MARKET ACCESS FOR COPY-WRITERS

A Strategic Field Guide to Payer Thinking, Regulatory Guardrails & the Art of Value Copy

OPDP · PRECLEARANCE · NCCN · BRAND STYLE GUIDES · COMPETITIVE INTEL

01 WHY MARKET ACCESS
02 THREE AUDIENCES
03 THE PAYER LANDSCAPE
04 HOW PAYERS DECIDE
05 HEOR LANGUAGE
06 STRATEGIC CONTENT DEV
07 OPDP + REGULATORY
08 NCCN + GUIDELINES
09 BRAND STYLE GUIDES
10 DRUG COMPARISONS
11 THE COPY TOOLKIT
12 MISTAKES TO AVOID
13 READING A BRIEF
14 LAUNCH SEQUENCING
15 RARE DISEASE
16 BIOSIMILARS
17 WRITER + ECONOMIST
18 CAREER + PORTFOLIO
19 GLOSSARY
20 REFERENCES

Alexandra Keena · Senior Market Access Copywriter

Pharma · Payer · Strategy · MedComms

SECTION 01

Why Market Access Isn't Just 'Payer Copy'

The strategic frame every writer needs

There's a version of pharma copywriting that is, essentially, clinical translation. You get the data. You clean up the language. You make sure the ISI is formatted correctly. And while that work matters, it is not what we're doing here.

> ***“Market access copy doesn't just communicate value. It constructs it — from evidence, economics, and audience psychology — for the people who control whether patients can actually get the drug.”***

Market access is the full-contact sport of pharmaceutical commercialization. It sits at the intersection of clinical science, health economics, competitive strategy, and stakeholder communications — and the copy that lives in this space has to do all of those things simultaneously.

Strategic content development in market access means:

- Building a coherent value narrative that holds up under clinical, economic, and regulatory scrutiny
- Anticipating payer objections before they're raised — and addressing them in the structure of your document
- Knowing which data to lead with (and which to bury in appendices)
- Understanding how your messages will land differently with a P&T; pharmacist vs. a health plan CMO vs. a Medicaid medical director
- Writing in a way that respects your audience's intelligence — because they have PhDs and they will notice if you don't

THE BIG SHIFT

In brand copywriting, you write to create desire. In market access copywriting, you write to remove doubt. Your audience isn't looking to be inspired — they're looking for a reason to say yes. Or a reason to say no. Your job is to give them the former and preempt the latter.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes.* 4th ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2015.
2. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. Alexandria, VA: AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
3. Neumann PJ, Cohen JT, Weinstein MC. Updating cost-effectiveness — the curious resilience of the $50,000-per-QALY threshold. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371(9):796-797. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1405158

SECTION 02

Three Audiences, Three Completely Different Jobs

Patient, HCP, and payer content are not the same discipline

One of the most common mistakes in pharma communications is treating all three audiences as variations on the same problem. They are not. Patient, HCP, and payer content are different jobs, requiring different skills, different instincts, and genuinely different ways of thinking about what copy is supposed to do.

PATIENT

Their question: Will this help me feel better?

Motivation: Hope, fear, lived experience, symptom relief

Evidence they trust: Personal stories, doctor recommendations, visible outcomes

Copy job: Build understanding, reduce fear, motivate adherence

Regulatory frame: OPDP-compliant promotion; fair balance; plain language standards

Tone: Warm, direct, human. Meets them where they are — not where the clinical team wants them to be.

Watch out for: Over-simplifying risk; assuming health literacy; using clinical jargon dressed up as plain language

HCP

Their question: Is this the right drug for this patient?

Motivation: Clinical outcomes, patient safety, practice efficiency

Evidence they trust: RCT data, guidelines, peer experience, clinical pathways

Copy job: Communicate efficacy/safety profile, differentiate vs. comparator, fit into clinical workflow

Regulatory frame: OPDP-regulated promotion; PI-consistent messaging; fair balance requirements

Tone: Peer-to-peer, evidence-led, efficient. HCPs don't want to be sold to any more than payers do.

Watch out for: Overpromising on subgroup data; soft-pedaling safety; ignoring guideline context

PAYER

Their question: Is covering this drug worth it across my population?

Motivation: Cost management, member outcomes, utilization, formulary integrity

Evidence they trust: RWE, health economics models, comparative effectiveness, total cost of care

Copy job: Demonstrate value (clinical + economic + humanistic), address coverage criteria, support access

Regulatory frame: Market access materials are largely non-promotional; different MLR pathway; HTA standards vary by market

Tone: Analytical, precise, structured. This is a business negotiation dressed up as a scientific review.

Watch out for: Emotional appeals; unsupported economic claims; weak comparator handling

Why This Matters for Your Practice

Experienced market access writers know that brand copy sensibilities can actively undermine payer materials. The warm, patient-centered language that works beautifully in a DTC campaign reads as promotional fluff to a P&T; committee. Conversely, the dense, evidence-heavy structure of a value dossier would be incomprehensible — and

alienating — in a patient brochure.

> **The skill that separates senior market access writers:** They can code-switch fluently across all three audiences without losing the underlying clinical and strategic integrity of the message. They know that the same data point — say, a 40% reduction in hospitalizations — needs to be translated completely differently for a patient ("fewer hospital stays"), an HCP ("significant reduction in all-cause hospitalization, p<0.001"), and a payer ("projected savings of $X per member per year based on claims data").

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Presenting Risk Information in Prescription Drug and Medical Device Promotion. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/72370/download
2. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
3. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.

For educational use. Not for distribution.

SECTION 03

The Payer Landscape

Who's actually sitting at the table — and what they care about

'Payers' is not a monolith. It's a landscape of different organizations, incentive structures, and decision frameworks — each requiring a distinct approach. Writing the same content for a commercial PBM and a state Medicaid program is a category error that will undermine your credibility.

Payer Type	Examples	Primary Focus	Key Copy Angle
Commercial PBMs	CVS/Caremark, Express Scripts, OptumRx	Drug cost, rebates, formulary tier placement	Net cost-effectiveness; adherence outcomes reducing total cost
Health Plans / MCOs	Aetna, UHC, Cigna, BCBS	Total cost of care, member outcomes, utilization management	Real-world outcomes; total episode cost; quality measure impact
Medicaid (State)	State-administered; managed by MCO partners	Best price compliance, supplemental rebates, access equity	Vulnerable population outcomes; health equity; rebate-adjusted value
Medicare Part D	CMS-administered via PDP/MA-PD plans	Formulary placement, star ratings, IRA negotiation (post-2026)	Adherence; quality measures; outcomes in older populations
IDNs / ACOs	Cleveland Clinic, Kaiser, Mayo, regional systems	Clinical pathways, hospital formulary, episode cost management	Pathway integration; total episode cost; readmission reduction
HTA Bodies (Int'l)	NICE (UK), G-BA (Germany), HAS (France), CADTH (CA)	Clinical added benefit vs. comparator; ICER vs. threshold	Comparative effectiveness vs. SoC; QoL evidence; QALY cost
VA / DoD	Veterans Affairs, Dept. of Defense pharmacy programs	VANF formulary; clinical criteria; population-specific outcomes	Evidence in target demographic; simplified access pathway

P&T; COMMITTEE — THE DECISION ROOM

Most formulary decisions run through a Pharmacy & Therapeutics (P&T) committee — a cross-functional group of pharmacists, physicians, and health economists. When you write a value dossier or payer slide deck, you're writing for this room. Your copy needs to anticipate their questions, survive their objections, and arm the MSL or account manager who's presenting on your behalf. They will not all read every page. Structure accordingly.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
2. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Manual. Baltimore, MD: CMS; 2023. https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Prescription-Drug-Coverage
3. Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. Pub L No. 117-169, 136 Stat 1818. 2022. https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5376

SECTION 04

How Payers Make Coverage Decisions

Value frameworks, decision levers, and the evidence hierarchy

Payer decision-making is not intuitive or emotional — it's structured, evidence-driven, and often formulaic. Understanding these frameworks is what separates a market access copywriter from a capable but generic pharma writer.

