

University of New Mexico  
**UNM Digital Repository**

---

Clinical and Translational Science Center Trainee  
Scholarly Output

Health Sciences Research Centers

---

11-4-2014

# Literature search strategy for economic evaluations of long acting reversible contraception (LARC)

Michelle R. Chungtuyco

Jonathan D. Eldredge

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc\\_ctsc\\_trainee\\_papers](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc_ctsc_trainee_papers)

---

## Recommended Citation

Chungtuyco, Michelle R. and Jonathan D. Eldredge. "Literature search strategy for economic evaluations of long acting reversible contraception (LARC)." (2014). [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc\\_ctsc\\_trainee\\_papers/9](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hsc_ctsc_trainee_papers/9)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Health Sciences Research Centers at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Clinical and Translational Science Center Trainee Scholarly Output by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [disc@unm.edu](mailto:disc@unm.edu).

Michelle Chungtuyco, MD  
Master of Science in Clinical Research (MSCR) Candidate  
Biomedical Research Education Program  
CTSC MSCR BioMedical Informatics Level 2 Course with Jonathan D. Eldredge, PhD  
August – October 2014

## **Literature search strategy for economic evaluations of long acting reversible contraception (LARC)**

**MeSH terms:** economics, intrauterine devices, desogestrel; cost and cost-analysis.

### **Introduction**

Long acting reversible contraception (LARC) methods consist of the *intrauterine device (IUD)* and *subdermal implant*. These birth control methods provide highly effective contraception that last from 3-10 years. The IUD comes in both medicated (levonorgestrel-containing) and copper-containing form while the implant is inserted sub-dermally in the upper arm under local anesthesia and releases a small continuous amount of the etonogestrel. Despite high efficacy, LARC remains underutilized, with only 8.5% of contraceptive-using American women reporting its use (Finer 2012). The relationship between low LARC use and unintended pregnancy is documented (Secura 2013, Blumenthal 2013, Blumenthal 2011). In the United States, more than half of all pregnancies are unintended, with an estimated annual direct cost of \$4.6 billion (Trussell 2013).

There are two well-accepted methods of LARC initiation – immediate postpartum and interval insertion. In “immediate insertion,” LARC are placed within 72 hours of delivery, prior to hospital discharge. In contrast, “interval insertion” encompasses delayed insertion at 4-8 weeks postpartum as well as LARC initiation that is not related to pregnancy. Although immediate postpartum LARC initiation has been commonly practiced in other parts of the world for the last three decades (Grimes 2010), only a few centers in the US offer this service.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends the use of LARC in the immediate postpartum period to aid in reducing unintended pregnancy rates and rapid repeat pregnancies (ACOG 2009, 2011). In the state of New Mexico, about 56% of pregnancies were unintended, with 58% ending in live births (NM PRAMS 2008). Data from the University of New Mexico Hospital (UNMH) in 2002 show that about 12% of postpartum women chose delayed LARC as their method of birth control. At best, only 60% of these women actually had a LARC placed (Ogburn 2005). More recent data from 2006-2011 indicate an increasing number of women who plan to use birth control after delivery, with preference for the implant and the IUD (Singh 2014).

Previous economic analysis of contraceptive methods show that, overall, LARC use leads to cost savings and quality adjusted life years compared to methods which require patient adherence such as oral contraceptive pills (Sonnenberg 2004, Secura 2013). Although previous research studies have been published regarding the cost effectiveness of LARC use in general, no cost-effective or cost utility study have directly analyzed immediate postpartum versus interval LARC use in the US.

### **Specific aims**

Our **long-term goal** is to increase the practice and uptake of highly effective contraceptive methods in the US. The **overall objective** of this application is to perform *economic analyses* of the two timing strategies of LARC initiation. *Cost effectiveness and cost utility analyses* are methods for full economic evaluation that, combined, make use of the decision analytic models in order to report costs with each unintended pregnancy that is prevented and costs with each quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained for any treatment or intervention (Gold MR 1996). The **central hypothesis** is that immediate postpartum LARC insertion is more cost-effective than interval initiation. To test our central hypothesis

and attain the objective of this application, we plan to pursue the following *three specific aims using the societal perspective*:

1. Cost utility analysis (CUA): Perform an incremental cost utility analysis (cost per QALY gained) of immediate postpartum LARC initiation compared with interval insertion through the creation of a decision analytic model.
2. Cost effectiveness analysis (CEA): Determine the incremental cost per unintended pregnancy that is prevented when LARC is initiated in the immediate postpartum period versus interval insertion.
3. Validate the model by conducting sensitivity analyses, using variables that may affect cost effectiveness and cost utility results.

