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Abstract

Objectives

The National Pharmaceutical Pricing Authority introduced a series of Drug Prices Control Orders since 1970 to regulate the prices of essential medicines in India. This study evaluated the impact of the Drug Prices Control Order of 2013 on the utilization of anticancer medicines in the Indian private sector.

Methods

We used monthly sales audit data for a period of 2012-15, provided by Intercontinental Medical Statistics (IMS) Health. Through interrupted time series design and segmented regression models, we estimated the change in utilization of anticancer medicines following the drug pricing policy implementation.

Results

Of 1556 anticancer drug packs, 22.3% (n= 347) were price-controlled. The policy led to an immediate monthly reduction of 27.3% (95% CI -38.6%, -15.9%; p=0.001) and a long-term monthly reduction of 0.7% (95% CI -1.6%, 0.3%; p=0.16) in price-controlled formulation’s utilization. In the final study month, the price-controlled formulation’s utilization was 5.03 thousand standard units lower than what would have been expected without the policy. Melphalan showed the highest immediate reduction, and alpha-interferon showed the highest long-term reduction in utilization.

Conclusion

Drug prices control order 2013 caused an immediate and long-term decline in the utilization of anticancer medicines in the Indian private sector. However, study data was limited to a specific part of the Indian anticancer drug market, which must be considered when interpreting findings.
formulation-specific and not drug-specific, i.e., it regulates the prices of certain strengths and dosage forms (such as tablets, capsules, etc.) of a bulk drug in contrast to the immediate prior order (DPCO 1995), which regulated prices of the bulk drug. A bulk drug is an active drug substance, which alone or in combination with inactive ingredients form the final medicinal product (known as formulation). Two, DPCO 2013 replaced the cost-based pricing of the earlier orders with market-based pricing (MBP) approach and computed a ceiling price of each formulation. Ceiling price refers to the maximum price of a formulation at which it is sold to the consumer, excluding the local taxes. Ceiling price calculation using MBP involved calculating an average price to retailer (PTR) of medicines having a market share of more than equal to 1%. A fixed 16% margin to the retailer was then added to the average PTR to obtain the ceiling price of a formulation. Also, unlike the previous versions of DPCO, which lacked provision for revising the prices, the current DPCO revises the ceiling price of each formulation on the 1st of April of every year, based on the wholesale price index (WPI) of the formulation for the preceding year. Three, the DPCO 2013 regulates the prices of essential formulations only, i.e., the formulations listed in the National List of Essential Medicines (NLEM) [14]. Thus, when DPCO 2013 was enforced, it regulated the prices of 348 essential medicines listed in NLEM 2011, of which 40 were anticancer drugs (corresponding to 63 anticancer formulations). But, currently, the policy regulates the prices of 376 essential medicines listed in NLEM 2015, of which 59 are anticancer medicines (corresponding to 108 anticancer formulations) [15,16].

The ceiling prices of essential anticancer formulations were notified gradually, rather than at a single time point. NPPA notified ceiling prices of anticancer formulations over a period of 14 months (June 2013 to July 2014), which denotes the implementation period of the policy (DPCO 2013) for anticancer formulations. But, as per the norms of the policy, each ceiling price notification was followed by providing an additional 45 days to its manufacturer to fix/revise the maximum retail price (MRP) of the formulation. Therefore, for anticancer formulations, the price adjustment period was extended from August 2014 to the end of September 2014 [14].

Policy evaluation studies for anticancer drugs have been conducted in countries of varying income groups, including the U.S., Italy, and China [17-20]. But, most of these studies evaluated the impact of the addition of anticancer medicines in insurance coverage or modification of existing cancer-related reimbursement schemes. These studies demonstrated either no systematic change or an improvement in the utilization of anticancer medicines after the implementation of the policy [17-20]. In 2017, an Indian study evaluated the impact of Drug Prices Control Order 2013 on the average price of an antidiabetic formulation (metformin 500mg). The study found that, as compared to unregulated metformin, the price of regulated metformin formulations increased prior to the policy implementation, which later declined after the policy was implemented [12]. Another Indian study in 2019 evaluated the impact of DPCO 2013 on statins and found a shift in utilization from unregulated to regulated statins after the policy was implemented [21]. Thus, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt at studying the impact of DPCO 2013 on the utilization of anticancer medicines.

In our study, we aimed to evaluate the impact of drug pricing policy (DPCO 2013) on the utilization of anticancer medicines in India. Our study objective was to quantify the impact of DPCO 2013 on the utilization of anticancer medicines in the private sector of India. We hypothesized that as compared to the pre-policy period, the utilization of anticancer medicines in the retail medicine sector of India would have increased after the drug pricing policy (DPCO 2013) was implemented.

**Materials And Methods**

**Data source**

Our study used sales audit data by Intercontinental Medical Statistics (IMS) Health, which is currently known as IQVIA. It is a for-profit organization that collects and provides data on pharmaceutical market intelligence in over 100 countries around the world. The data consisted of monthly sales (values and volumes) of pharmaceutical products, collected from a panel of 5600 stockists for a period of five years (2012-16). The data was collected across different regions of India, which was then extrapolated to provide estimates of overall national sales in the private sector. The sales data included sales made by the stockists to hospitals, retailers, and dispensing doctors. The monthly sales data in the dataset was recorded at the level of individual drug packs, and the drugs were classified into specific therapeutic levels, i.e., supergroup, group, and subgroup, using the European Pharmaceutical Market Research Association (EphARMA) classification system.

