

Title: Economic evaluation favours physiotherapy but not corticosteroid injection as a first line intervention for chronic lateral epicondylalgia: evidence from a randomised clinical trial.

Dr Brooke K Coombes PhD^{1,2}, Professor Luke Connelly PhD³, Dr Leanne Bisset PhD⁴,
Professor Bill Vicenzino PhD^{2*}

¹ The University of Queensland, School of Biomedical Sciences, Brisbane Australia

² The University of Queensland, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences,
Physiotherapy, Brisbane Australia

³ The University of Queensland, Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Brisbane,
Australia

⁴ Menzies Institute, Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus, Gold coast, Australia

* Corresponding author

Address for correspondence/reprints:

Bill Vicenzino

School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences: Physiotherapy

The University of Queensland, Building 84A, St Lucia QLD 4072

Phone: + 617 3365 2781

Fax: + 617 3365 1622

Email: b.vicenzino@uq.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Aim To determine the cost-effectiveness of corticosteroid injection, physiotherapy and a combination of these interventions, compared to a reference group receiving a blinded placebo injection.

Methods 165 adults with unilateral lateral epicondylalgia of longer than six weeks duration from Brisbane, Australia were randomised using concealed allocation to saline injection (placebo), corticosteroid injection, saline injection plus physiotherapy (eight sessions of elbow manipulation and exercise) or corticosteroid injection plus physiotherapy. Costs to society and health-related quality of life (estimated by EuroQol-5D) over one year follow-up were used to generate incremental cost per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) ratios for each intervention relative to placebo.

Results Intention to treat analysis was possible for 154 (93%) of trial participants.

Physiotherapy was more costly, but was the only intervention that produced a statistically significant improvement in quality of life relative to placebo (MD, 95% CI 0.035, 0.003 to 0.068). Similar cost/QALY ratios were found for physiotherapy (AUD29,343; GBP18,962) and corticosteroid injection (AUD31,750; GBP20,518), however the probability of being more cost-effective than placebo at values above AUD50 000 per quality-adjusted life year was 81% for physiotherapy and 53% for corticosteroid injection. Cost/QALY was far greater for a combination of corticosteroid injection and physiotherapy (AUD228,000; GBP147,340).

Summary: Physiotherapy was a cost-effective treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

Corticosteroid injection was associated with greater variability, and a lower probability of being cost-effective if a willingness to pay threshold of AUD\$50,000 is assumed. A combination of corticosteroid injection and physiotherapy was ineffective and cost-ineffective. Physiotherapy, not corticosteroid injection, should be considered as a first line intervention for lateral epicondylalgia.

Trial registration anzctr.org Trial identifier: ACTRN12609000051246

Keywords: tennis elbow, injections, physical therapy, exercise therapy, cost-benefit analysis

Word count: 2880

INTRODUCTION

Lateral epicondylalgia (LE), a common musculoskeletal condition, also known as tennis elbow, typically presents in the 4th-6th decade of life, and results in considerable individual morbidity and substantial healthcare utilization and lost time from work. It accounts for an estimated 0.3-1.1 medical consultations per year per 100 subjects of general practice,[2] while work absenteeism is documented in 5% of affected working adults, with a median duration of 29 days in the past 12 months.[3]

There are no UK or Australian national guidelines or literary consensus for the optimal management for LE. Corticosteroid injection remains in widespread use,[4] despite systematic review evidence showing worse outcomes in the long term compared to a 'wait and see' approach or physiotherapy.[5] Inconsistent long term clinical benefits of physiotherapy are observed,[6,7] raising debate as to whether the surplus value of physiotherapy is worth the additional resources needed for treatment. On this basis, clinical guidelines were issued by the Dutch College of General Practitioners in 1997 recommending a wait and see policy, including advice and prescription of pain medication if necessary. More recently, guidelines were issued by the Swedish Council on Health Technology Assessment, strongly arguing against the use of corticosteroid injection.[8]

The cost-effectiveness of competing therapeutic interventions for LE has been the subject of only two previous studies, both finding no significant differences.[9,10] A limitation of both of these trials was that the utilities that were used to generate cost-effectiveness ratios were derived from quality of life scores estimated at one year from baseline, whereas the costs were calculated over the entire one year period. This risks measurement error in the cost-effectiveness analysis denominator, by assuming that the health state over the preceding 12

months was equal to that observed one year from baseline.

