OBJECTIVES: The objective of this study is to assess and compare the characteristics of relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS) patients taking Interferon beta 1b (Extavia) or Interferon beta 1a (Rebif) subcutaneously. **METHODS:** A large US administrative retrospective claims database was used to identify patients diagnosed with RRMS and were prescribed Interferon beta 1b (IB1a) or 1a (IB1b) between January 2010 and December 2012 were included in the study. All patients were ≥ 18 years of age and continuously enrolled in the same health plan at least a year. Descriptive statistics and chi-square tests were performed on the data. **RESULTS:** There were a total of 317 patients on IB1a and 10,190 on IB1b during the study period. Of these, more than 70% of the patients in both groups were females (76.7% vs 74.9%, p=0.484). IB1a patients were older than IB1b (48.57±11.47 vs 46.51±10.63 years, p=0.001) and majority of the patients were in the 40 to 65 years age group (72.2% vs 69.1%, p<0.001). The majority of the patients in IB1a were from Midwest (60.35% vs 35.6%) and the least number of patients were from East (5.4% vs 27.0%, p<0.001). More than half of the IB1b patients were on group coverage (21.5% vs 58.0%) and the majority of the IB1a patients were on unknown coverage (77.6% vs 38.9%, p<0.001). The majority of the IB1b patients prescriptions were on health plan formulary (34.1% vs 65.1%, p<0.001) and were diagnosed with mental health problems (18.9% vs 56.9%, p<0.001). IB1a patients enrolled in the same health plan longer (5.71±3.48 vs 4.52±2.45 years, p<0.001) and submitted more claims (491.72±485.80 vs 377.36±363.13, p<0.001). IB1b patients received more number of days of supply than IB1a (30.47±6.80 vs 31.48±13.55 days, p<0.001). **CONCLUSIONS:** IB1b patients were younger, on health plan formulary and received more number of days of supply.

PND58
IMPACT OF NEW ENTRANTS TO THE MARKET FOR MULTIPLE-SCLEROSIS DISEASE-MODIFYING DRUGS IN CANADA
Bennetts L, Khoury H, O'Neil B
LASER Analytica, Montreal, QC, Canada
OBJECTIVES: Multiple sclerosis (MS) is one of the most common neurological diseases, and in Canada, MS rates are among the highest reported worldwide. Disease-modifying drugs (DMDs) for MS are used to prevent disability and delay disease progression. Ten DMDs are approved in Canada, of which four (oral therapies fingolimod, dimethyl fumarate and teriflunomide; monoclonal antibody alemtuzumab) have entered the market since 2011. The objective of this study was to evaluate the Canadian market for DMDs since 2011. **METHODS:** Data on retail prescriptions and on drugstore and hospital purchases of DMD in Canada were obtained from IMS Brogan. Numbers of prescriptions and purchases (in $Can) were collected for 12-month periods ending May 31st 2011, 2013 and 2015. **RESULTS:** Total numbers of prescriptions filled for DMDs in Canada amounted to 174,503, 181,536 and 231,513 in the 12 months ending May 31st of 2011, 2013, and 2015, respectively. The number of prescriptions for the market leader, glatiramer acetate, remained stable during this period, but as a percentage of overall DMD prescriptions decreased from 33.6% (2011) to 24.5% (2015). Prescription volume of the four newest DMD entrants to the Canadian market underwent steady growth, from <1% to 37% of overall DMD prescriptions in the 12 months ending May 31st2011 and 2015, respectively. Total drugstore and hospital purchases for these therapies in Canada reached $181 million in the 12 months ending May 2015, representing 40% of the value of total DMD purchases. **CONCLUSIONS:** DMDs represent a market of more than $450 million dollars in Canada; this will likely continue to grow due to the increasing prevalence of MS in the general population. Since 2011, the market share of the four newest entrants to the Canadian market has grown rapidly so that in 2015, they captured approximately two-fifths of DMD prescriptions and purchases.

