

**Table 2: Global evidence of lagging innovation in the drug development process**

Nation	Examples
Canada	Among 564 drugs evaluated by the Canadian Patented Medicine Prices Review Board between 2010 and 2016, only 37 (6.6%) were substantial improvements or breakthroughs. <sup>12</sup>
	Among "first-in-class" drugs approved by Health Canada between 1997 and 2012, only 16.3% represented therapeutic innovations. Among not "first-in-class" drugs, only 4.6% were therapeutic innovations. <sup>13</sup>
US	Among new molecular entities approved by the FDA between 1987 and 2011, only about one third were "first-in-class," while slightly less than half were addition-to-class "me too" drugs. <sup>14</sup>
	Among new cancer drugs approved between 2009 and 2013 by the FDA, a majority were "next-in-class." Prices for these drugs averaged over \$100,000 per year, with no association between price and drug efficacy or innovativeness. <sup>15</sup>
	Among new cancer drugs approved between April 2014 and February 2016, only 19% met the modest goals for improving overall survival proposed by the American Society of Clinical Oncology Cancer Research Committee. <sup>16</sup>
	Among cancer drugs approved by the FDA between 2008 and 2012, about two-thirds received marketing approval based on surrogate outcomes, and half of these were demonstrated to have no benefit on survival in later studies. <sup>17</sup>
	Among the cancer drugs found by Kim and Prasad to lack survival benefits, <sup>17</sup> almost none had evidence for a benefit in quality of life when compared to placebo, observational groups, or other agents. <sup>18</sup>
Australia	A minority of drugs approved by the Australian Drug Evaluation Committee between 2005 and 2007 were found to be therapeutically innovative. <sup>19</sup>
Europe	Among new drugs on the British National Formulary from 2001 to 2012, approximately one quarter were considered "highly innovative." <sup>20</sup>
	The European Medicine Agency (EMA) granted approval to 48 cancer medications for 68 indications over a four year period ending in 2013; after a median follow-up of more than 5 years, only 35/68 (51%) of these approvals were found to either prolong survival or improve patients' quality of life. <sup>21</sup>
	Among 61 new "biotech" products approved by the EMA from 1995 to 2003, approximately one quarter were deemed a "therapeutic innovation." <sup>22</sup>
	Among therapeutic drugs approved by the EMA between 1995 and 2004, 28% were found to be "important therapeutic innovations." <sup>23</sup>