

Life after patent: Drug price dynamics and cost-effectiveness analysis

Running title: Genericization pricing dynamics and cost-effectiveness

Miquel Serra-Burriel^{1,2}, Nicolau Martin-Bassols³, Gellért Perényi¹, Kerstin N. Vokinger¹

¹ Faculty of Law and Faculty of Medicine, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

² Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Prevention Institute, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

³ Centre for Health Economics, Monash University, Caulfield, Victoria, Australia

Abstract

This study analyzed the effects of patent expiration on drug prices in eight countries (US, UK, Canada, Australia, Japan, France, Germany, and Switzerland) and the impact of these price dynamics in cost-effectiveness assessments. First, using an event study design, we showed that average prices of drugs substantially decreased eight years after patent expiration. Then, to assess the implications of this finding for cost-effectiveness assessments, a theoretical cost-effectiveness model simulated two real-world scenarios: (1) the comparator drug was a generic and the patent of the new drug expired after market entry; (2) the comparator drug was also under patent protection, but the patent expired prior to the patent of the new drug. Not accounting for genericization or patent expiration of the comparator drug resulted in an underestimation or overestimation of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios, respectively. Our pricing dynamic estimates can be applied to base-case analyses of cost-effectiveness models.

Keywords: drug pricing, patent expiration, drug genericization, cost-effectiveness, drug price dynamics.

JEL Classification: I1; I11; I13; I18.

Correspondence: miquel.serraburriel@uzh.ch

Funding information: This study was partially funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant PCEGPI_194607).

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Word count: 3152

1. Introduction

The loss of patent protection for originator drugs and biologics (for simplicity both are referred to as “drugs”) is a crucial moment for manufacturers, patients and society at large. After a period of profit internalization by the innovator, society can benefit from the innovation at lower prices due to the market entry of generic versions of the originator drug that results in price competition (Frank & Salkever, 1997). However, the level of competition after generics and biosimilars (follow-on class of biologics, for simplicity both are referred to as “generics”) enter the market varies strongly across markets and nations (Beall et al., 2020; Carl et al., 2022). Companies of originator drugs have an incentive to delay or preclude the genericization of their products to extend their temporary monopoly with different strategies resulting in antitrust lawsuits (Böhme et al., 2021; Vokinger et al., 2017).

Cost-effectiveness analyses (CEA) of new drugs and biologics are usually conducted as a basis for price negotiations and reimbursement decisions, and to improve the efficiency of healthcare systems (Clement et al., 2009). CEAs are based on comparative analyses – the costs and effectiveness of the new originator drug are compared to those of an already marketed drug with the same indication. Therefore, the price of therapeutic alternatives tends to be the most significant contributing factor when determining the cost-effectiveness profiles of drugs. In general, originator drugs are under patent protection at market entry and patent expiration follows sometime after market entry. Most CEA’s use a fixed, non-dynamic price for the therapeutic alternatives. In previous studies, the assumption that prices will remain constant has been criticized with the reasoning that this does not adequately reflect the real-world setting (Guertin et al., 2015), and there have been debates on whether price dynamics of drugs should be incorporated into CEA’s (Hirst et al., 2015; Schans et al., 2020). Some argued that CEA estimates are rendered biased by not incorporating future price dynamics (Shih et al., 2016). In contrast, others highlighted that the CEA estimates are contingent to the target population and the timing of the investment (Guertin et al., 2015). Despite all these discussions, there is, in any case, i) a lack of estimates of pricing dynamics before and after patent loss of the new originator drug or comparative drug, and ii) unclarity of their influence on cost-effectiveness estimates (Hoyle, 2008; Hua et al., 2019). A recent review assessed to which degree there is clear guidance on

this issue, concluding that the omission of assumptions regarding genericization misguides long run opportunity costs assessments, and highlighting the need for further work in the area (Neumann et al., 2022).

The two most common real-world scenarios for the CEA of new originator drugs involve a comparison with either a generic drug or another originator drug under patent. In the first scenario, the price of the new originator drug is expected to substantially decrease after patent expiration, i.e., to improve its cost-effectiveness profile over time. As a result, its incremental cost-effectiveness ratio is presumably underestimated. In the second scenario, the patent of the comparator drug is expected to expire earlier than the patent of the new originator drug. In this case, ignoring the pricing dynamics will likely result in an overestimation of the cost-effectiveness of the new originator drug by assuming that the price of the comparator stays constant, and, thus, estimate a higher than the actual price after patent expiration.

In this study, we present for the first time a comprehensive genericization pricing dynamics estimation based on an event study design. First, we compared prices of new originator drugs before and after patent loss with drugs that did not experience patent loss in the same time period in eight major developed economies. Then, through simulation studies, we assessed the effects of incorporating such estimates into cost-effectiveness models based on their clinical profile and time to patent expiration. Overall, we found a steep progressive decrease in drug prices after patent expiration that varied significantly across countries. Finally, we created a theoretical cost-effectiveness model to simulate two common real-world scenarios: In the first scenario the new originator drug was compared with a generic drug, and the patent of the new originator drug expires after market entry. In the second scenario, both drugs – the new originator drug and the comparative drug – were under patent at the initial time point but the comparative drug lost patent prior to the new originator drug. For both scenarios we then analyzed how the incorporation of pricing dynamics affected the cost-effectiveness estimates. Our results demonstrate that in the first scenario the cost-effectiveness profile of the new originator drug is slightly underestimated, while in the second scenario the cost-effectiveness of the new originator drug is strongly overestimated.