The Four Dimensions of Value

Clinical Value	Economic Value	Humanistic Value	Equity Value
Efficacy and safety vs. comparator. What does this drug actually do — and how does it compare to what's already covered?	Impact on total cost of care. Does improved efficacy reduce hospitalizations, ER visits, or downstream medical costs?	Patient-reported outcomes, quality of life, functional status. Do patients actually feel and function better?	Access across diverse populations. Does this drug reduce or worsen disparities? Increasingly required by Medicaid.

Key Coverage Decision Levers

These are the tools payers use to manage access — and the copy implications you need to plan for:

Formulary Tier	Which tier a drug sits on determines patient cost share. Lower tier = lower out-of-pocket = higher adherence.	**Copy angle:** Emphasize cost-effectiveness and how adherence outcomes translate to member and plan economics.
Prior Authorization (PA)	Requires clinical criteria be met before coverage is approved.	**Copy angle:** Highlight differentiated patient profile, unmet need, and consequences of access delay.
Step Therapy	Patient must fail on a cheaper (often generic) drug before coverage of your product is approved.	**Copy angle:** Lead with failure rates of existing agents and the burden of treatment delay on outcomes and cost.
Quantity Limits	Caps on dosage, fill quantity, or duration of coverage.	**Copy angle:** Tie dosing regimen directly to trial-based outcomes data. Support clinical rationale for dosing.
Non-Medical Switching	Plans switching patients from a stable regimen for economic reasons.	**Copy angle:** Address risks of switching in stable patients. Humanistic and safety evidence is your anchor.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes.* 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.
2. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. 2020-2023 Value Assessment Framework. ICER; 2020. https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/value-assessment-framework/
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Guide to the Methods of Technology Appraisal 2013. London, UK: NICE; 2013. https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg9
4. Neumann PJ, Cohen JT, Weinstein MC. Updating cost-effectiveness — the curious resilience of the $50,000-per-QALY threshold. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371(9):796-797. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1405158

SECTION 05

HEOR Language Decoded

What every market access writer needs to know about health economics

You don't need a PhD in health economics to write great market access copy. But you do need to understand the vocabulary, know what each concept proves, and recognize when evidence is strong versus when it's directional. The difference matters — and sophisticated payer audiences will notice if you blur it.

CEA / CUA *Cost-Effectiveness & Cost-Utility Analysis*

CEA compares cost against a clinical outcome (e.g., cost per life year gained). CUA uses QALYs — cost per quality-adjusted life year. Payers use ICER thresholds (US: ~$100-150K/QALY; NICE: £30K/QALY) to judge acceptability. Copy tip: translate the ratio into a concrete benefit — don't just cite the number.

QALY *Quality-Adjusted Life Year*

One year of perfect health = 1.0 QALY. Used in cost-utility analysis. A treatment that keeps someone at 0.7 health utility for 5 years delivers 3.5 QALYs. Copy tip: QALYs contextualize impact — but always pair with the human story behind the number.

BIM *Budget Impact Model*

Estimates the financial impact of covering a new therapy on a payer's total spend over 3-5 years. Answers: 'What will this cost our plan?' — and ideally, 'What will it save?' Copy tip: frame around net impact after offsets (reduced hospitalizations, avoided procedures).

RWE *Real-World Evidence*

Clinical evidence from routine practice — claims data, EHR data, registries. Payers trust RWE because it reflects their actual populations, not trial populations. Copy tip: RWE is your bridge between the clinical trial and the payer's member base.

ITC / NMA *Indirect Treatment Comparison / Network Meta-Analysis*

Head-to-head trials rarely exist. ITCs and NMAs compare drugs across a network of trials statistically. Copy tip: be transparent about ITC limitations — payers respect intellectual honesty far more than oversell.

PROs / HRQoL *Patient-Reported Outcomes / Health-Related Quality of Life*

Validated instruments (SF-36, EQ-5D, disease-specific scales) measuring how patients feel and function. Increasingly required by payers and HTA bodies — they want proof patients actually benefit. Copy tip: connect PRO improvements to functional real-world outcomes, not just scale scores.

MCID *Minimal Clinically Important Difference*

The smallest change in a PRO or clinical measure that patients perceive as meaningful. Statistical significance ≠ clinical significance. Copy tip: if you're citing PRO improvements, confirm they exceed the MCID. If they don't, be honest.

ICER *Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio*

The additional cost per additional QALY gained vs. comparator. The core metric of HTA evaluation. Copy tip: the ICER tells you whether your drug 'passes' — your copy tells the committee why it's worth it.

For educational use. Not for distribution.

> **The writer's role in HEOR:** You will rarely write about models directly. Your job is to translate what the models show into clear, credible, and compelling value messages. The model lives in the appendix. Your narrative lives in the executive summary. The P&T committee reads the summary. Make it count.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis — principles of good practice: report of the ISPOR 2012 Budget Impact Analysis Good Practice II Task Force. *Value Health*. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291
2. Garrison LP Jr, Neumann PJ, Erickson P, Marshall D, Mullins CD. Using real-world data for coverage and payment decisions: the ISPOR Real-World Data Task Force Report. *Value Health*. 2007;10(5):326-335. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00186.x
3. Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, Norman GR; Clinical Significance Consensus Meeting Group. Methods to explain the clinical significance of health status measures. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2002;77(4):371-383. doi:10.4065/77.4.371
4. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/77832/download
5. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022 explanation and elaboration. *Value Health*. 2022;25(1):10-31. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.11.1351
6. Jansen JP, Fleurence R, Devine B, et al. Interpreting indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis for health-care decision making: part 1. *Value Health*. 2011;14(4):417-428. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2011.04.002
7. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.

For educational use. Not for distribution.

SECTION 06

Strategic Content Development in Market Access

How copy fits into the broader evidence and messaging architecture

In most pharma agencies, 'strategic content development' means working with medical affairs, health economics, and brand teams to build a coherent, defensible value narrative — before a single word of actual copy is written. Understanding this process makes you an incomparably more effective writer.

The Market Access Content Architecture

Think of market access content as a pyramid. At the top: your core value proposition — one or two sentences that capture what's uniquely valuable about this drug. Below that: your supporting value messages, organized by dimension (clinical, economic, humanistic). At the base: the evidence that substantiates each message.

CORE VALUE PROPOSITION	1-2 sentences. What is uniquely valuable about this drug for payers and their populations? Clinically differentiated + economically defensible.
VALUE MESSAGES (by dimension)	3-5 key messages per dimension (clinical, economic, humanistic). Each message is a claim. Each claim requires evidence.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	Trial data, RWE, HEOR analyses, PRO data, indirect comparisons. All claims grounded here. Each piece of evidence tagged to one or more value messages.