Based on a review of the literature, *our working hypothesis* is that immediate LARC initiation, through an increase in patient compliance, will lead to a decrease in unintended pregnancy rates with its associated direct and indirect costs, and to an increase in quality-adjusted life years. Additionally, we *hypothesize* that these results are robust across varied time horizons, payer systems, and a wide range of probabilities and costs.

### Replicable search strategy

In order to begin to achieve our aims, I conducted an extensive literature search on published economic evaluations on the IUD and contraceptive implant. Through the PubMed database, I performed separate searches during August 2014 for the IUD and during September 2014 for the sub-dermal implant. I considered all publications, whether they conducted the analysis specifically on LARC or in combination with other birth control methods. I did not apply any date and time restrictions since I wanted to capture all economic evaluations that have been completed in the past. Apart from gaining information on what methods have been done, I also wanted to ensure comparability of my unit of reporting with what was published.

### Economic evaluations - Intrauterine Device (IUD)

Search # 1: On opening the MESH database at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>, I entered “Intrauterine device” in the search bar. I then selected the first definition of “Intrauterine Devices” (which includes both medicated and copper IUDs). I selected the subheading “economics” and did **not** restrict to MeSH Major Topic. I added it to the search builder and searched PubMed.

Search #2: Returning to the Mesh Database, I entered “Intrauterine devices” in the search bar. I clicked on the same definition and did not select any subheading. I added the term to the search builder and then entered “Economics” in the search bar. Economics is defined as “the science of utilization, distribution, and consumption of services and materials.” (Under the Health Care Category, economics encompassed costs and costs analysis). I selected on the definition and did **not** select Restrict MeSH Major Topic. I added the term to the search builder and searched PubMed.

Next, I went to the Advanced Search Page. On the advanced search builder, I selected *All Fields* and added Search #1. I proceeded to the second line and again, selected *All Fields* and clicked on Search #2. I chose the Boolean term OR and hit Search. I filtered the results to Human and English. This search provided a total of one hundred eighty two (182) articles on the IUD and Economics.

Search ("Intrauterine Devices/economics"[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh] AND English[lang]) OR ("Intrauterine Devices"[Mesh] AND "Economics"[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh] AND English[lang]) Filters: Humans; English	182→	22
--	------	----

I reviewed the title and abstract (when available) of each of the articles and selected relevant publications based on the following inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion criteria: I considered all articles, including reviews and comparative observational studies, describing any type of economic evaluations of IUDs. Partial economic evaluations include cost descriptions, cost analysis, and cost-outcome descriptions, while CUAs, CEAs and cost-benefit analyses are considered full evaluations (Drummond 2005). I considered the publication as long as the IUD (both medicated and copper containing) was analyzed, whether alone or in combination with other contraceptive methods.

Exclusion criteria: I excluded articles from the search when it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Articles on IUD costs for non-contraceptive use (e.g. IUD use for heavy or dysfunctional menstrual bleeding)
2. Articles on IUD insertion costs post abortion
3. Articles on IUD costs for emergency contraceptive use
4. Articles on provider attitudes and practices on IUD insertion
5. Articles on IUD clinical risks and benefits alone, with no regard to costs
6. Articles on IUD cost marketing and other economic aspects such as patient incentives
6. Letters and editorials regarding IUD use
7. Reviews on the history and evolution of the IUD

Applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria yielded a total of twenty two (22) relevant articles (see Appendix A).

***Economic evaluations - Sub-dermal contraceptive implant***

I used the same search technique with regards to the contraceptive sub-dermal implant. Since the implant was FDA approved only in the mid 1990’s (compared to the IUD which has been available since the 1970’s), as expected, there is a significantly less number of published economic evaluations. Again, I did not apply any date or time restrictions to the search.

