

NOTE: THIS MATERIAL MAY BE COPYRIGHT PROTECTED.  
FURTHER REPRODUCTION, W/O PERMISSION, IS PROHIBITED.

# The Economics of New Goods

Edited by

Timothy F. Bresnahan and  
Robert J. Gordon



The University of Chicago Press

*Chicago and London*

IMMUNOGEN 2277, pg. 1  
Phigenix v. Immunogen

Studies in Income and Wealth  
Volume 58

National Bureau of Economic Research  
Conference on Research in Income and Wealth

DOCKET  
ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at [docketalarm.com](http://docketalarm.com).

TIMOTHY F. BRESNAHAN is professor of economics at Stanford University and a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research. ROBERT J. GORDON is the Stanley G. Harris Professor in the Social Sciences at Northwestern University and a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637  
 The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London  
 © 1997 by the National Bureau of Economic Research  
 All rights reserved. Published 1997  
 Printed in the United States of America  
 06 05 04 03 02 01 00 99 98 97 1 2 3 4 5  
 ISBN: 0-226-07415-3 (cloth)

Copyright is not claimed for "Comment" on chap. 2 by Jack E. Triplet; chap. 9 by Paul A. Armknecht, Walter F. Lane, and Kenneth J. Stewart; and chap. 10 by Marshall B. Reinsdorf and Brent R. Moulton.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The economics of new goods / edited by Timothy F. Bresnahan and Robert J. Gordon.

p. cm.—(Studies in income and wealth ; v. 58)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-226-07415-3 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Consumer price indexes—Congresses. 2. New products—Congresses. I. Bresnahan, Timothy F. II. Gordon, Robert J. (Robert James), 1940— . III. Series.

HB225.E3 1997

338.85'28—dc20

96-27822  
 CIP

© The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

**National Bureau of Economic Research**

**Officers**

Paul W. McCracken, *chairman*  
 John H. Biggs, *vice-chairman*  
 Martin Feldstein, *president and chief executive officer*  
 Gerald A. Polansky, *treasurer*

Sam Parker, *director of finance and corporate secretary*  
 Susan Colligan, *assistant corporate secretary*  
 Deborah Mankiw, *assistant corporate secretary*

**Directors at Large**

Peter C. Aldrich	George C. Eads	Robert T. Parry
Elizabeth E. Bailey	Martin Feldstein	Peter G. Peterson
John H. Biggs	George Hatsopoulos	Richard N. Rosett
Andrew Brimmer	Karen N. Horn	Bert Seidman
Carl F. Christ	Lawrence R. Klein	Kathleen P. Utgoff
Don R. Conlan	Leo Melamed	Donald S. Wasserman
Kathleen B. Cooper	Merton H. Miller	Marina v.N. Whitman
Jean A. Crockett	Michael H. Moskow	John O. Wilson

**Directors by University Appointment**

George Akerlof, <i>California, Berkeley</i>	Joel Mokyr, <i>Northwestern</i>
Jagdish Bhagwati, <i>Columbia</i>	Andrew Postlewaite, <i>Pennsylvania</i>
William C. Brainard, <i>Yale</i>	Nathan Rosenberg, <i>Stanford</i>
Glen G. Cain, <i>Wisconsin</i>	Harold T. Shapiro, <i>Princeton</i>
Franklin Fisher, <i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>	Craig Swan, <i>Minnesota</i>
Saul H. Hymans, <i>Michigan</i>	David B. Yoffie, <i>Harvard</i>
Marjorie B. McElroy, <i>Duke</i>	Arnold Zellner, <i>Chicago</i>