**Outcomes**

The dependent variable in our study was cancer medicine’s utilization. We assumed monthly sales volume to be a proxy measure of utilization in our study which was expressed in standard units (SUs). One SU refers to the smallest dose of a formulation, such as one tablet or capsule for oral solids, one vial or ampoule for injectables, and so on.

**Study design**

We used an interrupted time series (ITS) design in our study. ITS is considered the strongest quasi-experimental design as it balances the trade-offs of observational designs (which possess limited ability to establish causation) and randomized controlled trials (which are resource-intensive and often impractical) [22]. ITS is particularly useful for studying "natural experiments" in real-world settings. In our study, the natural experiment under investigation was the Drug Prices Control Order of 2013 [22-24].

**Statistical analysis**

Although our data source spanned across five years (2012-2016), we excluded 2016 observations as NLEM was revised in 2015, which could have changed the market dynamics in 2016. Hence, to obtain estimates
unaffected by the 2015 NLEM revision, we confined our study period to January 2012 to December 2015. The implementation period of DPCO 2013 divided our total study period (Jan-12 to Dec-15) into three segments: pre-intervention period comprising of 17 monthly data points (Jan-12 till the end of May-13), intervention implementation period consisting of 14 monthly data points (Jun-13 till the end of Jul-14), and post-intervention period formed by 17 monthly data points (Aug-14 till the end of Dec-15).

We descriptively assessed the yearly trend of sales volume and value using summary measures (mean ± SD or median ± IQR), the annual growth rate of cumulative sales (in %), and the compound annual growth rate of cumulative sales (in %). We also assessed monthly sales trends graphically by plotting them against time.

In order to quantify the impact of DPCO 2013 on the utilization of anticancer medicines, we used segmented linear regression analysis and approximated a "line of best fit" separately for data points before and after the intervention was implemented.

Based on a previous study assessing the impact of drug pricing policy on statins in India, we hypothesized a priori that DPCO 2013 can create an impact by altering both the level and trend of utilization of anticancer medicines. Thus, in order to obtain post-intervention estimates which are unaffected by pre-existing secular trends, we created three independent variables, i.e., time, intervention, and time after the intervention. Time was a continuous variable, which represented time from the beginning of our observation period. Thus, it ranged from 1 to 48, depicting each month of our total study period of four years (2012-2015). The intervention was a binary variable, coded zero for the pre-intervention period and one for the post-intervention period. Time after intervention signified time elapsed after the intervention. Thus, time after intervention was coded zero for the pre-intervention period, and it was a continuous variable from the beginning of the post-intervention period.

The regression equation was as follows:

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Time} + \beta_2 \text{Intervention} + \beta_3 \text{Time after Intervention} + \epsilon_t$$

where,

- $Y_t$: Dependent variable, i.e., logarithm of sales volume of anticancer medicines;
- $\beta_0$: Baseline level (i.e., $y$-intercept) of the dependent variable at time zero (i.e., Jan 2012);
- $\beta_1$: Baseline trend (i.e., slope) or growth rate of the dependent variable at time t, independent of the intervention effect;
- $\beta_2$: Immediate change in the level of the dependent variable after intervention;
- $\beta_3$: Long-term change in the trend of the dependent variable after intervention;
- $\epsilon_t$: Error term at time t, which denotes the random variability unexplained by the model.

As post-estimation tests, we checked our regression models for autocorrelation visually using residual vs. time plot, autocorrelation function plot, and partial autocorrelation function plot. We further used statistical tests for detecting autocorrelation, namely the Durbin-Watson statistic and the Breusch-Godfrey test. We did not test for seasonality as cancer is a chronic condition, and treatment is usually required for a lifetime.

Our primary analysis tested the impact of DPCO 2013 on the utilization of price-controlled anticancer formulations only (Model 1). Since the 45-day adjustment period marked a gradual introduction of the pricing policy in the market through revision of MRPs, it had the potential to confound our results. Thus, to assess if the adjustment period altered the policy impact on the price-controlled market, we conducted the sensitivity analysis by running an alternate model after excluding the adjustment period sales volume of price-controlled formulations (Model 2).

In addition to altering the implementation period, through our sensitivity analysis, we also assessed the impact of the policy on anticancer formulations which did not come under the purview of DPCO 2013, i.e., price not controlled anticancer formulations (Model 3). We further repeated the model after excluding adjustment period utilization (Model 4).

After building actual models, we introduced a counterfactual model, which predicted the outcome in a scenario wherein the pricing policy had not been implemented. This model assumed that in the pre-policy period, a linear relationship existed between utilization and time, which would have continued unaltered in a linear fashion in the absence of policy.

Finally, we calculated the absolute policy effect, which referred to the difference in outcome brought by the intervention (actual model) as compared to what would have continued without the intervention (counterfactual model). The absolute policy effect was assessed visually by plotting the predicted outcomes of actual and counterfactual models in a single graph. Mathematically, the absolute policy effect was calculated by subtracting the predicted utilization of the counterfactual model from the predicted utilization of an actual model.
Additionally, we also assessed the impact of the policy (DPCO 2013) on individual price-controlled anticancer formulation through subgroup analysis. The implementation period used in models for subgroup analysis varied for each anticancer formulation and included the 45-day price adjustment period.

