

Accuracy of pharmaceutical company licensing predictions: projected vs actual licensing dates

Doos, Lucy; Ward, Derek; Stevens, Andrew; Packer, Claire

DOI:

[10.1111/jphs.12132](https://doi.org/10.1111/jphs.12132)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Doos, L, Ward, D, Stevens, A & Packer, C 2016, 'Accuracy of pharmaceutical company licensing predictions: projected vs actual licensing dates', *Journal of Pharmaceutical Health Services Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jphs.12132>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Doos, L., Ward, D., Stevens, A. and Packer, C. (2016), Accuracy of pharmaceutical company licensing predictions: projected versus actual licensing dates. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Health Services Research*, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jphs.12132>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

Checked April 2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Abstract:**

2 **Objectives:** To determine the accuracy of pharmaceutical companies' predictions of
3 drug licensing timeframes for their products in late stage clinical development.

4 **Methods:** We compared predicted licensing dates provided to the National Institute
5 for Health Research Horizon Scanning Research and Intelligence Centre (NIHR
6 HSRIC) by pharmaceutical companies against actual market authorisation
7 application (MAA) and authorisation (MA) dates published by the European
8 Medicines Agency for drugs granted authorisation between 2009 and 2013.

9 **Key findings:** 123 drugs met our inclusion criteria. 78% were new drugs and 16%
10 had orphan designation. Less than half (44%) and less than a quarter (24%) of MAA
11 and MA predictions respectively were considered accurate (same month or one
12 month either side of the actual date). Pharmaceutical companies were significantly
13 more accurate in predicting MAA dates than MA dates ($p < 0.001$). For accurate
14 predictions, the mean duration between the prediction being made and the actual
15 MAA and MA dates were 17.5 and 18.7 months, respectively. Out of the total 108
16 MA predictions, almost two-thirds (65.4%, 16/26) of short-term predictions (made in
17 the two years prior to the actual MA) were accurate. For predicted dates that were
18 earlier than the actual MA date, there was a positive relationship between accuracy
19 and the time between the prediction and authorisation.

20 **Conclusions:** Even in predicting near events from well-informed sources, accuracy
21 is imperfect. There appears to be an optimum time for the provision of accurate
22 information on predicted MAA and MA dates for drugs. This information is crucial for
23 effective early awareness and alert activities.

24 **Key words:** Pharmaceutical, licensing, prediction, horizon scanning, early
25 awareness and alert systems

26

27

28

29

1 **Introduction**

2 New drugs and new indications for existing licensed drugs have the potential to bring
3 about important change in medical practice leading to benefits for patients, clinicians
4 and health services. They can improve the quality of patients' lives through improved
5 management of disease, enable patients to remain in their homes rather than in
6 hospitals, simplify treatment schedules, and allow clinicians to treat patients more
7 effectively and efficiently.^[1] They can, of course, also confer net harm if they displace
8 more cost-effective treatments. Before a drug can be marketed for a specific
9 indication, it undergoes a process of licensing by the applicable medicines regulator,
10 which then issues Marketing Authorisation (MA). The regulation of medicines
11 ensures its safety and the protection of public health. In the UK, two regulators
12 perform this function, the European Medicines Agency (EMA), which aims to
13 streamline the licensing process and ensure a homogeneous regulatory policy
14 throughout the European Union (EU), and the UK Medicines and Healthcare
15 Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).

16

17 Early identification of imminent technologies enables decision makers to plan further
18 evaluation, plan future investment, decide on the allocation of resources, identify
19 requirements for implementation such as staff training and the development of
20 facilities, and make changes to treatment and management pathways.^[2] This, in turn,
21 helps health systems incorporate such innovation in a sustainable way and facilitates
22 appropriate adoption.^[3-7] Timely evaluation and planning requires accurate
23 information about probable launch dates, and a lack of accurate intelligence can
24 hinder informed decision making with undesirable health and financial
25 consequences.^[8] Most pharmaceutical companies begin speculation about the
26 eventual date of licensing during phase II clinical development.^[9] These discussions
27 continue through the rest of the development process until the application for
28 regulatory approval.