We aimed to determine the cost-effectiveness of corticosteroid injection, physiotherapy and their combination by comparison with a reference group receiving placebo injection.

METHODS

Study design

Economic evaluation was conducted alongside a randomised controlled trial, performed in a community setting in Brisbane, Australia. Full details of the trial design, participants, interventions and results of clinical outcomes are reported elsewhere.[11,12] The factorial-design trial was powered to explore the long-term clinical efficacy of (1) corticosteroid versus placebo injection and (2) of adding physiotherapy to an injection. Differences in the analysis and reporting of clinical efficacy and economic evaluation are a reflection of the different research objectives.

Study funding was received from the National Health and Medical Research Committee (Grant 511238) and a University of Queensland Research Scholarship, awarded to B.K.C. Ethical approval was gained from University of Queensland Medical Research Ethics Committee. Trial registration anzctr.org/#12609000051246.

Patients

Patients responding to media announcements between August 2008 and May 2010 were assessed for eligibility by telephone interview, followed by physical screening. Individuals were required to be 18 years or older and have experienced unilateral, lateral elbow pain for

more than six weeks. A minimum pain intensity of 30mm on a 100mm visual analogue scale (VAS) was chosen to minimise floor effects and to ensure those with very mild pain were not subjected to unnecessary treatment. A clinical diagnosis of LE was defined as pain provoked by at least two of the following: gripping, palpation, resisted wrist or middle finger extension, or stretching of wrist extensor muscles with reduced pain-free grip. Patients were excluded if that had received any injection (preceding six months), a course of physiotherapy (preceding three months); concomitant neck or arm pain necessitating treatment or limiting usual activities (preceding six months); radicular, neurological or systemic symptoms; pregnancy; breastfeeding or contraindication to injection.

Interventions

Following written informed consent, 165 patients were randomly allocated by concealed allocation to one of four groups – saline injection (“placebo”), saline injection plus physiotherapy (“physiotherapy”), corticosteroid injection (“corticosteroid”) or corticosteroid injection plus physiotherapy (“combination”). Randomisation was stratified by high or low pain scores, based on a cut-off VAS of 65/100. One of five general practitioners injected either 0.5mL(0.9%) isotonic saline (placebo) or 10mg/1mL of triamcinolone acetonide plus 1mL(1%) lignocaine (corticosteroid), in a manner that ensured the participant was blinded to the contents of the syringe. A previous dose-response study showed demonstrated similar results for 10mg triamcinolone compared to a higher dose (20mg), but with lower rates of skin atrophy (18% compared to 27%).[13] Patients received standardised advice, recommending rest for 10-days, followed by gradual return to activity. They were discouraged from using other treatments, but were advised they could use over-the-counter analgesic or anti-inflammatory medication, forearm braces or heat or cold packs as needed.

Participants allocated to receive physiotherapy underwent eight, 30-minute sessions of treatment by one of 11 post-graduate physiotherapists. Treatment was individually prescribed based on a standardised protocol.[12] It included manual therapy techniques at the elbow with gripping, concentric and eccentric wrist extension exercises, motor control retraining and global upper body strengthening. Each participant was asked to complete a daily home exercise program, which was reviewed by the physiotherapist at the commencement of each session, to monitor compliance and to progress the program.

Resource utilisation and costing

A societal viewpoint was used as the basis for economic evaluation, and as such included direct healthcare and non-healthcare costs, and indirect costs incurred due to LE, its treatment or any adverse events related to its treatment.[9] Costs for the one-year study period were derived from the following three sources and are reported in 2013 Australian dollars (1AUD =0.64623GDP, January 2013). Utilisation of study treatments was ascertained from medical records. Costs of medical services, including both government subsidies and patient co-payments were obtained from the Medicare Australia database for the one-year follow-up period. Items listed as elbow, forearm or upper limb were included in analysis. All other resources/costs were collected via standardised telephone interviews,[14] administered by a research assistant blinded to health outcomes. At each of four randomly timed interviews, resources/costs incurred during the preceding month were recorded, and multiplied by three to generate annual costs. Where actual costs incurred were not available, costs were estimated as listed in Table 2.