We performed statistical analysis using Stata version 15 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas) software.

**Patient and public involvement**

Patients or the public were not involved in this study, which is based on secondary data.

**Results**

There were 1556 anticancer drug packs in our study data, of which 22.3% (n=347) drug packs were price-controlled, while 77.7% (n=1209) drug packs did not fall under the purview of pricing policy (DPCO 2013). Of 40 essential anticancer drugs (i.e., 63 anticancer formulations) listed in NLEM 2011, price-controlled drug packs in our data (n=347) corresponded to 45 essential anticancer formulations (list of included and excluded formulations, and their ceiling price notification period presented in appendix).

The cumulative utilization of price-controlled formulations in 2015 was 22.4 thousand SUs higher than that in 2012 (a relative increase of 27.2%) (Figure 1). In terms of monthly utilization, the growth of price-controlled formulations became stagnant as DPCO 2013 came into force (Figure 2). While the manufacturers were revising the maximum retail prices of formulations in the adjustment period (August 2014 to September 2014), the price-controlled market showed a negligible reduction or no change in the monthly utilization. But, immediately after the adjustment period, the sales volume of formulations declined minimally.

**FIGURE 1: Bar chart showing year-on-year growth rate (in %) and compound annual growth rate (CAGR) (in %) of sales volume for A) price-controlled formulations, B) price not controlled formulations, and C) overall anticancer drugs**

CAGR: compound annual growth rate
The cumulative sales value of price-controlled formulations increased throughout the study period, as suggested by consistently positive year-on-year growth rates, with the least growth seen in 2014 (Figure 3). The cumulative sales value of price-controlled formulations was 89.8 INR billions higher in 2015 than the sales value in 2012, demonstrating a relative increase of 83.5%. The monthly sales value of price-controlled formulations remained stable throughout the study period, with a slight reduction observed during the price-adjustment period (Figure 4).
FIGURE 4: Line chart showing the trend of total monthly sales value (in INR billions) for the total study period (Jan-12 to Dec-15) for A) overall anticancer drugs, B) price not controlled formulations, and C) price-controlled formulations

Vertical lines (in grey) represent first ceiling price notification on Jun-13, last ceiling price notification on Jul-14 and 45-day adjustment period (Aug-14 to Sep-14).

INR- Indian Rupee

Similar annual trends were observed in summary measures of sales volume and sales value (Table 1).

TABLE 1: Summary measures of sales volume and sales value for price-controlled, price not controlled, and overall anticancer medicines

|                      | Sales volume (in thousand standard units) | Sales value (in INR billions) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                      | 2012 2013 2014 2015                      | 2012 2013 2014 2015           |
| Price-controlled formulations (n=347), Mean (SD) | 6.9 (0.41) 7.9 (0.33) 8.8 (0.37) | 8.9 (1.02) 13.4 (2.51) 13.9 (0.91) 16.4 (1.57) |
| Price not controlled formulations (n=1209), Mean (SD) | 7.1 (0.58) 9.1 (0.50) 10.2 (0.76) 12.3 (0.80) | 39.7 (6.56) 64.6 (4.42) 73.3 (8.57) 98.2 (9.54) |
| Overall anticancer medicines (n=1556)            | 7.0 (0.51) 8.5 (1.02) 9.0 (1.35) 10.5 (1.89) | 20.2 (28.5) 37.9 (51.3) 37.7 (58.15) 52 (82.55) |

On evaluating the impact of pricing policy on the utilization of price-controlled anticancer formulations (Model 1 results in Table 2 and Figure S4), we found that at the beginning of the study, the average utilization of price-controlled formulations was 6.2 thousand Standard Units (95% CI 5.7, 6.6). Before the intervention, the utilization was increasing by an average of 1.8% (95% CI 1.1%, 2.5%; p<0.001) every month, independent of the intervention effect, and this trend change was statistically significant. After the intervention was implemented, the utilization of price-controlled formulations immediately reduced by 27.3% (95% CI -38.6%, -13.9%; p=0.001), and this reduction was statistically significant. Results also revealed that post-intervention, the utilization reduced by an average of 0.7% (95% CI -1.6%, 0.3%; p=0.16) every month but this change was statistically non-significant. When comparing the predicted utilization of Model 1 (actual model) against the counterfactual model (based on pre-intervention utilization only), we found that in the final study month, i.e., December 2015, the average utilization of price-controlled...
anticancer formulations was 5.03 thousand Standard Units lower than what would have been expected
without pricing policy (absolute policy effect presented in appendix).