The Strategic Content Development Process

A well-run market access content program follows a structured flow:

1 Stakeholder Mapping

Before anything is written, the team identifies every audience that will touch this content — payer types, HTA bodies, market access leads, MSLs, KOLs. Each audience gets a customized version of the core narrative.

2 Evidence Gap Analysis

What evidence do we have? What's missing? What can we generate? This step prevents the embarrassing situation of building copy around evidence that doesn't exist yet.

3 Value Message Development

Working with medical affairs and health economics, writers help develop, test, and refine the core value messages. This is strategy work, not copywriting — but the best writers do both.

4 Document Cascade

One Global Value Dossier spawns multiple downstream materials — payer decks, formulary kits, field tools, HTA submissions. Each must be consistent with the GVD but tailored to its audience.

For educational use. Not for distribution.

5

MLR Review & Iteration

Every piece of market access copy goes through Medical, Legal, and Regulatory review. Understanding the MLR process — and the specific concerns of each reviewer — is essential to writing first drafts that survive.

6

Launch & Field Readiness

Copy doesn't end at submission. Field teams need training, talking points, and tools to have value conversations in the real world. Writers often own this layer too.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
2. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022. *Value Health*. 2022;25(1):10-31. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.11.1351
3. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis — principles of good practice. *Value Health*. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291

SECTION 07

OPDP, Preclearance & Regulatory Guardrails

What you can say, how you can say it, and who decides

Regulatory literacy is not optional for market access writers. It's the difference between copy that makes it through MLR and copy that gets gutted — or worse, copy that goes out wrong. Here's what you need to know.

OPDP: The Office of Prescription Drug Promotion

OPDP is the FDA division that regulates prescription drug promotion in the United States. Their mandate: all promotional communications must be accurate, non-misleading, fairly balanced, and consistent with approved labeling (the PI/package insert).

- **Fair balance:** Risk information must be presented with comparable prominence to benefit claims. This is not a footnote requirement — it's a design and editorial requirement.
- **Labeling consistency:** Claims must be supported by and consistent with the approved PI. No off-label promotion. No implying broader indications than the approved one.
- **Substantiation:** Every efficacy or safety claim must be supported by substantial evidence — generally, two adequate and well-controlled studies, or one with very strong evidence.
- **Context matters:** OPDP looks at the totality of a communication — not just individual claims. A technically accurate headline paired with misleading visual hierarchy can still be a violation.

MARKET ACCESS MATERIALS & OPDP

Here's the nuance: not all market access materials are considered 'promotional' under FDA rules. Value dossiers submitted to payers for formulary consideration, HEOR publications, and health economics data may be considered scientific exchange rather than promotion — and operate under a different (though still strict) regulatory framework. However, payer marketing materials, promotional slide decks, and field tools ARE promotional and subject to full OPDP oversight. Know which box your document is in before you write a word.

Preclearance: Getting FDA to Review Before Launch

Preclearance (also called 'advisory comments') is an optional but increasingly common process where companies submit promotional materials to OPDP for review before launch. It's not required — but for major branded materials, it's often the smartest investment a launch team can make.

What Preclearance Is	Why Companies Use It	What It Means for Writers

Voluntary submission of draft promotional materials to OPDP for advisory feedback before public release.	Reduces regulatory risk at launch. Provides documented record of FDA review. Can prevent costly revisions post-launch.	Your first draft may be written with preclearance submission in mind. Claims need to be especially clean, sourced, and defensible — not just MLR-passable.

The MLR Process: A Writer's Survival Guide

MLR stands for Medical, Legal, and Regulatory review — the internal review committee that approves all promotional materials before they go anywhere. Every market access writer has a relationship with MLR. The good ones understand what each reviewer is looking for:

Reviewer	Primary Concerns	Writer Strategy
Medical Reviewer	Clinical accuracy, appropriate use of evidence, proper contextualization of data, off-label risk	Cite every claim. Be precise about study populations and limitations. Never extrapolate beyond data.
Legal Reviewer	Liability, IP, comparative advertising claims, contract obligations, regulatory risk	Hedge carefully on comparative claims. Avoid absolutes ('best', 'only', 'proven'). Reference NDAs/contracts.
Regulatory Reviewer	OPDP compliance, labeling consistency, fair balance, indication accuracy	Stay in-label. Balance risk and benefit. Ensure ISI/fair balance is present and prominent.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Presenting Risk Information in Prescription Drug and Medical Device Promotion. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/72370/download
2. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/77832/download
3. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Formal Meetings Between the FDA and Sponsors or Applicants in the PDUFA Program. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2017. https://www.fda.gov/media/109951/download
4. Kessler DA, Pines WL. The federal regulation of prescription drug advertising and promotion. *JAMA*. 1990;264(18):2409-2415. doi:10.1001/jama.1990.03450180089037

For educational use. Not for distribution.

SECTION 08

NCCN, Compendia & Clinical Guidelines

Why guideline inclusion is often the most powerful sentence in your deck

For oncology writers especially — but increasingly across specialty areas — clinical practice guidelines are not background context. They are a primary market access lever. A drug's guideline status can determine coverage, PA requirements, and formulary tier placement more powerfully than clinical trial data alone.

NCCN: The National Comprehensive Cancer Network

NCCN guidelines are the gold standard in oncology — and NCCN compendium inclusion is often required for Medicare Part B coverage of oncology drugs. Understanding how NCCN works is essential for any oncology market access writer.

NCCN Category	What It Means	Copy Implication
Category 1	High-level evidence + uniform NCCN consensus that the recommendation is appropriate	Lead with this. It's the strongest possible guideline language — use it prominently.
Category 2A	Lower-level evidence + uniform NCCN consensus. The most common designation.	Strong and citable — but contextualize the evidence basis if space allows.
Category 2B	Lower-level evidence + non-uniform consensus (may be appropriate)	Use carefully. Payers will notice the qualifier. Pair with supporting clinical data.
Category 3	Any evidence level + major NCCN disagreement that the intervention is appropriate	Rarely used in market access copy without significant hedging. Address the controversy directly.

Tracking Guideline Updates: A Strategic Imperative

NCCN updates its guidelines multiple times per year — and a single update can change the competitive landscape overnight. A drug that gets added to a preferred Category 1 recommendation in month 3 of your campaign is a completely different story than the one you wrote at launch. Market access writers need to:

- Monitor NCCN.org for updates in your therapeutic area — sign up for alerts for relevant guidelines
- Understand the compendia beyond NCCN: AHFS-DI, Drugdex, Clinical Pharmacology — each has CMS coverage implications
- Know how guideline mentions are regulated in promotional copy (you must cite the version and date)
- Understand the difference between guideline-listed and guideline-preferred — payers see that distinction clearly
- Track competitor guideline positioning as closely as your own drug's — it directly informs your differentiation copy

For educational use. Not for distribution.

BEYOND ONCOLOGY

While NCCN is primarily oncology, guideline tracking matters across all therapeutic areas. AHA/ACC guidelines in cardiovascular, ACR guidelines in rheumatology, ADA Standards in diabetes, ATS/ERS in respiratory — payers follow these closely, and inclusion (or absence) from a major guideline is fair game as a coverage criterion. Know your disease area's guideline landscape cold.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Fort Washington, PA: NCCN; 2024. https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/category_1
2. Canadian Drug and Health Technology Agency. Guidelines for the Economic Evaluation of Health Technologies: Canada. 4th ed. Ottawa, ON: CADTH; 2017. https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/guidelines_for_the_economic_evaluation_of_health_technologies_canada_4th_ed.pdf
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Guide to the Methods of Technology Appraisal 2013. NICE; 2013. https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg9

SECTION 09

Brand Style Guides in Market Access

Working within — and sometimes pushing back on — brand constraints

Every drug brand has a style guide. Some are 8 pages. Some are 180 pages. All of them were written primarily for consumer advertising and HCP promotion — and almost none of them were written with market access in mind. This creates a tension that every market access writer has to navigate.

