

## **Spiraling Drug Costs - Proposed Solutions (Part Two of a Two-Part Series)**

As stated in the first installment of this two-part series on rising pharmaceutical drug costs,<sup>1</sup> healthcare expenditures constitute approximately 17 percent of the U.S. *gross domestic product* (GDP), more than any other country in the world per capita.<sup>2</sup> However, the U.S. realizes poorer health outcomes than other developed countries on numerous measures.<sup>3</sup> One of the main factors for high healthcare expenditures is the rising cost of prescription drugs,<sup>4</sup> with drug net spending increasing by 20 percent from 2014.<sup>5</sup> Overall, pharmaceuticals expenditures comprises an estimated 16.7 percent of all healthcare costs in the U.S.<sup>6</sup> As discussed in the first installment of this two-part series, causes for these increased costs include: (1) the pharmaceutical industry's protection from competition; and, (2) uneven negotiating power among both government and private payors.<sup>7</sup> In the second installment of this two-part series, three proposed solutions for lowering costs will be discussed. These three proposed solutions include: (1) increasing marketplace competition among pharmaceutical companies; (2) expanding government flexibility with pharmaceutical price negotiations; and, (3) implementation of VBR programs on the provider level.<sup>8</sup>

Increasing competition in the pharmaceutical industry has been cited as a means to combat rising drug costs.<sup>9</sup> Several business practices, such as *evergreening* and *pay-for-delay* deals, can block or delay market entry of generic drugs, subsequently decreasing competition and increasing prices.<sup>10</sup> With *evergreening*, clinically irrelevant changes are made to a drug in order for the pharmaceutical company to extend the patent and maintain exclusivity rights on that product.<sup>11</sup> If the U.S. *Patent and Trademark Office* were to change their definition of what constitutes "*novelty*" when issuing patents, these insignificant changes, and their corresponding price increases, could potentially be avoided.<sup>12</sup> In recent years, several U.S. Supreme Court decisions have altered regulations on what products can be patented, such as those for DNA sequences, combination products, and diagnostic tests, among other pharmaceutical products.<sup>13</sup> Other countries, such as India, require pharmaceutical companies to show that a modified drug has increased effectiveness in order to receive a patent for it.<sup>14</sup> Implementation of a similar law in the U.S. may reduce drug costs significantly. Further, stronger government oversight and enforcement of existing laws, such as antitrust regulations against *pay-*

*for-delay* arrangements,<sup>15</sup> i.e., deals between two pharmaceutical companies to delay the release of a generic drug into the market, may greatly reduce drug costs by stifling anticompetitive business practices of pharmaceutical companies, consequently decreasing drug prices.<sup>16</sup>

Increasing the federal government's ability to negotiate drug prices with pharmaceutical companies may significantly reduce federal drug expenditures. The *Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act* of 2003 (MMA) established Medicare Part D, in which the federal government covers the cost of prescription drugs, but prohibits the Secretary of *Health and Human Services* (HHS) from "*interfer[ing] with the negotiations*" or "*institut[ing] a price structure*" for Medicare Part D drugs.<sup>17</sup> Because the federal government cannot negotiate for lower prices with pharmaceutical companies under Medicare Part D, a significant amount of Medicare benefit payments is spent on drug expenditures (approximately 14 percent of Medicare benefit payments were spent on drug expenditures in 2016, an increase from 9 percent in 2006).<sup>18</sup> A simple solution may be to remove this interference clause; however, with many private payors managing Medicare Part D, there are complex administrative and logistical obstacles to overcome before such a price negotiation can take place.<sup>19</sup> Unlike Medicare Part D, Medicaid has mandatory federal rebates and state-negotiated supplemental rebates, which grant significant discounts on drugs.<sup>20</sup> If Medicaid mandatory rebates are applied to Medicare Part D, then a 15 percent rebate could lead to a \$110 million reduction in federal expenditures between the years 2010 and 2019.<sup>21</sup> Further, when the MMA was passed, individuals who were dual-eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid were assigned to have drug costs covered by Medicare Part D, instead of Medicaid.<sup>22</sup> Switching dual-eligible individuals back to Medicaid, and taking advantage of those mandatory rebates, could lead to savings of up to \$2.8 billion annually.<sup>23</sup>

