to improving the overall quality level of drug use in China. In this study, we
10 calculated the use proportion of bid-winning products and non-winning original drugs in 9 pilot
11 cities, and found that the proportion raised prominently from 39.66% to 91.93%, with the
12 increment of 52.27 percentage points. This finding is generally in line with the NHSA's report
13³⁷. In the future, with the continuous promotion of NCDP policy, generic drugs that fail to pass
14 the consistent evaluation will be phased out of the market, and the drug use of the Chinese
15 public will gradually concentrate on high-quality medicines³⁸. In addition, we found that, in
16 different types of medical institutions, the increased value of the use proportion of bid-winning
17 products and non-winning original drugs showed a trend of tertiary (25.92 percentage points)
18 < secondary (47.99 percentage points) < primary medical institutions (49.52 percentage
19 points). This revealed that NCDP policy has great accessibility and plenty of patients can
20 benefit from this policy at the community level.

21 There is a lot of controversy regarding the quality consistency between the generic drugs
22 passed the consistency evaluation and original drugs. Previous researchers proposed that
23 the bioequivalence identified in the generic consistency evaluation is not exactly equivalent to
24 clinical pharmacological equivalence^{39,40}. For example, He et al.⁴¹ and Gu et al.⁴² mentioned
25 that some of the bid-winning generic drugs in “4+7” policy were observed with poor
26 therapeutic efficacy and increased adverse reactions compared to the original drugs.
27 Conversely, a lasted multicenter prospective study regarding antihypertensive drugs found no
28 significant differences between generic and brand-name antihypertensive drugs in the
29 efficacy and prognosis among Chinese hypertensive patients⁴³. Therefore, it is suggested to
30 make full use of large-scale real-world data, and further carry out clinical comprehensive
31 evaluation based on real-world evidence, to provide evidence support for consolidating the
32 drug quality basis of NCDP policy.

33 **Limitations**

34 This study had several limitations. First, 11 cities were selected as pilot cities in the “4+7”
35 policy, while this study only included 9 pilot cities for analysis due to the incomplete data of

1 two pilot cities (Guangzhou and Shenzhen) in the CDSIP database. Besides, considering the
2 impact of the COVID 2019 epidemic in the first half of 2020, this study only used the data
3 from January 2018 to December 2019, while the policy implementation was less than one
4 complete procurement cycle during this period. Thus, this study has a certain imperfection in
5 terms of sample cities and study periods. Second, this study used drug purchase data, rather
6 than drug use data (such as prescriptions). Although there is strong consistency between
7 purchase data and use data under a series of policies, there is still a possibility that the two
8 data sources may not exactly match, so there are certain limitations. Therefore, in the future,
9 further in-depth analysis by using clinical use data of policy-related drugs might make more
10 sense.

11 **CONCLUSION**

12 The implementation of “4+7” policy promoted the substitution use of generic drugs against
13 original drugs in 9 pilot cities, with the substitution ratio of 17.8% among the “4+7” List drugs.
14 The substitution use of generic drugs played a positive role in drug costs saving and the
15 development of domestic pharmaceutical enterprises. After the implementation of “4+7” policy,
16 the DDDc of bid-winning generic and original drugs significantly dropped, as well as the
17 DDDc of non-winning original drugs. While the increased DDDc of non-winning generic drugs
18 draws the importance of further monitoring. We also found that the implementation of “4+7”
19 policy significantly improved the overall quality level of drug use of public medical institutions,
20 especially in primary medical institutions.

21 **CRedit author statement**

22 **Jing Wang:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Project administration, Resources, Validation,
23 Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Ying Yang:** Conceptualization, Data
24 curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Visualization, Writing -
25 original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Luxinyi Xu:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing -
26 original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Yuan Shen:** Data curation, Resources, Supervision,
27 Validation, Writing - review & editing. **Xiaotong Wen:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing -
28 review & editing. **Lining Mao:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing. **Quan**
29 **Wang:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration,
30 Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review & editing. **Dan Cui:** Conceptualization,
31 Data curation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources,
32 Supervision, Validation, Writing - review & editing. **Zongfu Mao:** Conceptualization, Project
33 administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing - review & editing. All authors have read and
34 approved the final version of the manuscript.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 The authors wish to acknowledge Prof. Lu Xiao (Science and Technology Development
3 Center, Chinese Pharmaceutical Association), Prof. Wanyu Feng (Department of Pharmacy,
4 Peking University People's Hospital), and Prof. Li Yang (School of Public Health, Peking
5 University), for their help in study design. We thank the Department of Drug Information
6 Management, Statistical Information Centre of the National Health Commission of the PRC
7 for the support in regarding research data.