### TABLE 2: Regression results showing impact of policy on price-controlled, and price not
controlled anticancer formulations

| Independent variables | Price-controlled | Price not controlled |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
|                       | Model 1\(^I\)    | Model 2\(^E\)        | Model 3\(^I\)        | Model 4\(^E\)        |
| Baseline level (\(\beta_0\)) (in thousand SUs) | 6.2*** (5.7, 6.6) | 6.2*** (5.7, 6.6) | 6.2*** (5.9, 6.4) | 6.2*** (5.9, 6.5) |
| Baseline trend (\(\beta_1\)) | 1.8%*** (1.1, 2.5) | 1.8%*** (1.0, 2.5) | 2.2%*** (1.8, 2.6) | 2.2%*** (1.8, 2.7) |
| Level change (\(\beta_2\)) | -27.3%** (-38.6, -13.9) | -27.8%** (-40.3, -12.7) | -16.2%** (-24.1, -7.5) | -17.6%** (-26.3, -7.8) |
| Trend change (\(\beta_3\)) | -0.7% (-1.6, 0.3) | -0.7% (-1.8, 0.4) | -0.7% (-1.3, -0.1) | -0.7% (-1.3, -0.03) |
| Number of pre-policy observations | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of post-policy observations | 17 | 15 | 17 | 15 |
| \(R^2\) | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Durbin-Watson statistic (\(d\)) | 2.39 | 2.37 | 2.10 | 2.07 |
| Breusch-Godfrey test p-value\(^b\) | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.68 | 0.71 |
| Absolute policy effect for final study month, i.e., Dec-15 (in thousand SUs)\(^c\) | -5.03 | -5.06 | -4.58 | -4.57 |

\(^I\)Includes sales volume (utilization) of 45-days price adjustment period.

\(^E\)Excludes sales volume (utilization) of 45-days price adjustment period.

\(^a\)Durbin-Watson test assesses the null hypothesis, \(H_0\): no first-order autocorrelation or \(d\approx2\)

\(^b\)Breusch-Godfrey test assesses the null hypothesis, \(H_0\): no autocorrelation

\(^c\)Absolute policy effect = Predicted sales volume of Actual model minus Predicted sales volume of Counterfactual model.

***P<0.001; **P<0.01; *P<0.05. SUs- Standard Units
FIGURE 5: Policy impact on utilization of price-controlled anticancer formulations on A) including the adjustment period utilization (Model 1) and B) excluding adjustment period utilization (Model 2)

Absolute policy effect is defined as the difference between the predictions of actual and counterfactual model. Actual model refers to models accounting for intervention and counterfactual model refers to scenario with no intervention. Vertical lines (in grey) represent policy implementation period: Jun-13 to Jul-14 for Model 1 and Jun-13 to Sep-14 for Model 2.

Altering the implementation period for price-controlled formulations (Model 2 results in Table 2) resulted in estimates that were comparable to Model 1. The absolute policy effect on the final study month, i.e., December 2015 for Model 2, was -5.06 thousand Standard Units, which was only 0.03 thousand Standard Units higher reduction than that seen in Model 1 (absolute policy effect presented in appendix). We did not detect autocorrelation of any order in our regression models (autocorrelation results of all regression models presented in appendix).

However, the subgroup analysis showed that policy (DPCO 2013) caused a statistically significant change in utilization of seven anticancer molecules, i.e., Alpha interferon, Carboplatin, Cytosine arabinoside, Doxorubicin, Etoposide, Mesna, and Oxaliplatin (Table 3). Among these, six molecules showed an immediate as well as sustained reduction in utilization after the implementation of DPCO 2013. Mesna, on the other hand, showed an immediate decline, followed by a sustained increase in post-policy utilization. Immediately after the implementation of DPCO 2013, Melphalan demonstrated highest reduction in utilization (-83.5%; 95% CI -92.4%, -63.9%; p<0.001), followed by Mesna (-62.2%; 95% CI -79.6%, -29.8%; p=0.003), Chlorambucil (-61.4%; 95% CI -82.1%, 17.0%; p=0.03), and Paclitaxel (-52.3%; 95% CI -74.9%, -9.3%; p<0.001). Although Actinomycin D also showed a substantial immediate reduction in utilization after DPCO 2013 implementation, its level reduction was not significant statistically. In terms of long-term change in utilization, six anticancer molecules showed a statistically significant trend reduction after policy implementation. Alpha interferon showed the maximum trend reduction in post-policy sales volume (-10.3%; 95% CI -14, -6.5; p<0.001), followed by Oxaliplatin (-6.1%; 95% CI -8.7, -3.4; p<0.001), Etoposide (-4.7%; 95% CI -7.7, -1.7; p=0.003), Cisplatin (-4.5%; 95% CI -6.2, -2.8; p<0.001), and Daunorubicin (-4%; 95% CI -6.5, -1.4; p=0.003). Although Actinomycin D also showed a substantial immediate reduction in utilization after DPCO 2013 implementation, its level reduction was not significant statistically. In terms of long-term change in utilization, six anticancer molecules showed a statistically significant trend reduction after policy implementation. Alpha interferon showed the maximum trend reduction in post-policy sales volume (-10.3%; 95% CI -14, -6.5; p<0.001), followed by Oxaliplatin (-6.1%; 95% CI -8.7, -3.4; p<0.001), Etoposide (-4.7%; 95% CI -7.7, -1.7; p=0.003), Cisplatin (-4.5%; 95% CI -6.2, -2.8; p<0.001), and Daunorubicin (-4%; 95% CI -6.5, -1.4; p=0.003). Of the molecules that showed an increase in utilization trend after policy implementation, Vinblastine sulphate showed the maximum increase in trend (14.4%; 95% CI 8, 21.3; p<0.001), Vinorelbine (5.7%; 95% CI 0.4, 11.2; p=0.04), Cyclophosphamide (2.2%; 95% CI 0.2, 4.3; p=0.03), and Flutamide (1.6%; 95% CI 0.3, 2.9; p=0.02).

