

# **Working Paper**

## **The Future of the Pharmaceutical Industry: Beyond Government-Granted Monopolies**

By Dean Baker

March 2019

# Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Working Around United States Patent Monopolies.....	6
Towards Patent-Free Drugs.....	8
Conclusion: The Waste and Corruption from Patent Monopolies in Prescription Drugs Offers Opportunities .....	10
References.....	12

# Acknowledgements

The author thanks Kevin Cashman and Hayley Brown for helpful research assistance and Kevin Cashman for editing the paper.

# Executive Summary

Patent monopolies on prescription drugs raise their price by one or two orders of magnitude above the free market price. In this way, they are equivalent to tariffs of several thousand percent or even tens of thousands of percent. Just as tariffs lead to economic distortions, and provide incentives for corruption, so do patent monopolies on prescription drugs. We continually see evidence of this as drug companies are routinely found to make payoffs to keep generics out of the market, promote their drugs for uses for which they are inappropriate, and conceal evidence they are less effective than claimed, or even harmful.

The enormous distortions from patent monopolies mean that there are large potential gains from working around them. This paper discusses four mechanisms for getting drug prices closer to free market levels with actions at the state or local level or by private actors.

- 1) Increasing importation from foreign countries. Drug prices in the United States are far higher than elsewhere in the world. While large-scale importation of drugs for resale is against the law, the federal government has allowed people to import drugs for their own uses. State and local governments, as well as private organizations, can assist this effort by keeping up to date pricing information on reliable foreign pharmacies and making it widely available.
- 2) Traveling to other countries to take advantage of lower cost drugs. This is considerably more expensive than simply importing the drug, but in cases where the price difference can be tens of thousands of dollars, traveling to get lower cost drugs still makes sense. The State of Utah is already financing trips for drug purchases in Mexico for some of the people enrolled in its public employee health program.
- 3) State-financed research that makes newly discovered drugs available at generic prices. Many states, especially large ones like California, fund large amounts of biomedical research. They can increase this funding to have it go through the drug development process (rather than just basic research) as well as clinical testing and FDA approval. As a condition of the funding, newly developed drugs could be required to be available as generics, within the state. The drugs could still be sold at patent-protected prices elsewhere. This would give the taxpayers in the state a large return on their investment, while still allowing for profit to be made from those who did not contribute to the research.

- 4) Philanthropically funded research that makes newly discovered drugs available at generic prices. This would be the same story as with state-funded research, but there would be no need to prevent a drug from being sold at generic prices worldwide. If a philanthropy was committed to public health, it should be happy to see the fruits of its research spending available at low cost throughout the world.

We should recognize patent monopolies as interference in the market, like tariffs or the central planning of the Soviet Union. Because they are so inefficient, there are enormous opportunities for potential gains. Exploiting this can help bring down the system and move us towards a more efficient mechanism for financing research and development of new drugs.

# Introduction

We all know the story of how tariffs are bad. By raising the price of a product 10 or 25 percent, in addition to raising the costs to consumers, the tariff also leads to all sorts of bad outcomes in the form of corruption and wasted resources. Government-granted patent monopolies have the same bad outcomes, except instead of raising the price of the protected item by 10 percent or 25 percent above the free market price, patents typically raise the price of a protected drug 30- or 40-fold above the free market price and sometimes more than 100-fold. This is equivalent to tariffs of several thousand percent or even more than 10,000 percent.

In public debates, the distortions associated with patent monopolies are rarely seen as comparable to the distortions resulting from tariffs, but they are nonetheless of the same type, with the difference that the distortions are hugely larger from patent monopolies due to the larger effect on price. Markets don't care that we call one form of intervention a "tariff" and the other a "patent." The extent of the distortions is determined by their impact on the price of the product.

Businesses and individuals take steps to avoid trade tariffs, such as misclassifying products or making small alterations.<sup>1</sup> Similar practices occur with prescription drugs, although they have much larger consequences for people's health as well as the economy. The large gap between the patent monopoly price and the free market price also encourages a wide range of rent-seeking behavior, which has substantial economic costs as well as public health consequences.