Search # 1: Opening the MESH database at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>, I entered “Etonogestrel” in the search bar. The heading will be mapped to Desogestrel. I clicked on “Desogestrel” and selected the subheading “economics”. I did **not** restrict to MeSH Major Topic. I added the terms to the search builder and searched PubMed.

Search #2: Returning to the Mesh Database, I entered “Desogestrel” in the search bar. I selected the same definition and did not select any subheading. I added the term to the search builder and then entered “Economics” in the search bar. As above, “Economics” is defined as “the science of utilization, distribution, and consumption of services and materials.” (Under the Health Care Category, economics encompasses costs and costs analysis). I clicked on the definition and did not select any subheading. I did **not** select Restrict MeSH Major Topic and added the term to the search builder. I then searched PubMed.

I navigated to the Advanced Search Page, and on the advanced search builder, I selected *All Fields*. I added Search #1. I proceeded to the second line, selected *All Fields* and added Search #2. I chose the Boolean term OR and clicked Search. I applied filters on Human and English. This search provided a total of thirteen (13) articles on the contraceptive implant and Economics.

Search (("Desogestrel/economics"[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh] AND English[lang])) OR (("Desogestrel"[Mesh] AND "Economics"[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh] AND English[lang]) Filters: <b>Humans; English</b>	13→	7→	<b>6</b>
--	-----	----	----------

Inclusion criteria: I included all economic evaluations on the sub-dermal contraceptive implant whether partial or full.

Exclusion criteria: The following exclusion criteria were applied while reviewing the search results:

1. Articles on Implant for non-contraceptive use
2. Articles on Implant insertion post abortion

Again, I did not restrict articles based on study type, country and date of publication. Application of the inclusion and exclusion criteria narrowed down the articles to seven (7). An overlap of one (1) article with the search strategy on the IUD described above was also noted. This remained in the IUD literature search and was eliminated as a duplicate here. This gave us a total of six (6) additional articles (*see Appendix B*).

### Evaluation of References

My search strategy yielded a **total of twenty nine (28) relevant journals/articles**, 22 regarding the IUD and six on the implant. I reviewed the references of each article, and retrieved their abstracts as appropriate. Using this meticulous method, I was able to look up an additional twenty two (22) articles on the economic evaluation of the IUD (*see Appendix A*). Serendipitously, I came across three articles on the IUD that were published in 2014 that have not been cited by any article or even included in the original search results (*see Appendix A: Trussell et al. 2014, Trussell et al 2014 and Frost et al. 2014*).

### Summary

In summary, I searched the PubMed database to come up with relevant articles on the economic evaluation of the IUD and contraceptive implant. Combined, I was able to find twenty eight (28) relevant journals and articles describing partial or full economic evaluations, as defined by Drummond in 2005. I used the MeSH term *intrauterine devices*, to pertain to both types of IUDs and the term *desogestrel*, which is the parent compound of the active ingredient of the implant. I combined them with the term *economics*, which encompasses cost and cost analysis under the heading of health economics. This technique, together with a very detailed and diligent search of the references, yielded an additional twenty two (22) relevant journal articles. All in all, I was able to come up with a total of fifty (50) publications on the economic evaluations of LARC.