![Table and diagrams for policy impact on utilization of price-controlled anticancer formulations](image-url)
| Drug                  | Value 1 | Value 2 | Value 3 | Value 4 | Value 5 | Value 6 | Value 7 | Value 8 | Value 9 | Value 10 | Value 11 | Value 12 | Value 13 | Value 14 | Value 15 |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Paclitaxel           | 2.02*** | 0.81*** | 0.06*** | -0.4%   | -2.5%   | -3.7%   | -19.5%  | -19.2%  | -19.2%  | -19.2%   | -19.2%   | -19.2%   | -19.2%   | -19.2%   | -19.2%   |
| Oxaliplatin          | -0.3%   | -0.4%   | -0.5%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   | -1.4%   |
| Mitomycin-C          | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   | -0.6%   |
| Methotrexate         | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   |
| Mesna                | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    |
| Methylxanthine       | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    |
| Methotrexate         | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    |
| Mitomycin-C          | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   | -0.4%   |
| Oxaliplatin          | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    |
| Pazopanib            | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.3%    |
Presented here are the results of subgroup analysis—Segmented regression results for each price-controlled anticancer formulation. The results indicate significant changes in the utilization of these medicines post-policy implementation.

**Discussion**

In our study, we used an interrupted-time series design to quantify the impact of the Drug Prices Control Order of 2013 on the utilization of anticancer medicines in the private retail medicine sector of India. We found that utilization showed a slight decline at around a year after DPCO 2013 came into force. A notable finding was a reduction in both sales volume and value during the 45 days price adjustment period, which was consistent with our expectation as during this period, manufacturers would have withdrawn drug packs from the market for re-labeling, causing a reduction in sales. Segmented regression revealed that the baseline trend of utilization of anticancer medicines was increasing before the policy was implemented. But, DPCO 2015 caused a reduction in the utilization of price-controlled anticancer formulations, most of which belonged to the cytotoxic drug class, as suggested by our subgroup analysis results.

Subgroup analysis revealed that immediately after the policy was implemented, melphalan showed the most substantial reduction in utilization, and alpha-interferon showed the highest long-term reduction in utilization in the post-policy period.

There could be two plausible explanations for the reduction in utilization observed in our study. Firstly, certain features of DPCO 2015, such as controlling prices of specific strengths and dosage forms of a medicine and only regulating single-dose formulations, could have been used to selectively prescribe or market certain formulations which were not under price control policy, thus influencing the prescription practice. Secondly, our study data was not an exhaustive source of the utilization of anticancer medicines in India. Our data source lacked sales data for eight essential anticancer medicines. Moreover, it was a stockist level data, which is just one of the many procurement sources of medicines in hospitals, where most cancer treatment is administered. Thus, our results hold true only for the anticancer market that was surveyed by our data source.

Similar to our results, a study conducted by Guan et al. in China in 2019 showed that controlling maximum retail prices of anticancer medicines reduced the post-policy trend of utilization of regulated medicines [21]. Another study conducted in the U.S. by Leiberman et al. in 2015 used an interrupted time series design to assess the impact of prescription capping of overall medicines on utilization of essential medicines and found that the policy reduced the proportion of essential medicine prescription [25].

Our study results on the impact of price control on anticancer medicines were different from the impact of DPCO 2013 on statins, where a shift in utilization from price-not-controlled statins to price-controlled statins was reported [21]. This is due to the difference in nature of illness and the medicines required to treat such conditions, as, unlike anticancer medicines, statins are substitutable, and prescribers can change their prescription behavior for diseases associated with statin use. A study conducted in the U.S. by Dusetzina et al. in 2018 used a difference-in-difference approach to assess the impact of a state parity law, providing full insurance coverage of six targeted anticancer medicines improved their utilization [19]. Another Chinese study conducted by Hsu et al. in 2019 used an interrupted time series design and found that modifications of reimbursement policy (coverage of erlotinib and gefitinib) caused an increase in the prescription rate of these targeted therapies [20]. A plausible reason for the disparity of our study results with the results of non-Indian origin studies could be varying prescription practices, health system factors, and strength of governance across countries worldwide.

TABLE 3: Results of subgroup analysis - Segmented regression results for each price-controlled anticancer formulation

| Price Control | Coefficient | 95% CI | p-value | N | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 1.00 |
|---------------|-------------|--------|---------|---|------|------|------|------|
| 26 Procarbazine | 2.4*** (1.6, 3.4) | 3.1%* (0.3, 6) | 28.7% (-25.3, 121.6) | 0.4% (-3.4, 4.2) | 22 | 23 | 0.69 | 1.50 | 0.13 | 4.11 |
| 27 Tamoxifen Citrate | 947.9*** (780.9, 1150.7) | 3.4%* (1.4, 5.3) | -19.6% (-38.8, 5.5) | -2.9%** (-4.9, -0.9) | 17 | 28 | 0.37 | 2.12 | 0.46 | -3009.79 |
| 28 Vinblastine sulphate | 1.3 (0.7, 2.3) | -0.3% (-4.4, 4.1) | -44.5% (-76, 28.4) | 14.4%*** (8, 21.3) | 22 | 23 | 0.63 | 0.99 | <0.001 | 12.82 |
| 29 Vincristine | 1.8** (1.2, 2.8) | -4.9%* (-9.1, -0.4) | -23.3% (-22.3, 268.2) | 5.7%* (0.4, 11.2) | 11 | 16 | 0.19 | 1.18 | 0.31 | 1.14 |

Note: Three anticancer molecules (L-Asparaginase, Dacarbazine, and Busulphan) had inadequate observations, hence their results have not been presented here.