29

30 Many countries have established early awareness and alert (EAA) systems (also
31 known as horizon scanning or early warning systems), to provide decision makers
32 with information on new health technologies prior to their introduction and adoption
33 into health systems.^[7,10] The National Institute for Health Research Horizon Scanning

1 Research and Intelligence Centre (NIHR HSRIC) ^[11] in England is an EAA system
2 that provides advance notice on new and emerging health technologies and
3 interventions, including drugs that are likely to have a significant impact on the
4 English National Health Service (NHS) and/or patients within the next two to three
5 years.^[12] The system informs the topic selection and timing of health technology
6 assessments (appraisals) undertaken by the National Institute for Health and Care
7 Excellence (NICE). Key features of the NIHR HSRIC methods include extensive and
8 proactive contact with pharmaceutical companies to identify products in development
9 and obtain company predictions for future dates of marketing authorisation
10 application (MAA or 'filing') and marketing authorisation (MA or 'licence') with the
11 European Medicines Agency. Scanning for new medicines also includes scrutiny of
12 relevant commercial and general media, scientific publications, commercial R&D
13 databases, and access to the *UK PharmaScan* database of pharmaceuticals in
14 development.^[13] The NIHR HSRIC aims to produce information on new drugs and
15 new indications for existing licensed drugs around twenty months and around fifteen
16 months prior to launch, respectively.^[14]

17

18 Prediction, however, is not always accurate, and depends on the availability and
19 quality of data. It is generally assumed that as a technology nears licensing, any
20 predictions made about the timing of regulatory approval will be increasingly
21 accurate.^[15] Predictions from pharmaceutical companies on the anticipated timing of
22 MAA and MA are of crucial importance to the work of the NIHR HSRIC. We aimed to
23 determine how accurate such predictions have been, and if they varied according to
24 the whether this was the first or subsequent indication for the drug, by orphan
25 designation, as well as the time from making the prediction to subsequent licensing.

26

27 **Methods**

28 *Design*

29 A cross-sectional study comparing predicted MAA and MA dates obtained from
30 NIHR HSRIC contacts with pharmaceutical companies against actual MAA and MA
31 dates for both new drugs and new indications for existing licensed drugs awarded
32 MA between 2009 and 2013 (inclusive).

1 *Data sources*

2 Information on drugs licensed between 2009 and 2013 (inclusive, and including
3 those subsequently withdrawn), their indication, orphan designation, and dates of
4 MA and MAA were obtained from the EMA website.^[16]

5 Data on individual predicted MAA and/or MA dates were obtained from the NIHR
6 HSRIC's confidential information system, which is populated with data obtained
7 directly from commercial pharmaceutical companies. Data on whether the MA
8 represented a new drug or a new indication for an existing licensed drug were
9 obtained from the EMA website ^[16] and relevant editions of the British National
10 Formulary (BNF).^[17]

11 Whilst all new drugs (new chemical entities and new biologic products) and new
12 indications for existing licensed drugs receiving MA between 2009 and 2013 were
13 eligible for inclusion in this study, only those with a company prediction for
14 anticipated future MAA or MA dates available on the NIHR HSRIC information
15 system were included in the analysis. Generic drugs, biosimilars, and blood products
16 were excluded, as were vaccines and diagnostic agents, which have a different
17 assessment and market access pathway in the United Kingdom.

18 *Data handling and analysis*

19 Differences in the duration between the predicted and actual MAA and MA dates
20 were calculated to the nearest month. A prediction was considered accurate when
21 the actual MAA or MA date fell in the same month as the prediction or in the month
22 before or after the prediction.

23 Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS version 21 for Windows. Descriptive
24 analyses were presented as means and standard deviations (SD) for normally
25 distributed continuous variables, medians for skewed continuous data, and
26 percentages for dichotomous variables. Significant differences were determined
27 using ANOVA for continuous normally distributed data and X^2 for dichotomous
28 variables.

29

1 **Results**

2 *Data availability*

3 194 new drugs and new indications for existing licensed drugs were awarded MA by
4 the EMA in the five-year study period between 2009 and 2013 (inclusive), of which
5 123 (63.4%) had a company prediction of the likely MAA and/or MA date recorded in
6 the NIHR HSRIC information system. Two thirds of these 123 drugs (65%) had both
7 predicted MAA and MA dates available on the NIHR HSRIC database. More than
8 three quarters of the drugs included in the analysis were new drugs (78.3%) rather
9 than new indications for existing licensed drugs, and the majority did not have an
10 orphan designation (84.0%).

