

Risk communication, transparency

- What do patients say
- What do patients understand

Ditchley 6, June 1-2, 2016, Cork
The slides reflect the speakers personal opinion

Carcinogenicity of red & processed meat

WHO communicates per 50g daily intake of

- ♦ Red meat (mammalian muscle meat, including beef, veal, pork, lamb, mutton, horse, and goat)
- Processed meat (hot dogs (frankfurters), ham, sausages, corned beef, and biltong or beef jerky)

intestinal cancer risk will increase by 20%

Most people and press understood that 20 people out of 100 fulfilling the criteria would develop intestinal cancer.

However

- ♦ 5% of people not eating sausage or meat will develop intestinal cancer, and
- ♦ 6% of people eating sausage or meat will do the same

Lesson learned

- ♦ 20% intestinal cancer increase by sausage sells better than 1%
- → Public outcry in Switzerland: We want our sausage, our bacon, where's the fun without?
- ♦ WHO credibility questioned

Thromboembolic events & oral contraceptives

UK press reports 2011

- ♦ Use of 3rd generation oral contraceptives increases thromboembolic events by 100%
- Many women stop taking contraceptives, unknown number of unwanted pregnancies
- ♦ 14'000 abortions

However

- ♦ 1 out of 7 women using 2nd generation oral contraceptives will suffer from thromboembolic events, and
- ♦ 2 out of 7 women using 3rd generation oral contraceptives will do the same
- ♦ Older contraceptives have other unacceptable side effects

Thromboembolic events & oral contraceptives

Messy impact in Europe

- ♦ Very thorough communication by EMA on website
 - ♦ Missed opportunity for public hearing legal basis?
 - ♦ Thorough risk minimisation measures recommended, not easy to understand
 - → Danish NCA continues to recommend 2nd generation prescription over 3rd and 4th, and says many women preferring the newer confusing message
 - ♦ Irish agency says overall side effects 3rd generation is marginally better than 2nd and cycle control is also better
- Swissmedic communication in line with EMA, very thorough information on website, includes detailed risk minimisation measures
 - ♦ Information not understandable for lay audience

Background

- Communication on medicines have changed
- ♦ Open discussion between PCWP & HCPWP with communication experts to provide indicative lines of research supporting future advancements

Previous events

- ★ EMA risk communication workshop 2014
 <u>ema.europa.eu/docs/en GB/document library/Report/2014/12/WC50017</u>
 <u>8511.pdf</u>

Surfacing issues

- **♦** Challenges for production
 - ♦ Need for rapid reactions
 - ♦ Varying levels of literacy
 - ♦ Different languages and cultural variations to be taken into account

♦ Opportunities and actions for production

- → Transparency on source and unknowns
- ♦ Balanced, regularly updated summaries
- ♦ Appealing & individualised information

- ♦ Changes to PL to increase use
- ♦ Side effects and how to manage them

Surfacing issues

♦ Challenges for dissemination

- ♦ Fragmentation in access to information
- ♦ Maintenance of trust in regulators

Opportunities and actions for dissemination

- ♦ Structures strategy
- ♦ Dissemination is everyone's task
- ♦ A single portal
- → Multiplatform use of EMA website
- ♦ Search engine and new media optimisation
- ♦ Alert system for new & important changes
- ♦ Clear differentiation of regulator information

Using information – obstacles at point of care

♦ Challenges for use

- ♦ Preparing patients and HCP for share decision
- ♦ Information overload
- ♦ Time scarcity
- ♦ Health literacy

♦ Opportunities and actions for use

- ★ Education on hot topics

- ♦ Use of patient networks and blogs
- ♦ Increased transparency of decisions

Areas for improvement and further research

- ♦ Significant advances, creating greater transparency promoting shared, informed decision making
- → Improving quality of information & providing summaries of key information still on agenda due to changing technologies & information overload – finding the right facts more difficult than ever
- ♦ Search engine optimisation to improve EMA visibility on Google industry
 & Wikipedia results rank better
- ♦ Indicator to evaluate information impact and how it affects medicines use would be valuable
- ♦ Smartphone apps have potential to gather & disseminate information
- ♦ Initiatives such as the FDA users guide on R & B communication could be useful in Europe indeed
- → Improvements to the PL graphics, effects table, QR codes, PL as educational tool
- **♦ Communication advisory boards –** *Yes please, when?*

Personal thoughts

Recognising advances and improvements, the considerable effort & progress made in 20 years

- We spend too much time on trying to find the rational comprehensive magic bullet
- ♦ Be a little more "hands-on" and better use what is already here
- ♦ Educate & teach risk literacy sapere aude
- → Drug facts box by Schwartz & Woloshin there is currently nothing better published 2009 what are we waiting for?
- ♦ In Switzerland, a private health insurance company starts using the tool & publishing good clips (PSA screening, mammography, colonoscopy)
 - Suboptimal, perceived as economically interested party trying to limit access to approved interventions
 - ♦ Authorities & payers should collaborate and use the tool
- → Puzzled by national competent authorities not saying the same online after having contributed to the same decision making process at EMA
- ♦ Reaching out to WHO much needed, they seem far behind
- ♦ Need to move on with PL most important & most visible

Thanks

- Frederic Bouder, Dominic Way, Ragnar Löfstedt for continuous inspiration
- ➤ EMA for many years of dedicated activities in medicines communication and transparency, and Nathalie Bere for reviewing slides
- Swissmedic for catching up