What a Brand Style Guide Covers

Brand name usage

Proper capitalization, trademark symbols, approved generic name format, how the brand name appears in running text vs. headlines. Critical for MLR compliance.

Approved claims

The claim matrix — what can be said, how it must be said, what sources must be cited. Your first stop before writing any efficacy or safety statement.

Visual and tonal guidelines

Color palette, typography, approved imagery, brand voice descriptors. Often the part most in tension with payer communication needs.

Indication statement

The precise, approved language for describing the indication. Use this verbatim. Every time. No paraphrasing.

ISI / Fair Balance requirements

How risk information must be presented — format, length, placement. Non-negotiable in promotional materials.

Off-limits language

Words, comparisons, and framings that are legally or regulatorily prohibited. Usually listed explicitly. Read this section first.

> ***“The brand guide tells you the rules of the game. Your job as a market access writer is to win within them — and to push back clearly when the rules don't fit the payer audience.”***

When Brand Voice Doesn't Work for Payers

Brand teams invest heavily in creating a distinctive tone — warm, confident, aspirational. That tone serves patients and HCPs well. In a P&T; dossier, it reads as promotional and undermines credibility. Here's how to navigate the tension:

Brand Instinct	Payer Reality	Writer Solution

'Life-changing results'	Evidence-based claim only	'Demonstrated significant improvement in [endpoint]'
Emotional storytelling lede	Data-forward executive summary	Lead with ICER, then humanize in body
Brand color palette throughout	Neutral professional presentation	Use brand palette in headers; neutral in data tables
Consumer-friendly simplification	Clinical precision required	Match complexity to P&T; reviewer's expertise
Avoid competitor mentions	Comparative effectiveness required	Use indirect comparison with full methodology disclosure

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Presenting Risk Information in Prescription Drug and Medical Device Promotion. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/72370/download
2. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions

For educational use. Not for distribution.

SECTION 10

Drug Comparisons, Market Share & Competitive Intelligence

How to write about competitors without getting your copy killed

Comparative effectiveness is the beating heart of market access. Payers don't cover drugs in a vacuum — they compare them. And if you're not making the comparison for them, they will make it themselves, often using data that doesn't favor your drug.

> ***“In brand copy, you rarely mention competitors by name. In market access copy, not mentioning competitors is often a strategic mistake.”***

The Competitive Evidence Hierarchy

Evidence Type	Strength	Copy Usability	Watch For
Head-to-head RCT vs. named comparator	Strongest	Highest — cite prominently	Ensure comparator is clinically relevant to payer's formulary
Active-controlled trial vs. class	Strong	Good — cite with class framing	Don't overreach to specific competitor without naming them
NMA / ITC vs. named competitor	Moderate	Usable with full methodology disclosure	Transparent about assumptions; statistical uncertainty bounds
Real-world comparative effectiveness	Moderate-strong (for payers)	High payer credibility	Control for selection bias; disclose data source and population
Indirect meta-analysis (unadjusted)	Weak	Use carefully; contextualize limitations	Subject to confounding; payers will push back without adjustment
Clinical guideline preference	Strong (no n-clinical)	Excellent — often most persuasive	Must reflect current version; cite date and version number

Market Share & Epidemiology: Setting the Stage

Market access copy often begins with a disease state framing that includes prevalence, incidence, current treatment landscape, and market share data. This context is not filler — it's strategic. It sets the scale of the problem and positions your drug within a competitive landscape.

- **Prevalence / Incidence data:** From CDC, published epidemiology studies, or registry data. Used to establish disease burden and size the patient population your drug will serve.

- **Treatment landscape:** What's currently on the formulary? What are the standard-of-care agents? What are failure rates, adherence issues, unmet needs? This is the 'before' of your value story.
- **Market share:** Current prescribing patterns by agent, market segment, and payer type. Used in budget impact models to estimate uptake and cost projections. Handle carefully — projections must be conservative and defensible.
- **Formulary landscape:** Where is your drug currently covered? Where is it not? What are the PA requirements vs. competitor agents? This is often presented in a formulary coverage grid.
- **Pipeline awareness:** What's coming? Payers always ask. Having a clear, honest view of the competitive pipeline (biosimilars, generics, novel agents) demonstrates strategic credibility.

> **The legal line on comparative claims:** Comparative advertising is regulated — by FDA for pharma, and by FTC for general claims. In market access materials, you can present comparative data if it is: accurate, properly sourced, not misleading in context, and clearly attributed. Head-to-head comparisons require head-to-head evidence. Indirect comparisons must be clearly labeled as such. When in doubt: label, source, and let medical reviewers decide.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Jansen JP, Fleurence R, Devine B, et al. Interpreting indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis for health-care decision making: part 1. *Value Health*. 2011;14(4):417-428. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2011.04.002
2. Garrison LP Jr, Neumann PJ, Erickson P, Marshall D, Mullins CD. Using real-world data for coverage and payment decisions. *Value Health*. 2007;10(5):326-335. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00186.x
3. Ramsey SD, Willke RJ, Glick H, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis alongside clinical trials II. *Value Health*. 2015;18(2):161-172. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2015.02.001

SECTION 11

The Market Access Copy Toolkit

What you'll actually be asked to write — and what each piece needs to do

Market access is not one document. It's an interlocking system of materials, each serving a specific audience, purpose, and regulatory context. Here's what you'll encounter:

Global Value Dossier (GVD)

STRATEGIC

The master evidence document — sometimes 300+ pages. Covers clinical, economic, humanistic, and comparative value comprehensively. Writers work on narrative sections, executive summaries, and key messages. This is the source of truth for every downstream material. Get it right.

Payer Slide Decks

HIGH IMPACT

15–30 slides tailored to payer type (commercial vs. Medicaid vs. Medicare vs. IDN). High impact per word. Must balance clinical rigor with accessible communication. Often the first thing a payer sees — structure and headline copy matter enormously.

Formulary Submission Kits

REGULATORY

Structured packages submitted to P&T; committees. Include cover letter, clinical summary, economic summary, and supporting evidence. Tone is formal and evidence-heavy; structure often follows payer templates that have their own specific requirements.

Value Message Framework

STRATEGIC

The internal master copy platform — defines the hierarchy of value messages, approved claims, and evidence mapping for a product. Writers often develop these in partnership with strategy leads. Everything downstream flows from this document.

HTA Submission Narratives

INTERNATIONAL

For NICE, G-BA, HAS, CADTH, and other bodies. Extensive written narratives covering clinical context, unmet need, patient perspective, and response to agency questions. Writers contribute to the narrative architecture; health economists build the models.

MSL / Field Tools

FIELD ENABLEMENT

Q&A; documents, objection handlers, leave-behind summaries, discussion guides. Shorter, more conversational. Enable non-writers to have sophisticated value conversations. Often the most-used materials in the entire market access program.

Payer-Facing Digital Content

EMERGING

Websites, email campaigns, and digital tools built specifically for payer audiences are growing rapidly. Same principles as all market access copy — evidence-led, precise — but with digital UX considerations.