### References:

- (2009). "ACOG Committee Opinion no. 450: Increasing use of contraceptive implants and intrauterine devices to reduce unintended pregnancy." Obstet Gynecol **114**(6): 1434-1438.
- (2011). "ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 121: Long-acting reversible contraception: Implants and intrauterine devices." Obstet Gynecol **118**(1): 184-196.
- Blumenthal, P. D., N. M. Shah, K. Jain, A. Saunders, C. Clemente, B. Lucas, K. Jafa and M. Eber (2013). "Revitalizing long-acting reversible contraceptives in settings with high unmet need: a multicountry experience matching demand creation and service delivery." Contraception **87**(2): 170-175.
- Blumenthal, P. D., A. Voedisch and K. Gemzell-Danielsson (2011). "Strategies to prevent unintended pregnancy: increasing use of long-acting reversible contraception." Hum Reprod Update **17**(1): 121-137.
- Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M.J. Torrance, G.W., O'Brien, B. J., and Stoddart, G.L. (2005). Chapter 2 Basic types of economic evaluation In Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Finer, L. B., J. Jerman and M. L. Kavanaugh (2012). "Changes in use of long-acting contraceptive methods in the United States, 2007-2009." Fertil Steril **98**(4): 893-897.
- Gold MR, S. J., Russell LB, Weinstein MC. . 1996. (1996). Estimating Costs in Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Ogburn, J. A., E. Espey and J. Stonehocker (2005). "Barriers to intrauterine device insertion in postpartum women." Contraception **72**(6): 426-429.
- Secura, G. (2013). "Long-acting reversible contraception: a practical solution to reduce unintended pregnancy." Minerva Ginecol **65**(3): 271-277.
- Singh, R. H., R. G. Rogers, L. Leeman, N. Borders, J. Highfill and E. Espey (2014). "Postpartum contraceptive choices among ethnically diverse women in New Mexico." Contraception.
- Sonnenberg, F. A., R. T. Burkman, C. G. Hagerly, L. Speroff and T. Speroff (2004). "Costs and net health effects of contraceptive methods." Contraception **69**(6): 447-459.

## Appendix A: Relevant Search Results for IUD and Economics

(1-44)

1. Amaral G, Foster DG, Biggs MA, Jasik CB, Judd S, Brindis CD. Public savings from the prevention of unintended pregnancy: a cost analysis of family planning services in California. *Health services research*. 2007 Oct;42(5):1960-80. PubMed PMID: 17850528. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC2254565. Epub 2007/09/14. eng. *[cited by Han et al. 2014]*
2. Ashraf T, Arnold SB, Maxfield M, Jr. Cost-effectiveness of levonorgestrel subdermal implants. Comparison with other contraceptive methods available in the United States. *The Journal of reproductive medicine*. 1994 Oct;39(10):791-8. PubMed PMID: 7837126. Epub 1994/10/01. eng.
3. Britton A. Comment on 'what is the actual cost of providing the intrauterine system for contraception in a UK community sexual and reproductive health setting?'. *The journal of family planning and reproductive health care / Faculty of Family Planning & Reproductive Health Care, Royal College of Obstetricians & Gynaecologists*. 2014 Apr;40(2):153. PubMed PMID: 24648537. Epub 2014/03/22. eng.
4. Burlone S, Edelman AB, Caughey AB, Trussell J, Dantas S, Rodriguez MI. Extending contraceptive coverage under the Affordable Care Act saves public funds. *Contraception*. 2013 Feb;87(2):143-8. PubMed PMID: 22840280. Epub 2012/07/31. eng. *[cited by Dusetzina et al. 2013]*
5. Chiou CF, Trussell J, Reyes E, Knight K, Wallace J, Udani J, et al. Economic analysis of contraceptives for women. *Contraception*. 2003 Jul;68(1):3-10. PubMed PMID: 12878280. Epub 2003/07/25. eng. *[cited by Gariepy et al. 2011]*
6. Cleland K, Peipert JF, Westhoff C, Spear S, Trussell J. Family planning as a cost-saving preventive health service. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2011 May 5;364(18):e37. PubMed PMID: 21506736. Epub 2011/04/22. eng. *[cited by Pace et al. 2013]*
7. Cook L, Fleming C. Comment on 'what is the actual cost of providing the intrauterine system for contraception in a UK community sexual and reproductive health setting?': authors' response. *The journal of family planning and reproductive health care / Faculty of Family Planning & Reproductive Health Care, Royal College of Obstetricians & Gynaecologists*. 2014 Apr;40(2):153-4. PubMed PMID: 24648538. Epub 2014/03/22. eng.
8. Cook L, Fleming C. What is the actual cost of providing the intrauterine system for contraception in a UK community sexual and reproductive health setting? *The journal of family planning and reproductive health care / Faculty of Family Planning & Reproductive Health Care, Royal College of Obstetricians & Gynaecologists*. 2014 Jan;40(1):46-53. PubMed PMID: 23625961. Epub 2013/04/30. eng.
9. Correa H, Parrish VW, Jr., Beasley JD. A three-year longitudinal evaluation of the costs of a family planning program. *American journal of public health*. 1972 Dec;62(12):1647-57. PubMed PMID: 4637881. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC1530556. Epub 1972/12/01. eng.
10. Dusetzina SB, Dalton VK, Chernew ME, Pace LE, Bowden G, Fendrick AM. Cost of contraceptive methods to privately insured women in the United States. *Women's health issues : official publication of the Jacobs Institute of Women's Health*. 2013 Mar-Apr;23(2):e69-71. PubMed PMID: 23481693. Epub 2013/03/14. eng. *[cited by Pace et al. 2013]*
11. Forrest JD, Samara R. Impact of publicly funded contraceptive services on unintended pregnancies and implications for Medicaid expenditures. *Family planning perspectives*. 1996 Sep-Oct;28(5):188-95. PubMed PMID: 8886761. Epub 1996/09/01. eng. *[cited by Frost et al. 2008]*
12. Forrest JD, Singh S. Public-sector savings resulting from expenditures for contraceptive services. *Family planning perspectives*. 1990 Jan-Feb;22(1):6-15. PubMed PMID: 2108877. Epub 1990/01/01. eng. *[cited by Frost et al. 2008]*
13. Foster DG, Biggs MA, Malvin J, Bradsberry M, Darney P, Brindis CD. Cost-savings from the provision of specific contraceptive methods in 2009. *Women's health issues : official publication of the Jacobs Institute of Women's Health*. 2013 Jul-Aug;23(4):e265-71. PubMed PMID: 23816157. Epub 2013/07/03. eng. *[cited by Sonfield et al. 2011]*