11 *Accuracy of company predictions for MAA and MA dates*

12 Less than half (43.8%) and less than a quarter (24.1%) of MAA and MA predictions,
13 respectively, were regarded as accurate. Out of the 80 drugs where predictions were
14 available for both MA and MAA, only 9 (11.3%) drugs had accurate predictions for
15 both MAA and MA (Table 1). The majority of errors were optimistic ones; with 28.8%
16 of those predictions were expected to happen before the actual MA/MAA dates. The
17 differences between the in the accuracy of predictions were statistically significant
18 (McNemar-Bowker test =14.4, df=3, p=0.002). Company predictions for MAA dates
19 ranged from seventy two months before the actual MAA date to twenty eight months
20 after the actual MAA date. Company predictions for MA dates ranged from seventy
21 five months before the actual MA date to fifteen months after the actual MA date.

22 There was no difference in the percentage accuracy of MAA predictions between
23 new drugs (44.3%) and new indications (45.5%). However, for MA, only 24.0% of
24 predictions for new drugs were accurate compared to 30.8% for new indications, but
25 this difference was not statistically significant. For drugs with predictions earlier than
26 the actual dates, the mean number of months difference from the actual dates was
27 less for new drugs (8.6 and 10.4 for MAA and MA respectively) than for new
28 indications (14.6 and 7.3 months for MAA and MA respectively). For drugs with
29 predictions later than the actual dates, the mean difference between actual and
30 predicted dates was greater for new drugs (6.4 months for MAA and 4.8 for MA) than
31 for new indications (3.0 months for MAA and 3.0 for MA).

1 Orphan designation made little difference to the percentage of accurate predictions
2 (MAA, 50% and 43.2% and MA, 23.8% and 25%, for those with and without orphan
3 designations, respectively), though an increase in the spread of data was observed
4 in the accuracy of prediction for drugs without orphan designations. However, for
5 drugs with predictions earlier than the actual dates, the mean difference between
6 actual and predicted dates was less for drugs with an orphan designation (4.3 for
7 MAA and 8.8 for MA) than those without an orphan designation (10.7 for MAA and
8 10.3 for MA), but these differences were not statistically significant. However, for
9 drugs with predictions later than the actual dates, this pattern was observed only for
10 MAA (mean difference between actual and predicted dates for MAA, 4.3 for orphan
11 and 10.7 for non-orphan drugs; mean difference between actual and predicted dates
12 for MA, 7.3 for orphan and 4.2 for non-orphan drugs).

13

14 *Length of time between the prediction being received, actual MAA/MA date, and*
15 *prediction accuracy*

16 More than half of company predictions for MA dates available on the NIHR HSRIC
17 database (58.3%) were received within two years of the actual MA date (Table 2),
18 and almost two thirds of accurate predictions (65.4%, 17 of 26) were found in this
19 group. For predictions received more than 24 months prior to final MA, only 20% (9
20 of 45) were accurate and the vast majority were optimistic (67%, 30 of 45).

21

22 Cases where the company prediction was accurate for MAA had a statistically
23 significantly shorter median length of duration between the date when predictions
24 was received and the actual MAA date (Table 3, median 17.0 months, $p < 0.0001$).
25 For the nine drugs where the predictions were accurate for both MAA and MA, the
26 mean duration between the predictions was received and the actual MA date was
27 15.8 months (SD 6.04, median 17, minimum 4 and maximum 26).

28

29 For company predictions that were earlier than the actual MA date, there was a
30 positive relationship between the length of time between making the prediction and
31 the actual MA date, and the accuracy of prediction ($y = 0.54x - 4.17$, $r = 0.70$, $R^2 =$
32 0.49 , $p = 0.0001$, Figure 1a). Visual inspection of the scatter plot suggested that the

1 three drugs with predictions received more than five years before actual MA date
2 may be outliers. After their exclusion, there still remained a positive, but much
3 weaker relationship between the length of time between receiving the company
4 prediction and the actual licensing date, and the accuracy of prediction ($y = 0.13x$
5 4.58 , $r=0.26$, $p=0.05$). In contrast, no statistically significant relationship between
6 prediction accuracy and the length of time between the prediction being received and
7 actual MA date was seen for company predictions that were subsequently found to
8 be later than the actual MA date (Figure 1b).