Congress / Publication Support

SCIENTIFIC

Posters, abstracts, and presentations at AMCP, ISPOR, ASH, ASCO and similar venues. Scientific exchange context — different regulatory pathway but same evidence precision requirements.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
2. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Guide to the Methods of Technology Appraisal 2013. NICE; 2013. https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg9
3. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis — principles of good practice. *Value Health*. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291

SECTION 12

Mistakes That Will Get Your Copy Killed

The patterns that undermine credibility, fail MLR, and lose payers

Even experienced pharma writers make these mistakes when they move into market access. Some will get your copy sent back with MLR comments. Some will cost you payer credibility. A few will genuinely create regulatory risk. Know them cold.

✕ **Writing to persuade instead of inform**
Payers don't want to be sold to. The moment your copy feels promotional, you lose the room. Evidence-led, narrative-supported. In that order, always.

✕ **Confusing statistical significance with clinical significance**
A p-value does not equal meaningful benefit. A 1.2-point PRO improvement may be statistically significant but clinically meaningless. Always check the MCID. If you're below it, acknowledge it.

✕ **Ignoring the comparator**
Payers evaluate your drug against what they already cover. If you don't address that comparison proactively — with real data — they'll do it themselves. And they'll use whatever data they find.

✕ **Using brand voice in payer documents**
Warm, patient-centered, aspirational. Great for DTC. Catastrophic in a value dossier. Strip the emotion, elevate the evidence, and respect the audience's analytical intelligence.

✕ **Burying the clinical bottom line**
P&T; committees review hundreds of pages. If your key message isn't visible in the first 30 seconds, it may never land. Structure ruthlessly. Headers and callouts do more work than body copy in this world.

✕ **Misrepresenting subgroup data**
Post-hoc subgroup analyses are exploratory, not confirmatory. Presenting them as primary evidence is a red flag for every medical reviewer — and for sophisticated payer audiences who will see through it.

✕ **Failing to address off-label territory clearly**
If a significant clinical use of your drug falls outside the approved indication, you cannot promote it. Full stop. But you can create non-promotional scientific exchange materials. Know the difference.

✕ **Writing NCCN claims without version/date attribution**
NCCN updates regularly. A claim that was accurate at the time of writing may be out of date by the time it's in the field. Always cite the specific NCCN guideline version and update date.

✕ **Not understanding the specific payer's formulary before you write**
Generic market access copy is almost always weaker than tailored copy. Before you write a payer deck, know how the target payer currently covers your drug and your competitors. Write to their specific situation.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, Norman GR; Clinical Significance Consensus Meeting Group. Methods to explain the clinical significance of health status measures. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2002;77(4):371-383. doi:10.4065/77.4.371
2. Jansen JP, Fleurence R, Devine B, et al. Interpreting indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis for health-care decision making: part 1. *Value Health.* 2011;14(4):417-428. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2011.04.002

For educational use. Not for distribution.

3. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Presenting Risk Information in Prescription Drug and Medical Device Promotion. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. https://www.fda.gov/media/72370/download

SECTION 13

Reading & Responding to a Market Access Brief

The questions to ask before you write a single word

A market access brief is not a brand brief. The format may look similar — background, objectives, audience, deliverables, timeline — but the information you need to extract is categorically different. Writers who treat a market access brief the same way they treat a brand brief produce copy that is generically competent and strategically useless.

What a Well-Written Market Access Brief Contains

Disease/product background

The indication, mechanism of action, approved dosing, and clinical profile summary. This should include trial names, primary endpoints, and the approved label language.

Audience specification

Not just 'payers' — which payers, which segment, which decision-makers within that segment. A commercial PBM medical director and a Medicaid CMO require completely different framing.

Strategic objectives

What is this piece supposed to achieve? Formulary listing? PA criteria modification? HTA submission support? Payer education? The objective determines the structure.

Evidence package

The clinical data, HEOR analyses, RWE studies, and PRO evidence available to support claims. A good brief lists what exists — a great brief also flags what's missing.

Approved key messages

The hierarchy of value messages that have been through MLR or strategy sign-off. These are not optional. They are the claim architecture your copy must support.

Comparator context

What is currently on the formulary? What are the PA criteria for competitors? What is the clinical guideline context? Without this, comparative copy is impossible.

Deliverable specifications

Document type, page/slide count, format requirements, MLR submission deadline. For HTA submissions, specific agency templates may be mandatory.

Regulatory constraints

Any specific claims that are off-limits, approved indication boundaries, and whether materials are promotional or scientific exchange.

The 10 Questions to Ask Before You Write

Don't start writing until you have answers to these. If the brief doesn't provide them, ask. If no one can answer them, that's a strategic problem you should flag — not paper over with copy.

1	Who exactly is reviewing this document — what is their role, training, and decision-making authority?
2	What is the drug's current formulary status with this payer — and what are we asking them to change?
3	What does the comparator landscape look like for this specific payer's formulary right now?
4	Which data do we have that the payer hasn't seen before — and what's genuinely new here?
5	What is the strongest objection this payer is likely to raise — and does our evidence address it?
6	Are there any pending label changes, new data readouts, or guideline updates that affect our messages?
7	Is this promotional material or scientific exchange — and has that been determined by legal/regulatory?
8	What has this payer's previous response to our drug been — and what did they say no to before?
9	What is the timeline for their next formulary review — and is this content timed to that cycle?
10	What happens if we get preferred tier vs. non-preferred vs. step therapy — and does the brief reflect those stakes?

RED FLAGS IN A POORLY WRITTEN BRIEF

Vague audience: 'All payers' is not a brief — it's an abdication of strategy. **No comparator context:** If the brief doesn't tell you what's already on the formulary, someone hasn't done the strategic work. **Missing evidence inventory:** You cannot write credibly about value if you don't know what evidence exists — and what doesn't. **Objectives and deliverables don't match:** A 6-slide deck cannot achieve a comprehensive formulary submission objective. Push back early.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
2. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis — principles of good practice. *Value Health*. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291
3. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.

SECTION 14

Launch Sequencing & Content Timelines

Market access content starts 2 years before approval — here's the full picture

One of the most disorienting things about moving from brand to market access is the timeline. Brand campaigns are built for launch. Market access content is built for the negotiation that determines whether launch actually reaches patients. That negotiation starts — at minimum — 18 to 24 months before the PDUFA date.[15]

The Pre-Launch Content Waterfall

Milestone	Timeframe	Key Market Access Deliverables	Writer's Role
Global Value Dossier Development	T-24 to T-18 months	GVD drafting; value message framework; evidence gap analysis; HTA pre-submission briefs	Core writer on GVD narrative sections; value message development with strategy lead
Payer Research & Message Testing	T-18 to T-12 months	Advisory board materials; payer research discussion guides; landscape analysis reports	Interview discussion guides; advisory board presentation copy; research report narratives
HTA Submissions (International)	T-12 to T-6 months	NICE/G-BA/HAS/CADTH dossiers; indirect comparison narratives; patient evidence summaries	Submission narrative drafting; clinical context sections; response to agency questions
US Payer Launch Package	T-6 to T-3 months	Payer slide decks (by segment); formulary submission kits; MSL Q&A; tools; field leave-behinds	Full suite of payer-facing materials; objection handler copy; executive summary drafting
MLR Review Cycles	T-4 to T-1 months	Iterative review and revision across all launch materials	Rapid revision cycles; reference management; annotation management for submission
PDUFA Approval	T-0	Label finalized; PI approved; indication language locked	Final label review; claim alignment check across all materials; rapid update if label differs from expectation
Formulary Review Cycle	T+1 to T+6 months	P&T; committee submissions; coverage decision responses; contract offer support materials	Real-time response letters; data update summaries; customized payer materials by account
Lifecycle Management	T+6 months onward	RWE publications; new indication materials; biosimilar defense (if applicable); label expansion dossiers	Ongoing update cycle; new data integration; competitive response materials; new indication launches