Changes at the provider-level may also serve to reduce drug prices, including physician education<sup>24</sup> and *value-based reimbursement* (VBR).<sup>25</sup> For example, information regarding drug costs and VBR models could be integrated into the medical school curriculum.<sup>26</sup> Additionally, *academic detailing*, or educational

outreach programs facilitated by pharmacists, nurses, and physicians, which uses pharmaceutical sales techniques in an academic, evidence-based manner to inform physicians about recent trends in drug advancements.<sup>27</sup> These programs have been shown to assist physicians in making more appropriate medication decisions in relation to cost and effectiveness, and are currently being implemented in numerous states and hospital systems.<sup>28</sup> Further, incentivizing physicians to make optimal decisions when prescribing medications through VBR models may help reduce drug expenditures. Two VBR models have been proposed, including the *clinical pathways* approach and the *bundled payment* approach.<sup>29</sup> In the *clinical pathways* approach, a board of physicians utilize evidence-based medicine to determine the least costly procedural regimen, and physicians are rewarded for compliance with this regimen through higher reimbursement rates and bonus payments.<sup>30</sup> This type of payment model led to a 35 percent reduction in drug costs when treatments established by the *U.S. Oncology Network*, a national oncology management organization, were adopted for lung cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy.<sup>31</sup> In the *bundled payment* approach, payors can bundle drug costs with other procedures performed during an *episode of care*, which may force pharmaceutical drug companies to lower prices to align with lower reimbursement rates.<sup>32</sup>

As described above, drug costs may be significantly lowered through enhanced market competition; increased government involvement in the price negotiation process; physician education; and, VBR. Attempts to decrease drug prices may have a significant impact on U.S. healthcare spending, given that almost half of pharmaceutical drugs are purchased by the government.<sup>33</sup> Reductions in drug expenditures may have major implications not only for drug consumers, who are burdened by out-of-pocket costs, but also for taxpayers, who fund federal government healthcare programs. Despite many of the potential solutions proposed for decreasing pharmaceutical drug costs, one of the most significant hurdles to the execution of these solutions is the lobbying power of the pharmaceutical industry, which spends more on lobbying efforts than any other industry.<sup>34</sup> Their lobbying power, however, may wane as an increasing number of politicians, including senators Bernie Sanders (D-NH) and Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), have publically criticized the industry.<sup>35</sup> President Donald Trump has also taken a public stance against rising pharmaceutical drug costs, stating that pharmaceutical companies are “*getting away with murder*.”<sup>36</sup> To date, however, the Trump Administration has not taken any action against the industry, other than revealing a draft of an Executive Order that may enhance, rather than stifle the industry’s efforts to increase drug costs.<sup>37</sup>

1 See part one of this two part series: “Perpetual Motion – Pharma Cost Spiral Persists” Health Capital Consultants, Vol. 10, Issue 8, August 2017, [https://www.healthcapital.com/hcc/newsletter/08\\_17/PDF/PHARMA.pdf](https://www.healthcapital.com/hcc/newsletter/08_17/PDF/PHARMA.pdf) (Accessed 9/12/2017).

2 “U.S Health Care from a Global Perspective: Spending, Use of Services, Prices, and Health in 13 countries” By David Squires and Chloe Anderson, The Commonwealth Fund, October 2015, <http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2015/oct/us-health-care-from-a-global-perspective> (Accessed 8/25/2017), p. 2.

3 *Ibid.*

4 “The High Cost of Prescription Drugs in the United States – Origins and Prospects for Reform” By Aaron S. Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., Journal of American Medical Association, August 2016, Vol. 316, No. 8 p. 859.

5 “Medicine Use and Spending in the U.S. - A Review of 2015 and Outlook to 2020” IMS Institute for Healthcare Informatics, April 2016, <https://morningconsult.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/IMS-Institute-US-Drug-Spending-2015.pdf> (8/25/2017), p. 1.

6 “Observations on Trends in Prescription Drug Spending” Department of Health and Human Services, ASPE Issue Brief, March 8, 2016, <https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/187586/Drugspending.pdf> (Accessed 8/17/2017).

7 Health Capital Consultants, August 2017.

8 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 2016, p. 865-866.

9 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 2016, p. 865.

10 Health Capital Consultants, August 2017.

11 “Pay-for-Delay Deals: Do They Hurt or Help Patients?” By Roxanne Nelson, R.N., Medscape, April 15, 2016, [http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/843231#vp\\_2](http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/843231#vp_2) (Accessed 8/17/2017).

12 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 30, 2016, p. 866.

13 *Ibid.*

14 *Ibid.*

15 Health Capital Consultants, August 2017.

16 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 30, 2016, p. 864.

17 “How Medicare Could Get Better Prices on Prescription Drugs” By Kevin Outterson and Aaron S. Kesselheim, Health Affairs, Vol. 28, No. 5 (July 2009) <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/28/5/w832.full> (Accessed 9/12/2017).

18 “The Facts on Medicare Spending and Financing” By Juliette Cubanski and Tricia Neuman, The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, July 18, 2017) <http://www.kff.org/medicare/issue-brief/the-facts-on-medicare-spending-and-financing/> (Accessed 9/22/2017).