The structure of this study is as follows: In section 2, we present both the statistical methods and data for the empirical analysis as well as the theoretical cost-effectiveness simulation model. In section 3, we outline the empirical and simulation results, and we discuss the results in section 4.

2. Methods

This study comprises two distinct parts: First, an empirical analysis of drug pricing dynamics, including the impact of price competition on drug prices before and after patent expiration, in eight countries (US, UK, Japan, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Switzerland). Second, a theoretical cost-effectiveness model was constructed to simulate two real-world scenarios with incorporated pricing estimates.

2.1 Data

We use drug pricing data from IQVIA data (IMS health) for the time period 2011 to 2020 for eight countries –US, UK, Japan, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Switzerland. The dataset contains quarterly information on list prices, units, companies, molecules, doses, and patent status for privately sold drugs. For the included countries, both retail and in-hospital sales data were available. Our unit of observation was at molecule level and our outcome was the unit-weighted average price for a given quarter. Table S1 presents the descriptive statistics of the analytical sample by included country, and Table S2 displays the observation availability with respect to the timing of the patent expiration alongside the patent status.

In our analytical sample, we included all drugs that were under patent protection at the start of the observation window. Drugs that lost their patent at any time point between 2011 and 2020 were classified in the “treatment” group, and those drugs that did not lose their patent in this time period were classified in the “control” group. Our data contained list prices adjusted for national inflation; we were not able to account for rebates (Kakani et al., 2020).

2.2 Empirical strategy

To identify the effects of patent expiration on drug prices, we leveraged the timing of patent expiration within countries between 2011 and 2020. We used quasi-experimental variation created by the staggered loss of patents, which under a certain set of assumptions allowed us to approximate the causal effect of patent expiration on drug prices with a difference-in-differences strategy. We estimated one model per country, independently.

The main assumption of our empirical strategy was that if drugs did not experience patent loss, their prices would have evolved in parallel to those under patent protection. Under this assumption, our model rules out that results are driven by constant price differences across drugs and common national pricing trends. To provide empirical support for this assumption, we estimated a dynamic version to examine the existence of pre-trends with the Callaway and Sant'Anna difference-in-differences estimator (Callaway & Sant'Anna, 2021). Another reason to use the estimator instead of a standard two-way fixed-effects model is that should the treatment effects be heterogeneous across time, the estimator would be inconsistent. The target estimand was the average treatment effect on the treated group (ATT), i.e., the effect of losing patent for those drugs for which the patent expired. Standard errors of the coefficients of interest were clustered at molecule level. We also performed the same model with number of competitors selling the molecule in the market as an outcome.

Finally, to provide suggestive evidence on the effect of competitor entry on price competition, we estimated the effect of one additional competitor in the market on the log price, using a panel design with country, substance, and time fixed-effects:

$$\log[E(y_{i,t,j})] = \beta_j X_{i,t,j} + \alpha_i + \gamma_{j,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t,j}$$

Where, $y_{i,t,j}$ is the unit-weighted price of molecule i , at calendar quarter t , in country j . The coefficient of interest is β_j , the marginal effect of one additional competitor on the log price per country, and $X_{i,t,j}$ is an indicator of the number of competitors selling a given molecule at a given time

period in a given country. α_i represents molecule fixed-effects, and $\gamma_{j,t}$ country-quarter fixed-effects. Finally, $\varepsilon_{i,t,j}$ is an idiosyncratic error term. We also included an additional specification with both linear and quadratic terms of number of competitors to provide suggestive evidence on the effect of the intensity of competition on prices.

We estimated the model with a quasipoisson specification, clustered the standard errors at the molecule-country level, and scaled the coefficients by two standard deviations (Gelman, 2008) to enhance comparability across countries. The estimates of this model must be interpreted cautiously as they represent a mechanistic approximation, and there might be factors not captured in the fixed-effects structure that simultaneously affect the price and the entry decision by competitors.

2.3 Theoretical cost-effectiveness modelling and simulation studies

To assess the influence of price dynamics after patent expiration on cost-effectiveness estimates, we created a simple health economic model. It compares two alternative treatments with survival of patients as the effectiveness metric. We created two scenarios that cover most scenarios found in health economic evaluations that aim to serve as a basis for price negotiation and reimbursement decisions.

In the first scenario, the originator drug was subject to patent protection for a time period prior to patent expiration, while the comparator drug was a generic. In the second scenario, both drugs, the originator and the comparator drug were under patent protection, with the latter losing patent protection prior to the originator drug.