8 **Funding**

9 This work was supported by the Global Health Institute, Wuhan University, China. The role of
10 funding body included designing the study, analysis and interpretation of data, and writing the
11 manuscript.

12 **Competing interests**

13 The authors declared no conflict of interest.

14 **Patient consent for publication**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Ethics statement**

17 This study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Faculty
18 of Medical Sciences, Wuhan University (IRB number: 2019YF2050). In this study, we only
19 included the drug procurement information and all the information was anonymous. Neither
20 patients nor the public were involved in this research.

21 **Data availability statement**

22 The data used in this study is not publicly available. The dataset (CDSIP database) used and
23 analyzed during the current study is available from the corresponding author on reasonable
24 request. In this study, no additional data is used.

25 **Patient and public involvement**

26 No patient involved.

27 **ORCID ID:** Ying Yang <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9252-5071>

28 **REFERENCES**

29 1. Cameron A, Mantel-Teeuwisse AK, Leufkens HG, Laing RO. Switching from originator

- 1 brand medicines to generic equivalents in selected developing countries: how much
2 could be saved? *Value Health* 2012;15(5):664-73
- 3 2. Li L, Du L, Zhang Y, Mei D. Inter-Changeability between Generic Medicines and
4 Brand-name Medicines. *Chinese Pharmaceutical Journal* 2015;50(02):178-181
- 5 3. Chen J, Fan P, Han S, Lin F, Shi L. Analysis of generic drug policy in China.
6 2021;42(01):16-20
- 7 4. Ma Z, Li Y. Research Progress of Generic Drug Conformance Assessment at Home and
8 Abroad. *Chinese Journal of Drug Evaluation* 2018;35(04):288-291
- 9 5. Li H, Guan X, Xu L et al. Empirical research of price difference and market share between
10 brand-name drugs and generics in one province in China. *Chinese Journal of New
11 Drugs* 2012;21(24):2853-2856+2874
- 12 6. Huang Z, Liu S, Wei X et al. Originals and Generics Utilization Analysis of Cardiovascular
13 Medicines in 85 Secondary and Tertiary Public Hospitals in Beijing. *Chinese Journal of
14 Pharmacoepidemiology* 2017;26(07):490-495
- 15 7. Li H, Zhu J, Chen Y. Usage of Original and Generic Antihypertensive Drugs in a Special
16 Outpatient Department of a Hospital. *China Pharmaceuticals* 2019;28(10):90-93
- 17 8. Tang Y, Chen J, Li X. Utilization Analysis of the Original and Generic Drugs for
18 Hypertension and Diabetes in a Tertiary Public Hospital in Jiangsu Province. *China
19 Pharmacy* 2019;30(21):2890-2894
- 20 9. Cahn L. Focus on the patent cliff to maximize generic savings. *Manag Care*
21 2012;21(11):28-32
- 22 10. Center for Drug Evaluation, NMPA. 2018 Drug Review Report. 2019;
23 <http://www.cde.org.cn/news.do?method=largelInfo&id=b9d07dad8486701e>. Accessed
24 May 29, 2021.
- 25 11. World Health Organization. Operational principles for good pharmaceutical procurement.
26 1999;
27 [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/66251/WHO_EDM_PAR_99.5.pdf;jsessi
28 onid=EE0982FC343F7CBE882EE1080B8E3608?sequence=1](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/66251/WHO_EDM_PAR_99.5.pdf;jsessionid=EE0982FC343F7CBE882EE1080B8E3608?sequence=1). Accessed May 31,
29 2021.
- 30 12. General Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China. Pilot Program for
31 National Centralized Drug Procurement and Use. 2019;
32 http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2019-01/17/content_5358604.htm. Accessed
33 January 9, 2021.
- 34 13. Joint Procurement Office. The results of 4+7 city drug centralized procurement. 2018;
35 <http://www.smpaa.cn/gjsdcg/2018/12/07/8531.shtml>. Accessed 25 Nov 2020.
- 36 14. Wang H, Li X, Chen J. Impact of "4+7" City Drug Centralized Procurement Program
37 on the utilization of original and generic cardiovascular drugs in a tertiary hospital.
38 *Journal of Pharmaceutical Practice* 2020;38(04):373-378
- 39 15. Zou G, Zhao J, Mei Q et al. Analysis of Application of Original Drugs and Generic Drugs
40 after the Implementation of "4+7 Cities" Group Procurement of Drugs in Guangdong
41 Second Provincial Central Hospital. *Evaluation and analysis of drug-use in hospitals of
42 China* 2020;20(07):854-858
- 43 16. Johansen ME, Richardson C. Estimation of Potential Savings Through Therapeutic
44 Substitution. *Jama Intern Med* 2016;176(6):769
- 45 17. Chen L, Yang Y, Luo M et al. The Impacts of National Centralized Drug Procurement
46 Policy on Drug Utilization and Drug Expenditures: The Case of Shenzhen, China. *Int J*