19 Outterson and Kesselheim, July 2009.

20 *Ibid.*

21 *Ibid.*

22 *Ibid.*

23 *Ibid.*

24 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 30, 2016, p. 866.

25 “Changing Physician Incentives For Cancer Care To Reward Better Patient Outcomes Instead Of Use Of More Costly Drugs” By Lee N. Newcomer, Health Affairs, Vol. 31, No. 4 (April 2012) <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/31/4/780.long> (Accessed 9/11/2017).

26 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 30, 2016, p. 866.

27 “Academic Detailing Programs – What is academic detailing?” Alosa Health, 2017, <http://alosahealth.org/our-solutions/academic-detailing-programs> (Accessed 9/11/2017).

28 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., et al., August 30, 2016, p. 866.

29 Newcomer, April 2012.

30 *Ibid.*

31 “Cost Effectiveness of Evidence-Based Treatment Guidelines for the Treatment of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer in the Community Setting” By Marcus A. Neubauer, M.D., et al., Journal of Oncology Practice, Vol. 6, No. 1 (January 2010) <http://ascopubs.org/doi/pdf/10.1200/JOP.091058> (Accessed 9/11/2017).

32 Newcomer, April 2012.

33 Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H., August 2016, p. 859, 862.

34 “Lobbying – Top Industries” The Center for Responsive Politics, OpenSecrets.org, August 7 2017, <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/top.php?showYear=a&indexType=i> (Accessed 9/22/2017).

- 
- 35 “A warning for Big Pharma: Lobbying won’t work anymore” By Jake Novak, CNBC, October 28, 2016, <https://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/28/a-warning-for-big-pharma-lobbying-wont-work-anymore-commentary.html> (Accessed 9/22/2017).
- 36 “Three Ways President Trump Can Make Good On His Promise To Bring Down Drug Prices” By Alfred Engelberg, Health Affairs Blog (August 9, 2017), <http://healthaffairs.org/blog/2017/08/09/three-ways-president-donald-trump-can-make-good-on-his-promise-to-bring-down-drug-prices/> (Accessed 9/22/2017).
- 37 *Ibid*; “Executive Order – Reducing the Cost of Medical Products and Enhancing American Biomedical Innovation” By Donald J. Trump, The White House, June 2017, <https://www.keionline.org/sites/default/files/trum-drug-pricing-eo-draft.pdf> (Accessed 9/22/2017).



(800)FYI - VALU

Providing Solutions  
in the Era of  
Healthcare Reform

Founded in 1993, HCC is a  
nationally recognized healthcare  
economic financial consulting firm

- [HCC Home](#)
- [Firm Profile](#)
- [HCC Services](#)
- [HCC Experts](#)
- [Clients & Projects](#)
- [HCC News](#)
- [Upcoming Events](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Email Us](#)

## HCC Services

- [Valuation Consulting](#)
- [Commercial Reasonableness Opinions](#)
- [Commercial Payer Reimbursement Benchmarking](#)
- [Litigation Support & Expert Witness](#)
- [Financial Feasibility Analysis & Modeling](#)
- [Intermediary Services](#)
- [Certificate of Need](#)
- [ACO Value Metrics & Capital Formation](#)
- [Strategic Consulting](#)
- [Industry Research Services](#)



**Robert James Cimasi**, MHA, ASA, FRICS, MCBA, CVA, CM&AA, serves as Chief Executive Officer of **HEALTH CAPITAL CONSULTANTS (HCC)**, a nationally recognized healthcare financial and economic consulting firm headquartered in St. Louis, MO, serving clients in 49 states since 1993. Mr. Cimasi has over thirty years of experience in serving clients, with a professional focus on the financial and economic aspects of healthcare service sector entities including: valuation consulting and capital formation services; healthcare industry transactions including joint ventures, mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures; litigation support & expert testimony; and, certificate-of-need and other regulatory and policy planning consulting.

Mr. Cimasi holds a Master in Health Administration from the University of Maryland, as well as several professional designations: Accredited Senior Appraiser (ASA – American Society of Appraisers); Fellow Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (FRICS – Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors); Master Certified Business Appraiser (MCBA – Institute of Business Appraisers); Certified Valuation Analyst (CVA – National Association of Certified Valuators and Analysts); and, Certified Merger & Acquisition Advisor (CM&AA – Alliance of Merger & Acquisition Advisors). He has served as an expert witness on cases in numerous courts, and has provided testimony before federal and state legislative committees. He is a nationally known speaker on healthcare industry topics, and is the author of several books, the latest of which include: *“The Adviser’s Guide to Healthcare – 2nd Edition”* [2015 – AICPA]; *“Healthcare Valuation: The Financial Appraisal of Enterprises, Assets, and Services”* [2014 – John Wiley & Sons]; *“Accountable Care Organizations: Value Metrics and Capital Formation”* [2013 – Taylor & Francis, a division of CRC Press]; and, *“The U.S. Healthcare Certificate of Need Sourcebook”* [2005 – Beard Books].

