

Off-patent biologicals and biosimilars tendering in Europe – a proposal towards more sustainable practices

Pharmaceuticals – Biosimilars special issue

Liese Barbier, Steven Simoens, Caroline Soontjens, Barbara Claus, Arnold G. Vulto, Isabelle Huys

Corresponding author: Liese Barbier, Email: liese.barbier@kuleuven.be

Supp. Table S4. Survey questions and results - Application of selection- and award criteria in tenders for off-patent biologicals and biosimilars		
What is the relative weight that is given to price when tendering for biological medicines?	Predominately on price	38% (18/47)
	100% on price	23% (11/47)
	50% on price, 50% on other criteria	19% (9/47)
	Predominantly on other criteria besides price	19% (9/47)
How are the selection and award criteria formulated? <i>(multiple answers were possible)</i>	In collaboration with/with advice from experts within the own organization	70% (33/47)
	Based on previous tender experiences	53% (24/47)
	Based on national or European guidelines	43% (20/47)
	In collaboration with/with advice from (one of) the suppliers	13% (6/47)
Are there differences between the selection criteria for suppliers applied in tender procedures for small molecules and these for biological medicines?	Yes	22% (11/50)
	No	68% (34/50)
	I don't know	10% (5/50)
	<i>Mentioned differences under "Yes": interchangeability data/switching studies are requested, support with implementation is needed, for biologicals only price, higher requirements regarding reliability of supply as we cannot interchange</i>	
Which selection criteria are applied to select viable suppliers of biological medicines? <i>(multiple answers were possible)</i>	The financial viability of the supplier	27% (14/51)
	The supplier's production capacity	20% (10/51)
	The supplier's reputation	20% (10/51)
	The supplier's track record of previous tenders	16% (8/51)
	Previous collaboration with the supplier	12% (6/51)

Off-patent biologicals and biosimilars tendering in Europe

	The duration that the supplier already markets the product	8% (4/51)
	The supplier's investment in R&D	8% (4/51)
	The product's market share	6% (3/51)
	The supplier's investment in academic research	4% (2/51)
	The supplier's investment in clinical trials	2% (1/51)
	Not applicable: no selection criteria for the supplier since we conduct open tenders	39% (20/51)
Are there differences between the award criteria applied in tender procedures for small molecules and these for biological medicines?	Yes	33% (16/48)
	No	60% (29/48)
	I don't know	6% (3/48)
	<i>Mentioned differences under "Yes": depends on the product, can be due to patented indications, switch studies, different weight on other criteria vs price, separate lot for patients under treatment and new patients</i>	
What are the award criteria that are applied to select the winning biological product(s)? (multiple answers were possible)	The product's registered indications	49% (24/49)
	The product's stability/shelf life	45% (22/49)
	The supply conditions	41% (20/49)
	The delivery device	35% (17/49)
	The packaging	35% (17/49)
	Emergency delivery and 24/7 reachability supplier	29% (14/49)
	Additional efficacy and/or safety data (in addition to data for regulatory approval)	22% (11/49)
	Value added services (e.g. supporting educational activities, product training programs, information brochures for HCPs or patients about the product, support with switching from the medicinal product previously used)	18% (9/49)
	Customer support	14% (7/49)
	Expenses incurred from switching from the previous winner	6% (3/49)
<u>Abbreviations:</u> HCPs: healthcare professionals; R&D: research and development		

