

Shire Pharmaceuticals: Historical Promotion Cases and the Transition to Generic Access

Research checked: 9 September 2026. Publication date: 9 September 2026. New research edition.

1. Executive assessment: a historical company within a current portfolio

Shire is best understood here as a historical pharmaceutical group and set of operating subsidiaries, rather than a separate present-day public company. Takeda completed its acquisition of Shire plc on January 8, 2019. The acquired portfolio included important neuroscience, rare-disease, and other specialty products.¹ A reader following an old Shire product or assistance link therefore needs to establish its current owner and market before relying on the information.

Two substantial United States civil resolutions are central to this report. In 2014, Shire Pharmaceuticals LLC agreed to pay \$56.5 million to resolve False Claims Act allegations involving promotion of several medicines. In 2017, Shire subsidiaries agreed to a \$350 million resolution involving Dermagraft and alleged inducements and billing-related conduct.^{2,3} The cases involved different products, periods, and mechanisms. Neither should be transformed into a generalized claim that every Shire medicine was improperly marketed or that the same activities continue today.

The access story also includes a later development with measurable economic relevance: FDA approved multiple generic versions of Vyvanse in 2023. FDA's subsequent analysis estimated substantial spending reductions associated with lisdexamfetamine generic entry.^{4,5} This is evidence about competition in a defined product market, not proof of a previously unlawful price or a guarantee of a particular patient's current pharmacy bill.

Our assessment is that Shire's record illustrates three distinct accountability problems. Promotional statements must be supported by appropriate evidence. Commercial incentives should not displace independent clinical judgment. Finally, historical corporate labels must be updated so that users can reach the organization responsible for current products and access services. Combining these questions under an undifferentiated “pharmaceutical misconduct” label would obscure the evidence rather than clarify it.

This report focuses on documented United States events and publicly available company materials. It is a new research edition, not a recovered version of an unavailable Pharma Foundation report. It does not establish the Foundation's prior research output or any individual's historic contributions. It also does not provide clinical advice about ADHD, ulcerative colitis, wound care, or drug substitution. The intended reader should be able to distinguish what was alleged, what was resolved, and what remains unknown about prices and access today.

2. Timeline: promotion investigations, Dermagraft, and ownership change

The 2014 resolution covered allegations concerning Adderall XR, Vyvanse, Daytrana, Lialda, and Pentasa. DOJ assigned different time periods and promotional claims to the individual products. Its account described unsupported claims about comparative efficacy and outcomes, statements about misuse potential, and promotion for uses not covered by the relevant approvals or federal programs.² The historical periods matter: the settlement announcement did not describe a 2014 clinical finding that all approved uses lacked benefit.

The written agreement provides a particularly important qualification. It identifies the covered drugs and claims, states that the agreement compromises disputed claims, and records Shire's express denial of the allegations. It does not constitute an admission of liability by Shire.⁶ The seriousness of the alleged conduct does not change that procedural status.

A separate chain of events concerned Dermagraft, a bioengineered skin substitute. DOJ reported that Shire acquired Advanced BioHealing in 2011 and sold the Dermagraft-associated assets in early 2014. The January 2017 settlement addressed alleged conduct by Shire and the acquired business.³ Corporate acquisition therefore forms part of the factual setting, but it does not establish which particular individuals knew about, approved, or carried out each alleged practice.

Date	Event	Scope to preserve
2011	Shire acquires Advanced BioHealing	Predecessor connection to Dermagraft
Early 2014	Dermagraft assets sold	Product ownership changes
September 2014	\$56.5 million civil resolution	Several prescription medicines
January 2017	\$350 million civil resolution	Dermagraft-related allegations
January 2019	Takeda completes Shire acquisition	Current corporate context
August 2023	First Vyvanse generics approved	Later competition milestone

Takeda's acquisition announcement establishes the January 2019 closing date and its Japan-based parent identity.¹ FDA's approval records establish a later transition in the United States lisdexamfetamine market.⁴ These are different kinds of change: ownership consolidates corporate control, while generic approval authorizes additional manufacturers to compete with a reference product.

The chronology is useful because it prevents retroactive attribution. A historical Shire event should not automatically be described as a decision made by Takeda's current management. Equally, acquisition should not erase the history of the acquired operations. A careful report preserves the historical entity, relevant product, period, and successor relationship side by side.

3. Principal evidence: promotional claims and financial inducements

The 2014 DOJ announcement is evidence of the government's allegations and the amount and structure of a civil resolution. Its product-specific examples include claims about Adderall XR's comparative results, Vyvanse's misuse potential, and Lialda promotion. DOJ also recognized Shire's cooperation and corrective changes before settlement.² These details support a focused discussion of the evidence behind promotional messaging. They do not justify repeating the alleged promotional claims as established medical truths.