Mr. Cimasi is the author of numerous additional chapters in anthologies; books, and legal treatises; published articles in peer reviewed and industry trade journals; research papers and case studies; and, is often quoted by healthcare industry press. In 2006, Mr. Cimasi was honored with the prestigious *“Shannon Pratt Award in Business Valuation”* conferred by the Institute of Business Appraisers. Mr. Cimasi serves on the Editorial Board of the Business Appraisals Practice of the Institute of Business Appraisers, of which he is a member of the College of Fellows. In 2011, he was named a Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). In 2016, Mr. Cimasi was named a *“Pioneer of the Profession”* as part of the recognition of the *National Association of Certified Valuators and Analysts (NACVA)* *“Industry Titans”* awards, which distinguishes those whom have had the greatest impact on the valuation profession.



**Todd A. Zigrang**, MBA, MHA, ASA, FACHE, is the President of **HEALTH CAPITAL CONSULTANTS (HCC)**, where he focuses on the areas of valuation and financial analysis for hospitals, physician practices, and other healthcare enterprises. Mr. Zigrang has over 20 years of experience providing valuation, financial, transaction and strategic advisory services nationwide in over 1,000 transactions and joint ventures. Mr. Zigrang is also considered an expert in the field of healthcare compensation for physicians, executives and other professionals.

Mr. Zigrang is the co-author of *“The Adviser’s Guide to Healthcare – 2nd Edition”* [2015 – AICPA], numerous chapters in legal treatises and anthologies, and peer-reviewed and industry articles such as: *The Accountant’s Business Manual* (AICPA); *Valuing Professional Practices and Licenses* (Aspen Publishers); *Valuation Strategies: Business Appraisal Practice*; and, *NACVA QuickRead*. In addition to his contributions as an author, Mr. Zigrang has served as faculty before professional and trade associations such as the American Society of Appraisers (ASA); the National Association of Certified Valuators and Analysts (NACVA); Physician Hospitals of America (PHA); the Institute of Business Appraisers (IBA); the Healthcare Financial Management Association (HFMA); and, the CPA Leadership Institute.

Mr. Zigrang holds a Master of Science in Health Administration (MHA) and a Master of Business Administration (MBA) from the University of Missouri at Columbia. He is a Fellow of the American College of Healthcare Executives (FACHE) and holds the Accredited Senior Appraiser (ASA) designation from the American Society of Appraisers, where he has served as President of the St. Louis Chapter, and is current Chair of the ASA Healthcare Special Interest Group (HSIG).



**John R. Chwarzinski**, MSF, MAE, is Senior Vice President of **HEALTH CAPITAL CONSULTANTS (HCC)**. Mr. Chwarzinski’s areas of expertise include advanced statistical analysis, econometric modeling, as well as, economic and financial analysis. Mr. Chwarzinski is the co-author of peer-reviewed and industry articles published in *Business Valuation Review* and *NACVA QuickRead*, and he has spoken before the Virginia Medical Group Management Association (VMGMA) and the Midwest Accountable Care Organization Expo.

Mr. Chwarzinski holds a Master’s Degree in Economics from the University of Missouri – St. Louis, as well as, a Master’s Degree in Finance from the John M. Olin School of Business at Washington University in St. Louis. He is a member of the St. Louis Chapter of the American Society of Appraisers, as well as a candidate for the Accredited Senior Appraiser designation from the American Society of Appraisers.



**Jessica L. Bailey-Wheaton**, Esq., is Vice President and General Counsel of **HEALTH CAPITAL CONSULTANTS (HCC)**, where she conducts project management and consulting services related to the impact of both federal and state regulations on healthcare exempt organization transactions and provides research services necessary to support certified opinions of value related to the Fair Market Value and Commercial Reasonableness of transactions related to healthcare enterprises, assets, and services. Ms. Bailey-Wheaton is a member of the Missouri and Illinois Bars and holds a J.D., with a concentration in Health Law, from Saint Louis University School of Law, where she served as Fall Managing Editor for the *Journal of Health Law & Policy*.



**Daniel J. Chen**, MSF, is a Senior Financial Analyst at **HEALTH CAPITAL CONSULTANTS (HCC)**, where he develops fair market value and commercial reasonableness opinions related to healthcare enterprises, assets, and services. In addition he prepares, reviews and analyzes forecasted and pro forma financial statements to determine the most probable future net economic benefit related to healthcare enterprises, assets, and services and applies utilization demand and reimbursement trends to project professional medical revenue streams and ancillary services and technical component (ASTC) revenue streams. Mr. Chen has a M.S. in Finance from Washington University St. Louis.