> **What brand writers consistently underestimate:** By the time a drug is approved, the market access team has been in the field for 18+ months. The conversations with payers have already happened. The objections are known. The evidence gaps have been exposed. Great market access copy is written with full awareness of that history — not as if the drug just appeared.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Formal Meetings Between the FDA and Sponsors or Applicants in the PDUFA Program. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2017. https://www.fda.gov/media/109951/download
2. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
3. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022. *Value Health*. 2022;25(1):10-31. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.11.1351

SECTION 15

Rare Disease & Orphan Drug Access

A completely different framework — smaller populations, different evidence, higher stakes

Rare disease market access operates under different rules. The patient populations are smaller, the clinical evidence is often thinner (by necessity), the prices are dramatically higher, and the emotional stakes are unlike anything in primary care. Writers who apply standard market access frameworks to rare disease materials produce work that misses the point — and often fails to secure coverage.[12]

The Orphan Drug Act Framework

In the US, the Orphan Drug Act (ODA) designates drugs treating conditions affecting fewer than 200,000 Americans. Designation confers 7-year market exclusivity, tax credits, and reduced FDA filing fees. For market access writers, the ODA context shapes how you frame unmet need — because in rare disease, the need is almost always profound and the treatment options are almost always limited.

Dimension	Standard Drug	Orphan / Rare Disease Drug
Patient Population	Hundreds of thousands to millions	Often <10,000 in the US; sometimes <1,000 globally
Clinical Evidence	Phase 3 RCTs; multiple studies; head-to-head data often available	Single pivotal trial; often single-arm; natural history controls; accelerated approval common
Comparator	Active comparator typically available	Often no approved treatment; comparator = best supportive care or historical data
Pricing	$5K–$50K/year typical range	$100K–$3M+/year; ICER thresholds often exceeded; alternative frameworks required
Budget Impact Model	Population-based; formulary-level projections	Patient-level; often <100 patients in plan; impact per-patient rather than per-member
Patient Advocacy	Disease-based advocacy; some payer influence	Highly organized; often co-produce evidence; direct payer engagement; can define coverage criteria
HTA Approach	Standard QALY-based framework	Modified approaches (NICE Highly Specialised Technologies; multi-criteria decision analysis)

Writing for Rare Disease: Key Differences

Unmet need is your lead, always.

In rare disease, the unmet need is often catastrophic — progressive disability, premature death, no alternatives. This is your strongest and most defensible argument. Lead with it. Quantify the natural history. Patient registry data and published natural history studies are your evidence base here.

Evidence limitations are not weaknesses to hide.

Payers and HTA bodies know that rare disease trials are small and often uncontrolled. Acknowledging limitations proactively — and then explaining why the evidence is nonetheless compelling — builds more credibility than presenting thin data as if it were a 5,000-patient RCT.

The patient voice carries more weight.

In rare disease, patient testimony and patient-reported outcomes carry unusual evidential weight — particularly at NICE (via the NICE HST process) and at CADTH. Patient advocacy group submissions often directly influence coverage decisions. Your copy should reflect and reinforce the patient perspective with clinical precision.

QALY thresholds don't always apply.

Traditional cost-per-QALY frameworks are often not appropriate for rare disease — the populations are too small, the evidence too limited, and the societal value of treatment too complex to reduce to a single ratio. Many HTA bodies now use multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) or severity-adjusted approaches. Know which framework applies to which market.

Registry data is gold.

Patient registries are often the primary source of real-world data in rare disease. If your drug has registry evidence — or if the manufacturer funds a registry — this is a major access asset. Treat it accordingly in your evidence hierarchy.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Rare Diseases: Common Issues in Drug Development: Guidance for Industry. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2019. https://www.fda.gov/media/119757/download
2. Canadian Drug and Health Technology Agency. Guidelines for the Economic Evaluation of Health Technologies: Canada. 4th ed. Ottawa, ON: CADTH; 2017. https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/guidelines_for_the_economic_evaluation_of_health_technologies_canada_4th_ed.pdf
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Highly Specialised Technologies: Evaluating Optimised Treatments. NICE; 2022. https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-highly-specialised-technologies-guidance
4. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.

SECTION 16

Biosimilars — Both Sides of the Argument

Defending the reference biologic and arguing for biosimilar access: two different jobs

The Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCIA, 2010) created the US biosimilar approval pathway, and the biosimilar market has fundamentally reshaped how biologic drugs are covered.[13] As a market access writer, you may find yourself on either side of this equation — defending a reference biologic against biosimilar encroachment, or arguing for coverage parity for a biosimilar. These are genuinely different strategic jobs.

Key Terms

Biosimilar: A biological product highly similar to an FDA-approved reference product with no clinically meaningful differences in safety, purity, or potency.

Reference Product: The original FDA-approved biologic against which the biosimilar is compared.

Interchangeable: FDA designation indicating a biosimilar may be substituted for the reference product by a pharmacist without prescriber intervention. Higher evidentiary bar than biosimilar approval.

Extrapolation: When a biosimilar approved in one indication is automatically considered approved in all indications of the reference product — without separate clinical trials in each.

Non-Medical Switching: A payer-driven switch from a stable biologic regimen to a biosimilar for cost reasons — without clinical indication.

The Reference Product Defense

When you're writing for the originator biologic, your market access challenge is to maintain formulary preference as biosimilar alternatives enter the market. The evidence arguments available to you:

Long-term safety and real-world durability: Years of post-market safety data, immunogenicity surveillance, and real-world effectiveness in complex patient populations are assets biosimilars cannot match at launch. Cite them specifically.

Stability in established patients: Switching stable patients from an effective biologic regimen introduces risk — loss of response, immunogenicity, and disruption to clinical management. The non-medical switching argument is your strongest defensive position, particularly in autoimmune conditions.

Patient support infrastructure: REMS programs, patient support services, nursing support, and co-pay assistance programs are part of the value proposition. Payers care about adherence — and adherence support is a real differentiator.

Indication-specific evidence: If the reference product has been studied and labeled in an indication where the biosimilar relies on extrapolation, that clinical trial history is a meaningful differentiator. Be precise about it.

The Biosimilar Access Argument

When writing for a biosimilar manufacturer, your goal is coverage parity — placement on the same formulary tier as the reference product, without additional PA criteria, and with pharmacist substitution rights (if interchangeable).

Your evidence arguments:

FDA approval equivalence: The FDA biosimilar approval standard is rigorously defined.[13] Extensive analytical, preclinical, and clinical evidence demonstrates no clinically meaningful differences. This is your foundational claim — and it is defensible.

Real-world safety and effectiveness: Post-launch RWE from biosimilar-using populations builds the real-world record that payers find most persuasive. Lead with this as it accumulates.

