Insights from behavioral economics for improving usage of rectal microbicides

Sebastian Linnemayr, PhD RAND

May 14, 2014

Take-home message

 Behavioral Economics ≠ Economics as you may know it...

What is behavioral economics (BE)?

 It is economics in the sense that people make decisions based on costs and benefits



What is behavioral economics?

- It is economics in the sense that people make decisions based on **costs** and **benefits**
- But BE recognizes that they make systematic mistakes in assessing them
- People are *predictably* irrational / show biases



Motivating example- organ donations

Fraction of drivers who are organ donors:

Germany: 12%

Austria: 99%

What is the difference?

• No, the difference is this:



Opt in versus opt out of donating organs

In the next 10 minutes I will talk...

- 1. About the **costs and benefits** of microbicide use (the 'traditional' economics angle)
- About the biases that interact with the characteristics of microbicides (the 'behavioral economics angle')
- 3. Some (very) preliminary solution suggestions for discussion

Costs: the quick part

- -Financial
- Opportunity cost (of enjoying carefree sex)
- -Stigma
- -Discomfort

—...

The more difficult part: benefits

- Timing: costs now, benefits later
- Prevention versus Treatment
 - Uncertainty / odds
- Efficacy versus effectiveness
 - "enroll in a study of a gel that might (or not) work, and you may (or not) receive the real gel."

Healthy behaviors likely when...

- Decision is simple
- Single action
- Good feedback
- → vaccination

Microbicides:

- Long-term behavior needed
- Daily / event-specific adherence needed
- Infrequent testing feedback

1. Costs immediate, benefits later → Myopia

Particularly bad if coincides with overconfidence

Potential intervention: incentives

PROBLEM: measurement

2. The benefits of microbicides are largely invisible (absence of infection) → Salience

Related: difficulty of dealing with odds / numerical literacy

Potential intervention: make benefits visible (HIV infection 'counter')

3. Little feedback → un-learning

- See other people with unhealthy behaviors not getting infected
- Person not getting infected despite irregular usage

Potential intervention: frequent information of similar users who got infected due to non-adherence?

- 4. Active decision-making required → status-quo bias (inertia)
 - Compare to organ donation example (default is not to take the medication)
 - Daily versus event-specific usage (similar to condom)

Potential intervention: reduce cognitive effort needed to make the decision

Repeated (daily) decision-making required >
long-term strategy needed

– Long-term effects of interventions?

Potential intervention: one size fits all? Combination of different strategies at different stages in the user life cycle needed

Conclusion

- Behavioral economics suggests that the biases of
 - Myopia
 - Overconfidence
 - Salience
 - Status quo bias
 - Un-learning may contribute to low microbicide usage
- BE suggests to use the same biases to 'nudge' people in the right direction
- Next step: think more carefully about specific nudges

Thank you!

slinnema@rand.org

Extra slide 1: Clinical trials vs. real-life adherence

Clinical trials:

- Recruitment
- Intrinsic motivation / study sample (students, ...) / risk profile
- Fixed duration
- Reduced benefits (placebo; efficacy not established)

Actual adherence:

- Life-long
- General population
- Different types of barriers (financial costs; intra-couple bargaining, ...)
- Social effects