Priyanka, Prabakarrao

[3.8/4.0] – [University of South Florida]

Question 1 [5 min]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sum of Units** | Column Labels |  |  |
| Row Labels | Med A | Med B | Grand Total |
| 07-2012 | 4,303,700.00 |  | 4,303,700.00 |
| 08-2012 | 4,477,100.00 |  | 4,477,100.00 |
| 09-2012 | 849,900.00 | 535.00 | 850,435.00 |
| 10-2012 |  | 393.00 | 393.00 |
| 11-2012 | 75,300.00 | 420.00 | 75,720.00 |
| 12-2012 | 10,200.00 | 1.00 | 10,201.00 |
| **Grand Total** | **9,716,200.00** | **1,349.00** | **9,717,549.00** |

Question 2 [5 min]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Count of ID** | Column Labels |  |  |  |
| Row Labels | Med A | Med B | Grand Total |  |
| 07-2012 | 839 |  | 839 |  |
| 08-2012 | 793 |  | 793 |  |
| 09-2012 | 160 | 76 | 236 |  |
| 10-2012 |  | 68 | 68 |  |
| 11-2012 | 7 | 75 | 82 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **1799** | **219** | **2018** |  |

Question 3 [8 min]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average of Units** | Column Labels |  |  |  |
| Row Labels | Med A | Med B | Grand Total |  |
| 07-2012 | 5,129.56 |  | 5,129.56 |  |
| 08-2012 | 5,645.78 |  | 5,645.78 |  |
| 09-2012 | 5,311.88 | 7.04 | 3,603.54 |  |
| 10-2012 |  | 5.78 | 5.78 |  |
| 11-2012 | 10,757.14 | 5.60 | 923.41 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **5,395.22** | **6.16** | **4,810.38** |  |

Question 4 [8 min]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Previously on Med A - Count of ID** | Column Labels |  |  |
| Row Labels | Switched | Grand Total |  |
| 2012-09 | 67 | 67 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **67** | **67** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **New to Med B-Count of ID** | Column Labels |  |  |
| Row Labels | New Start | Grand Total |  |
| 2012-09 | 5 | 5 |  |
| 2012-10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| 2012-11 | 6 | 6 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **16** | **16** |  |

Question 5 [8 min]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Previously on Med A | Switched |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Row Labels | Average of No of weeks on Med A |  |  |  |
| 2012-09 | 8.245202559 |  |  |  |
| **Grand Total** | **8.245202559** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | |

Question 6 [8 min]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Previously on Med A | Switched |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Row Labels | Average of Monthly Med A Dose Before Switching | Average of Monthly Med B Dose |  |
| 2012-07 | 36372 | 3750 |  |
| 2012-08 | 17733.04818 | 3250 |  |
| 2012-09 | 16767.96438 | 3681.818182 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **17402.82784** | **3618.75** |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Question 7 [8 min]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Row Labels | Average of Breakeven Price per Unit of Med B |
| 2012-07 | 0.010833333 |
| 2012-08 | 0.082638889 |
| 2012-09 | 0.09090796 |
| **Grand Total** | **0.087705761** |
|  |  |

Question 8 [10 min]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Row Labels | Sum of Total Monthly Dose Per Patient |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-07 | 80244 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-08 | 251796.5782 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-09 | 1349685.649 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Grand Total** | **1681726.227** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | No data available for October and November | | | | |

Question 9 [8 min]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Row Labels | Count of ID |
| 2012-09 | 77.63% |
| Higher Dose | 4.61% |
| Lower Dose | 60.86% |
| Same Dose | 12.17% |
| 2012-10 | 22.37% |
| Higher Dose | 7.24% |
| Lower Dose | 5.92% |
| Same Dose | 9.21% |
| **Grand Total** | **100.00%** |
|  |  |

Question 10 [8 min]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Switched to Med B | Yes |
|  |  |
| Average of LAB B Value While on Med A | Average of LAB B Value While on Med B |
| 10.64241164 | 10.53058252 |
|  |  |

Question 11 [10 min]

Based on the analysis from Question 9 and 10, the breakeven price point for Med B needs to be reconsidered. The data shows that most patients (60.86%) received a lower Med B dose in the month following their switch, and only a small percentage (4.61% in September, 7.24% in October) had their doses increased. At the same time, LAB B values remained almost the same before and after switching to Med B, with only a slight decrease from 10.64 to 10.53.

This suggests that even though Med B was given in lower doses for most patients, it still maintained LAB B levels effectively. If we assume that more of Med A and Med B is generally associated with higher LAB B values, then the fact that LAB B levels did not drop significantly—even with reduced doses—means that Med B might be more efficient at maintaining LAB B values than Med A. This would justify a higher breakeven price per unit of Med B because less of it is needed to achieve similar results.

In practical terms, this means that the total cost per patient might not increase, even if the price per unit of Med B is set higher than originally calculated. Given that the dosage trends suggest lower usage over time, adjusting the breakeven price upwards would still ensure cost-effectiveness while accounting for Med B’s potential efficiency.
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