9

10 **Discussion**

11 *Major findings of this study*

12 Our analysis showed that most company predictions of licensing dates were
13 inaccurate, with less than half of pharmaceutical company predictions for MAA timing
14 and less than a quarter of their predictions for MA timing falling within our definition
15 of accurate (the same month or the month either side of the actual date). More than
16 half of company predictions for MA were optimistic, being earlier than the actual
17 date. Our findings regarding the accuracy of pharmaceutical company predictions
18 agree with the general comments of other authors, who suggest that one cannot
19 expect fully accurate predictions and that by their very nature some predictions will
20 inevitably be wrong.^[18-20] Accordingly, there are inherent limits to the accuracy of
21 health care horizon scanning programmes and the future will always be uncertain.

22

23 Pharmaceutical companies were more accurate in predicting the dates for MAA than
24 for MA, which may be explained by the date of filing being at least partly under the
25 company's control, whilst the final MA date is primarily determined by the regulator.
26 The maximum time taken for the EMA to conduct its review is limited by legislation,
27 so that variations in the time taken for drugs to be awarded authorisation depends on
28 whether more information is requested from the company to meet regulatory
29 requirements. In this study neither orphan designation nor drug development status
30 (in terms of being a new drug or a new indication for an existing licensed drug) made
31 a significant difference to the accuracy of company predictions.

32

1 *Implications for EAA systems*

2 Estimation of the potential timing of approval for new and emerging drugs is crucially
3 important for early decision making and appropriate planning. A major objective of an
4 effective EAA system is to provide sufficient notice to policy makers before a new
5 drug or technology diffuses into a health care system, and monitoring of drug
6 licensing is critical with accuracy a fundamental criterion.^[21, 22] Acknowledging the
7 challenge, the NIHR HSRIC performs extensive and proactive contact with
8 pharmaceutical companies to identify products in company development pipelines
9 and obtain predictions for licensing dates.^[12]

10

11 Making predictions is a complex process, and their accuracy and certainty is always
12 open to question.^[6, 23] Perhaps unsurprisingly, predictions received nearer to the time
13 were more likely to be accurate. This finding needs to be considered when designing
14 effective EAA systems as increasing uncertainty must be recognised when
15 predictions are to be received a long time before the actual event. Our results
16 suggest that providing information on emerging drugs more than 2 years from
17 estimated MAA or MA dates is likely to result in less accurate predictions.

18

19 *Strengths and limitations*

20 This is the first study to look comprehensively at the accuracy of pharmaceutical
21 companies' predictions for the expected dates of their drugs' marketing authorisation
22 application and subsequent authorisation. Although we have been able to use the
23 NIHR HSRIC extensive internal information system to provide company predictions,
24 we were limited by data availability: not all the drugs licensed in the period of our
25 study had company predictions available on the NIHR HSRIC database, and not all
26 drugs for which there were predictions had predicted dates available for both MAA
27 and MA. In addition, the availability of the data depends on the NIHR HSRIC data
28 collecting efforts. For this study, the last available information from the company prior
29 to the NIHR HSRIC producing an output was taken as the final predicted MAA or MA
30 date.

31

32

33

1 **Conclusion**

2 This study suggests that the current timescales used by the NIHR HSRIC to inform
3 the NICE topic selection process are valid and provide a reasonable balance
4 between earliness and accuracy. But making predictions for drug licensing
5 timeframes even when using well informed sources represents a challenge for
6 effective EAA systems and the results presented here demonstrate the inherent
7 difficulties.