**Directors by Appointment of Other Organizations**

Marcel Boyer, <i>Canadian Economics Association</i>	Robert S. Hamada, <i>American Finance Association</i>
Mark Drabenstott, <i>American Agricultural Economics Association</i>	Charles Lave, <i>American Economic Association</i>
William C. Dunkelberg, <i>National Association of Business Economists</i>	Rudolph A. Oswald, <i>American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations</i>
Richard A. Easterlin, <i>Economic History Association</i>	Gerald A. Polansky, <i>American Institute of Certified Public Accountants</i>
Gail D. Fosler, <i>The Conference Board</i>	Josh S. Weston, <i>Committee for Economic Development</i>
A. Ronald Gallant, <i>American Statistical Association</i>	

**Directors Emeriti**

Moses Abramovitz	Franklin A. Lindsay	George B. Roberts
George T. Conklin, Jr.	Paul W. McCracken	Eli Shapiro
Thomas D. Flynn	Geoffrey H. Moore	William S. Vickrey
	James J. O'Leary	

Since this volume is a record of conference proceedings, it has been exempted from the rules governing critical review of manuscripts by the Board of Directors of the National Bureau (resolution adopted 8 June 1948, as revised 21 November 1949 and 20 April 1968).

if price is mismeasured, so is the dependent variable, but then their formula the coefficient becomes  $(\beta + 1)(\sigma - 1)$ , and the implied  $\sigma = 1.2$  is even credible.

Aging of lines": Once popular restaurants lose customers over time. We would bring in new ones and make an adjustment for their superiority. But then, some time later, the chefs are hired away and the old restaurants regain their prestige. Will we come back to the same level? How?

A major finding is that if one allows for the changing mix of import goods, it leads to lower estimates of their income elasticity. That makes sense, but why low "should" the import income elasticity be? Can one really explain world trade just by the reduction in transport costs and the rising quality of traded goods? I find the notion that traded goods have higher income elasticities quite plausible. The explicit "bias" adjustment to the price index that follows is, however, more problematic. But the advice to collect more data is surely right!

#### References

Anderson, S. T. 1994. Estimating discrete-choice models of product differentiation. *Rand Journal of Economics* 25, no. 2 (summer): 242-62.  
Baltagi, Badi H., Zvi Lerman, and Iain Cockburn. 1994. Generics and new goods in pharmaceutical price indexes. *American Economic Review* 84 (5): 1213-32.  
Cobb, Douglas, and J. V. Roach. 1971. CRESH production functions. *Econometrica* 39 (5): 695-712.  
Griliches, Zvi, and Manuel Rosen. 1990. Product innovation, price indices and the (mis-) measurement of economic performance. NBER Working Paper no. 3261. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau of Economic Research.

7

## The Roles of Marketing, Product Quality, and Price Competition in the Growth and Composition of the U.S. Antulcer Drug Industry

Ernst R. Berndt, Linda T. Bui, David H. Lucking-Reiley, and Glen L. Urban

### 7.1 Introduction

The introduction of Tagamet into the U.S. market in 1977 marked the beginning of a revolutionary treatment for ulcers and the emergence of a new industry. What distinguished the products of this new industry was their ability to heal ulcers and treat preulcer conditions pharmacologically on an outpatient basis, thereby substituting for traditional, and costly, hospital admissions and surgeries. Tagamet, known medically as an H<sub>2</sub>-receptor antagonist, promotes the healing of ulcers by reducing the secretion of acid by the stomach.

A striking feature of the antilucer market is that it has sustained growth in sales (quantity, not just revenue) for over fifteen years and still shows no sign of slowing. New prescribing habits have clearly diffused to an ever increasing number of physicians. Today there are a total of four H<sub>2</sub>-receptor antagonists: Tagamet, Zantac, Pepcid, and Axid. Zantac is now the United States' (and the world's) largest-selling prescription drug, having estimated worldwide sales in 1992 of about \$3.5 billion. Moreover, Tagamet is also among the ten top-selling prescription drugs in the United States.<sup>1</sup>

