

OPTIC Vetted Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP) Policy Data

This is the final documentation for the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP) policy variables (through June 1, 2017) included in the OPTIC Vetted Policy Data Warehouse.

Information for ten variables included in this data set come from the following sources:

- PDAPS (policy data last reported on June 1, 2017, but last downloaded by us and checked in September 19, 2019). These data were used primarily for the construction of (1) AnyPDMP_partial / date_AnyPDMP for new first-time PDMP laws passed after 1/1/1998; (2) electronic_partial / date_electronic; and (3) Must Access_partial / date_prescriber_mustaccess.
- Use of Brandeis University PDMP Training and Technical Assistance Center (TTAC) from <http://www.pdmpassist.org/content/pdmp-legislation-operational-dates> to obtain dates on first PDMP policy (including paper-based systems) that were adopted prior to January 1, 1998, (for AnyPDMP_partial / date_AnyPDMP).
- Use of Horowitz, J., Davis, C. S., McClelland, L. S., Fordon, R. S., & Meara, E. (2018). The Problem of Data Quality in Analyses of Opioid Regulation: The Case of Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (No. w24947). National Bureau of Economic Research for two variables: (1) Any_PMP_Horowitz_Partial / date_Any_PMP_Horowitz (source: Table 2, Column 1 of their table) and (2) Op_PDMP_partial / date_Op_PDMP (source: Table 2, Column 4 of their table).
- Consultation with Corey Davis who was also consulting with PDAPS to update their data.

Constructed Variables Contained in Analytic Files

| Variable Name | description |
|----------------------------|---|
| AnyPDMP_partial | Fraction of year that state has any PDMP operating |
| Any_PMP_Horowitz_Partial | Fraction of year that state has PDMP enabling legislation for any type of PDMP in effect, including paper-based systems, (as determined by Horowitz et al., 2018) enacted. |
| Op_PDMP_partial | Fraction of year that state has a “modern system” operational and users could access (as determined by Horowitz et al., 2018). |
| electronic_partial | Fraction of year that state has an electronic PDMP system operating |
| Must Access_partial | Fraction of year that state has any legislation requiring Prescribers to access PDMP before prescribing (as interpreted by PDAPS) enacted. |
| AnyPDMP_partial | Fraction of year that state has any PDMP operating. |
| date_AnyPDMP | Date when PDMP enabling legislation was first enacted for <u>any type of</u> PDMP in effect (including paper-based systems). Source: PDAPS for first PDMP laws passed after January 1, 1998; Info on laws prior to 1998 came from Brandeis TTAC. |
| date_Any_PMP_Horowitz | Date when PDMP enabling legislation was first enacted for any type of PDMP in effect (including paper-based systems). Source: Horowitz et al., 2018, Table 2, column 1. |
| date_Op_PDMP | Date when a “modern system” became operational and users could access. Source: Horowitz et al., 2018, Table 2, column 4. This definition includes specific caveats adopted by Horowitz et al., 2018, described further below. |
| date_electronic | Date state began operating an electronic PDMP system. |
| date_prescriber_mustaccess | Date of legislation requiring Prescribers to access PDMP before Prescribing as interpreted by PDAPS. |

Fractions are calculated based on the number of months out of 12 that a law is effective. A law is considered effective for a given month

- if a law becomes effective by the 7th for January
- if a law becomes effective by the 3rd for February – December

These PDMP variables can be found in the following data file:

- Excel File: WEB_PDMP.xls
- Stata File: WEB_PDMP.dta

Last Updated: July 29, 2020

Please cite the use of these data as "RAND-USC Schaeffer Opioid Policy Tools and Information Center. [YEAR]. OPTIC-Vetted PDMP Policy Data. Obtained from <https://www.rand.org/health-care/centers/optic/resources/datasets.html> on [DOWNLOAD DATE]."

Here are some important notes and decision points made in the data we have in our files:

In Horowitz et al (2018), the authors adopted specific definitions of the policies, which we clarify here for those interested in using their policy variable:

date_Any_PMP_Horowitz : Month and year of when any type of PDMP was enacted (including paper-based systems) according to legislation.

date_Op_PDMP_Horowitz: Month and year of when that PDMP data became accessible to any user (e.g., physician, pharmacist, or member of law enforcement) authorized by state law to receive it.

Some caveats:

- States that required prescribers or dispensers to keep records of prescriptions, but not send them to a central repository, were not considered to have a PDMP.
- If the statute stated a specific date when the PDMP was required to exist, this date was included, not the effective date of the statute.
- If the authorization of the PDMP was contingent upon receiving sufficient funding, the date of when funding was secured was used.

Regarding “must access” provisions, various data sources use the term “mandatory use” to mean different things. Mandatory use (which differs from mandatory registration) may simply mean that prescribers must have an account on the system; that they must input their patient’s information in the system, or that they must check the system before prescribing an opioid under different circumstances (see: <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2018/when-are-prescribers-required-to-use-prescription-drug-monitoring-programs>). These are ultimately different levels of specificity of the law, and in the spirit of Horowitz et al., 2018, which encourages greater specificity in how these laws are defined, it is appropriate to use the term “physician must access” only when prescribers are mandated to access the database (regardless of the circumstance, which could differ if it is new patient, existing patient, and so on).

The database that best captures this definition is constructed by PDAPS and shows that no state adopted a “prescriber must access” law until 2012. Other papers using data sets showing earlier dates typically have weaker definitions of this policy, such as (a) including state laws that require prescribers

to register in the system or use it together – as was done by Patrick et al., 2016 (Health Affairs paper), or (b) indicating that physicians actually have access to the data in the system, but not requiring that they access the data before prescribing – which was done in Horowitz et al., 2018 (NBER working paper). Neither of these are a pure “must access” requirement and could lead to earlier implementation dates than what actually were required for true “must access” provisions. For example, a lot of papers count Nevada’s 2007 must-access PDMP. PDAPS does not count Nevada because PDAPS only counts policies as must-access if the policy required physicians to access/use the data system *based on objective criteria*. Nevada’s 2007 law basically said physicians must access “if they suspect abuse” but did not define what “suspected abuse” looked like. In 2015, Nevada put criteria on the conditions requiring PDMP use. Therefore, given all of this information, we are only capturing the need for prescribers to check before prescribing to a patient, NOT dispensers to access before dispensing. Also, we interpret must-access to apply to ANY subset of patients.

Notes on enactment dates:

1. Following a re-download of PDAPS data on September 19, 2019, we compared the PDAPS dates that were downloaded in early 2017 with those from the update and found a few differences for “date_Any PDMP”.
2. For Missouri’s “date_Any PDMP”, the PDAPS update occurred before Missouri implemented their PDMP in July 2017. As Horowitz et al provide a date for the adoption of this law, we use their date for “date_Any PDMP”, and “date_electronic”.