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Objectives

1) What is it?
   • Provide an overview of the factors and initiatives leading to the current national interest in comparative effectiveness.
   • Compare the differences between comparative effectiveness studies and traditional efficacy studies.
   • Describe the study designs and methods pertinent to comparative effectiveness.

2) How is it Relevant to Pharmacy?
   • Discuss the relevance of comparative effectiveness research to pharmacy practice.
     (For example, funding opportunities, patient and system-level decision making, other)

How much do you know about CER?

1. Nothing
2. Little bit
3. Moderate amount
4. A lot
CER: What is it?

- Provide an overview of the factors and initiatives leading to the current national interest in comparative effectiveness.
- Compare the differences between comparative effectiveness studies and traditional efficacy studies.
- Describe the study designs and methods pertinent to comparative effectiveness.

What is the Problem?

- The US continues to spend more on health care than other countries.
- Outcomes of the health care system are not better in the US compared to other developed countries.
- There is much variation in the provision and cost of care between regions of the US.
- Clinicians often do not have necessary evidence on which to base decisions.

Health Spending Per Capita\(^1\)

![Graph showing health spending per capita across different countries.](image)

\(1\) Source: OECD Health Data 2010 (OECD, 2011).
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Health Care Spending Per Capita and Life Expectancy
Information Gap

- Insufficient evidence to support rational decisions about one alternative versus another for the same indication
  - Not studied in same patient population
  - Not compared to true therapeutic alternatives
  - Not studied in actual practice
  - Outcomes of interest not measured
- Illustrated by drug approval process in the US which does not require manufacturers to produce evidence necessary for clinicians or policymakers to choose between drugs for the same indication.

Drug Approval Process

- Safety: Side effects acceptable?
- Efficacy: Can it work? (under optimal conditions)
- Effectiveness: Does it work? (under average or usual conditions)
- Efficiency: Is there sufficient value?
“[T]here are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns – the ones we don’t know we don’t know.”
—Former US Secretary of State, Donald Rumsfeld

---

What are reasons for the recent interest in CER in the US?

1. High cost of health care in US compared to other countries.
2. Lack of apparent differences in outcomes achieved in US compared to other countries.
3. Lack of information needed to make decisions between alternative treatments.
4. All of above.

---

CER: What is it?

- Provide an overview of the factors and initiatives leading to the current national interest in comparative effectiveness.
- Compare the differences between comparative effectiveness studies and traditional efficacy studies.
- Describe the study designs and methods pertinent to comparative effectiveness.
Definition of CER³

Comparative effectiveness research is the conduct and synthesis of research comparing the benefits and harms of different interventions and strategies to prevent, diagnose, treat and monitor health conditions in “real world” settings.

From Federal Coordinating Council 2009

Purpose of CER⁴

The purpose of CER is to assist consumers, clinicians, purchasers, and policy makers to make informed decisions that will improve health care at both the individual and population levels.

From Institute of Medicine 2009

Essential Elements

- Comparison of two or more drugs, devices, surgeries, diagnostic tools, care management strategies, or other approaches to care that are considered true therapeutic alternatives.
- Examines effects/outcomes in actual practice (i.e., effectiveness).
Comparison to Traditional RCTs

| Placebo comparison  | Most RCTs for drug approval |
| Active comparison (head-to-head) | Goal of CER |

Comparison to Traditional RCTs

Efficacy
(Can it work?)

Effectiveness
(Does it work in routine care?)

Placebo comparison (or usual care)

Active comparison (head-to-head)

Differences Between Efficacy and Effectiveness Drug Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Traditional Phase III RCTs</th>
<th>Comparative effectiveness study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research question</td>
<td>Can the drug work?</td>
<td>Does the drug work in normal practice and how does it compare to current practice and pharmacists’ aspirations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Normatively selected, usually healthier true patients who will eventually receive the drug</td>
<td>Patients who actually use the drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>Real-world setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Often short-term, surrogate, or intermediate endpoints</td>
<td>Outcomes that are relevant to decision-making at the clinical level, policy level, or both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>High internal validity but low external validity, not widely generalizable</td>
<td>Higher internal validity than RCT but higher external validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Schumock, AJHP 2009

Types of CER

- Primary comparative effectiveness
  - Prospective observational studies (aka “large simple clinical trial,” “pragmatic clinical trials”) 
  - Cluster randomized studies
  - Registry-based studies
  - Retrospective observational studies (case control or cohort studies)
- Secondary comparative effectiveness
  - Systematic review and meta-analyses
  - Modeling and decision-analysis
Which of the following is most true about CER?

1. Compares true therapeutic alternatives in actual practice setting.
2. Is not randomized.
3. Does not include a placebo comparator.
4. Is usually retrospective.

CER: What is it?

- Identify rationale/need for comparative effectiveness research.
- Review the basic purpose, definitions, and methods involved in comparative effectiveness research.
- Provide examples of primarily and secondary comparative effectiveness research.

Example: CER - Primary Prospective

- Clinical Antipsychotic Trials of Intervention Effectiveness (CATIE)
- Patients:
  - Schizophrenia
- Intervention:
  - Drug treatment (antipsychotics)
- Comparators:
  - Olanzapine, perphenazine, quetiapine, risperidone, ziprasidone
- Endpoint/outcome:
  - Treatment failure (time to discontinue)

Other Examples: ALLHAT, WHI
CATIE Impact

- CATIE found little difference between the effectiveness of older, cheaper antipsychotics and that of more expensive “second-generation” drugs.
- If reimbursement policies had been changed in response and Medicaid had stopped paying for the more costly drugs, it would have saved $1.2 billion out of the $5.5 billion that it spent on these medications in 2005.