Quality of life

Health-related quality of life was measured at baseline, 4, 8, 12, 26 and 52 weeks using the paper-based EuroQol-5D (EQ-5D) by an examiner blinded to treatment allocation.[9]

Responses were converted to an overall utility score, by applying scoring weights based on the UK population.[15] Quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) were estimated for each individual using area-under-the-curve analysis with linear interpolation between observations.[16]

Statistical analysis

Sample size was based on primary clinical effects of corticosteroid injection and physiotherapy at one year.[11,12] Economic analysis was performed by intention-to-treat. As only one participant reported work absence, costs related to this were excluded for the base case analysis. Discounting was not applied, as the study duration was only 12-months.

Incremental costs and incremental QALYs (and 95% CI) were computed using generalised linear modelling (GLM) bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrapping with 2000 replications, with increments calculated as the intervention group value minus the placebo group value. Models were adjusted for baseline Patient Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation (PRTEE) scores because of prognostic significance.[17] Adjustment for baseline utilities was also performed for estimation of incremental QALYs.[16] The primary outcome was the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), calculated by dividing the incremental cost by the incremental QALY. Uncertainty was explored by graphical display of cost-utility planes and acceptability curves.[18] Since cost-effectiveness analysis is a relative technique, we also compared our results to a theoretical ICER threshold of AUD\$50,000 per QALY, consistent with previous studies.[19].

Three sensitivity analyses were performed to test the robustness of assumptions. First, we tested the impact of including work absence, and second by excluding all productivity costs,

as inclusion of lost productivity as a cost is considered controversial,[20]. Third, we tested the effect of alternative calculation of medical costs, using self-reported costs/resources.

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA 13.1 for Mac (StataCorp, 2014), and cost-utility planes and acceptability curves were generated using Excel for Mac 14.4.5 (Microsoft, 2011).

RESULTS

The flow of participants leading to economic analysis of 154 (93%) participants is illustrated in Figure 1. There were no significant differences at baseline between participants included (n=154) and excluded (n=11) from analysis. Per protocol resources were available for all participants, while 3.9% of interviews (25/644) were missing, with no differences between treatments or between survey periods. Six people missed a single interview, and estimates were replaced using the mean of their three completed interviews. Five people did not complete any interviews and were excluded from the analysis. Medical Benefit Schedule data was missing or ineligible for 5% participants, because of international residence (n=5), non-consent (n=1) or invalid paperwork (n=3). Quality of life estimates were missing for 2.4% individuals, because of death (n=2) or loss to follow up (n=2) and were excluded from analysis. Demographic and injury characteristics did not differ between groups at baseline (Table 1).

Table 1: Baseline characteristics

Characteristic	Physiotherapy			Corticosteroid +	P
	Placebo	+ Placebo	Corticosteroid	Physiotherapy	
n Analysed	39	39	40	36	
Age (years)	49.8 (7.5)	48.9 (7.7)	49.7 (9.0)	50.7 (8.6)	0.813
Female, n (%)	15 (38%)	14 (36%)	15 (38%)	14 (39%)	0.993

Duration (median (IQR), weeks)	16 (8,32)	16 (8, 26)	16 (10, 28)	13 (10, 26)	0.217
Worst pain (VAS: 0-100)	62.0 (19.7)	63.0 (18.3)	61.6 (19.4)	59.3 (15.8)	0.844
Resting pain (VAS: 0-100)	13.9 (16.1)	7.9 (9.2)	11.9 (16.1)	9.7 (10.3)	0.225
Pain & disability (PRTEE: 0-100)	42.2 (14.5)	36.4 (13.1)	41.1 (13.8)	38.2 (12.9)	0.224
Quality of life (EQ-5D: 0-1)	0.737 (0.122)	0.744 (0.125)	0.692 (0.175)	0.755 (0.036)	0.139
Annual income (AUD)	77390 (51843)	65031 (46171)	57439 (37453)	65135 (39549)	0.253
Nil income, n (%)	4 (10%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	0.448

Data represents mean (SD) or count (%), unless otherwise stated. Differences between groups were analysed using Analysis of Variance or Pearson Chi-square statistic. PRTEE: Patient rated tennis elbow evaluation, EQ-5D: Euroqol questionnaire.