The modelling was motivated by the fact that most economic evaluations of drugs occur when the new originator drug enters the market. In most cases, the new drug is under patent protection at market entry but will lose its patent within the modelling time window. The model includes incremental costs and survival effects discounted at a constant rate over the time horizon:

$$ICER = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\frac{\Delta C_t}{(1+r_c)^{(t-1)}}}{\frac{\Delta E_t}{(1+r_e)^{(t-1)}}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{(p_{bt}+c_{bt}) \cdot s_{bt} - (p_{at}+c_{at}) \cdot s_{at}}{\frac{(1+r_c)^{(t-1)}}{s_{bt}-s_{at}}} \cdot \frac{1}{(1+r_e)^{(t-1)}} \quad (ii)$$

Where incremental effectiveness ΔE_t expressed as the difference in survival rates $s_{bt} - s_{at}$ between intervention b and a , at time point t . Incremental costs ΔC_t are defined as the difference in drug price p_t plus non-drug costs c_t times the proportion of patients that survived S_t (assuming that patients receive therapy while alive) between interventions b and a . Both incremental costs and survival are discounted at r_c and r_e respectively. Derivations and special cases of the model are presented in the supplementary material.

We then incorporated the pricing estimates from the empirical assessment two, eight, and 14 years after target intervention introduction times. We presented three effectiveness scenarios with a different survival effects hazard ratios of (0.44, 0.58, 0.89), representing high, mid, and low effectiveness. We then assessed the extent of the influence that the introduction of pricing dynamics has depending on the abovementioned scenarios.

3. Results

3.1 Price levels

Overall, when comparing all eight included countries in the study, the US presented the highest drug prices, both on average and median terms. Mean list prices in the US were between 3.5 (Japan) and 1.6 (Germany) times higher for new originator drugs under patent protection, and 4.1 (Australia) and 1.7 (Switzerland) times higher for drugs without patent protection. The pattern was similar for median prices.

In terms of price developments over time, the US experienced the highest mean price increase over the 10-year period, with a 119% growth, while for the other countries the increase ranged from 10 to 30%. **Table 1** provides the summary statistics of prices.

3.2 Event study

Figure 1 presents the dynamic ATT estimates from our primary specification by country, and shows that after patent expiration, drug prices decreased in all countries. Our estimates pre-intervention also provide strong support for parallel trends in all countries, up to eight year pre-patent loss or 32 quarters.

Stark differences across countries were observed in terms of effect sizes. The US and Australia presented the steepest declines in prices, reaching 82% and 64% eight years after patent expiration in the US and Australia, respectively. Japan and Germany followed with an approximately 50% price decrease. Canada, France, Germany, and Switzerland presented the smallest price decrease with approximately 25%. **Table 2** presents the numeric estimates and confidence intervals for each country, and **Figure S1.1.** presents all estimates of the countries with their respective confidence intervals.

3.3 Competition

Overall, we found that after patent expiration the increase in the average number of generic competitors entering the market differed strongly between countries. **Figure S2** presents the event study estimates.

We found the highest number of competitors in Germany, with approximately 15 competitors entering the market up to eight years after patent expiration, followed by Japan (~10 competitors), France (~7 competitors), and the US (~7 competitors). Conversely, Australia, Canada, Switzerland, and the UK presented the lowest number of competitors with less than 5 generics entering the market after patent expiration. **Figure S3** presents all the point estimates to ease interpretation.

When examining the influence on the price per competitor, we found the greatest effect size for the US, **Figure S4** (standardized coefficients by two standard deviations). The estimates suggest that price competition varied greatly, and seemed to be independent from the number of competitors

that entered the market. **Figure S5** presents the estimates for both linear and quadratic coefficients of amount of competition. Overall, the estimates of the linear terms were stable.

3.3 Cost-effectiveness effects

The main results of our cost-effectiveness simulation models are presented in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3**. All the simulations incorporated the US genericization pricing estimates.

In the first scenario, we compared two drugs indicated for the same treatment. The first drug was a new originator drug with an annual price of \$200,000, the second drug was a generic comparator with an annual price of \$1,000, and annual non-pharmaceutical costs of \$50,000, over a 20-year time horizon. The model only included overall survival as the outcome of effectiveness, differentiating between three subscenarios – moderate, high, and low effectiveness. We then analyzed the ICERs for different scenarios, where patent expiration occurred two, eight and 14 years after the assessment. Our model revealed that if patent expiration occurs 14 years after market entry, ignoring price dynamics after patent expiration has a very small impact on ICERs, with an underestimation of 1%, 2%, and 5%, for the low, mid and high effectiveness cases. In contrast, if patent expiry occurs one year after the ICER assessment, the underestimation ranges from 33% to 40% of the ICER with constant prices.

In the second scenario, we compared two drugs indicated for the same treatment, both under patent protection at the time of ICER assessment. The new originator drug had an annual price of \$200,000. The comparator drug had an annual price of \$180,000, and annual non-pharmaceutical costs of \$50,000, with the same time horizon, effectiveness and discount rates as in the first scenario. We analysed three subscenarios: In the first subscenario, the comparator drug lost its patent two years after time zero and the new originator drug eight years after. In the second subscenario, the patent of both drugs expired eight years after time zero. In the final subscenario, the patent of the comparator drug expired eight years after time zero, while the patent for the new originator drug expired 14 years after time zero. We found that ignoring post-patent pricing dynamics had a significant impact on es-

timated ICERs, with an ICER overestimation ranging from 19 to 125% when the comparator's patent expired prior to the new originator drug.