Philipson, 2011

Advantages and Disadvantages of Prospective CER

- Allows for inclusion of outcomes that might not be available in a retrospective database.
- Can be randomized.
- However, it is an unrealistic expectation that we will have head-to-head randomized trials...
  - for every intervention and
  - its combinations
  - in every patient subgroup
  - that exactly mimic routine care.
- Prospective studies are expensive and take time to conduct.

Example: CER - Primary Retrospective

- Patients:
  - Adults with COPD
- Intervention:
  - Drug regimens containing theophylline
- Comparators:
  - Drug regimens not containing theophylline
- Endpoint/outcome
  - Death
  - COPD exacerbations
  - COPD hospitalizations
Advantages of retrospective CER

- Are more representative of routine care
  - Spectrum of disease severity
  - Spectrum of co-morbidities
  - Co-medications
  - Real world adherence
- Have very large sample sizes, good for
  - Infrequent exposure, recently marketed medications
  - Many subgroups to study treatment effect heterogeneity
- May allow Long follow-up
  - With hard clinical endpoints
- Produce results fast, inexpensive

Disadvantages of retrospective CER

- Not randomized therefore subject to bias
  - Confounding by indication (selection bias)
- Important outcomes may not be present in data
  - Clinical outcomes, quality of life

Example: CER - Secondary

- Patients:
  - Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)
- Intervention:
  - Drug therapy (anticholinergics)
- Comparators:
  - Ipratropium or tiotropium vs. control (placebo or active comparator)
- Endpoint/outcome
  - Death
  - Myocardial infarction (MI)
  - Stroke
- Many meta-analyses may not be easily characterized as “secondary CER” as are often based on clinical trials setting not actual practice
Which of the following is a potential disadvantage of retrospective CER?

1. Takes a long time to conduct.
2. Expensive
3. Subject of confounding
4. Not representative of actual practice

CER: How is it Relevant to Pharmacy?

• Discuss the relevance of comparative effectiveness research to pharmacy practice.
  – Lots of opportunities for funding CER in pharmacy.
  – Pharmacists can serve as stakeholders to inform CER.
  – CER can inform policy and patient care decisions.

CER Funding

• Medicare Modernization Act 2003
• Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act
  – Section 6301: Patient-Center Outcomes Research (previously known as CER)
  – Patient-Center Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI)
### PCORI Funding (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gov Rev</th>
<th>Medicare</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less DHHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$50.0</td>
<td>$50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$50.2</td>
<td>$199.8</td>
<td>$538.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$104.3</td>
<td>$254.3</td>
<td>$608.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$107.1</td>
<td>$257.1</td>
<td>$624.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$110.1</td>
<td>$260.1</td>
<td>$630.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$113.2</td>
<td>$263.2</td>
<td>$636.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$116.5</td>
<td>$266.5</td>
<td>$642.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$119.9</td>
<td>$269.9</td>
<td>$649.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
<td>$123.4</td>
<td>$273.4</td>
<td>$656.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IOM CER Priorities

- Compare the effectiveness of treatment strategies for atrial fibrillation, including surgery, catheter ablation, and pharmacologic treatment.
- Compare the effectiveness of primary prevention methods, such as smoking and lifestyle changes, versus clinical treatments in preventing falls in older adults suffering from physical impairments.
- Compare the effectiveness of upper endoscopy utilization and frequency for patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) and its impact on the diagnosis of esophageal adenocarcinoma.
- Compare the effectiveness of comprehensive care coordination programs, such as the medical home, and usual care in managing chronic and acute illness in children and adults with severe chronic disease, especially in populations with known health disparities.
- Compare the effectiveness of different strategies of introducing biologics into the treatment algorithm for inflammatory diseases, including Crohn’s disease, ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, and juvenile idiopathic arthritis.
- Compare the effectiveness of various screening, prophylaxis, and treatment interventions in preventing health care-associated infections (e.g., antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent surgical site infections, hand hygiene, and ventilator-associated pneumonia).
- Compare the effectiveness of strategies (e.g., bio-patches, reducing central line entry, chlorhexidine for all line entries, antibiotic impregnated catheters, treating all line entries via a sterile field) for reducing health care-associated infections (HCAs), including catheter-associated bloodstream infections (CABIs), ventilator-associated pneumonia, and surgical site infections in children and adults.
Prioritizing Topics for CER: Stakeholder Input

- Importance of stakeholder input.
- Examples of stakeholders:
  - Physicians
  - Pharmacists
  - Payers
  - Policy-makers
  - Patients

Application of CER

- CER data can be used to help inform:
  - Individual patient care decisions/recommendations (patient-level)
  - Population or system-level decisions (e.g., formulary decisions)
- CER data can add to body of evidence on:
  - Effectiveness of one drug compared to another
  - Safety of one drug compared to another
- Outcomes from CER studies provide inputs for cost-effectiveness analyses and decisions analysis

What Should Pharmacists Do?

- Understand study design and methods used in comparative effectiveness research.
- Understand differences between efficacy and effectiveness studies and their strengths and weaknesses.
- Monitor literature for results of comparative effectiveness studies.
- Integrate evidence from these studies with existing knowledge base relevant to patient and system-level decision making.
Which of following is not a current use of CER?

1. Individual patient care decisions.
2. FDA drug approval decisions.
3. Policy-level decisions.
4. Input to cost-effectiveness analyses.

Conclusion

• We need comparative effectiveness data in order to make more informed decisions in health care.
• CER compliments efficacy data.
• There are various study designs and methods to conduct CER that the pharmacist should understand.
• CER results can be very relevant to the daily patient care and policy-level decisions that pharmacists are involved in.

How much do you know about CER now?

1. Still nothing
2. Little bit
3. Moderate amount
4. A lot
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