Ernst R. Berndt is professor of applied economics at the Sloan School of Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Linda T. Bui is assistant professor of economics at Boston University. David H. Lucking-Reiley is assistant professor of economics at Vanderbilt University. Glen L. Urban is professor of marketing and dean of the Sloan School of Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Financial support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation is gratefully acknowledged, as is the data support of Stephen C. Chappell, Nancy Duckwitz, and Richard Fehring at IMS International, and Joan Curran, Marjorie Donnelly, Phyllis Rausch, Ditas Riad, Paul Snyderman, and Jeff Tarlowe at Merck & Co. The authors have also benefited from the research assistance of Adi Alon, Amit Alon, Ittai Harel, Michele Lombardi, and Bonnie Scouler, and from discussions with Tim Bresnahan, Stan Finkelstein, M.D., Valerie Suslow, and Stephen Wright, M.D.

1. One hundred powerhouse drugs (1993, \$1). Incidentally, Tagamet ranks 7th, Pepcid 17th, Prilosec 25th, and Axid 61st in terms of U.S. sales. In terms of world sales, Tagamet is 7th, Pepcid 22d, Prilosec 49th, and Axid 67th.

In this paper we attempt to explain the growth and changing composition of the antiulcer drug market. Although we examine the impacts of pricing and product quality, we devote particular attention to the role of firms' marketing efforts. We distinguish between two types of marketing: (1) that which concentrates on bringing new consumers into the market ("industry-expanding" advertising), and (2) that which concentrates on competing for market shares from these consumers ("rivalrous" advertising). Note that of these two types, market-expanding advertising has particular economic importance in a new market, because no matter how potentially beneficial is the new product, it can generate no consumer's surplus until consumers have been informed about the product and have been induced to experiment with it.

Others have done, we estimate the effects of industry-expanding advertising on sales. However, we also examine how the effectiveness of this socially optimal type of advertising varies with market structure. We exploit two facts. First, in the earliest years of the market when Tagamet was a monopoly, almost all of the Tagamet advertising was, by definition, market-expanding. Second, the timing of entry is largely exogenous in this industry, for patent protection ensures that firms cannot enter until their research laboratories develop a new molecule that has the desired impact and until approval for use is granted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

We also analyze factors affecting the market shares earned by the limited number of firms in this market. A principal theme is that the patent and pioneer advantages of Tagamet were overcome by Zantac, the second entrant, through aggressive but effective marketing efforts, especially efforts that interacted with the prior existence of more favorable side-effect profiles than Tagamet's. Moreover, Zantac's relative price, although higher than Tagamet's, declined significantly over time. Thus, evidence from this industry suggests that while barriers to entry from patent and first-mover advantages are considerable, they are not insurmountable.

The empirical analysis is based on an unusually rich and detailed data set. Beginning with the introduction of Tagamet in July 1977, we have obtained monthly data, for each of the products in this market, on quantity and average price of sales (separately for the retail drugstore and hospital markets); market shares (minutes of detailing by sales representatives to physicians, and professional medical journal advertising); and product-quality information, including side-effect profiles, efficacy, dosage forms, and indications for which each product had received approval from the FDA.

We begin in section 7.2 by providing background information on ulcers and their treatments. Then in section 7.3 we present an overview of data trends, describe the growth of the antiulcer market, as well as the pricing and marketing behavior of the various market participants. We move on in section 7.4 to develop an econometric framework for modeling the growth of the antiulcer industry. In particular, we examine the effects of "informative" or market-expanding marketing efforts on industry sales. In section 7.5 we report findings

from an analogous attempt to model factors affecting market shares earned by the various products in this industry. Here we examine in particular the roles of rivalrous marketing, product quality, order of entry, and price competition. Finally, in section 7.6 we offer some concluding observations and suggestions for future research. The paper also includes a data appendix.