The most troubling form of rent-seeking behavior in the pharmaceutical industry is misrepresenting the safety and effectiveness of drugs in order to maximize monopoly profits. Since the drug companies have access to their data, and no one else does, they are often able to get away with these sorts of misrepresentations. They are helped by the fact that they can use a portion of their monopoly rents to pay for and promote statements of researchers and doctors touting the benefits of their drugs.

The drug companies also try to maximize their monopoly profits by using lobbying expenditures and campaign contributions to enlist the support of politicians, who can then support favored treatment for drugs in public programs like Medicare and Medicaid. They may also put in place laws or rules which require private insurers to pay excessive prices for drugs of little value.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tankersley (2018).

Drug companies also commonly make payoffs to generics to keep them from entering the market when their patent has expired. They also will file patents of dubious validity as a way to discourage new entrants. There is a fundamental asymmetry in any legal battle between a brand manufacturer and a generic. The brand manufacturer is fighting to sell the drug at the monopoly price whereas the generic company is looking to sell the drug at the free market price. In this context, the brand manufacturer has an enormous advantage since they have so much more at stake.

Patent monopolies also distort the research process itself. Drug companies will often spend large amounts of money developing drugs that essentially duplicate existing drugs, with the hope of getting a portion of the patent rents. While it is generally of some benefit to have multiple potential treatments for a condition (some people may react poorly to a specific drug), in general, research money would be better spent on developing drugs for conditions where there is no effective treatment.

These are well-known reasons for why patent monopolies have negative consequences in the prescription drug market. However, precisely because patent monopolies give so much power to the pharmaceutical industry, it is difficult to envision a direct attack on patent-financed development drugs at the federal level. As an alternative, there are steps that can be taken at the state or local level, or by private non-profits, to try to undermine the system.

## **Working Around United States Patent Monopolies**

Since the United States is the only wealthy country in the world that gives drug companies unchecked patent monopolies, this means drug prices are considerably higher than in any other country. This creates enormous opportunities for savings by getting around United States monopolies and allowing patients to get drugs at lower prices elsewhere. This means either bringing lower-cost foreign drugs into the United States or having patients in the United States go overseas to take advantage of lower cost drugs.

Clearly, importing drugs into the country is the more efficient route since it is much cheaper to transport drugs than people. However, large-scale importation is blocked by federal law, and even importation for personal use is illegal.<sup>2</sup> As a practical matter, the Food and Drug Administration

---

2 Friedman (2018).

(FDA) has generally opted not to take enforcement measures against patients who import modest quantities of drugs (less than a three-month supply) for personal use.

While state and local governments may run into legal obstacles if they were to directly promote importation, for example by keeping a list of high-quality mail-order pharmacies in other countries, they could take more modest measures which would almost certainly be within the law. For example, they could publish price lists showing the relative cost of drugs in the United States and a range of other countries. This would simply be providing information that allows people in the United States see how much more money they pay for drugs as a result of unchecked patent monopolies.

This is, in fact, the sort of action that could be undertaken by any organization and promoted by state and local governments who want to better inform their citizens as to why drug prices are high. Specifically, if there were one website that cataloged prices for various drugs in countries around the world, any state or local government would be able to have this information posted on their own website to broaden public awareness of the price differences. If based on this information, people decided to seek out lower-cost drugs from other countries, that would be entirely their own choice.

The other route, of sending people to other countries to take advantage of lower drug prices, is considerably costlier, but may still make sense in the context of the large price differences for many important drugs. With the cost of many drugs in the United States 100 times higher (or more) than the cost of generic versions in other countries, it may be possible to pay for a patient's travel, including a family member, and still save money on the cost of treatment.

Simple arithmetic suggests that such situations may not be rare. For example, the list price for the Hepatitis C drug Sovaldi was originally \$84,000. High-quality generic versions were available in India for less than \$1,000.<sup>3</sup> If two round-trip airfares cost \$6,000 and accommodations could be arranged for \$100 per night for a 3-month course of treatment, this would mean total travel expenses of \$15,000. With savings from buying the drug in India of \$80,000, this would allow for net after-travel savings of more than \$65,000. This could be split by a state government health insurance program (Medicaid, SCHIP, or public employee insurance) and the patient.

States could also structure their insurance regulations and liability rules to facilitate this practice among private insurers. This would mean setting up guidelines, presumably with some list of approved providers in other countries, with whom insurers could arrange care. It could also adjust rules on malpractice to ensure that patients had clear recourse if something goes wrong with their treatment.