- 1 *Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17(24)
- 2 18. Yang Q, Guo W, Liu S. Effects of procuring with target quantity on using antipsychotics at
- 3 a hospital. *Chinese Journal of Hospital Pharmacy* 2020:1-6
- 4 19. Deng J, Tian H, Guo Y et al. A retrospective and prospective assessment of the
- 5 zero-markup drug reform in China from the perspective of policy diffusion. *Int J Health*
- 6 *Plann Manage* 2018;33(4):e918-e929
- 7 20. General Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China. Guiding Opinions
- 8 on Improving the Centralized Drug Procurement in Public Hospitals (Guobanfa [2015]
- 9 No. 7). 2015; http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2015-02/28/content_9502.htm.
- 10 Accessed March 6, 2021.
- 11 21. Wang Y, Wu Z. Keypoint Analysis of Monitoring Plan for Centralized Drug Purchase and
- 12 Use Project Pilot Launched Organized by State. *China Pharmacy*
- 13 2019;30(17):2317-2322
- 14 22. WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology. ATC/DDD Index 2021. 2021;
- 15 https://www.whocc.no/atc_ddd_index/. Accessed March 6, 2021.
- 16 23. WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology. Guidelines for ATC
- 17 classification and DDD assignment 2021. 2021; <http://www.whocc.no>. Accessed March
- 18 6, 2021.
- 19 24. Shen M, Hu M, Zeng N, Sun Z. Application of the Difference-in-difference Model in
- 20 Medical Research. *Chinese Journal of Health Statistics* 2015;32(03):528-531
- 21 25. Ye F, Wang Y. Introduction and Application of the Difference-in-difference Model.
- 22 *Chinese Journal of Health Statistics* 2013;30(01):131-134
- 23 26. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best
- 24 Practices for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu Rev Publ Health* 2018;39(1):453-469
- 25 27. Zhang F, Wagner AK, Soumerai SB, Ross-Degnan D. Methods for estimating confidence
- 26 intervals in interrupted time series analyses of health interventions. *J Clin Epidemiol*
- 27 2009;62(2):143-148
- 28 28. Hu R, Lin M. Application of Difference-Difference Method in Public Policy Evaluation.
- 29 *FINANCIAL MINDS* 2018;3(03):84-111+143-144
- 30 29. Hursh SR. Behavioral economics of drug self-administration: an introduction. *Drug*
- 31 *Alcohol Depen* 1993;33(2):165-172
- 32 30. Hursh S, Bauman R. The behavioral analysis of demand. 1987:117-165
- 33 31. Wang N, Yang Y, Xu L, Mao Z, Cui D. Influence of Chinese National Centralized Drug
- 34 Procurement on the price of policy-related drugs: an interrupted time series
- 35 analysis. *Preprints* 2021;(2021040157)
- 36 32. Li D, Bai X. The General Mechanism of Reducing the Price of Medicines by Quantity
- 37 Purchase and the Analysis of "4+7 Recruitment Mode". *Health Economics Research*
- 38 2019;36(08):10-12
- 39 33. Fu H, Li L, Yip W. Intended and unintended impacts of price changes for drugs and
- 40 medical services: Evidence from China. *Social science & medicine (1982)*
- 41 2018;211:114-122
- 42 34. Yip W, Hsiao WC. The Chinese health system at a crossroads. *Health Aff (Millwood)*
- 43 2008;27(2):460-8
- 44 35. State Council of the People's Republic of China. Healthy China 2030 blueprint. 2016;
- 45 http://www.gov.cn/gongbao/2016-11/20/content_5133024.htm. Accessed January 29,
- 46 2021.