## 7.2 Background on Ulcer Treatments

Peptic ulcer disease occurs in 10–15 percent of the U.S. population.<sup>2</sup> Ulcers located in the stomach proper are termed gastric ulcers, while those in the duodenum (the bulb connecting the stomach to the small intestine) are called duodenal ulcers. A related nonulcerous condition is gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), which occurs in the esophagus. What the three conditions have in common is that they involve inflammation of tissue in the digestive tract that is exacerbated by the presence of the body's naturally occurring gastric acid. GERD and duodenal ulcers have roughly the same rates of occurrence in the U.S. population, whereas gastric ulcers are about one-fourth as likely. The incidence of ulcers in adult males is about twice that in adult females and appears to be most common in individuals twenty to fifty years old.

Ulcers have a long history of clinical treatment. There is evidence that already in the first century A.D., coral powder (calcium carbonate, an antacid) was used to relieve symptoms of dyspepsia (see Fine, Dannenberg, and Zakim 1988). Early in the twentieth century, conventional medical wisdom conformed to the notion "no acid, no ulcer." As a result, until the 1970s recommended treatments sought to neutralize gastric acid and often consisted of hourly feedings of milk and/or antacids, as well as a dietary reduction of acidic food and drink. If ulcers persisted, surgery was undertaken. It is worth noting that while antacids such as Maalox and Mylanta neutralize gastric acid, they do not decrease the rate of gastric secretions (they may in fact increase them). Moreover, the required dosages of antacids are typically quite large, side effects can be considerable, and adverse interactions with other drugs are not uncommon. As a result, with antacids patient compliance can be problematic.

An alternative ulcer treatment involves acid suppression with anticholinergics, such as Pro-Banthine and atropine. Anticholinergic agents decrease acid secretion by inhibiting receptors for the hormone acetylcholine in the acid-producing cells of the stomach lining. However, these agents cause considerably unpleasant reactions, because acetylcholine is involved in a number of biochemical processes other than the secretion of gastric acid, and anticholinergics tend to be nonselective. The side effects of dry mouth, blurred vision, urinary retention, abnormally rapid heartbeat, and drying of bronchial secretions are particularly frequent.

2. The material in this section is taken in large part from Scouler (1993) and the references cited therein. Also see Fine, Dannenberg, and Zakim (1988) and McKenzie et al. (1990).



1977 a revolutionary form of antiulcer drug was introduced to the United States, known as an H<sub>2</sub>-receptor antagonist.<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>-receptor antagonists act by blocking the histamine-2 (H<sub>2</sub>) receptor on parietal cells in the lining of the stomach—cells that produce gastric acid. Histamine-2 is one of three “messenger molecules” (along with gastrin and acetylcholine) that can stimulate the production of acid by the parietal cells. By blocking the receptor for H<sub>2</sub> (and, therefore, the anticholinergic drugs, avoiding any interference with other biochemical processes), an H<sub>2</sub>-antagonist can decrease overall acid concentration in the stomach. H<sub>2</sub>-antagonist healing rates are very high. A four- to six-week treatment period, for example, is associated with a healing rate of 70–80 percent in patients suffering from duodenal ulcers.

Johnson & Johnson was the first pharmaceutical company to introduce an H<sub>2</sub>-antagonist in the U.S. market (in August 1977), and they dubbed it Tagamet. Its chemical name is cimetidine). Thereafter three companies followed suit—with Zantac (ranitidine) in June 1983, Merck with Pepcid (famotidine) in October 1986, and Lilly with Axid (nizatidine) in April 1988. Each of these H<sub>2</sub>-antagonists is a slightly different chemical entity. Tagamet’s patent protection could not prevent entry by such therapeutic substitutes.