Cost savings — net, not gross: The value of a biosimilar to a payer is net savings after rebates. If the reference product's rebate program is aggressive, the net cost advantage of the biosimilar may be narrower than the WAC discount suggests. Model this honestly.

Interchangeability evidence: If FDA has granted interchangeability status, this is your strongest access argument. It means pharmacist-level substitution without physician intervention — the payer's gold standard for switching.

> **The extrapolation question — handle it directly:** Whether you're defending the reference product or arguing for the biosimilar, extrapolation is the most contested issue. If writing for the reference product, you can highlight the depth of indication-specific clinical evidence. If writing for the biosimilar, you can cite the regulatory and scientific rationale for extrapolation without overclaiming. Either way, don't pretend the question doesn't exist.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Biosimilar Development, Reference Product Exclusivity, and Approval of Biosimilar and Interchangeable Products. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2020. https://www.fda.gov/media/89049/download
2. Garrison LP Jr, Neumann PJ, Erickson P, Marshall D, Mullins CD. Using real-world data for coverage and payment decisions. *Value Health*. 2007;10(5):326-335. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00186.x
3. Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009. Pub L No. 111-148, §7001-7003. 2010.

For educational use. Not for distribution.

SECTION 17

Working with Health Economists

The collaboration that defines the quality of your market access copy

The single most important professional relationship in market access writing is with the health economist. They build the models. You translate the models. And if that translation fails — if what the model shows and what the copy says are misaligned — everything downstream breaks.

> ***"The health economist knows what the model proves. You know what the audience needs to believe. Great market access copy happens where those two things meet."***

The Division of Labor

Health Economist Owns	Writer Owns	Shared Territory
Model architecture and assumptions	Executive summary narrative	Key message development
Statistical analysis and output validation	Headline data translation	Evidence hierarchy decisions
Sensitivity analysis interpretation	Clinical context framing	Determining what the model 'says' vs. 'shows'
ICER calculation and threshold comparison	Callout box and pull quote selection	Comparator framing
Evidence gap identification	Audience-specific message calibration	Claim annotation and referencing

How to Read a Model Output Without Being an Economist

You will regularly receive model outputs — spreadsheets, summary tables, or technical reports — and be asked to translate them into copy. Here's what to look for:

- **The base case result:** The primary ICER or cost-per-outcome figure under the model's central assumptions. This is what you lead with — but always paired with what the comparator is.
- **The sensitivity analysis range:** How much does the ICER change when assumptions vary? A wide range signals uncertainty — which you need to acknowledge in your narrative.
- **The population definition:** Which patients was the model built for? How closely does that match the payer's actual covered population? Mismatches need to be addressed, not ignored.

- **Dominant vs. dominated scenarios:** If your drug is 'dominant' (better outcomes AND lower cost), say so clearly and prominently. It's the strongest possible economic message.
- **The time horizon:** A 1-year model and a 5-year model for the same drug will produce very different results. Know the time horizon — and know whether it's appropriate for the disease and payer context.

The Translator's Most Common Failures

Translation Failure	Why It Happens	How to Fix It
Reporting the ICER without context	Writer takes the number at face value without understanding the threshold or comparator	Always pair the ICER with: the comparator, the threshold, and a plain-language interpretation
Conflating base case with sensitivity result	Choosing the most favorable scenario from sensitivity analysis as the 'result'	Lead with base case; use sensitivity range to demonstrate robustness, not to cherry-pick
Over-extrapolating model conclusions	The model shows X for population Y; copy implies it shows X for all patients	Stay within the model's defined population; flag limitations clearly
Neglecting the 'so what'	Reporting the HEOR findings without translating to a payer-relevant implication	Every model output needs a 'what this means for your formulary' statement

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.
2. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis — principles of good practice. *Value Health*. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291
3. Ramsey SD, Willke RJ, Glick H, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis alongside clinical trials II. *Value Health*. 2015;18(2):161-172. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2015.02.001
4. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022. *Value Health*. 2022;25(1):10-31. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.11.1351

SECTION 18

Career & Portfolio in Market Access

How to break in, what to build, and where the work lives

Market access writing is one of the most well-compensated niches in pharma communications — and one of the least clearly mapped career paths. Most people who end up here arrived from brand, from medical/regulatory writing, or from HEOR itself. Very few were trained directly for it. That gap is your opportunity.

Entry Points Into Market Access Writing

Background	What You Bring	What You Need to Add	Fastest Path In
Brand / DTC Pharma Copywriter	Pharma regulatory fluency; HCP audience experience; MLR familiarity	HEOR literacy; payer audience understanding; evidence-first writing structure	Request market access exposure from current agency; offer to support GVD narrative sections
Medical / Scientific Writer	Clinical precision; evidence evaluation; data interpretation; publication standards	Commercial and strategic framing; payer audience psychology; economic translation	Lateral move within a full-service health agency; target HEOR publication roles first
Regulatory Affairs Writer	Label literacy; FDA process fluency; compliance precision; submission experience	Value narrative skills; comparative effectiveness framing; audience-adaptive copy	Move through medical affairs; offer to support HTA response writing
Health Economics Consultant	Deep HEOR literacy; model familiarity; evidence evaluation; stakeholder fluency	Narrative and persuasive writing; copy architecture; plain-language translation skills	Embed with writing teams; offer to own executive summary drafting on HEOR reports
General Copywriter (No Pharma)	Writing craft; audience psychology; persuasive architecture; clarity under constraints	Everything clinical and regulatory — significant ramp required	Build education foundation first (this guide is a start); target junior agency roles or self-study + freelance

Building a Market Access Portfolio

The challenge with market access portfolio work is that most of it is confidential. Here's how to build demonstrated expertise without violating NDAs:

- **Spec work on published drugs:** Take an approved drug with publicly available clinical data and build a mock payer slide deck or value message framework. Use real trial data; create fictional company/brand context. This demonstrates exactly the skills a hiring team wants to see.
- **HEOR translation samples:** Take a published economic model or ISPOR poster and write the executive summary narrative it would support. Shows you can read technical content and produce access-ready copy.

- **Published work:** Contribute to AMCP's *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy* or ISPOR's *Value in Health*. Even a letter or commentary demonstrates professional engagement with the field. Both are accessible at amcp.org and ispor.org.
- **Case studies (with permission):** If you can get sign-off, document the approach and outcome of a market access project — strategy, audience, evidence used, how the piece was structured. The clinical data doesn't need to be included.
- **Educational content:** Writing publicly about market access (blog, LinkedIn, Substack) demonstrates knowledge and builds the authority that gets you inbound inquiries. This guide is an example of that approach.

Title Progression & Where the Work Lives

Level	Typical Titles	Primary Focus	Where to Find
Entry	Junior/Associate Medical Writer; Editorial Associate	GVD sections; reference management; slide formatting; MSL tools	Full-service health agencies (Syneos, Publicis, OPEN Health, Lumanity, Fishawack)
Mid-Level	Medical Writer; Senior Writer; Access Writer	Full deliverable ownership; payer slide decks; formulary kits; field tools	Specialist market access agencies; pharma medical affairs; HEOR consultancies
Senior	Senior Medical Writer; Principal Writer; Associate Director	Value message strategy; client leadership; dossier architecture; HTA narratives	Market access-focused agencies; pharma payer marketing teams; strategy consultancies
Principal / Director	Medical Director; VP Scientific Strategy; Head of Content	Portfolio-level messaging strategy; cross-functional leadership; business development	Mid-to-large pharma; independent consulting; agency leadership tracks
Freelance / Independent	Independent Contractor; Fractional Market Access Writer	Project-based work across all deliverable types; rate premium for niche expertise	Direct pharma relationships; agency contractor networks; specialist platforms

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ANCHORS

AMCP (Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy) — the annual meeting is the best single event for market access immersion. ISPOR — the health economics professional home; CHEERS certification is increasingly valued. ISMPP — for publication and medical writing credentialing. CMPP certification (Certified Medical Publication Professional) demonstrates technical writing rigor. None of these are required — but all of them signal professional seriousness to the market access community.