**Durbin-Watson test assesses the null hypothesis, H0: no first-order autocorrelation or d=2**

**Breusch-Godfrey test assesses the null hypothesis, H0: no first-order autocorrelation**

**Absolute policy effect = Predicted sales volume of Actual model minus Predicted sales volume of Counterfactual model.**

***P<0.001; **P<0.01; *P<0.05. SUs- Standard Units**
A major limitation of our study was that we could not assess the impact of the policy (DPCO 2013) on the utilization of current price-controlled formulations (those listed in NLEM 2015), as our study data had inadequate data points beyond 2015. In addition, our study data lacked patient-level information; thus, we could not assess patient-level prescription use, and we could not adjust for varying patient characteristics during the study period. Moreover, we could not correlate the market findings with any clinically relevant health outcomes.

Conclusions

The evidence generated in our study suggested that before the policy was implemented, utilization of anticancer medicines had an increasing trend. But the Drug Prices Control Order of 2013 caused an immediate as well as long-term decline in the utilization of anticancer medicines in the private pharmaceutical sector of India. However, our study data was limited to a specific part of the entire anticancer drug market of India, which must be considered when interpreting our findings.

Appendices

| S. No. | Name of drug | Formulation | Strengths | Notification date | Ceiling price per unit formulation as of 2020 | Drug class | Drug sub-class |
|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1      | 5-Fluorouracil | Injection   | 250 mg / 5 ml | 2nd December 2013 | ₹ 2.08                                      | Cytotoxic drug | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| 2      | Actinomycin D/ Dactinomycin | Injection | 0.5 mg | 10th July 2014 | ₹ 562.98 | Cytotoxic drug | Antitumor antibiotics |
| 3      | Alpha Interferon | Injection | 3 million IU | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 799.70 | Toxicity amelioration/ Palliative care | Immunomodulatory (antiviral) |
| 4      | Azathioprine | Tablets | 50 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 9.89 | Cytotoxic drug | Antimetabolites (Purine antagonist) |
| 5      | Bleomycin | Injection | 15 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 616.06 | Cytotoxic drug | Antitumor antibiotics |
| 6      | Busulphan | Tablets | 2 mg | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 3.41 | Cytotoxic drug | Alkylating agents |
| 7      | Carboplatin | Injection | 150 mg | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 789.01 | Cytotoxic drug | Platinum coordination complexes |
| 8      | Carboplatin | Injection | 450 mg vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 2,424.93 | Cytotoxic drug | Platinum coordination complexes |
| 9      | Chlorambucil | Tablets | 2 mg | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 45.22 | Cytotoxic drug | Alkylating agents |
| 10     | Cisplatin | Injection | 10 mg / vial | 22nd July 2013 | ₹ 84.84 | Cytotoxic drug | Platinum coordination complexes |
| 11     | Cisplatin | Injection | 50 mg / vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 301.26 | Cytotoxic drug | Platinum coordination complexes |
| 12     | Cyclophosphamide | Tablets | 50 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 3.75 | Cytotoxic drug | Alkylating agents |
| 13     | Cyclophosphamide | Injection | 500 mg | 21st August 2013 | ₹ 72.71 | Cytotoxic drug | Alkylating agents |
| 14     | Cyclosporine | Capsules | 25 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 24.75 | Toxicity amelioration/ Palliative care | Immunosuppressant |
| 15     | Cyclosporine | Capsules | 50 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 48.26 | Toxicity amelioration/ Palliative care | Immunosuppressant |
| 16     | Cyclosporine | Capsules | 100 mg | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 106.29 | Toxicity amelioration/ Palliative care | Immunosuppressant |
| 17     | Cytosine arabinoside/ Cytarabine | Injection | 100 mg/vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 238.44 | Cytotoxic drug | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| 18     | Cytosine arabinoside/ Cytarabine | Injection | 500 mg/vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 515.53 | Cytotoxic drug | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| 19     | Cytosine arabinoside/ Cytarabine | Injection | 1000 mg/vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 1,170.62 | Cytotoxic drug | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| No. | Drug Name          | Formulation | Quantity | Date       | Price (₹)  | Category                  | Subcategory                      |
|-----|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 20  | Dacarbazine        | Injection   | 500 mg   | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 1,029.09 | Cytotoxic drug             | Alkylating agents                |
| 21  | Daunorubicin       | Injection   | 20 mg vial | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 353.69 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antitumor antibiotics            |
| 22  | Doxorubicin        | Injection   | 10 mg    | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 196.48 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antitumor antibiotics            |
| 23  | Etoposide          | Capsules    | 100 mg   | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 52.30 | Cytotoxic drug             | Topoisomerase-2 inhibitors        |
| 24  | Etoposide          | Injection   | 100 mg/5 ml vial | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 192.39 | Cytotoxic drug             | Topoisomerase-2 inhibitors        |
| 25  | Flutamide          | Tablet      | 250 mg   | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 8.62 | Hormonal drug             | Antiandrogen                      |
| 26  | Gemcitabine Hydrochloride | Injection | 200 mg | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 1,304.86 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| 27  | Gemcitabine Hydrochloride | Injection | 1 gm | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 5,969.16 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antimetabolites (Pyrimidine antagonist) |
| 28  | Ilofarbime         | Injection   | 1 gm/2ml vial | 2nd December 2013 | ₹ 344.88 | Cytotoxic drug             | Alkylating agents                |
| 29  | Imatinib           | Tablets     | 100 mg   | 21st June 2013 | ₹ 87.59 | Targeted drug             | Tyrosine protein kinase inhibitors |
| 30  | Imatinib           | Tablets     | 400 mg   | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 268.33 | Targeted drug             | Tyrosine protein kinase inhibitors |
| 31  | L-Asparaginase     | Injection   | 5000 KU. | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 1,183.92 | Cytotoxic drug             | Miscellaneous                    |
| 32  | Melphalan          | Tablet      | 2 mg     | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 108.53 | Cytotoxic drug             | Alkylating agents                |
| 33  | Melphalan          | Tablet      | 5 mg     | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 182.06 | Cytotoxic drug             | Alkylating agents                |
| 34  | Mercaptopurine     | Tablet      | 50 mg    | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 8.93 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antimetabolites (Purine antagonist) |
| 35  | Mesna               | Injection   | 200 mg   | 22nd July 2013 | ₹ 24.57 | Toxicity amelioration/ Palliative care | Uroprotective thiol agent          |
| 36  | Methotrexate       | Tablet      | 2.5 mg   | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 4.72 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antimetabolites (Folate antagonist) |
| 37  | Methotrexate       | Injection   | 50 mg/ml | 22nd July 2013 | ₹ 33.18 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antimetabolites (Folate antagonist) |
| 38  | Mitomycin-C        | Injection   | 10 mg    | 2nd December 2013 | ₹ 397.57 | Cytotoxic drug             | Antitumor antibiotics            |
| 39  | Oxaliplatin        | Injection   | 50 mg vial | 21st August 2013 | ₹ 2,693.26 | Cytotoxic drug             | Platinum coordination complexes |
| 40  | Paclitaxel         | Injection   | 30 mg/5 ml vial | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 301.24 | Cytotoxic drug             | Microtubule damaging agents (Taxanes) |
| 41  | Procarbazine       | Capsules    | 50 mg    | 5th November 2013 | ₹ 31.64 | Cytotoxic drug             | Alkylating agents                |
| 42  | Tamoxifen Citrate  | Tablets     | 10 mg    | 28th June 2013 | ₹ 4.35 | Hormonal drug             | Selective oestrogen receptor modulators |
| 43  | Tamoxifen Citrate  | Tablets     | 20 mg    | 14th June 2013 | ₹ 2.77 | Hormonal drug             | Selective oestrogen receptor modulators |
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Essential anticancer formulations absent in study data