The agreement itself adds legal precision beyond the press release. It identifies the federal programs and civil proceedings involved, delineates covered conduct, and states the parties' disagreement about liability.⁶ The distinction is substantive: an agreed payment resolves a dispute on specified terms, whereas a trial finding would establish facts through a different process. A report that calls this a criminal conviction would materially misstate the record.

In the Dermagraft matter, DOJ described alleged inducements including entertainment, payments for purported speaking engagements and case studies, and other transfers intended to encourage use. It also described allegations involving off-label promotion, pricing statements, and claims coding.³ The central access concern is not simply whether more treatment was available. It is whether purchasing and reimbursement decisions reflected valid evidence and independent judgment rather than an undisclosed financial incentive.

That concern should be separated from legitimate patient support, education, and professional services. The existence of a payment, dinner, or speaking contract does not by itself establish that it violated a law. Evidence about purpose, terms, services actually performed, and connection to federally reimbursed use is necessary. This report reports the government's specific allegations without creating its own unsupported accusations about other programs or clinicians.

The company's contemporaneous 2014 statement said it had admitted no wrongdoing and described a five-year corporate integrity agreement, cooperation, and commitment to compliance. It also disclosed a separate \$2.9 million Louisiana resolution.⁷ That state amount must not silently be included within, or confused with, the \$56.5 million federal-and-state figure. Its inclusion here shows why even apparently simple settlement totals require a defined perimeter.

Our analysis is that the two cases concern the information and incentives surrounding treatment decisions. The public record does not provide a complete patient-level estimate of resulting harm or excess utilization. Monetary recovery is an enforcement outcome; it is not an independently calculated measure of every dollar of harm, every improper prescription, or all revenue generated by the products.

4. Pricing and access: what generic Vyvanse evidence contributes

A current access report should include developments after the historical settlements. FDA's approval of multiple generic lisdexamfetamine capsule and chewable-tablet applications in 2023 created additional authorized suppliers of products referencing Vyvanse.⁴ Approval establishes that an application meets the relevant regulatory requirements. It does not establish that every manufacturer immediately launched every strength or that all local pharmacies obtained adequate inventory.

FDA subsequently analyzed savings from the broader cohort of generic approvals in 2023. For lisdexamfetamine, it reported 13 approved applications, an average price decline from approximately \$12 to \$9 per capsule, annual volume approaching 520 million capsules, and estimated savings of about \$1.7 billion.⁵ These are FDA's reported estimates and rounded contextual figures. They are attributed FDA estimates, not a new Pharma Foundation calculation.

The agency's method combined brand and generic dollar sales and units to construct a weighted average product price. Dollar amounts were inflation-adjusted to January 2025, and the savings analysis followed approvals over twelve months. Consequently, its price is not a manufacturer list price, an individual pharmacy cash quote, or a patient copayment.⁵ A user seeing “\$9 per capsule” in this report should not assume that multiplying it by their prescription quantity yields their own bill. Coverage, pharmacy contracts, assistance eligibility, and product selection may change the amount due.

Evidence item	What it supports	What it cannot establish
Multiple generic approvals	Additional authorized competitors	Immediate local availability
FDA average-price estimate	Market-level price movement	Universal pharmacy cash price
FDA savings estimate	Modeled aggregate spending reduction	Each patient's realized savings
Current Takeda product listing	Current brand portfolio reference	Unrestricted financial assistance

The observed competition milestone is important even without a complete patient-level dataset. It supplies an evidence-based alternative to evaluating affordability exclusively through settlement payments. A company can have a historical compliance resolution and a product can later experience substantial generic competition; those facts should be investigated through their own evidence rather than collapsed into one narrative.

Current Takeda materials continue to identify Vyvanse within the United States product list.⁸ That listing provides a route to current product information, but it should not be treated as a promise that historical assistance programs remain available. This report has not verified a current universal assistance entitlement. The practical next step for an access database is to verify each live program's country, product, payer restrictions, eligibility, duration, and responsible administrator rather than reuse a discontinued Shire-era link.

5. Outcomes and current status: preserving history without freezing it

The 2014 and 2017 sources describe monetary settlements of civil allegations. They should be presented as historical resolutions. The 2014 settlement agreement expressly records disputed claims and denial; the 2017 DOJ release distinguishes its civil settlement from separate proceedings concerning individuals.^{6,3} This report makes no inference that the corporate settlement convicted every person associated with the business.

The company's position and compliance response also belong in the record. Shire's 2014 statement described its corporate integrity agreement and cooperation, while DOJ separately acknowledged cooperation.^{7,2} These statements establish the response announced at the time. They do not independently prove that every subsequent control operated effectively or establish an ongoing agreement in 2026. A five-year agreement announced in 2014 should not be described as currently active without checking later records.

