

Executive Summary

Most Innovative Approach

The Question - How to differentiate an anti-emetic other than on price?

The research methodology used to find the answer to this question was not a complicated one. Rather a revival of a technique that is often ignored or simply forgotten about.

The essence of the innovation was to mix respondents, in this case purchasers and prescribers, who are traditionally spoken to separately, to help understand both differences and similarities. The differences provide the extremes of opinion into which the new campaign had to fit. The similarities provided building blocks of common ground and common purpose, in other words, the foundation stones of the new campaign.

The research programme combined the fact gathering of depth interviews and duos with the creativity allowed in group discussions. Mixing 'antagonistic' respondent types enabled us to reach consensus on a way forward that worked for a critical mass of customers.

The methodology is very easily repeated in any scenario where more than one individual affects the prescribing choice.

BOBI Awards 2007

Example Entry – Most Innovative Approach

Background / Situation Analysis

Candor Pharmaceuticals recently acquired an anti emetic called Nauzap, through company acquisition.

Nauzap has the 3rd largest market share of the anti-emetics prescribed in the UK. Nauzap growth has been static for 3 years. The product has been available for 6 years. There has been no research conducted on the product for 4 years.

Reports from field based staff, and informal contacts with main customers indicate that there is very little brand differentiation between current anti-emetics, with their purchase into hospitals purely based on most competitive pricing / discount schemes.

Research Objectives

1. To understand / confirm if anti-emetics are bought into UK hospitals purely on the basis of price
2. If it is revealed that there is indeed, some effect of branding and / or functional benefits of products – to understand how Nauzap stacks up against the other 2 main competitors, in terms of brand personality / unique attributes / competitive differentiation
3. To use any differentiation uncovered, however slight, to build a clearer brand profile for Nauzap, with the ultimate aim of making it the best value / best choice anti emetic on the market

Approach

The approach contained 3 stages and was qualitative in nature.

- a) Initially 8 'antagonistic pairs' were conducted
 - Oncologists and Oncology Pharmacists were interviewed, first separately and then brought together
 - The separate interviews allowed personal views on the importance of price versus other attributes to be investigated
 - It enabled the interviewer to understand the different mindsets of the prescriber and the purchaser – revealing issues where they disagreed and, where there was common ground. It also gave clues to the powerbase in the decision making process

- b) At the same time as the antagonistic pairs were conducted, 8 depths with specialist oncology nurses were also undertaken
 - These depths were aimed at understanding the minutiae of the administration of anti-emetics with the aim of gathering any information / clues as to what really matters on the coal face to both patients and nurses – their key problems with the 2 main brands and their differentiation of available products
 - These nuggets of information would then be tested for resonance with the purchasers and prescribers in the last stage of research, where the new brand profile for Nauzap was developed

- c) 4 mixed focus groups were conducted with Oncologists and Oncology Pharmacists
 - These groups were largely creative exercises
 - Respondents first created brand collages for the 3 main products,
 - They then worked in small teams to develop a differentiating sales story for each brand, using both their own ideas and positioning phrases developed from the previous pairs and depths

Fulfilment of Research Objectives / Recommendations Made

1. Price was indeed revealed to be the main factor in selection of anti-emetics in the UK. BUT, it was clear that *certain* adverse reactions were of particular concern to oncologists, nurses and patients – pharmacists were willing to re-think product stocked if adverse events were proving too time consuming for staff to deal with, and more importantly, risky for patients

2. The research showed that Nauzap was the only competitively priced anti-emetic that didn't cause dizziness. Dizziness was of particular concern to patients, nurses and oncologists as it could cause falls in patients whose quality of life was already poor. Patients and their carers were reported to be very distressed by these falls. Additionally, if these falls happened in hospital, there was risk of litigation – something which could be used to justify brand selection by purchasers

3. Nauzap was therefore repositioned as a good value anti-emetic that specifically avoided dizziness, making vulnerable patients safer without compromising on price

Successful Outcomes / Impact on UK Business

The implementation of the new campaign is 3 months in and sales have grown, they have remained static in Ireland where the campaign has not yet been launched.

22 UK hospitals have switched to Nauzap as the only anti-emetic on the hospital formulary.

The marketing team have a much better idea of the purchasing/prescribing dynamics of the sale – and are repeating the project for 2 more of their products.