- 1 36. Huang Y, Tao L. The Influence of Drug Centralized Group Procurement Policy to Chinese
2 Pharmaceutical Industry—An Analysis Based on Perspective of Industrial Economics.
3 *China Health Insurance* 2020;(02):64-67
- 4 37. National Healthcare Security Administration of the People's Republic of China. Answer to
5 Reporters' Request about the Second Round of National Centralized Drug Procurement
6 and Use. 2020; http://www.nhsa.gov.cn/art/2020/1/17/art_38_2264.html. Accessed
7 January 29, 2021.
- 8 38. Mao Z, Yang Y, Chen L. Reform of Drug Supply and Guarantee System in China: Policy
9 Measures and Effects. 2020:96-123
- 10 39. Chen Y, Ding J, Hao L, Tang D. Centralized Procurement or Purchasing by Price
11 Negotiation? Research on the Procurement Mode of Biological Analogues. *Chinese*
12 *Journal of Pharmaceuticals* 2020;51(04):539-544
- 13 40. Tian J. Why is there a difference in efficacy between generic drugs and original drugs?
14 *China Drug Store* 2014;(20):14-15
- 15 41. He J, Tang M, Cong L et al. The impact of National Centralized Drug Procurement on the
16 clinical management and drug use. *Chinese Health Resources* 2021:1-3
- 17 42. Yang Q, Gu H. Investigation of the implementation status of national centralized drug
18 procurement in community health service centers of Shanghai. *Shanghai Medical &*
19 *Pharmaceutical Journal* 2020;41(04):11-14
- 20 43. Zhang SY, Tao LY, Yang YY et al. Evaluation of blood pressure lowering effect by generic
21 and brand-name antihypertensive drugs treatment: a multicenter prospective study in
22 China. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2021;134(3):292-301
- 23

1 **Table 1.** Changes in the volume, expenditures, and DDDc of original drugs and generic drugs
 2 in the pilot cities.

	Volume (million DDD)			Expenditures (million CNY)			DDDc (CNY)		
	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)
Bid-winning products									
Original	15.94	28.54	79.04	159.24	158.41	-0.52	9.99	5.55	-44.44
Generic	211.04	1442.98	583.76	1530.40	2197.85	43.61	7.25	1.52	-79.00
Subtotal	226.98	1471.53	548.31	1689.63	2356.25	39.45	7.44	1.60	-78.49
Non-winning products									
Original	692.14	430.72	-37.77	5805.84	3067.46	-47.17	8.39	7.12	-15.10
Generic	883.90	166.92	-81.12	4304.79	1339.77	-68.88	4.87	8.03	64.81
Subtotal	1576.04	597.64	-62.08	10110.63	4407.23	-56.41	6.42	7.37	14.95
“4+7” List drugs									
Original	708.08	459.26	-35.14	5965.07	3225.86	-45.92	8.42	7.02	-16.62
Generic	1094.93	1609.90	47.03	5835.19	3537.62	-39.37	5.33	2.20	-58.77
Subtotal	1803.02	2069.16	14.76	11800.26	6763.48	-42.68	6.54	3.27	-50.06
Alternative drugs									
Original	1046.39	1120.73	7.10	4303.76	5314.90	23.49	4.11	4.74	15.30
Generic	1067.53	1271.34	19.09	4278.78	5163.61	20.68	4.01	4.06	1.33
Subtotal	2113.93	2392.07	13.16	8582.54	10478.51	22.09	4.06	4.38	7.89
Overall policy-related drugs									
Original	1754.48	1579.99	-9.95	10268.83	8540.77	-16.83	5.85	5.41	-7.64
Generic	2162.47	2881.24	33.24	10113.97	8701.22	-13.97	4.68	3.02	-35.43
Subtotal	3916.94	4461.24	13.90	20382.80	17241.99	-15.41	5.20	3.86	-25.73

3 DDD, defined daily dose; CNY, Chinese Yuan; DDDc, defined daily drug cost; GR, growth rate. Pre-
 4 refers to March to November 2018; Post- refers to March to November 2019.

