



Free Download: RFK, Jr.'s New Book — 'A Letter to Liberals'

10/13/22 • [BIG PHARMA](#) › [VIEWS](#)

Who Benefits When Pharma-Funded FDA Fast-Tracks Drugs and Vaccines? Not Consumers, Critics Warn.

According to the experts interviewed by Kaiser Health News, the push to get drugs fast-tracked has clear advantages for companies — but iffy benefits for consumers.

By Children's Health Defense Team

Miss a day, miss a lot. Subscribe to [The Defender's Top News of the Day](#). It's free.

Although Americans may not realize it, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) decisions loom large in their everyday lives — [one-fifth of every dollar](#) a U.S. consumer spends goes to a product that the FDA regulates.

However, it is questionable whether consumer safety or the pocketbook concerns of the average patient drive much of the FDA's decision-making.

As a recent [report by Kaiser Health News](#) (KHN) pointed out, nearly half (47%) of the FDA's 2022 budget came from pharmaceutical industry "user fees" — representing "two-thirds of the drug regulation budget, and the work of at least 40% of the FDA's 18,000 employees."

The FDA brags that the user fees, along with [additional mechanisms](#) at its disposal, merely help expedite drug development and review.

However, KHN and other critics argue that the [3,000-plus closed-door meetings](#) that take place annually between industry and a [captured FDA](#) foster a relationship that is [a bit too cozy](#).

During [COVID-19](#), the public learned about the downside of one of the FDA's industry-friendly workarounds — the [Emergency Use Authorization](#) (EUA) — discovering that the shortcut not only allowed the FDA to rush unapproved vaccines into American arms but also kept the jobs on the market despite early and widespread [safety signals](#).

But the FDA's toolkit of approaches to speed up approvals during ordinary times also deserves scrutiny.

For products it deems to be addressing "unmet medical needs" and "serious conditions," the agency can draw on the [Orphan Drug Act](#) (1983), [Accelerated Approval Program](#) (1992), [Priority Review](#) (1992), the [Fast Track](#) process (1997) and/or the [Breakthrough Therapy](#) designation (2012).

Moreover, investigational products often benefit from more than one of these FDA green lights, with 4 of 5 of the [New Drug Applications](#) the FDA approves for Fast Track also given Priority Review.

According to the experts interviewed by KHN, the push to get drugs approved more quickly using these programs has clear advantages for companies — but iffy benefits for consumers. As KHN summed it up, "Pharma-Funded FDA Gets Drugs Out Faster, But Some Work Only 'Marginally' and Most Are Pricey."

But poor performance and high cost are not the worst outcomes associated with fast-tracking.

As even an industry-favorable publication pointed out in 2017, “Fast Track and other expedited review programs unnecessarily [rush drug approvals without sufficient safety data](#),” with the result that nearly 3 of 5 (57%) Fast-Track-approved drugs end up needing to add [black box warnings](#).

In a 2018 article, “FDA Repays Industry by Rushing Risky Drugs to Market,” [ProPublica confirmed](#) that while the FDA may “review and approve drugs faster than any other regulatory agency in the world,” the “aftermath” can be deadly.

Watching these drug approval trends, a survivor of the [disastrous drug thalidomide](#) warned in 2015, “We could be returning to a time in which physicians had little way of knowing if their prescriptions would help or harm their patients.”

Get Text Alerts

Sign up for breaking news from The Defender.

Currently only eligible for numbers in the U.S. and Canada.

Phone

REQUIRED. Phone number must be in a standard 10-digit format: 1234567890 or 123-456-7890

CONTINUE

A ‘boon for day traders, hedge funds and others looking to make quick money off biotech stocks’

According to a discussion by the publication [CenterWatch](#) (a “trusted source for clinical trials information”), as of 2017, the [Fast Track program was “going strong,”](#) with companies pursuing the designation in “record numbers” and roughly two-thirds of applications gaining FDA approval.

It’s estimated the FDA reaches decisions about whether to approve or deny Fast Track applications in [under two months](#).

For companies, the low-bar “evidentiary hurdle” for Fast Track provides an incentive to apply, as does “the potential to generate investor attention.”

In fact, the [Cleveland Plain Dealer observed](#) in 2007, that it was the drug industry that “came up with the idea for the [Fast Track] designation and lobbied for its passage.”

The Plain Dealer bluntly stated that while the designation “creates a boon for day traders, hedge funds and others looking to make quick money off biotech stocks,” it “delivers little to anyone but investors.”

“Trading binges” frequently follow Fast Track announcements, the Plain Dealer reported, with “one-day increases in shares bought and sold that average almost 1,300 percent.”

One company saw a [one-day jump in its stock price](#) of 23% after its Fast Track announcement.

The Plain Dealer investigation also discovered many instances “of heavy buying of biotech companies’ stock in the days before a Fast Track announcement.”

CenterWatch agreed that a Fast Track designation tends to bump up a company’s stock valuation, and a 2016 business school [analysis of stock market reactions](#) to products given the [Breakthrough Therapy](#) designation