14. Foster DG, Rostovtseva DP, Brindis CD, Biggs MA, Hulett D, Darney PD. Cost savings from the provision of specific methods of contraception in a publicly funded program. *American journal of public health*. 2009 Mar;99(3):446-51. PubMed PMID: 18703437. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC2661445. Epub 2008/08/16. eng. [cited by Mattson 2012]
15. French RS, Cowan FM, Mansour DJ, Morris S, Procter T, Hughes D, et al. Implantable contraceptives (subdermal implants and hormonally impregnated intrauterine systems) versus other forms of reversible contraceptives: two systematic reviews to assess relative effectiveness, acceptability, tolerability and cost-effectiveness. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)*. 2000;4(7):i-vi, 1-107. PubMed PMID: 10944741. Epub 2000/08/17. eng.
16. Frost JJ, Finer LB, Tapales A. The impact of publicly funded family planning clinic services on unintended pregnancies and government cost savings. *Journal of health care for the poor and underserved*. 2008 Aug;19(3):778-96. PubMed PMID: 18677070. Epub 2008/08/05. eng. [cited by Sonfield et al. 2011]
17. Frost JJ, Sonfield A, Zolna MR, Finer LB. Return on Investment: A Fuller Assessment of the Benefits and Cost Savings of the US Publicly Funded Family Planning Program. *The Milbank quarterly*. 2014 Oct 15. PubMed PMID: 25314928. Epub 2014/10/16. Eng.
18. Garipey AM, Simon EJ, Patel DA, Creinin MD, Schwarz EB. The impact of out-of-pocket expense on IUD utilization among women with private insurance. *Contraception*. 2011 Dec;84(6):e39-42. PubMed PMID: 22078204. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC3217182. Epub 2011/11/15. eng.
19. Golditch I. Coverage issues and IUD acceptance: a model for managed care. *Obstetrical & gynecological survey*. 1996 Dec;51(12 Suppl):S54-5. PubMed PMID: 8972504. Epub 1996/12/01. eng.
20. Hughes D, McGuire A. The cost-effectiveness of family planning service provision. *Journal of public health medicine*. 1996 Jun;18(2):189-96. PubMed PMID: 8816317. Epub 1996/06/01. eng. [cited by Mavranouzouli et al. 2009]
21. Kaufman J. The cost of IUD failure in China. *Studies in family planning*. 1993 May-Jun;24(3):194-6. PubMed PMID: 8351700. Epub 1993/05/01. eng.
22. Kee WF, Tee QS. Singapore: a cost-effect analysis of a family planning program. *Studies in family planning*. 1972 Jan;3(1):8-11. PubMed PMID: 4656400. Epub 1972/01/01. eng.
23. Mattson L. Cost effectiveness in obstetrics and gynecology: The levonorgestrel intrauterine system. *Minnesota medicine*. 2012 Mar;95(3):51-4. PubMed PMID: 22611822. Epub 2012/05/23. eng.
24. Mavranouzouli I. The cost-effectiveness of long-acting reversible contraceptive methods in the UK: analysis based on a decision-analytic model developed for a National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) clinical practice guideline. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)*. 2008 Jun;23(6):1338-45. PubMed PMID: 18372257. Epub 2008/03/29. eng.
25. Mavranouzouli I. Health economics of contraception. *Best practice & research Clinical obstetrics & gynaecology*. 2009 Apr;23(2):187-98. PubMed PMID: 19147410. Epub 2009/01/17. eng. [cited by Lipetz et al. 2009]
26. Monea E, Thomas A. Unintended pregnancy and taxpayer spending. *Perspectives on sexual and reproductive health*. 2011 Jun;43(2):88-93. PubMed PMID: 21651707. Epub 2011/06/10. eng. [cited by Trussell et al. 2013]
27. Nakhaee N, Mirahmadizadeh AR, Gorji HA, Mohammadi M. Assessing the cost-effectiveness of contraceptive methods in Shiraz, Islamic Republic of Iran. *Eastern Mediterranean health journal = La revue de sante de la Mediterranee orientale = al-Majallah al-sihhiyah li-sharq al-mutawassit*. 2002 Jan;8(1):55-63. PubMed PMID: 15330561. Epub 2004/08/28. eng.
28. Oddens BJ. Evaluation of the effect of contraceptive prices on demand in eight Western European countries. *Advances in contraception : the official journal of the Society for the Advancement of Contraception*. 1993 Mar;9(1):1-11. PubMed PMID: 8342449. Epub 1993/03/01. eng.
29. Pace LE, Dusetzina SB, Fendrick AM, Keating NL, Dalton VK. The impact of out-of-pocket costs on the use of intrauterine contraception among women with employer-sponsored insurance. *Medical care*. 2013 Nov;51(11):959-63. PubMed PMID: 24036995. Epub 2013/09/17. eng.

