

STATE OF UTAH  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL



MARK L. SHURTLEFF  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

RAYMOND A. HINTZE  
Chief Deputy

KIRK TORGENSEN  
Chief Deputy

December 17, 2007

Dennis G. Smith, Director  
Center for Medicaid and State Operations  
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  
7500 Security Boulevard, Mail Stop S2-26-12  
Baltimore, Maryland 21244-1850

Re: Improper Off-Label Indications - definition of "covered outpatient drugs"

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for your reply dated December 6, 2007, in which you stated that "the Social Security Act does not provide definitive policy on the coverage of Medicaid drugs for the uses you describe in your letter," namely for uses other than "medically accepted indications" (i.e., for uses not FDA-approved or "supported" in the specified compendia).

With all due respect, I beg to differ and direct your attention to Section 1927(k)(3) regarding a specific exception to the definition of "covered outpatient drug." In pertinent part it states that the term "covered outpatient drug" (which would otherwise be eligible for Medicaid Federal Financial Participation) **does not include "a drug or biological used for a medical indication which is not a medically accepted indication."**

This federal statute defining the term "covered outpatient drug" clearly delineates that Medicaid drugs are covered only so long as they are used for "medically accepted indications." Congress apparently intended that Medicaid not be so restrictive as to prohibit all off-label use, but that it not be so expansive as to cover experimental uses not yet medically accepted. The criterion Congress chose for permissible off-label use was that the particular use be "supported" in at least one of the specified compendia [(k)(6)].

Frankly, I do not see how CMS can ignore this unambiguous statutory definition of "covered outpatient drug." I conclude from your letter that CMS, while ignoring the clear statutory definition, is focusing on the Limitations subsection (d) that lists permissible restrictions, including prescribed uses not for a medically accepted indication at subsection (d)(1)(B)(i).

Dennis G. Smith, Director  
December 17, 2007  
Page Two of Two

Apparently an inference is being drawn from this subsection that, since a State may exclude coverage for a prescribed use that is not a medically accepted indication, it is not required to do so. But for the clear, unambiguous definition of "covered outpatient drug," it would appear to be reasonable to draw such an inference; however, as a principle of statutory construction, a mere negative inference from a Limitations section (the purpose of which is to identify restrictions to coverage, not to expand coverage) does not trump a clear delineation of coverage in the definitional section.

I strongly encourage you to run this issue by your legal counsel and am confident that they will conclude that the clear, unambiguous definition of "covered outpatient drug" means that States are eligible for Federal Financial Participation with respect to drugs that are reimbursed only for "medically accepted indications," i.e., only for uses either approved by the FDA or "supported" in the specified compendia.

A "poster child" example of exactly why this issue is important not only for cost considerations, but also for patient safety, is the atypical antipsychotic drug Zyprexa manufactured by Eli Lilly. For about 10 years it has been at or near the highest dollar volume drug reimbursed by Medicaid nationwide. It is only approved for schizophrenia and bipolar disorder in adults, a very narrow segment of the population. It has been widely reported that approximately 50% of utilization is off-label, including for infants and toddlers. Based on recent lawsuit settlements totaling over a billion dollars and involving thousands of Zyprexa users, the drug causes substantial weight gain and diabetes in a significant percentage of cases. In other words, Medicaid is not only paying for a very expensive drug for uses that are not "medically accepted indications," but its reimbursement of this drug is resulting in many Medicaid recipients developing diabetes, a life-threatening condition with many adverse health complications for the individuals and a significant cost burden on taxpayers for treating these complications.

I implore you to look into this drug coverage issue resulting in substantial overpayments and jeopardizing the health and safety of hundreds of thousands of Medicaid recipients.

Very truly yours,



David R. Stallard, CPA  
Assistant Attorney General  
(801) 281-1269  
[dstallard@utah.gov](mailto:dstallard@utah.gov)  
/DRS

cc: Steven E. Phurrough, M.D., MPA, Director, Coverage and Analysis Group  
David Frank, Director, Medicaid Integrity Group