The results can be summarized as follows: First, if the new originator drug under evaluation has a high effectiveness profile resulting in prolonged therapy administration (i.e., a drug for a chronic illness that is administered to the patient until death or progression), ignoring post-patent price dynamics underestimates the true ICER in cases where the comparator is a generic drug. Second, if the comparator drug is still under patent protection at the time of evaluation, but the patent will expire prior to the patent of the new originator drug, ignoring pricing dynamics severely overestimates its cost-effectiveness. Third, the closer the time duration between CEA and patent expiration, the higher is the bias of the true ICER.

4. Discussion

In this study, we present credible estimates of drug pricing dynamics and on the effects of patent protection loss on drug prices for eight developed economies. Our estimates demonstrate a generalized price decrease across nations after market entry of generic competitors, with a high degree of heterogeneity across countries. Stark differences in price trajectories before patent loss across countries were observed, likely reflecting the different priority settings and price negotiations for each healthcare system (Vokinger et al., 2021).

Our estimates revealed that the strongest price declines after patent expiration occurred in the US. However, each included country in our study presented its own particular dynamics. Our estimates can be incorporated into cost-effectiveness analyses, either as sensitivity analyses or for base-case scenarios (Woods et al., 2021). Additionally, our estimates can also be applied to models where both comparators are under patent protection at the time of the cost-effectiveness analysis, but the patent of the comparator drug will expire earlier than the new originator drug. A price decline of the comparator drug with a constant price of the new originator drug results in an overestimation of the cost-effectiveness of the new originator drug.

Our study has limitations. First, our dataset contained list prices for several countries. Many countries have initiated the incorporation of (confidential) rebates, for which we could not account for. If such rebates increase after patent loss, our estimates are biased upwards. Second, the comparability of prices across countries is compromised due to the difference in data sources extracted by IMS data.

5. Conclusion

We estimated significant decline in drug prices after patent expiration, ranging from 30 to 80% depending on the country eight years after patent expiration. Our results further showed that if the new originator drug under evaluation has a high effectiveness profile resulting in prolonged therapy administration, ignoring post-patent price dynamics underestimates the true ICER in cases where the comparator is a generic drug. Furthermore, if the comparator drug is still under patent protection at the time of evaluation, but the patent will expire prior to the patent of the new originator drug, ignoring pricing dynamics severely overestimates its cost-effectiveness. Lastly, the closer the time duration between CEA and patent expiration, the higher is the bias of the true ICER.

Our pricing dynamic estimates can be applied to base-case analyses of cost-effectiveness models across the lifecycle of drugs in the US, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Switzerland, and the UK.

References

- Beall, R. F., Ronksley, P. E., Wick, J., Darrow, J. J., Sarpatwari, A., & Kesselheim, A. S. (2020). Comparing Onset of Biosimilar Versus Generic Competition in the United States. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 108(6), 1308–1314. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.1981>
- Böhme, E., Frank, J. S., & Kerber, W. (2021). Optimal Incentives for Patent Challenges in the Pharmaceutical Industry. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 59(3), 503–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11151-021-09815-0/TABLES/1>
- Callaway, B., & Sant’Anna, P. H. C. (2021). Difference-in-Differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 200–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JECONOM.2020.12.001>
- Carl, D. L., Laube, Y., Serra-Burriel, M., Naci, H., Ludwig, W.-D., & Vokinger, K. N. (2022). Comparison of Uptake and Prices of Biosimilars in the US, Germany, and Switzerland. *JAMA Network Open*, 5(12), e2244670–e2244670. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.44670>
- Clement, F. M., Harris, A., Jing, J. L., Yong, K., Lee, K. M., & Manns, B. J. (2009). Using Effectiveness and Cost-effectiveness to Make Drug Coverage Decisions: A Comparison of Britain, Australia, and Canada. *JAMA*, 302(13), 1437–1443. <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMA.2009.1409>
- Frank, R. G., & Salkever, D. S. (1997). Generic Entry and the Pricing of Pharmaceuticals. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 6(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1430-9134.1997.00075.X>
- Gelman, A. (2008). Scaling regression inputs by dividing by two standard deviations. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(15), 2865–2873. <https://doi.org/10.1002/SIM.3107>
- Guertin, J. R., Mitchell, D., Ali, F., & LeLorier, J. (2015). Bias within economic evaluations – the impact of considering the future entry of lower-cost generics on currently estimated incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of a new drug. *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research*, 7, 497–503. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CEOR.S90386>

