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Ordinary Revision of the Therapeutic Products Act (Stage 2) & Therapeutic Products Ordinance Package IV

- Facilitating market access:
  Creating new and simpler access opportunities for certain medicinal product categories (especially medicinal products approved in an EU or EFTA country, medicinal products with traditional uses and medicinal products already approved in a canton, as well as various medicinal products used in complementary medicine);
  **simplifying self-medication by modified allocation of the medicinal products to the different supply categories, and an easing of the supply requirements.**
Pharmaceutical market by reimbursability according to value

Market volume 2016: CHF 5,594.8 million (at ex-factory prices, 100%)

- **Reimbursable products**
  - 83.8% (CHF 4,689.0 million)
  - Prescription only
    - 79.3% (CHF 4,439.6 million)
  - Over the counter
    - 4.5% (CHF 249.4 million)

- **Non-reimbursable products**
  - 16.2% (CHF 905.8 million)
  - Prescription only
    - 6.9% (CHF 386.7 million)
  - Over the counter
    - 9.3% (CHF 519.1 million)

Reclassification

Switch C>B=(Rx)/BTC (Pharmacist)

Switch C>D

Abolish C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Rx</th>
<th>no refill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rx</td>
<td>(&amp; BTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Dispensed by pharmacist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>OTC - Dispensed with counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>General Sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Therapeutic index, critical dose? Drug monitoring DDI?
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Switch Decision

Criteria (CH)

a) Pharmacological action (MoA)
b) Acute & chronic toxicity
c) Clinical experience (ADR, tolerability)
d) Indication
e) Abuse potential
f) Need for diagnosis & monitoring
For PBRERs for products with several indications, formulations, or routes of administration, where there may be significant differences in the identified and potential risks, it may be appropriate to present risks by indication, formulation, or route of administration. Headings that could be considered include:

- Risks relating to the active substance;
- Risks related to a specific formulation or route of administration (including occupational exposure);
- Risks relating to a specific population; and
- Risks associated with non-prescription use (for substances that are available as both prescription and non-prescription products).

Provide a clear explanation of the methodology and reasoning used to develop the benefit-risk evaluation:

- The assumptions, considerations, and judgement or weighting that support the conclusions of the benefit-risk evaluation should be clear.
- If a formal quantitative or semi-quantitative assessment of benefit-risk is provided, a summary of the methods should be included.

Economic considerations (e.g., cost-effectiveness) should not be included in the benefit-risk evaluation.
When describing the benefit-risk assessment, the following additional aspects should be considered:

- The impact of the therapeutic context on the assessment, which may include information on the patient perspective if available. This discussion should consist of the following:
  - how the severity of disease and expected benefit influence the acceptability of the risks of the therapy.
  - how the medicinal product addresses a medical need.
- Key aspects of risk management that are important in reaching a favourable benefit-risk assessment, such as:
  - the proposed labeling.
  - whether non-responders can be readily identified allowing them to discontinue treatment.
  - other risk management activities, such as registries or restricted distribution systems.

There are many approaches available for conducting the benefit-risk assessment. This guideline does not prescribe a specific approach. A descriptive approach that explicitly communicates the interpretation of the data and the benefit-risk assessment will generally be adequate. An applicant may choose to use methods that quantitatively express the underlying judgments and uncertainties in the assessment. Analyses that compare and/or weigh benefits and risks using the submitted evidence may be presented. However, before using any method,
2.5 If applicable: Paediatric Investigation Plan (PIP)

2.6 Assessment 1

2.6.1 Preliminary Benefit-Risk Assessment

Not all submitted data have equal importance to the critical assessment of benefits and risk. It is acceptable to give preferential attention to the key elements and summarize other data by means of a short description.

The tabular Benefit-Risk Framework below is meant as a tool in the decision making process, it is not meant to replace free text descriptions of the benefit risk assessment.

- The utility of the Framework needs to be determined from case to case.
- The Framework is meant as an aid and mental map to make the assessments more structured and more systematic, the tool cannot replace judgment.
- The Framework should aid the reader of the report to get an efficient overview and summary what were the key data, uncertainties, their interpretation and conclusions from all five dimensions which are driving the benefit-risk assessment.

Refer also to Appendix 3 for further explanations about this Benefit-Risk Framework.
Patients
- Self-diagnose
- Self-treat
- Self-manage

Regulator
- B:R:U
- Label / PI
- Communication

Applicant
- PBRER
- Quality
- Distribution

Stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Regulator</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>• Empowered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Distribution channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>• Unintended &amp; intended misuse</td>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>• Correct diagnosis (delay)?</td>
<td>Communication (patient information)</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Application?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-medication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special cases:**
- St. John’s wort
- Corticosteroids
- PDE-5 inhibitors
- Antimicrobials
How new fact boxes are explaining medical risk to millions

Smart “fact boxes” that communicate evidence-based information on the benefits and harms of drugs and health screening are being rolled out to millions of people in Europe. Gerd Gigerenzer and Kai Kolpatzik report

Gerd Gigerenzer director¹, Kai Kolpatzik head²

¹Harding Center for Risk Literacy and Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany;
²Department of Prevention, General Local Health Insurance Fund (AOK-Bundesverband), Berlin, Germany; Correspondence to: G Gigerenzer gigerenzer@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

An alien investigating healthcare on Earth would be quite puzzled. We spend billions on clinical studies but fail to ensure that patients and physicians are communicated the results transparently.¹ Instead they get persuasion, marketing, and, in some countries, misleading direct-to-consumer advertising.²³

Assembling the data

In general, fact boxes report the results from a randomised trial or, if available, a systematic review; provide quantitative, evidence-based information about benefits and harms; use absolute numbers rather than relative risk reductions or other formats that are known to confuse patients and physicians; and