PND59
COST ANALYSIS OF PATIENTS WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS NEWLY INITIATING SUBCUTANEOUS INTERFERON β-1A VERSUS ORAL DISEASE-MODIFYING DRUGS
Kozma CM[1], Munschauer FE[2], Phillips AL[2]
[1]CK Consulting Associates, LLC, Saint Helena Island, SC, USA, [2]EMD Serono, Inc., Rockland, MA, USA
OBJECTIVES: Evaluate costs among patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) newly initiating subcutaneous interferon beta-1a (scIFNβ1a) vs oral disease-modifying drugs (DMDs; ie, teriflunomide, fingolimod, dimethyl fumarate). **METHODS:** Patients from IMS LifeLink PharMetrics Plus™ met the following criteria: MS diagnosis (ICD-9-CM:340.xx); initiation of scIFNβ1a, teriflunomide, fingolimod, or dimethyl fumarate between 1/1/2012–6/30/2013 (1st claim=index date); continuous eligibility 12 months pre- and post-index; no DMD 12 months pre-index (treatment-naïve); and age 18–63 years. Total (all-cause) and medical costs (excluding DMD cost) were examined 12-months post-index (reported in 2014 US dollars). Generalized linear models with gamma distribution and log link controlled for demographics (age, sex, region) and clinically-meaningful disease severity measures (90-day pre-index relapse, neurologist visits, MRI). **RESULTS:** 1665 patients (686 scIFNβ1a, 118 teriflunomide, 455 fingolimod, 406 dimethyl fumarate) met inclusion criteria (mean age=44.4 years; 75.5% female). After adjustment, estimated least squares mean 12-month total cost for scIFNβ1a was $57,558 compared with teriflunomide ($55,414; p=0.4977), fingolimod ($69,478; p<0.0001), and dimethyl fumarate ($69,798; p<0.0001). Age (p<0.0001) and 90-day pre-index relapse (p<0.0001) were significant predictors of cost. Estimated least squares mean 12-month medical cost for scIFNβ1a was $13,562 compared with fingolimod ($15,840; p=0.0234), teriflunomide ($17,148; p=0.0350), and dimethyl fumarate ($20,987; p<0.0001). Age (p<0.0001), region (p=0.0006), and each clinically-meaningful disease severity measure (all p<0.0001) were significant predictors of cost. Interactions between DMD and region were identified, as was between DMD and no 90-day pre-index relapse. Among patients with no 90-day pre-index relapse, medical costs were lower for patients initiating scIFNβ1a compared with patients initiating an oral DMD. **CONCLUSIONS:** In this real-world assessment, after controlling for demographics and clinically-meaningful disease severity measures, patients initiating scIFNβ1a had lower 12-month total costs compared to fingolimod and teriflunomide and lower 12-month medical costs compared with

patients initiating any oral DMD. Examination of interactions identified effects between various covariates and cost.

PND60
FINGOLIMOD VERSUS TEIFLUNOMIDE: HEALTH CARE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH RELAPSING REMITTING MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS TAKING DISEASE MODIFYING THERAPIES IN THE UNITED STATES
Greene M[1], Greene N[2]
[1]Health Economics & Outcomes Research and Market Access Researcher, Medford, MA, USA, [2]Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences University, Medford, MA, USA
OBJECTIVES: The objective of this study is to assess and compare the health care costs associated with patients diagnosed with relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS) and taking Fingolimod capsules or Teriflunomide tablets. **METHODS:** A large US administrative retrospective claims database was used to identify patients diagnosed with RRMS and were prescribed Fingolimod or Teriflunomide between January 2010 and December 2012 were included in the study. All patients were ≥ 18 years of age and continuously enrolled in the same health plan for a year. Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests and regression analysis were performed on the data and statistical significance level was set a priori at 0.05. **RESULTS:** There were a total of 3,102 patients on Fingolimod and 114 on Teriflunomide that met the study criteria. Patients on average were charged $5168.66±2371.50 and $3811.13±1377.13 for their treatment (p<0.001). However, the amount allowed (p<0.001) by the health plan was $5013.07±2351.37 and $3705.05±1373.52 and the actual amount paid (p<0.001) was $4905.78±2344.11 and $3630.08±1375.79 for a month supply. On average, patient's deductible (p=0.748) was $12.12±106.89 and $8.40±55.13 and patient co-payment (p=0.887) was $75.14±239.49 and $78.74±159.46 for Fingolimod and Teriflunomide. The majority of the Fingolimod (54.9%) and Teriflunomide (92.1%) patients were charged anywhere between $50K to $100K and $25K to $50K for their treatment per year. For patients whose prescription was on their health plans formulary ($148.37±12.99 vs $126.88±15.62) on average charged per day lower compared to patients on non-formulary status ($158.22±25.40 vs $125.98±39.61). The regression analysis shows that patients receiving drug supply ≤30 days, having mental health issues, individual coverage, patient's <65 years of age and patients receiving Fingolimod were more likely (p<0.05) to have higher charges. **CONCLUSIONS:** The cost of Fingolimod treatment for RRMS patients is higher than Teriflunomide.