Costs

Mean costs per individual (excluding work absence) for each group were: \$173 for placebo, \$295 for corticosteroid, \$1177 for physiotherapy and \$1069 for corticosteroid plus physiotherapy (Table 2). Incremental costs showed that all interventions were significantly more costly than placebo (Table 3; $P < 0.035$). Baseline pain and disability (PRTEE score) was a significant independent predictor of societal costs, with greater costs incurred by individuals with higher pain and disability at baseline (β 4.0, 95% CI 0.3, 7.6; $P = 0.034$). No participants required surgery or prescribed medication.

Table 2: One-year costs to society and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs).

Resource	Data source	Physiotherapy		Corticosteroid +		P
		Placebo	+ Placebo	Corticosteroid	Physiotherapy	
Direct healthcare costs (total)		\$101 (5)	\$673 (102)	\$159 (245)	\$636 (143)	<0.001*
Per protocol medical	\$100 per visit ^a	\$100 (0)	\$100 (0)	\$100 (0)	\$100 (0)	NA
Per protocol physiotherapy	\$75 per visit ^a	-	\$569 (97)	-	\$515 (118)	0.031*
Non protocol medical (MBS)	Real costs ^b	\$1 (5)	\$0 (0)	\$20 (49)	\$7 (25)	0.008*
Non protocol other	Real costs ^c	\$0 (0)	\$4 (26)	\$39 (215)	\$14 (58)	0.42
Direct non-healthcare costs (total)		\$34 (108)	\$144 (169)	\$78 (204)	\$100 (32)	0.01*
Over the counter medication	Real costs ^c	\$3 (11)	\$3 (13)	\$19 (38)	\$4 (16)	0.004*
Assistive devices (e.g., brace, ultrasound, hotpack)	Real costs ^c	\$0 (0)	\$11 (33)	\$37 (161)	\$0 (0)	0.168
Paid or unpaid labour	\$36.33 per hr ^{c, d}	\$18 (108)	\$23 (122)	\$0 (0)	\$0 (0)	0.481

Per protocol transportation	\$0.63 per km ^{c,e}	\$13 (0)	\$106 (15)	\$13(0)	\$94 (19)	<0.001*
Non protocol transportation	\$0.63 per km ^{c,e}	\$0 (0)	\$0.2 (1.5)	\$9 (34)	\$2 (9)	0.059
Indirect costs (total)		\$38 (0)	\$360 (57)	\$157 (626)	\$333 (75)	0.001*
Time loss due to work absence	Individual rate ^{c,f}	\$0 (0)	\$0 (0)	\$99 (627)	\$0 (0)	0.419
Per protocol leisure time loss ^f	\$36.33 per hr ^{c,g}	\$38 (0)	\$358 (54)	\$38 (0)	\$327 (66)	<0.001*
Non protocol leisure time loss	\$36.33 per hr ^{c,g}	\$0 (0)	\$2 (13)	\$20 (54)	\$6 (25)	0.017*
Societal costs excluding work absence						
absence		\$173 (108)	\$1177 (251)	\$295 (372)	\$1069 (244)	<0.001*
Societal costs (total)		\$173 (108)	\$1177 (251)	\$394 (708)	\$1069 (244)	<0.001*
QALYs		0.880 (0.092)	0.920 (0.075)	0.873 (0.078)	0.891 (0.084)	0.069

Values represent mean (SD) per participant for each group. Costs are AUD. Differences between groups were examined using Analysis of Variance, with significant (<0.05) differences marked by an asterisk.

^a Rate paid to practitioners taking part in the study;

^b Costs determined by Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS) items listed as either elbow, forearm or upper limb;

^c Resources/costs derived from interview, multiplied by three to give annual estimates;

^d Shadow price based on average weekly earnings for an adult (\$1453 per 40 hour week) from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012).

^e Mean travel distances for medical (19.9km) and physiotherapy appointments (18.9km) were multiplied by \$0.63/km, based on private vehicle reimbursement rate by the Australian Taxation Office (2011), plus any other out-of-pocket transport costs;

^f Total days of work absence were multiplied by the respondent-specific hourly rate;

^g Mean (appointment plus travel) times per session for medical (62.4min) and physiotherapy (69.5min)

Table 3: Incremental costs and incremental quality-adjusted of life years (QALY) for physiotherapy, corticosteroid injection and their combination, compared to a reference group receiving placebo injection.

