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BACKGROUND
Tapentadol Immediate Release Oral Tablets (C-II) was launched in 2009. This product was designed to address the need for a new oral analgesic with a unique mechanism of action, a balanced profile and a different type of pain receptor. A large volume of literature has been generated by the clinical trials and economic models supporting this product. The purpose of this survey was to determine customer feedback on the dossier such as Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy (AMCP), WellPoint, and Drug Evidence Reviews Project (DERP).

The Tapentadol Immediate Release Oral Tablets (C-II) dossier was developed based on the AMCP format. The dossier was developed over a period of six months and was aimed to provide a reference document for clinical and economic evaluations of the Tapentadol Immediate Release Oral Tablets (C-II).

METHODS
An anonymous survey was created and sent via email to 187 customers who had submitted request or responses to pre-launch clinical trial information. The survey was distributed via email to customers and was launched in June 2009 (shortly after the product launch). The survey was sent in a 2-week window (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th). The survey was sent to customers who had submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier from product launch till the date of survey (June 22nd to July 6th).

RESULTS: Demographics
• For small hospitals or health-systems, medium hospitals or health-systems, and large (>350 beds) hospital or health-systems, 3 customers were neutral about the importance and usefulness of the Modeling Report.
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RESULTS: Flow
• 2 Q assessed flow
• 1 Q branched into 3 Q
• 1 Q assessed the purpose for which the dossier was requested

RESULTS: Content
• Positive response to the content
• No customer requested additional products in the Product Information section.

RESULTS: Supporting Clinical and Economic Information Section
• The majority of customers agreed additional information should be included in the Supporting Clinical and Economic Information section to conduct a complete evaluation of the product.
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DISCUSSION
• Customers were given 2 weeks to respond to the survey.

LIMITATIONS
• The tapeentadol immediate release oral tablets C-II was developed based on the AMCP format in order to conduct a more thorough review of the product.

CONCLUSIONS
• Customers were satisfied with the content and format of the dossier.
• Customer satisfaction was not statistically significant for the content of the dossier.
• All 11 respondents are pharmacists.
• Out of the 181 emails that went out to customers who submitted unsolicited requests for the dossier, 100% of customers responded using a five-point likert scale as well as free text.