SECTION REFERENCES *AMA Manual of Style, 11th edition*

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. AMCP; 2016. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
2. International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research. ISPOR Education and Training. Lawrenceville, NJ: ISPOR; 2024. https://www.ispor.org/education-training/training
3. International Society for Medical Publication Professionals. CMPP Certification. ISMPP; 2024. https://www.ismpp.org/certification

SECTION 20

References

AMA 11th edition citations for key concepts referenced in this guide

The following references are cited in superscript throughout this guide. All URLs were verified at time of publication. For living documents (FDA guidance, NCCN guidelines), always access the current version directly from the issuing organization.

1. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Presenting Risk Information in Prescription Drug and Medical Device Promotion. Silver Spring, MD: FDA Office of Prescription Drug Promotion; 2009. Accessed 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/72370/download
2. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, et al. Budget impact analysis—principles of good practice: report of the ISPOR 2012 Budget Impact Analysis Good Practice II Task Force. Value Health. 2014;17(1):5-14. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2291
3. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2009. Accessed 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/77832/download
4. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Fort Washington, PA: NCCN; 2024. Accessed 2024. https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/category_1
5. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Guide to the Methods of Technology Appraisal 2013. London, UK: NICE; 2013. Accessed 2024. https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg9
6. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022 explanation and elaboration: a report of the ISPOR CHEERS II Good Practices Task Force. Value Health. 2022;25(1):10-31. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.11.1351
7. Garrison LP Jr, Neumann PJ, Erickson P, Marshall D, Mullins CD. Using real-world data for coverage and payment decisions: the ISPOR Real-World Data Task Force Report. Value Health. 2007;10(5):326-335. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00186.x
8. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. 2020–2023 Value Assessment Framework. Boston, MA: ICER; 2020. Accessed 2024. https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/value-assessment-framework/
9. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. AMCP Format for Formulary Submissions Version 4.1. Alexandria, VA: AMCP; 2016. Accessed 2024. https://www.amcp.org/research/amcp-format-formulary-submissions
10. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes. 4th ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2015.
11. Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, Norman GR; Clinical Significance Consensus Meeting Group. Methods to explain the clinical significance of health status measures. Mayo Clin Proc. 2002;77(4):371-383. doi:10.4065/77.4.371
12. US Food and Drug Administration. Rare Diseases: Common Issues in Drug Development: Guidance for Industry. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2019. Accessed 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/119757/download
13. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Biosimilar Development, Reference Product Exclusivity, and Approval of Biosimilar and Interchangeable Products. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2020. Accessed 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/89049/download
14. Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. Pub L No. 117-169, 136 Stat 1818. Enacted August 16, 2022. https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5376
15. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Formal Meetings Between the FDA and Sponsors or Applicants in the PDUFA Program. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2017. Accessed 2024. https://www.fda.gov/media/109951/download
16. Neumann PJ, Cohen JT, Weinstein MC. Updating cost-effectiveness—the curious resilience of the $50,000-per-QALY threshold. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(9):796-797. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1405158

For educational use. Not for distribution.

For the most current versions of FDA guidance documents, NCCN guidelines, and NICE methods guides, always access issuing organization websites directly. Living documents update on irregular schedules and the version current at time of writing may not reflect current standards.

SECTION 19

Market Access Glossary

Essential vocabulary for every market access writer

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
ACO	Accountable Care Organization — providers sharing financial responsibility for patient outcomes.	**BIM**	Budget Impact Model — estimates payer spend impact of covering a new therapy over 3-5 years.
CEA/CUA	Cost-Effectiveness / Cost-Utility Analysis — compares cost per clinical outcome or QALY.	**Compendia**	Drug information databases (AHFS-DI, Drugdex, Clinical Pharmacology) used to determine Medicare coverage eligibility.
Dossier (GVD)	Global Value Dossier — the master evidence package submitted to payers and HTA bodies.	**EQ-5D**	A widely used HRQoL instrument producing utility values for QALY calculations.
Fair Balance	FDA requirement that risk information be presented with prominence comparable to benefit claims.	**Formulary**	A payer's list of covered drugs; tier placement determines patient cost share and access.
HEOR	Health Economics and Outcomes Research — the scientific foundation of market access evidence.	**HRQoL**	Health-Related Quality of Life — how a condition or treatment affects patients' physical, mental, and social functioning.
HTA	Health Technology Assessment — systematic evaluation of clinical and economic value by payers and governments.	**ICER**	Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio — additional cost per additional QALY gained vs. comparator.
IDN	Integrated Delivery Network — health system combining hospitals, clinics, and often insurance.	**IRA**	Inflation Reduction Act — US law enabling Medicare to negotiate drug prices directly.
ITC/NMA	Indirect Treatment Comparison / Network Meta-Analysis — statistical method for comparing drugs without head-to-head trial data.	**KOL**	Key Opinion Leader — clinical expert who influences practice and contributes to evidence generation.
MCO	Managed Care Organization — health plan managing cost, utilization, and quality.	**MCID**	Minimal Clinically Important Difference — the smallest PRO change patients perceive as meaningful.
MLR	Medical, Legal, Regulatory review — the internal committee that approves all promotional materials.	**MSL**	Medical Science Liaison — field-based scientific expert engaging payers, KOLs, and clinical stakeholders.
NCCN	National Comprehensive Cancer Network — publisher of oncology clinical practice guidelines; compendium inclusion drives Medicare Part B coverage.	**OPDP**	Office of Prescription Drug Promotion — FDA division that regulates prescription drug promotion.

P&T;	Pharmacy & Therapeutics Committee — the body that reviews evidence and makes formulary recommendations.	**PBM**	Pharmacy Benefit Manager — intermediary managing drug benefits for health plans.
PI / Label	Prescribing Information / Package Insert — the FDA-approved document that defines approved indication and claims.	**Preclearance**	Voluntary submission of promotional materials to OPDP for advisory review before launch.
PRO	Patient-Reported Outcome — health status reported directly by the patient.	**QALY**	Quality-Adjusted Life Year — one year of perfect health = 1.0 QALY; used in cost-utility analysis.
RWE	Real-World Evidence — clinical evidence from routine care settings including claims, EHR, and registry data.	**SoC**	Standard of Care — currently accepted treatment; primary comparator in market access arguments.
Step Therapy	Coverage requirement that patients try (and often fail) less expensive treatments before access to your drug.	**UMDNS / Unmet Need**	Unmet Medical Need — the gap between existing treatments and optimal patient outcomes; central to access arguments.
WTP	Willingness-to-Pay threshold — maximum cost-per-QALY a payer will accept; varies by country and plan type.		

Market access is where clinical science meets economic reality, and where the right words — precisely chosen, rigorously sourced — determine whether patients can actually reach the drugs that help them.

That's not a small job. Write accordingly.

Alexandra Keena · Senior Market Access Copywriter · Pharma · Payer · Strategy · MedComms