- Hirst, A., Murphy, D., & Vlachaki, I. (2015). Patent Expiry and Generic Pricing: The Impact on Cost-Effectiveness Results. *Value in Health*, 18(7), A703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2015.09.2635>
- Hoyle, M. (2008). Future drug prices and cost-effectiveness analyses. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 26(7), 589–602. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00019053-200826070-00006/FIGURES/TAB3>
- Hua, L. H., Hersh, C. M., Morten, P., Kusel, J., Lin, F., Cave, J., Varga, S., Herrera, V., & Ko, J. J. (2019). The impact of price reductions after loss of exclusivity in a cost-effectiveness analysis: Fingolimod versus interferon beta-1a for the treatment of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Journal of Managed Care and Specialty Pharmacy*, 25(4), 490–498b. <https://doi.org/10.18553/JMCP.2019.25.4.490/ASSET/IMAGES/SMALL/UFIG1.GIF>
- Kakani, P., Chernew, M., Chandra, A., Kakani, U. S. P., & Kennedy, J. F. (2020). *Rebates in the Pharmaceutical Industry: Evidence from Medicines Sold in Retail Pharmacies in the U.S.* <https://doi.org/10.3386/W26846>
- Neumann, P. J., Podolsky, M. I., Basu, A., Ollendorf, D. A., & Cohen, J. T. (2022). Do Cost-Effectiveness Analyses Account for Drug Genericization? A Literature Review and Assessment of Implications. *Value in Health*, 25(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JVAL.2021.06.014>
- Schans, S. van der, Vondeling, G. T., Cao, Q., Pol, S. van der, Visser, S., Postma, M. J., & Rozenbaum, M. H. (2020). The impact of patent expiry on drug prices: insights from the Dutch market. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20016689.2020.1849984>, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/20016689.2020.1849984>
- Shih, Y. C. T., Han, S., & Cantor, S. B. (2016). Impact of Generic Drug Entry on Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272989X04273139>, 25(1), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X04273139>
- Vokinger, K. N., Hwang, T. J., Daniore, P., Lee, C. C., Tibau, A., Grischott, T., Rosemann, T. J., & Kesselheim, A. S. (2021). Analysis of Launch and Postapproval Cancer Drug Pricing, Clinical

Benefit, and Policy Implications in the US and Europe. *JAMA Oncology*, 7(9), e212026–e212026. <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAONCOL.2021.2026>

Vokinger, K. N., Kesselheim, A. S., Avorn, J., & Sarpatwari, A. (2017). Strategies That Delay Market Entry of Generic Drugs. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 177(11), 1665–1669. <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAINTERNMED.2017.4650>

Woods, B., Fox, A., Sculpher, M., & Claxton, K. (2021). Estimating the shares of the value of branded pharmaceuticals accruing to manufacturers and to patients served by health systems. *Health Economics*, 30(11), 2649–2666. <https://doi.org/10.1002/HEC.4393>

List of Tables & Figures

Table 1. Absolute mean and median price levels by country, year, and patent status.

Table 2. Annual price change estimates with respect to patent protection loss.

Figure 1. Difference in different estimates by country.

Figure 2. Cost-effectiveness simulation scenarios with and without post-patent expiry prices for the new treatment.

Figure 3. Cost-effectiveness simulation scenarios with and without post-patent expiry prices for the new treatment and control arms.

Table 1. Absolute mean and median drug price levels by country, year, and patent status in US dollars (2020).

Year	Patent	Australia		Canada		France		Germany		Japan		Switzerland		UK		US	
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
2011	Protected	1254.7	680.3	2446.6	1010.4	2302.3	61.4	2399.3	536.6	1293.4	941.1	1969.4	15.8	1844.5	873.8	2556.3	589.6
2011	Unprotected	536.4	110.7	738.0	173.3	599.3	60.1	845.5	135.5	576.3	249.7	963.2	192.4	587.4	128.5	1133.4	354.2
2012	Protected	1256.9	603.2	2721.8	1459.5	1478.7	66.9	2930.4	1031.4	1482.6	865.1	2182.9	132.5	2410.3	867.7	3185.4	906.3
2012	Unprotected	585.9	117.3	840.9	184.1	586.6	57.5	851.4	132.8	552.1	242.0	996.1	184.1	605.4	181.6	1267.1	341.0
2013	Protected	1300.9	568.2	2634.7	1331.3	1342.0	150.5	3180.3	1265.9	1116.0	662.4	2161.5	150.0	2299.0	839.3	4031.2	975.5
2013	Unprotected	525.3	88.1	828.1	174.2	570.6	60.8	931.9	159.5	440.9	193.2	970.3	181.9	691.4	189.9	1361.7	353.6
2014	Protected	1535.1	620.4	2898.3	1361.6	1310.8	315.5	3014.0	1217.9	1068.0	707.6	2444.8	158.4	2621.7	904.4	4724.0	1526.5
2014	Unprotected	454.2	69.8	787.9	172.9	610.8	61.2	972.8	140.1	427.0	167.4	999.8	188.1	743.8	189.2	1392.7	382.8
2015	Protected	1319.0	380.8	2717.0	1186.8	1330.0	347.3	2828.9	1300.4	1235.0	644.0	2576.5	692.5	2533.6	1177.1	4745.5	1253.3
2015	Unprotected	339.1	51.8	676.3	148.0	490.3	50.1	984.6	121.1	412.9	147.5	1078.2	186.2	726.3	181.1	1734.8	463.3
2016	Protected	1466.3	391.8	2576.6	1092.7	1359.0	260.6	2937.4	1290.8	1369.9	714.5	2375.1	1039.6	2208.6	1075.3	4808.1	1439.5
2016	Unprotected	334.9	49.3	654.9	132.6	513.6	57.3	881.9	120.9	489.0	148.4	1038.3	204.8	726.0	149.8	1902.0	530.3
2017	Protected	1697.7	534.1	2720.6	1058.3	1385.8	587.1	2939.9	1428.8	1149.4	725.9	2634.1	1268.2	2243.8	1021.7	5089.4	1737.9
2017	Unprotected	354.1	48.9	663.0	129.0	597.9	62.6	861.0	132.5	506.4	137.5	1032.9	207.1	730.6	122.0	2097.2	519.7
2018	Protected	1634.7	475.4	2709.0	1073.0	2162.7	876.9	2973.9	1485.6	1273.9	806.2	2464.7	1180.3	2408.6	1060.3	5096.8	2040.7
2018	Unprotected	339.7	45.1	708.4	128.5	625.5	59.5	923.1	125.2	507.7	132.9	939.4	176.7	786.8	141.1	2103.0	431.7
2019	Protected	1536.0	440.1	2417.6	939.4	2137.0	907.8	2718.1	1324.0	1413.5	843.6	2219.9	1045.9	2352.3	1002.0	5395.2	2433.1
2019	Unprotected	338.8	39.9	694.3	118.1	595.0	56.9	883.7	115.8	493.4	123.7	883.2	161.3	803.8	127.7	1997.6	397.6
2020	Protected	1666.3	456.9	2588.2	1001.1	2227.4	899.1	2936.4	1413.3	1418.4	871.2	2435.3	1122.2	2434.1	1044.5	5586.8	2541.0
2020	Unprotected	315.3	35.2	690.5	120.1	571.7	57.4	833.4	116.2	492.2	119.6	922.8	162.0	817.7	121.4	1776.9	387.0