PND61
HEALTH ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF ORALLY VERSUS SUBCUTEANOUSLY ADMINISTERED DISEASE MODIFYING THERAPIES FOR PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH RELAPSING REMITTING MULIPLE SCLEROSIS
Greene M[1], Greene N[2]
[1]Health Economics & Outcomes Research and Market Access Researcher, Medford, MA, USA, [2]Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences University, Medford, MA, USA
OBJECTIVES: The objective of this study is to conduct a health economic evaluation and compare the health care costs associated with patients diagnosed with relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis and taking orally or subcutaneously administered disease modifying therapies (DMTs). **METHODS:** A large US administrative retrospective claims database was used to identify patients diagnosed with RRMS and were prescribed either orally or subcutaneously administered DMTs between January 2010 and December 2012 were included in the study. All patients were ≥ 18 years of age and continuously enrolled in the same health plan at least a year. Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests and logistic regression analysis were performed on the data and statistical significance level was set a priori at 0.05. **RESULTS:** There were a total of 3,216 patients on Orals and 10,507 on Subcutaneous DMTs that met study criteria. Patients on average were charged $5120.54±2356.75 and $3966.75±1904.01 for their treatment with Orals and Subcutaneous DMTs (p<0.001). However, the amount allowed (p<0.001) by the health plan was $4966.70±2336.18 and $3615.94±1752.21 and the actual amount paid (p<0.001) was $4860.56±2328.56 and $3504.89±1745.19 for a month supply. The annual cost of treating patients with Orals was higher than Subcutaneous DMTs ($61,446.57±28281.09 vs $47,601.01±22848.23, p<0.001). The majority of the Orals were charged anywhere between $50K and $100K (53.1% vs 11.9%, p<0.001) and Subcutaneous were charged between $25K and $50K (36.1% vs 80.4%) for their annual treatment. The mean cost of DMTs per day of treatment is higher for Orals compared to Subcutaneous ($151.04±21.25 vs $117.93±35.24, p<0.001). The logistic regression analysis showed that patients receiving Orals were eight times more likely to have costs for their treatment more than $50K per year compared to subcutaneous DMTs (OR 8.0, p<0.001). **CONCLUSIONS:** Patients on Orals DMTs have a higher treatment costs than Subcutaneous administered DMTs.

PND62
HEALTH ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF INTERFERON BETA 1B VERSUS 1A FOR PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH RELAPSING REMITTING MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS
Greene M[1], Greene N[2]
[1]Health Economics & Outcomes Research and Market Access Researcher, Medford, MA, USA, [2]Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences University, Medford, MA, USA
OBJECTIVES: The objective of this study is to conduct a health economic evaluation and compare the health care costs associated with patients diagnosed with relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis and taking Interferon beta 1b (Extavia) or Interferon beta 1a (Rebif) subcutaneously. **METHODS:** A large US administrative retrospective claims database was used to identify patients diagnosed with RRMS and were prescribed Interferon beta 1b (IB1a) or 1a (IB1b) between January 2010 and December 2012 were included in the study. All patients were ≥ 18 years of age and continuously enrolled in the same health plan for a year. Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests and regression analysis were performed on the data and statistical significance level was set a priori at 0.05. **RESULTS:** There were a total of 317 patients on IB1a and 10,190 on IB1b that met study criteria. Patients on average were charged $3378.06±963.58 and $3985.06±1923.06 for their treatment (p<0.001) with IB1a and IB1b. However, the amount allowed (p<0.001) by the health plan was $3060.36±917.77 and $3633.22±1769.11 and the actual amount paid (p<0.001) was $2977.23±912.96