1. Allopurinol
   Tablets 100 mg
2. Cyclophosphamide
   Tablets 200 mg
3. Cyclosporine
   Capsules 10 mg
4. Cyclosporine
   Concentrate for injection 100 mg/ml
5. Danazol
   Capsules 50 mg
6. Danazol
   Capsules 100 mg
7. Filgrastim
   Injection 1 ml vial
8. Folic Acid
   Injection 3 mg/ml
9. Mercaptopurine
   Injection 100 mg/ml
10. Morphine Sulphate
    Tablets 10 mg
11. Ondansetron
    Tablets 4 mg
12. Ondansetron
    Tablets 8 mg
13. Ondansetron
    Injection 2 mg/ml
14. Ondansetron
    Syrup 2 mg/5 ml
15. Prednisolone
    Tablets 5 mg
16. Prednisolone
    Injection 20 mg (as sodium phosphate or succinate)
17. Prednisolone
    Injection 25 mg (as sodium phosphate or succinate)
18. Raloxifene
    Tablets 60 mg

TABLE 4: List of included and excluded essential anticancer formulations, with the ceiling prices and notification dates

Table shows that our study data included 45 essential anticancer formulations, most of them being cytotoxic drugs. Majority of ceiling prices were notified in 2013, earliest being June 2013. Only 1 formulation (Actinomycin D) had its ceiling price notified in July 2014. Thus, ceiling price notification period of pricing policy was June 2013 till July 2014. Our study data did not include 18 essential anticancer formulations. Most of the excluded formulations are indicated for palliative care and management of chemotherapy-induced toxicity.