Notes: control group: never treated, 0 anticipation periods, doubly robust estimation, Callaway-Sant'Anna staggered difference-in-differences method.

Table 2. Annual drug price change estimates with respect to the period previous to patent protection expiration.

T	Australia		Canada		France		Germany		Japan		Switzerland		UK		US	
	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI	Exp(L)	95%CI
-8	1.02	0.96-1.08	1.03	0.93-1.15	1.02	0.97-1.07	0.93	0.75-1.15	1.01	0.99-1.03	0.97	0.88-1.08	0.97	0.88-1.08	0.95	0.89-1.02
-7	1.04	0.95-1.14	1.00	0.98-1.02	0.99	0.95-1.04	0.99	0.94-1.05	1.04	0.93-1.16	1.00	0.98-1.03	1.00	0.97-1.02	1.00	0.96-1.04
-6	0.99	0.95-1.03	1.03	0.96-1.1	1.00	0.98-1.03	1.00	0.95-1.05	1.01	0.99-1.04	0.99	0.97-1.01	1.01	0.99-1.03	0.99	0.96-1.01
-5	1.00	0.97-1.03	0.99	0.96-1.03	0.99	0.96-1.02	1.00	0.97-1.04	1.02	0.99-1.04	0.98	0.95-1.01	1.00	0.97-1.03	0.99	0.97-1.01
-4	0.98	0.94-1.02	1.00	0.98-1.01	1.02	0.99-1.05	1.01	0.97-1.05	1.01	0.98-1.04	1.00	0.99-1.01	1.00	0.99-1.01	1.00	0.98-1.02
-3	0.99	0.96-1.02	1.06	0.98-1.14	0.98	0.96-1	0.98	0.92-1.04	1.01	0.98-1.04	0.99	0.98-1.01	1.01	0.99-1.02	0.99	0.97-1.01
-2	1.02	0.99-1.05	1.00	0.98-1.01	1.01	0.98-1.05	0.99	0.95-1.03	1.00	0.98-1.02	1.01	1-1.02	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.99	0.97-1.01
-1	1.00	0.98-1.03	1.00	0.98-1.01	1.00	0.98-1.03	1.00	0.96-1.05	1.00	0.98-1.02	1.00	0.99-1.01	1.00	0.99-1.01	1.00	0.99-1.02
0	0.99	0.97-1.02	0.97	0.94-0.99	1.00	0.98-1.02	1.00	0.98-1.02	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.99	0.98-1	1.01	1-1.02	0.95	0.93-0.97
1	0.89	0.84-0.95	0.87	0.81-0.92	0.96	0.91-1.02	0.96	0.89-1.02	0.99	0.92-1.06	0.99	0.97-1.02	1.01	0.98-1.04	0.68	0.61-0.76
2	0.79	0.72-0.86	0.82	0.75-0.89	0.94	0.86-1.03	0.87	0.78-0.96	0.97	0.87-1.08	0.97	0.93-1.01	0.97	0.93-1.01	0.55	0.47-0.64
3	0.64	0.55-0.73	0.78	0.7-0.86	0.95	0.85-1.06	0.81	0.7-0.94	0.91	0.8-1.03	0.95	0.91-1	0.94	0.89-0.99	0.47	0.38-0.57
4	0.55	0.45-0.67	0.76	0.66-0.87	0.91	0.78-1.06	0.77	0.64-0.92	0.85	0.73-0.99	0.95	0.88-1.01	0.89	0.83-0.95	0.41	0.33-0.52
5	0.52	0.41-0.67	0.74	0.64-0.85	0.86	0.72-1.03	0.73	0.58-0.92	0.82	0.68-0.98	0.89	0.82-0.97	0.85	0.78-0.92	0.33	0.25-0.44
6	0.53	0.41-0.67	0.72	0.62-0.84	0.79	0.63-0.98	0.66	0.52-0.86	0.71	0.57-0.87	0.86	0.77-0.96	0.82	0.73-0.91	0.28	0.2-0.38
7	0.45	0.34-0.6	0.69	0.59-0.83	0.82	0.65-1.04	0.63	0.46-0.85	0.61	0.46-0.81	0.84	0.75-0.94	0.81	0.73-0.91	0.22	0.15-0.34
8	0.36	0.24-0.54	0.73	0.59-0.89	0.70	0.54-0.91	0.52	0.35-0.76	0.54	0.37-0.78	0.82	0.7-0.96	0.68	0.58-0.79	0.18	0.11-0.29


Notes: Control group: never treated, 0 anticipation periods, doubly robust estimation, Callaway-Sant'Anna staggered difference-in-differences method.

