■ To the Editor

Making a formulary decision entails piecing together a jigsaw puzzle, except it remains to be determined which pieces belong in the puzzle that are relevant for the picture to be elucidated. The CER (Comparative Effectiveness Research) Collaborative toolkit comes into use in this respect by providing a systematic framework to analyze the quality of the evidence and its applicability to a health plan.

In our case study for Eylea (aflibercept), we found the toolkit to be valuable in guiding evidence-based team discussion. Since we employed a broad range of resources, the study assessments proved particularly useful for evaluating relevance and credibility. For example, the trials for the CRVO (central retinal vein occlusion) indication only compared aflibercept with placebo; hence, we deemed it critical to objectively judge the strength of evidence of a meta-analysis comparing different CRVO treatments. Further, our economic data assessment ultimately led to our decision to construct our budget impact model. In the second component of the toolkit, we visually graphed our conclusion of the drug's benefit with a corresponding level of certainty, rendering a transparent formulary decision. The CER toolkit served as a powerful tool in helping our team confirm our formulary decision. Based on our use for the case study, we see that the toolkit has great utility in promoting and implementing comparative effectiveness research.

Edna Cheung, BA; Randal Du, BS;
Isabel Fong, BA; and Thomas Lee, BS
University of California, San Francisco
Pharmacy & Therapeutics Team
edna.cheung@ucsf.edu