---

3 Collins (2016).

This not simply a hypothetical scenario. Utah, one of the most Republican-leaning states in the country, is putting in place a system where it will pay patients who are insured through its public employee health insurance program, to fly to San Diego and cross into Tijuana and buy drugs there. The state insurance plan will cover the transportation cost and give the patient \$500 for their troubles.<sup>4</sup> This is not being done to make a political point, this is being done to save the state money.

If this option proves popular with patients, it is likely that the state will look to expand it and that other states will also follow this path. In addition to saving money, allowing people the option to travel to countries where drugs are much cheaper is also a way to drive home the point that drugs don't have to be expensive. This realization is likely to be increasingly important as more people find themselves in a situation where they or a family member need a drug with an extremely high price in the United States.

## Towards Patent-Free Drugs

It would be a huge step forward if drug companies had more difficulty charging high patent-protected prices for their drugs. But this is only part of the long-term story for cleaning up the prescription drug market. While the industry hugely exaggerates the costs associated with developing drugs, bringing a drug through the development process, clinical testing, and the FDA approval process is costly. If drug companies are not allowed to charge some premium over a free market price, they will be unable to recoup these costs. If we are going to continue to develop new drugs in a context where drug companies don't rely on patent monopolies to finance their research, we will need some alternative source of research funding.

In the long-run, the federal government would ideally pick up the cost, either through a system of direct funding that could look like an expanded National Institutes of Health or a patent buyout system under which the government would buy up drug patents and place them in the public domain so new drugs could be sold as generics.<sup>5</sup> However, this sort of transformation of funding mechanisms is not likely to happen any time soon. In the meantime, there are possibilities for incremental progress either through the actions of state governments or private philanthropies.

---

4 Albery (2018).

5 For a discussion of what such an alternative might look like, see *Rigged: How Globalization and the Rules of the Modern Economy Were Structured to Make the Rich Richer*, Chapter 5 (Baker 2016) and Baker, Jayadev, and Stiglitz (2017).



In the case of state governments, a large amount of research at public universities is already directly or indirectly supported by state governments. States could look to increase this funding with the idea that the drugs developed would be available to the states' residents at generic prices. The state could make this a condition for research at state-supported universities. In order to allow it to recoup the costs of the research, the research could still be patented with the drugs developed selling at patent-protected prices elsewhere. (Existing pharmaceutical companies could be contracted to market the drug outside of the state.)

Having low prices in one state, or a consortium of states if several states agreed to act collectively, will naturally lead people to come to these states to take advantage of the low prices. That has the disadvantage of reducing the potential profits from selling the drug at the patent-protected price in other states and countries. At the same time, it does help to both make the new drug available to a larger group of people at a low price, and it also helps to drive home the point that government intervention in the form of patent monopolies is the reason drug prices are high. In short, the outcome of people flocking to a state that pays for research to take advantage of its low drug prices should not be viewed as something to be feared.

There also is the advantage of a state paying for research that it can be a model for disclosure of results. This is especially important for clinical trials. While there have been efforts to increase disclosure of information on clinical trials in recent years, the fact is most drug companies only make available the most minimal information about their outcomes.

Ideally, there should be a full breakdown of the results for each patient, subject to the limits required to ensure anonymity, that would allow any researcher to independently analyze the results of the trial. This would allow researchers to determine not only the effectiveness of the drug in aggregate but also to assess differences by sex, age, prior health conditions, and other factors.

There is no legitimate reason that this information should be kept secret. The fact that it is generally not public is a serious impediment to doctors trying to determine the best treatment for their patients. If universities used public funds to carry through clinical trials, they could be required to have full disclosure. This would be a benefit for those seeking a full analysis of these trials, but also provide a benchmark that could be used to demand more disclosure from industry-funded trials.

The other potential source for funding the development of new drugs is philanthropic organizations. In this case, there is the advantage that there is no need to show a direct return on the money spent. In principle, an organization devoted to public health would be advancing its goals by directly funding research that led to the availability of important new drugs at a low cost.