Zantac was marketed very aggressively by Glaxo, in partnership with Sanofi-Sintelabo and Sanofi-LaRoche, and was also priced at a premium over Tagamet. Detailers (sales representatives who call on physicians) emphasized that unlike Tagamet, whose original dosage required it to be taken four times daily, Zantac needed to be taken only twice per day. Moreover, Zantac detailers highlighted side-effect profiles that had accumulated with Tagamet—nausea, diarrhea, drowsiness, decreased sperm count, gynecomastia (swelling of the breasts in males), and drug interactions.<sup>4</sup> Within eighteen months Tagamet responded to Zantac by introducing a twice-per-day version of its drug, but it continued to find itself on the defensive in terms of alleged side-effect and adverse-interaction claims. A prolonged rivalry then ensued, first between Tagamet and Zantac in the form of new versions whose dosages were but once per day (thereby facilitating patient compliance even further), and later including additional competitors—the newly entered Pepcid and Axid, each available with a once-daily regimen.

In addition to side-effect profiles and frequency of dosage, another form of rivalry among the four H<sub>2</sub>-antagonists involved FDA-approved treatments for ulcers (indications). Since several distinct types of ulcerous conditions exist, similar products can compete on the basis of efficacy for different indications. In the United States, before a drug can be introduced into the market, the FDA must grant approval for at least one indication. When Tagamet was originally introduced into the U.S. market in August 1977, its approval was for duodenal

<sup>3</sup> Tagamet was introduced into the United Kingdom one year earlier, in 1976.

<sup>4</sup> In June 1983, Tagamet had registered ten adverse interactions at the FDA. Zantac recorded its first adverse interaction in January 1992.

ulcers; Tagamet was also the first to be approved for duodenal ulcer maintenance treatment (to prevent recurrence of a newly healed duodenal ulcer) in April 1980, and gastric ulcers in December 1982. However, Zantac was the first to obtain approval for the GERD indication (May 1986),<sup>5</sup> and it was not until March 1991 that Tagamet obtained FDA approval for GERD. It is worth noting that once FDA approval for an indication is granted, the manufacturer is permitted to provide promotional and marketing material *only* for approved indications. Thus, even though Tagamet had clinical effects very similar to Zantac’s, suggesting that it would probably be effective in the treatment of GERD, Tagamet promotions were not permitted to mention GERD until 1991. Although physicians often prescribe drugs for indications not approved by the FDA (called off-label prescribing), not having FDA approval for an indication which is held by a competitive product may constitute a significant disadvantage in the marketplace. Hence, even though Tagamet pioneered in the three antiulcer indications, the fact that it lagged behind Zantac in the relatively populous GERD market was of considerable importance.

Today the four H<sub>2</sub>-antagonist drugs are frequently viewed as being “... equally efficacious in their ability to suppress acid secretion” (McKenzie et al. 1990, 58), but different in their pharmacological profiles. McKenzie et al. note that Tagamet is “the H<sub>2</sub>-antagonist implicated with the most side effects and drug interactions,” and that such adverse impacts occur “to a lesser extent” with Zantac. The third and fourth entrants—Pepcid and Axid—appear to have even fewer drug interactions and side effects. What is not yet clear, however, is the extent to which apparent differences in side-effect profiles simply reflect differential lengths of time over which the various drugs have been able to accumulate medical experience.

Modern ulcer medicines are not restricted to H<sub>2</sub>-antagonists. One alternative therapy is Carafate (sucralfate), introduced into the United States by Marion Labs in August 1981. Instead of inhibiting acid secretion, Carafate acts by forming a protective coating over the ulcer that in turn promotes healing. While it is relatively free from side effects, Carafate has problems of convenience and compliance, since it must be taken four times per day, always on an empty stomach (before meals). It also acts more slowly than the acid inhibitors in relieving pain. For these reasons, Carafate serves a market niche, being used predominantly for older patients and patients in intensive care.

Another entrant in the antiulcer market is Cytotec (misoprostol), introduced in December 1988. Cytotec has been targeted at ulcers associated with the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs—pain relievers such as Motrin). Its rather small market niche consists of patients who take NSAIDs chronically and are at greater risk for the development of peptic ulcer disease or complications from peptic ulcers—particularly the elderly, those with previ-

<sup>5</sup> Discussions with industry officials suggest that Glaxo actually invented the GERD indication at the FDA.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.