1 **Table 2.** Changes in the volume proportion and expenditure proportion of generic drugs
 2 among 25 “4+7” List drugs in the pilot cities.

	Volume proportion (%)			Expenditure proportion (%)		
	Pre-	Post-	D-value	Pre-	Post-	D-value
Atorvastatin	42.07	68.41	26.34	35.65	28.48	-7.17
Escitalopram	96.93	98.61	1.68	98.03	97.85	-0.18
Amlodipine	56.51	75.84	19.33	26.86	20.61	-6.25
Olanzapine	93.72	91.39	-2.33	86.88	81.57	-5.31
Irbesartan	65.23	79.01	13.78	49.81	36.58	-13.22
Irbesartan hydrochlorothiazide	80.87	89.41	8.54	73.72	74.40	0.68
Entecavir	81.85	92.22	10.37	64.36	38.63	-25.74
Flurbiprofen	2.34	6.55	4.21	0.48	5.18	4.70
Fosinopril	29.91	3.34	-26.57	23.99	6.00	-18.00
Gefitinib	29.44	19.05	-10.39	21.26	18.92	-2.34
Lisinopril	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Risperidone	64.59	80.00	15.41	44.73	47.52	2.79
Clopidogrel	58.97	77.19	18.22	45.25	49.58	4.33
Losartan	58.16	80.12	21.95	53.20	53.75	0.55
montmorillonite	75.51	93.12	17.60	33.34	82.43	49.08
Montelukast	44.86	72.28	27.42	40.87	58.28	17.41
Paroxetine	77.61	90.82	13.22	60.00	71.54	11.54
Pemetrexed disodium	93.15	93.78	0.64	83.94	85.53	1.60
Rosuvastatin	69.16	83.32	14.15	59.38	53.99	-5.39
Tenofovir disoproxil	83.90	96.69	12.79	83.59	89.85	6.26
Cefuroxime	98.09	99.11	1.01	97.31	97.83	0.53
Imatinib	78.68	84.70	6.03	26.73	31.88	5.15
enalapril	99.01	99.73	0.72	98.51	99.47	0.96
Dexmedetomidine	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Levetiracetam	4.69	29.95	25.27	3.39	23.05	19.65
Total	60.73	77.80	17.08	49.45	52.30	2.86

3 D-value, difference value. Pre- refers to March to November 2018; Post- refers to March to November
 4 2019.

1 **Table 3.** DID analysis for the change in purchase volume, expenditures, and DDDc of original
 2 and generic drugs between the pilot group and control group.