30. Rodriguez MI, Caughey AB, Edelman A, Darney PD, Foster DG. Cost-benefit analysis of state- and hospital-funded postpartum intrauterine contraception at a university hospital for recent immigrants to the United States. *Contraception*. 2010 Apr;81(4):304-8. PubMed PMID: 20227546. Epub 2010/03/17. eng.
31. Rodriguez MI, Edelman A, Wallace N, Jensen JT. Denying postpartum sterilization to women with Emergency Medicaid does not reduce hospital charges. *Contraception*. 2008 Sep;78(3):232-6. PubMed PMID: 18692614. Epub 2008/08/12. eng. [cited by Rodriguez et al. 2010]
32. Sonfield A FJaGR. Estimating the Impact of Expanding Medicaid Eligibility for Family Planning Services: 2011 Update, . New York: Guttmacher Institute. 2011. [cited by Rodriguez et al. 2010]
33. Sonnenberg FA, Burkman RT, Hagerty CG, Speroff L, Speroff T. Costs and net health effects of contraceptive methods. *Contraception*. 2004 Jun;69(6):447-59. PubMed PMID: 15157789. Epub 2004/05/26. eng. [cited by Mavrenzouli et al. 2009]
34. Trussell J. The cost of unintended pregnancy in the United States. *Contraception*. 2007 Mar;75(3):168-70. PubMed PMID: 17303484. Epub 2007/02/17. eng. [cited by Trussell et al. 2013]
35. Trussell J. Update on the cost-effectiveness of contraceptives in the United States. *Contraception*. 2010 Oct;82(4):391. PubMed PMID: 20851236. Epub 2010/09/21. eng.
36. Trussell J. Update on and correction to the cost-effectiveness of contraceptives in the United States. *Contraception*. 2012 Jun;85(6):611. PubMed PMID: 22459232. Epub 2012/03/31. eng.
37. Trussell J. Update on and correction to the cost effectiveness of contraceptives in the United States. *Contraception*. 2012 Feb;85(2):218. PubMed PMID: 22067776. Epub 2011/11/10. eng.
38. Trussell J, Hassan F, Henry N, Pocoski J, Law A, Filonenko A. Cost-effectiveness analysis of levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system (LNG-IUS) 13.5 mg in contraception. *Contraception*. 2014 May;89(5):451-9. PubMed PMID: 24576791. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC4019682. Epub 2014/03/01. eng.
39. Trussell J, Hassan F, Lowin J, Law A, Filonenko A. Achieving cost-neutrality with long-acting reversible contraceptive methods. *Contraception*. 2014 Sep 6. PubMed PMID: 25282161. Epub 2014/10/06. Eng.
40. Trussell J, Henry N, Hassan F, Prezioso A, Law A, Filonenko A. Burden of unintended pregnancy in the United States: potential savings with increased use of long-acting reversible contraception. *Contraception*. 2013 Feb;87(2):154-61. PubMed PMID: 22959904. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC3659779. Epub 2012/09/11. eng.
41. Trussell J, Koenig J, Stewart F, Darroch JE. Medical care cost savings from adolescent contraceptive use. *Family planning perspectives*. 1997 Nov-Dec;29(6):248-55, 95. PubMed PMID: 9429869. Epub 1998/01/16. eng. [cited by Trussell et al. 2009]
42. Trussell J, Lalla AM, Doan QV, Reyes E, Pinto L, Gricar J. Cost effectiveness of contraceptives in the United States. *Contraception*. 2009 Jan;79(1):5-14. PubMed PMID: 19041435. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC3638200. Epub 2008/12/02. eng.
43. Trussell J, Leveque JA, Koenig JD, London R, Borden S, Henneberry J, et al. The economic value of contraception: a comparison of 15 methods. *American journal of public health*. 1995 Apr;85(4):494-503. PubMed PMID: 7702112. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC1615115. Epub 1995/04/01. eng. [cited by Rodriguez et al. 2010]
44. Wen J, Li Y, Li Y, Wang L, Zhou J, Ba L, et al. Comparative cost-effectiveness of three intrauterine devices: a multi-center randomized trial. *Journal of evidence-based medicine*. 2010 May;3(2):76-82. PubMed PMID: 21349048. Epub 2011/02/26. eng.