For corporate identity, Takeda's 2019 acquisition is the key successor event.¹ Current portfolio pages and financial disclosures describe ongoing operations. This account retains the historical name for continuity while explaining the Takeda acquisition and distinguishing present businesses from the former company.

Fresh searches for this edition identified Takeda's May 2026 results discussion, which attributed revenue headwinds in part to loss of exclusivity for Vyvanse. The same page prominently warns that certain financial information was subsequently revised because of separate Amitiza litigation.⁹ This report uses the page only for its stated Vyvanse context and does not reproduce superseded profit figures or treat the unrelated case as a Shire finding. That warning illustrates why “latest annual results” must be checked for amendments.

A responsible current-status statement is narrower than a claim that all matters have been resolved. This review verifies the selected historical settlements, acquisition, later generic approvals, and current product context. It is not an exhaustive search of all international litigation, subsidiary obligations, or access arrangements. It does not claim that brand and generic supply are interchangeable in every locality or that reimbursement barriers disappeared after competition began.

The historical case and current access information answer separate questions. The case record is defined by its legal status and dates; current access depends on owners, assistance terms, approved competitors, and supply conditions at a specified time. Historical accountability does not depend on whether an old corporate website still exists.

6. Research method, implications, and limitations

Nine primary or first-party sources underpin this report: DOJ announcements, a settlement agreement, FDA approval and economic-analysis materials, and company disclosures. Each central source was opened rather than accepted solely from a search snippet. A fresh status search included 2026 Takeda material to avoid presenting Shire as an unchanged independent company. The source register separates the factual claims supported by each document from points requiring further verification.

The strongest findings have clear boundaries. The acquisition date establishes corporate succession. Settlement documents establish the terms and contested status of specified claims. FDA approvals establish authorization for defined generic products. FDA's economic study supplies a modeled market-level savings estimate. None of these sources alone establishes a complete causal account of patient access, company intent, or the medically appropriate choice for a particular person.

A product-level analysis needs to distinguish historical Shire subsidiaries from Takeda and later owners of divested products. Brand name, active ingredient, presentation, geography, and the dates that ownership or marketing rights changed are all material. Without those distinctions, a researcher may wrongly assign a modern program to an old entity or confuse an asset sale with a transfer of every historical liability.

Further quantitative work could examine actual patient payments and fill rates around lisdexamfetamine generic entry. A useful design would distinguish cash and insured transactions, prescription quantity, strength, geographic availability, and changes in formularies. It should compare similar patients over time and account for concurrent supply constraints. Merely observing a lower aggregate price would not identify which patients benefited or whether interruptions offset some savings.

For promotional accountability, future research should prioritize original court filings, applicable product labels at the time of the alleged conduct, and detailed integrity-agreement reports where public. These can clarify what particular statements meant in context and which controls were required. Missing evidence should remain marked as missing; a report should not fill gaps with assumptions about personal motives or clinical outcomes.

This review has no private contracts, patient records, internal sales training, or complete transaction-level pricing data. It therefore does not calculate overcharges, recommend treatment, or make findings beyond the cited record. Its contribution is a precise, updateable account: historical marketing and inducement allegations had substantial civil resolutions; Shire became part of Takeda; and later generic competition supplies a separate, measurable access development. Those conclusions remain useful only if their legal status, time periods, and units remain visible.

References

1. Takeda. *Takeda Completes Acquisition of Shire, Becoming a Global, Values-based, R&D-Driven Biopharmaceutical Leader*. January 8, 2019, dateline. [Open source](#)
2. U.S. Department of Justice. *Shire Pharmaceuticals LLC to Pay \$56.5 Million to Resolve False Claims Act Allegations Relating to Drug Marketing and Promotion Practices*. September 24, 2014. [Open source](#)
3. U.S. Department of Justice. *Shire PLC Subsidiaries to Pay \$350 Million to Settle False Claims Act Allegations*. January 11, 2017. [Open source](#)
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *FDA approves multiple generics of ADHD and BED treatment*. 2023 approval announcement; checked September 2026. [Open source](#)
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Estimating Cost Savings from New Generic Drug Approvals in 2023*. 2025. [Open source](#)
6. United States, Shire Pharmaceuticals LLC, and relators. *Settlement Agreement*. September 2014. [Open source](#)
7. Shire, archived by Takeda. *Shire Reaches Final Agreement With U.S. Government*. September 24, 2014. [Open source](#)
8. Takeda U.S. *Product List*. Undated; checked September 9, 2026. [Open source](#)
9. Takeda. *Takeda Announces FY2025 Full Year Results and FY2026 Outlook, Highlighted by Excellent Pipeline Progress and Solid FY2025 Results*. May 13, 2026; page carries subsequent financial-revision warning. [Open source](#)