8

9 **References**

- 10 1. House of Commons Health Committee. The use of new medical technologies
11 within the NHS. Fifth report of session 2004-2005, Volume1.
12 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmhealth/398/398i.pdf>
13 (accessed 20 April 2014).
14
- 15 2. Varela-Lema L et al. Making processes reliable: A validated PubMed search
16 strategy for identifying new or emerging technologies. *Int J Technol Assess Health*
17 *Care* 2012; 28(4): 452–459.
18
- 19 3. Hailey D et al. Horizon scanning for health technologies relevant to Alberta. A
20 report on a pilot project. Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. May
21 2001. <http://www.ihe.ca/documents/info2.pdf> (accessed 18 November 2014).
22
- 23 4. Packer C et al. The evolution of early awareness and alert methods and systems.
24 *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* (Editorials) 2012; 28(3): 199–200.
- 25 5. Gutierrez-Ibraluzea I et al. Early awareness and alert systems: An overview of
26 Euroscan methods. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2012; 28(3): 301–307.
27
- 28 6. Lerner JC et al. Case studies on forecasting for innovative technologies: Frequent
29 revisions improve accuracy. *Health Affairs* 2015; 34(2): 311-318.
30
- 31 7. EuroScan International Network. A toolkit for the identification and assessment of
32 new and emerging health technologies. October 2014.

- 1 [http://www.hsrhc.nihr.ac.uk/topics/a-toolkit-for-the-identification-and-assessment-of-
3 new-and-emerging-health-technologies/](http://www.hsrhc.nihr.ac.uk/topics/a-toolkit-for-the-identification-and-assessment-of-
2 new-and-emerging-health-technologies/) (accessed 15 February 2015).
- 4 8. Bloom BS et al. Surgeon predictions on growth of minimal invasive therapy: the
5 difficulty of estimating technologic diffusion. *Health Policy* 2001; 54: 201–207.
- 6
- 7 9. Kalamas J, Pinkus G. From the analyst couch: The optimum time for drug
8 licensing. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* (Highlights) September 2003; 2: 691.
- 9
- 10 10. Nachtnebel A et al. Scanning the horizon—Development and implementation of
11 an early awareness system for anticancer drugs in Austria. *Health Policy* 2012;
12 104:1–11.
- 13
- 14 11. NIHR Horizon Scanning Research & Intelligence Centre (NIHR HSRIC).
15 <http://www.hsc.nihr.ac.uk/> (accessed 13 December 2014).
- 16
- 17 12. Packer C et al. Analysing 10 years of early awareness and alert activity in the
18 United Kingdom. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2012; 28(3): 308–314.
- 19
- 20 13. UK PharmaScan. www.ukpharmascan.org.uk (accessed 20 April 2014).
- 21
- 22 14. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE): Guide to the process of
23 technology appraisal. Published 2 September 2014.
24 [http://www.nice.org.uk/article/pmg19/resources/non-guidance-guide-to-the-
26 processes-of-technology-appraisal-pdf](http://www.nice.org.uk/article/pmg19/resources/non-guidance-guide-to-the-
25 processes-of-technology-appraisal-pdf) (accessed 11 May 2015).
- 27 15. Sun F, Schoelles K. A systematic review of methods for health care technology
28 horizon scanning. (Prepared by ECRI Institute under Contract No.
29 290-2010-00006-C.) AHRQ Publication No. 13-EHC104-EF. Rockville, MD: Agency
30 for Healthcare Research and Quality; August 2013.
31 [http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/393/1679/Horizon-Scanning
33 Methods-Report_130826.pdf](http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/393/1679/Horizon-Scanning
32 Methods-Report_130826.pdf) (accessed 15 July 2014).

- 1 16. European Medicine Agency (EMA). <http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/> (accessed
2 20 February 2014).
- 3
- 4 17. British National Formula (BNF). BNF Editions 57-65 (March 2009- September
5 2013). British Medical Association; Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain
6 <http://www.bnf.org> (accessed 19 May 2014).
- 7 18. Spiby J. Advances in medical technology over the next 20 years. *Community*
8 *Med* 1998; 10(4): 273-278.
- 9 19. Canongia C et al. Technological foresight—the use of biotechnology in the
10 development of new drugs against breast cancer. *Technovation* 2004; 24: 299-309.
- 11 20. Porter AL. Technology futures analysis: Towards integration of the field and new
12 methods. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang* 2004; 7: 287-303.
- 13
- 14 21. Robert G, Gabbay J. Which are the best information sources for identifying
15 emerging health care technologies? *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 1998; 14(4):
16 636-643.
- 17
- 18 22. Stevens A et al. Keeping pace with new technologies: systems needed to identify
19 and evaluate them. *BMJ* 1999; 319: 1-3.
- 20
- 21 23. Robert G et al. Early warning systems' for identifying new healthcare
22 technologies. *Health Technol Asses* 1999; 3(13): 1-78.
- 23
- 24