## Appendix B: Relevant Search Results for Etonogestrel Implant and Economics

(1-6)

1. Han L, Teal SB, Sheeder J, Tocce K. Preventing repeat pregnancy in adolescents: is immediate postpartum insertion of the contraceptive implant cost effective? *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2014 Jul;211(1):24 e1-7. PubMed PMID: 24631431. Epub 2014/03/19. eng.
2. Lipetz C, Phillips C, Fleming C. Actual cost of providing long-acting reversible contraception: a study of Implanon cost. *The journal of family planning and reproductive health care / Faculty of Family Planning & Reproductive Health Care, Royal College of Obstetricians & Gynaecologists*. 2009 Apr;35(2):75-9. PubMed PMID: 19356275. Epub 2009/04/10. eng.
3. Lipetz C, Phillips CJ, Fleming CF. The cost-effectiveness of a long-acting reversible contraceptive (Implanon) relative to oral contraception in a community setting. *Contraception*. 2009 Apr;79(4):304-9. PubMed PMID: 19272500. Epub 2009/03/11. eng.
4. Phillips CJ. Economic analysis of long-term reversible contraceptives. Focus on Implanon. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2000 Feb;17(2):209-21. PubMed PMID: 10947343. Epub 2000/08/18. eng.
5. Rissanen P. Economic analysis of long-term reversible contraceptives. Focus on Implanon. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2000 Nov;18(5):511-3. PubMed PMID: 11151403. Epub 2001/01/11. eng.
6. Varney SJ, Guest JF. Relative cost effectiveness of Depo-Provera, Implanon, and Mirena in reversible long-term hormonal contraception in the UK. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2004;22(17):1141-51. PubMed PMID: 15612832. Epub 2004/12/23. eng.