	Volume			Expenditure			DDDc		
	Overall	Original	Generic	Overall	Original	Generic	Overall	Original	Generic
Bid-winning products									
Constant, β_0	15.80***	0.93***	14.87***	126.29***	19.08***	107.22***	8.04***	20.62***	7.25***
Time, β_1	3.82*	0.39**	3.44**	31.36**	10.24***	21.13*	0.003	1.75	-0.25*
Treat, β_2	8.92***	0.90***	8.02***	59.18***	0.42	58.76***	-0.51***	-9.97***	0.01
Treat*Group, β_3	134.96***	0.95***	134.01***	44.97*	-12.14**	57.11**	-5.93***	-6.85***	-5.49***
R^2	0.980	0.812	0.981	0.738	0.333	0.795	0.989	0.914	0.993
RC (%)	854.08	102.25	901.20	35.61	-63.62	53.26	-73.75	-33.20	-75.74
Non-winning products									
Constant, β_0	93.17***	30.45***	62.71***	610.64***	303.89***	306.75***	6.60***	10.00***	4.95***
Time, β_1	22.58**	10.71***	11.87*	139.10**	80.25***	58.85*	-0.13	-0.67***	-0.05
Treat, β_2	84.28***	46.75***	37.53***	511.32***	337.56***	173.76***	-0.28*	-1.69***	-0.15
Treat*Group, β_3	-133.63***	-40.06***	-93.58***	-771.37***	-380.87***	-390.50***	1.18***	-0.54**	3.64***
R^2	0.823	0.889	0.813	0.808	0.853	0.774	0.692	0.940	0.920
RC (%)	-143.43	-131.53	-149.21	-126.32	-125.33	-127.30	17.89	-5.35	73.66
“4+7” List drugs									
Constant, β_0	108.97***	31.38***	77.58***	736.94***	322.97***	413.97***	6.81***	10.30***	5.39***
Time, β_1	26.41**	11.10***	15.31*	170.46**	90.48***	79.98*	-0.11	-0.57***	-0.07
Treat, β_2	93.20***	47.65***	45.55***	570.50***	337.98***	232.51***	-0.34**	-1.94***	-0.13
Treat*Group, β_3	1.33	-39.10***	40.43**	-726.40***	-393.01***	-333.39***	-3.10***	-0.78***	-3.00***
R^2	0.795	0.885	0.793	0.739	0.835	0.601	0.970	0.963	0.964
RC (%)	1.22	-124.59	52.12	-98.57	-121.69	-80.54	-45.55	-7.60	-55.60
Alternative drugs									
Constant, β_0	175.89***	54.74***	121.14***	476.48***	194.23***	282.25***	2.73***	3.58***	2.34***
Time, β_1	19.10	5.88	13.22	100.14**	61.94***	38.20	0.23***	0.65***	0.04
Treat, β_2	64.77***	62.24***	2.54	515.74***	294.36***	221.39***	1.39***	0.60***	1.72***
Treat*Group, β_3	6.03	1.67	4.36	71.92	40.02	31.90	0.03	-0.08	-0.04
R^2	0.529	0.880	0.109	0.866	0.926	0.758	0.976	0.817	0.989
RC (%)	3.43	3.05	3.60	15.09	20.61	11.30	1.21	-2.32	-1.83
Overall policy-related drugs									
Constant, β_0	284.85***	86.13***	198.73***	1213.41***	517.20***	696.22***	4.30***	6.04***	3.54***
Time, β_1	45.51*	16.98**	28.53	270.60**	152.42***	118.18*	0.19*	0.46***	0.05
Treat, β_2	157.97***	109.88***	48.09*	1086.24***	632.34***	453.90***	0.90***	-0.17*	1.12***
Treat*Group, β_3	7.36	-37.43***	44.79*	-654.47***	-352.98***	-301.49***	-1.52***	-0.92***	-1.69***
R^2	0.691	0.879	0.540	0.766	0.863	0.614	0.911	0.807	0.950
RC (%)	2.58	-43.46	22.54	-53.94	-68.25	-43.30	-35.40	-15.18	-47.64

3 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. The data presented is the regression coefficient. RC, relative change.

1 **Table 4.** Changes in the volume proportion and expenditures proportion of generic drugs in
 2 different levels of medical institutions in the pilot cities.

	Tertiary			Secondary			Primary		
	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)	Pre-	Post-	GR (%)
Volume proportion									
Bid-winning products	94.93	97.77	2.84	94.75	98.29	3.54	89.98	98.19	8.21
Non-winning products	38.77	20.91	-17.86	65.81	38.45	-27.36	64.88	31.56	-33.32
“4+7” List drugs	47.54	72.81	25.27	69.88	84.96	15.08	67.38	79.37	12.00
Alternative drugs	37.24	39.75	2.51	55.04	58.12	3.08	57.97	60.49	2.52
Overall policy-related drugs	42.10	55.95	13.84	61.79	70.62	8.84	62.24	68.88	6.64
Expenditure proportion									
Bid-winning products	87.46	90.50	3.04	96.31	94.70	-1.62	92.98	97.54	4.56
Non-winning products	39.04	34.89	-4.15	54.66	40.82	-13.84	43.09	17.25	-25.84
“4+7” List drugs	46.01	53.04	7.03	61.30	64.66	3.36	49.81	45.22	-4.59
Alternative drugs	39.75	37.43	-2.32	59.77	61.16	1.39	58.55	60.42	1.87
Overall policy-related drugs	43.54	44.15	0.60	60.60	62.40	1.79	53.71	55.12	1.41

3 GR, growth rate. Pre- refers to March to November 2018; Post- refers to March to November 2019;

4 Tertiary means tertiary public hospital; Secondary means secondary public hospital; Primary means

5 government-run primary medical institution.