| Month    | Predicted utilization of counterfactual model (common for Model 1 and 2) | Model 1 Predicted utilization of actual model | Absolute policy effect (actual predictions minus counterfactual predictions) | Model 2 Predicted utilization of actual model | Absolute policy effect (actual predictions minus counterfactual predictions) |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jun-13   | 8.44                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Jul-13   | 8.59                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Aug-13   | 8.74                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Sep-13   | 8.90                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Oct-13   | 9.05                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Nov-13   | 9.21                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Dec-13   | 9.38                                                                     | Implementation period: Jun-13 till Jul-14     | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Jan-14   | 9.54                                                                     | .                                             | Implementation period: Jun-13 till Jul-14                                   | .                                             | .                                                                           |
| Feb-14   | 9.71                                                                     | .                                             | .                                                                           | .                                             | .                                                                           |
### TABLE 5: Absolute policy effect on price-controlled formulations (in thousand Standard Units)

Predicted utilization of actual models were based on Model 1 (testing policy effect on price-controlled formulations and includes price adjustment period utilization) and Model 2 (testing policy effect on price-controlled formulations after excluding price adjustment period utilization). Counterfactual model considers a scenario with no intervention and assumes that in such a scenario, the pre-intervention trend would continue unaltered. Hence, counterfactual model utilization was predicted by regressing time on pre-intervention utilization only. Absolute policy effect refers to change in utilization brought by intervention, as compared to the trend that would have continued without intervention. Thus, it was computed by subtracting counterfactual model predictions from actual model predictions. All utilization figures are in thousand Standard Units.

| Month  | Predicted utilization of actual model | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|
|         | Predicted utilization of counterfactual model (common for Model 3 and 4) | Absolute policy effect (actual predictions minus counterfactual predictions) | Predicted utilization of actual model | Absolute policy effect (actual predictions minus counterfactual predictions) |
| Jun-15 | 9.21                                 | .       |         |
| Jul-15  | 9.41                                 | .       |         |
| Aug-15  | 9.62                                 | .       |         |
| Date   | Value | Value | Value | Value |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Sep-13 | 9.84  |       |       |       |
| Oct-13 | 10.06 |       |       |       |
| Nov-13 | 10.28 |       |       |       |
| Dec-13 | 10.51 | Implementation period: Jun-13 till Jul-14 |       |       |
| Jan-14 | 10.75 | Implementation period: Jun-13 till Sep-14 |       |       |
| Feb-14 | 10.99 |       |       |       |
| Mar-14 | 11.23 |       |       |       |
| Apr-14 | 11.48 |       |       |       |
| May-14 | 11.74 |       |       |       |
| Jun-14 | 12.00 |       |       |       |
| Jul-14 | 12.27 |       |       |       |
| Aug-14 | 12.54 | 10.44 | -2.11 |       |
| Sep-14 | 12.83 | 10.60 | -2.23 |       |
| Oct-14 | 13.11 | 10.76 | -2.35 | 10.74 | -2.38 |
| Nov-14 | 13.41 | 10.92 | -2.48 | 10.90 | -2.50 |
| Dec-14 | 13.70 | 11.09 | -2.62 | 11.07 | -2.63 |
| Jan-15 | 14.01 | 11.26 | -2.75 | 11.24 | -2.77 |
| Feb-15 | 14.32 | 11.43 | -2.90 | 11.41 | -2.91 |
| Mar-15 | 14.64 | 11.60 | -3.04 | 11.59 | -3.05 |
| Apr-15 | 14.97 | 11.78 | -3.19 | 11.77 | -3.20 |
| May-15 | 15.31 | 11.96 | -3.35 | 11.95 | -3.36 |
| Jun-15 | 15.65 | 12.14 | -3.51 | 12.13 | -3.51 |
| Jul-15 | 16.00 | 12.32 | -3.68 | 12.32 | -3.68 |
| Aug-15 | 16.36 | 12.51 | -3.85 | 12.51 | -3.84 |
| Sep-15 | 16.72 | 12.70 | -4.02 | 12.70 | -4.02 |
| Oct-15 | 17.10 | 12.89 | -4.20 | 12.90 | -4.20 |
| Nov-15 | 17.48 | 13.09 | -4.39 | 13.10 | -4.38 |
| Dec-15 | 17.87 | 13.29 | -4.58 | 13.30 | -4.57 |

**TABLE 6: Absolute policy effect on price not controlled formulations (in thousand Standard Units)**

Model 3 tests policy effect on price not controlled formulations and includes price adjustment period utilization. Model 4 tests policy effect on price not controlled formulations after excluding price adjustment period utilization. All utilization figures are in thousand Standard Units.
FIGURE 6: Autocorrelation test results for Model 1 (price-controlled formulations)

Model 1 tests policy impact on price-controlled formulations only and includes utilization of 45-day price adjustment period. Intervention implementation period: Jun-13 to Jul-14.

FIGURE 7: Autocorrelation test results for Model 2 (price-controlled formulations)

Model 2 tests policy impact on price-controlled formulations only and excludes utilization of 45-day price adjustment period. Intervention implementation period: Jun-13 to Sep-14.
FIGURE 8: Autocorrelation test results for Model 3 (price not controlled formulations)

Model 3 tests policy impact on price not controlled formulations only and includes utilization of 45-day price adjustment period. Implementation period: Jun-13 to Jul-14.

FIGURE 9: Autocorrelation test results for Model 4 (price not controlled formulations)

Model 4 tests policy effect on price not controlled formulations only and excludes utilization of 45-day price adjustment period. Intervention implementation period: Jun-13 to Sep-14.
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