Figure 1. Difference-in-differences dynamics estimates by country.




Notes: Confidence intervals not displayed for comparison purposes (see Figure S1.1).

Figure 2. Cost-effectiveness simulation scenarios with and without post-patent expiry prices for the new originator drug.



Notes: Parameters for the simulation were: Price (annual) new treatment \$200,000, non-treatment annual costs \$50,000, price of comparator \$1,000. Scenarios a), b) and c) present different survival (effectiveness profiles). Scenario a): 0.58 HR, scenario b): 0.44 HR, scenario c) 0.89 HR scenario. Different columns present different times of patent expiry with relation to the investment assessment timing. The first column presents a scenario where the patented drug loses patent 2 years after introduction. The second column presents a scenario where the patent is lost 8 years after, and the third 14 years afterwards. The last column represents the survival profile of each treatment arm compared. For effectiveness scenario a) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an underestimation in the ICER of 33% for the first case, 8% for the second case, and 1% for the last case. For effectiveness scenario b) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an underestimation in the ICER of 45% for the first case, 19% for the second case, and 5% for the last case. For effectiveness scenario c) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an ov underestimation in the ICER of 40% for the first case, 12% for the second case, and 2% for the last case.

Figure 3. Cost-effectiveness simulation scenarios with and without post-patent expiry prices for the new originator drugs and their control arms.



Notes: Parameters for the simulation were: Price (annual) new treatment \$200,000, non-treatment annual costs \$50,000, price of comparator \$180,000. Scenarios a), b) and c) present different survival (effectiveness profiles). Scenario a): 0.58 HR, scenario b): 0.44 HR, scenario c) 0.89 HR scenario. Different columns present different times of patent expiry with relation to the investment assessment timing. The first column presents a scenario where the comparator is set to lose patent protection 2 years after the introduction of the new therapy, while the new one 8 years after introduction. The second column presents a scenario where both are set to lose patent 8 years after time 0. The third column presents a scenario where the comparator will lose patent 8 years after time 0 and the new treatment 14 years after. The last column represents the survival profile of each treatment arm compared. For effectiveness scenario a) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an overestimation in the ICER of 19% for the first case, an underestimation of 13% for the second case, and a 1% overestimation for the last case. For effectiveness scenario b) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an overestimation in the ICER of 7% for the first case, an underestimation of 30% for the second case, and a 2% overestimation for the last case. For effectiveness scenario c) assuming constant prices vs dynamic ones results in an overestimation in the ICER of 125% for the first case, an underestimation of 18% for the second case, and a 39% overestimation for the last case.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Cost-effectiveness model summary

Assume that the discount rates for both costs and effectiveness are the same ($r_c=r_e$) and further assume that the non-pharmaceutical cost of the treatment and the control group are equal ($c_{bt}=c_{at}$).

$$ICER = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\frac{\Delta C_t}{(1+r_c)^{(t-1)}}}{\frac{\Delta E_t}{(1+r_e)^{(t-1)}}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\frac{(p_{bt} + c_{bt}) * s_{bt} - (p_{at} + c_{at}) * s_{at}}{(1+r_c)^{(t-1)}}}{\frac{s_{bt} - s_{at}}{(1+r_e)^{(t-1)}}}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_{at} * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + c_{bt}$$

In the last step the two assumptions were used namely that $\frac{(1+r_c)^{(t-1)}}{(1+r_e)^{(t-1)}} = 1$ and that

$$\frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} + c_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_{at} * s_{at} - c_{at} * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} = \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_{at} * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + \frac{c_{bt} * (s_{bt} - s_{at})}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} = \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_{at} * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + c_{bt}$$

Further assuming that c_{bt} and p_{at} are constant over time (c_b, p_a) we can simplify to:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_a * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + c_b &= \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt} - p_a * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + c_b + \frac{p_a * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} - \frac{p_a * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + \frac{p_a * s_{bt} - p_a * s_{at}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} - \frac{p_a * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} + c_b \\ &= \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} \right] - p_a * \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} \right] - T * (p_a + c_b) \end{aligned}$$


Using in the last step that we can sum over p_a and c_b as they are constant in time.

Finally, by recentering the observations we can set p_a and c_b to 0, meaning that the control group has assumed cost zero, and then derive the final expression for ICER:

$$ICER = \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_{bt} * s_{bt}}{s_{bt} - s_{at}} \right]$$


Supplementary Results

Figure S1.1. Event study estimates of patent loss and prices, Callaway-Sant'Anna.



Notes: The time unit of estimation is at the molecule-quarter level. Standard errors are clustered at the molecule level, lines present 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S1.2. Event study estimates of patent loss and amount of competitors in the market.