There is already precedent for this sort of philanthropic support with the Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDI).<sup>6</sup> DNDI has developed a number of effective new drugs and treatments on a budget that is less than has been estimated as the cost for developing a single drug in the United States.<sup>7</sup> These treatments have benefited tens of millions of people in the developing world. It would be a small, but tremendously important step, to rely on philanthropic contributions to develop drugs that would be produced as generics in the wealthy countries.<sup>8</sup>

If even a small number of successful drugs could be developed with philanthropic support, it could provide an incredibly powerful example. It would be a blunt reminder that drugs are cheap to produce, it is only patent monopolies and related protections that make them expensive. Also, as with state-supported research, in the case of drugs developed with philanthropic support, all results could be put in the public domain, including the raw data from clinical trials.

## **Conclusion: The Waste and Corruption from Patent Monopolies in Prescription Drugs Offers Opportunities**

In spite of its corruption and inefficiency, it would be difficult politically to directly challenge the patent system for financing prescription drug research at the federal level. However, the fact that drug prices in the United States are so far above their free market price offers enormous opportunities for smaller-scale attacks on the system.

These attacks can take two main forms. The first simply involves facilitating the purchase of drugs outside the United States. Since patent-protected drugs in the United States can typically be purchased at far lower prices in other countries, there are large potential gains from either bringing foreign drugs into the United States or sending patients overseas to take advantage of lower priced drugs.

The other form of attack is to directly support the development of new drugs that can then be sold at generic prices from the day they are approved by the FDA. This can be done either by state

---

6 DNDi (2018).

7 DiMasi et al. (2016) put the cost for developing a new drug at \$2.6 billion.

8 It is common for philanthropies to partner with drug companies to support drugs for specific diseases, but the intention is generally to help their work in developing a drug on which the drug company will hold patents and sell at patent-protected prices. It would be a qualitatively different model to pay for research with the requirement that all results and patents would be in the public domain.

governments, which already fund a substantial amount of research through their university systems, or by private philanthropy. In the former case, it should be possible to design mechanisms that would allow the state to recover its additional spending through lower prices to its residents, as well as a share of patent rents for drugs sold elsewhere.

In both cases, the example of new drugs being developed outside the patent system and then sold at generic prices, should be an important model for an alternative system for supporting drug development. The fact that the current system does such a poor job of meeting health needs provides a large amount of room for improvement.

# References

- Alberty, Erin. 2018. "To fight high drug prices, Utah will pay for public employees to go fill prescriptions in Mexico." *The Salt Lake Tribune*, October 28. <https://www.sltrib.com/news/2018/10/28/fight-high-drug-prices/>.
- Baker, Dean. 2016. *Rigged: How Globalization and the Rules of the Modern Economy Were Structured to Make the Rich Richer*. Washington, DC: Center for Economic and Policy Research. <https://deanbaker.net/books/rigged.htm>.
- Baker, Dean, Arjun Jayadev, and Joseph Stiglitz. 2017. "Innovation, Intellectual Property, and Development: A Better Set of Approaches for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." AccessIBSA: Innovation & Access to Medicines in India, Brazil & South Africa. <http://cepr.net/publications/reports/innovation-intellectual-property-and-development-a-better-set-of-approaches-for-the-21st-century>.
- Collins, Simon. 2016. "1,000-Fold Mark-Up for Drug Prices in High Income Countries Blocks Access to HIV, HCV and Cancer Drugs." *The Body Pro*, October 24. <http://www.thebodypro.com/content/78658/1000-fold-mark-up-for-drug-prices-in-high-income-c.html>.
- DiMasi, JA, HG Grabowski, and RW Hansen. 2016. "Innovation in the pharmaceutical industry: New estimates of R&D costs." *J Health Econ.*, 47: 20-33. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26928437>.
- Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi). 2018. "DNDi — Best science for the most neglected." Geneva, Switzerland: DNDi. <https://www.dndi.org/>.
- Friedman, Ronald. 2018. "Importing Prescription Drugs Remains Risky Business Due to FDA and DEA." Chicago, IL: American Bar Association. [https://www.americanbar.org/groups/health\\_law/publications/aba\\_health\\_esource/2017-2018/march2018/importing/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/health_law/publications/aba_health_esource/2017-2018/march2018/importing/).
- Tankersley, Jim. 2018. "A Winter-Coat Heavyweight Gives Trump's Trade War the Cold Shoulder." *The New York Times*, November 23. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/23/business/economy/columbia-sportswear-trump-trade-war.html>.