1 **Table 5.** DID analysis for the change in purchase volume of original and generic drugs in
 2 different levels of medical institutions between the pilot group and control group.

	Original drugs			Generic drugs		
	Tertiary	Secondary	Primary	Tertiary	Secondary	Primary
Winning products						
Constant, β_0	0.34***	0.43***	0.16***	9.01***	4.69***	1.18***
Time, β_1	0.17**	0.14*	0.07***	1.70*	1.34*	0.40***
Treat, β_2	0.30***	-0.18**	0.77***	1.32	-0.63	7.34***
Treat*Group, β_3	0.48***	0.08	0.39***	44.61***	22.23***	67.16***
R^2	0.758	0.490	0.909	0.965	0.957	0.991
RC (%)	139.18	19.49	245.63	495.18	474.58	5711.05
Non-winning products						
Constant, β_0	20.08***	8.78***	1.59***	20.67***	19.57***	22.47***
Time, β_1	4.97***	4.43***	1.30***	3.67*	3.28	4.92*
Treat, β_2	16.47***	0.38	29.90***	2.79	-1.76	36.50***
Treat*Group, β_3	-19.51***	-8.63***	-11.92***	-21.31***	-17.99***	-54.27***
R^2	0.777	0.705	0.967	0.768	0.754	0.889
RC (%)	-97.12	-98.34	-750.38	-103.08	-91.95	-241.51
"4+7" List drugs						
Constant, β_0	20.43***	9.21***	1.75***	29.68***	24.25***	23.65***
Time, β_1	5.15***	4.58***	1.38***	5.37*	4.62	5.32**
Treat, β_2	16.78***	0.20	30.67***	4.10	-2.39	43.84***
Treat*Group, β_3	-19.03***	-8.55***	-11.52***	23.30***	4.24	12.89*
R^2	0.767	0.686	0.970	0.782	0.308	0.908
RC (%)	-93.17	-92.82	-659.21	78.50	17.49	54.51
Alternative drugs						
Constant, β_0	30.55***	17.74***	6.45***	31.65***	34.87***	54.62***
Time, β_1	3.62	1.67	0.60	3.42	3.99	5.81
Treat, β_2	19.96***	-0.77	43.04***	-0.87	-13.40***	16.80**
Treat*Group, β_3	-0.31	-1.28	3.26	1.31	-1.36	4.41
R^2	0.768	0.069	0.968	0.108	0.544	0.453
RC (%)	-1.02	-7.20	50.51	4.14	-3.91	8.08
Overall policy-related drugs						
Constant, β_0	50.98***	26.95***	8.20***	61.33***	59.12***	78.27***
Time, β_1	8.76*	6.24**	1.98**	8.78	8.61	11.14
Treat, β_2	36.74***	-0.56	73.71***	3.23	-15.78**	60.64***
Treat*Group, β_3	-19.34***	-9.83***	-8.27*	24.61***	2.88	17.30
R^2	0.740	0.324	0.973	0.594	0.374	0.793
RC (%)	-37.94	-36.45	-100.85	40.13	4.87	22.11

3 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. The data presented is the regression coefficient.

4 RC, relative change. Tertiary means tertiary public hospital; Secondary means secondary public

5 hospital; Primary means government-run primary medical institution.

China Drug Supply Information Platform (CDSIP) database

- 7647 drugs (by generic name)
- 141,624 products (by YPID code)

Drugs related to "4+7" policy

- 122 drugs (25 "4+7" List drugs and 97 alternative drugs)
- 5906 products

Exclude drug purchase orders did not come from 9 pilot cities (Pilot Group) and 12 non-pilot provinces (Control Group).

Policy-related drugs purchased in Pilot Group and Control Group from January 2018 to November 2019



- 122 drugs (25 "4+7" List drugs and 97 alternative drugs)
- 3358 products

Samples in Pilot Group

- 116 drugs (25 "4+7" List drugs and 91 alternative drugs)
- 2545 products


Samples in Control Group

- 121 drugs (25 "4+7" List drugs and 96 alternative drugs)
- 2859 products



A: Bid-winning products; B: Non-winning products; C: "4+7" List drugs;
 D: Alternative drugs; E: Overall policy-related drugs

(a) Volume proportion



(b) Expenditure proportion