Notes: Callaway-Sant'Anna difference in differences dynamic estimator. Standard errors are clustered at the molecule level, lines present 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S1.3. Event study estimates of patent expiration and number of competitors entering the market after patent expiration.






Figure S1.4. Estimates on the marginal effect of one additional competitor drug on prices of new originator drugs.



Notes: Estimates are standardized by two standard deviations, controlling for: molecule fixed-effects, calendar quarter fixed-effects, country fixed effects, weighted by standard units sold. Specification model: quasipoisson balanced panel.

Figure S1.5. Estimates on the effects of additional competitors drug on prices of new originator drugs, linear and quadratic effects.



Notes: Estimates are standardized by two standard deviations, controlling for: molecule fixed-effects, calendar quarter fixed-effects, country fixed effects, weighted by standard units sold. Specification model: quasipoisson balanced panel.

Table S1. Distribution of the drugs in the study cohort classified in therapeutic areas by countries (ATC-1st-level)

ATC group code	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Japan	Switzerland	UK	US
Alimentary tract and metabolism	46	37	26	35	52	30	35	56
Blood and blood forming organs	18	21	18	26	15	19	25	39
Cardiovascular system	21	35	25	35	31	38	33	40
Dermatologicals	9	10	4	8	9	5	7	11
Genito urinary system and sex hormones	12	8	11	9	7	10	10	15
Systemic hormonal preparations, excl. sex hormones and insulins	4	7	6	9	5	4	5	8
Anti-infective for systemic use	57	68	69	70	62	61	65	83
Antineoplastic and immunomodulating agents	88	94	96	106	97	86	97	118
Musculo-skeletal system	15	10	11	10	11	14	15	18
Nervous system	36	36	25	32	31	32	36	63
Respiratory system	19	18	16	20	17	14	18	21
Sensory organs	8	15	7	9	12	7	8	12
Various	2	2	3	6	3	1	2	4

Table S2. Time distribution of observation with and without patent loss by country.

Time	Australia Treated	Canada Treated	France Treated	Germany Treated	Japan Treated	Switzerland Treated	UK Treated	US Treated
-32	17	13	15	26	13	17	17	24
-31	18	16	18	29	16	20	20	27
-30	19	18	20	31	18	25	23	34
-29	21	24	24	35	21	30	28	40
-28	24	31	28	39	27	33	30	43
-27	33	32	29	41	30	37	33	49
-26	38	40	36	48	33	43	38	52
-25	47	44	41	52	38	46	41	54
-24	52	45	45	56	40	48	43	59
-23	55	48	47	59	43	50	47	64
-22	57	50	49	61	47	52	49	74
-21	63	54	52	65	50	55	54	81
-20	66	59	56	66	59	56	58	84
-19	73	68	62	73	62	62	66	100
-18	83	73	66	79	69	64	70	105
-17	88	80	73	90	72	68	76	116
-16	90	84	78	95	79	73	82	122
-15	94	89	84	101	82	83	85	130
-14	100	100	91	108	87	91	94	136
-13	111	104	94	110	94	93	98	152
-12	117	106	95	112	98	95	99	167
-11	123	110	102	120	105	103	104	177
-10	128	120	113	127	116	114	113	183
-9	134	126	120	135	121	117	121	193
-8	144	129	123	139	125	122	123	196
-7	150	138	125	142	132	123	127	200
-6	155	144	131	145	138	126	132	208
-5	159	150	138	149	146	131	138	224
-4	168	160	147	159	155	140	144	235
-3	174	171	149	163	162	144	149	246
-2	184	190	160	175	169	154	158	256
-1	184	190	160	175	169	154	158	256
0	191	204	173	187	183	169	172	272
1	188	200	168	182	185	166	171	265
2	185	195	164	176	180	160	169	261
3	177	186	161	174	178	153	159	257
4	171	186	161	170	178	149	156	251
5	168	182	149	159	175	140	148	247
6	163	182	149	159	174	138	148	244
7	161	175	142	152	172	131	145	242
8	160	173	140	152	169	134	145	240
9	161	172	137	149	165	132	143	241
10	160	170	133	148	162	129	142	232
11	159	164	129	141	161	127	137	230
12	155	160	128	139	156	126	135	226
13	145	155	128	137	154	125	134	217
14	142	146	125	128	150	115	130	215
15	133	145	119	127	142	113	126	213
16	127	142	120	125	141	111	124	208
17	122	140	119	124	142	110	121	205
18	121	140	119	122	139	105	120	193
19	114	140	115	121	137	107	117	187
20	113	138	116	118	124	103	111	181
21	107	130	109	111	121	98	105	162
22	99	127	109	107	115	96	99	155

23	96	120	99	101	111	91	94	146
24	95	112	94	95	106	88	87	143
25	90	107	89	90	102	83	86	135
26	85	98	78	80	96	72	75	128
27	72	95	77	78	90	73	75	116
28	68	91	77	76	87	69	73	101
29	63	84	66	67	80	64	67	92
30	59	78	59	61	66	55	60	87
31	52	72	52	52	61	51	53	79
32	44	70	47	47	59	49	50	76
Control†	146	149	128	174	156	154	179	222
Ratio	1.31	1.37	1.35	1.07	1.19	1.1	0.96	1.23

Notes: † never treated, i.e., never experienced patent loss in the observation window.