	Physiotherapy + Placebo	Corticosteroid	Corticosteroid + Physiotherapy
Incremental QALY (95% CI); <i>P</i>	0.035 (0.003, 0.068)*	0.004 (-0.030, 0.039)	0.004 (-0.032, 0.041)
Base case - Societal costs excluding work absence			
Incremental cost (95% CI)	\$1027 (941,1113)*	\$127 (9, 245)*	\$912 (822, 1002)*
Cost per QALY (ICER)	\$29,343	\$31,750	\$228,000
Probability ICER < \$50,000 ^a	81%	53%	24%
Sensitivity 1 - Societal costs inclusive of work absence			
Incremental cost (95% CI)	\$1027 (941,1113)*	\$226 (5, 447)*	\$912 (822, 1002)*
Cost per QALY (ICER)	\$29,343	\$56,500	\$228,000
Probability ICER < \$50,000 ^a	81%	48%	24%
Sensitivity 2 - Direct healthcare & non-healthcare costs, i.e., productivity costs excluded			
Incremental cost (95% CI); <i>P</i>	\$702 (\$627, 776)*	\$106 (2, 209)*	\$615 (545, 684)*
Cost per QALY (ICER)	\$20,057	\$26,500	\$153,750

Probability ICER < \$50,000 ^a	90%	53%	34%
Sensitivity 3 - Medical costs derived from interview			
Incremental cost (95% CI); <i>P</i>	\$1028 (940,1116)*	\$182 (6, 359)*	\$905 (817, 994)*
Cost per QALY (ICER)	\$29,371	\$45,500	\$226,250
Probability ICER < \$50,000 ^a	81%	50%	24%

Confidence intervals were calculated using generalized linear modelling with bias corrected bootstrapping (2000 replicates), adjusted for baseline scores of pain and disability, using the Patient rated tennis elbow evaluation. Incremental QALY was adjusted for baseline EQ-5D utilities. Significant ($P<0.05$) differences compared to placebo are marked with an asterisk. ICER: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio calculated as incremental cost divided by incremental quality-adjusted life year. ^a Probability that the intervention is more cost-effective than placebo at an ICER threshold of AUD\$50,000.

The major contributors to direct healthcare costs, productivity costs and travel expenses were physiotherapy-driven. Participants assigned to physiotherapy plus placebo completed an average of 7.6 sessions (range 1-9), while significantly ($P=0.031$) fewer sessions were completed by those assigned to corticosteroid plus physiotherapy (mean 6.9, range 2-9). Non-protocol medical costs (derived from Medicare database) and over-the-counter medication costs also differed between groups, with higher costs incurred by participants assigned to corticosteroid injection. Costs of other appointments, not listed by the Medicare, such as shockwave therapy, physiotherapy, chiropractic and massage, were also highest in participants assigned to corticosteroid although differences did not reach significance.

Quality of life

Utilities estimated over the one-year follow up for the four interventions ranged from 0.873 to 0.920 (Table 2). Incremental QALYs (Table 3) showed significantly greater benefit for physiotherapy plus placebo ($P=0.032$), but not corticosteroid ($P=0.746$) or corticosteroid plus physiotherapy ($P=0.743$) when compared to placebo. Baseline EQ-5D was a significant independent predictor of one-year QALY (β 0.25, 95% CI 0.13, 0.37; $P<0.001$).

Cost-effectiveness

Incremental cost/QALY ratios were \$29,343 for physiotherapy, \$31,750 for corticosteroid and \$228,000 for corticosteroid plus physiotherapy (Table 3). Cost-utility planes and acceptability curves are illustrated in Figures 2A-2C and 3 respectively. For physiotherapy, increased costs and increased benefits were seen (Figure 2A). For both corticosteroid and corticosteroid plus physiotherapy groups, bootstrapped cost-utility pairs straddled the northern quadrants, indicating increased costs but considerable uncertainty regarding the health benefits. For corticosteroid injection, a small minority (1%) of cost-utility pairs were located in the southeast quadrant, indicating cost saving and increased effectiveness compared to placebo (Fig 2B). At a threshold of \$50,000/QALY, the probability of being more cost-effective than placebo, was 81% for physiotherapy, 53% for corticosteroid and 24% for corticosteroid plus physiotherapy (Figure 3). Thus, at this threshold, physiotherapy was more likely to be cost-effective than the alternatives.

Sensitivity analysis

Inclusion of costs associated with work absence increased the incremental cost/QALY to \$56,500 for corticosteroid, while the probability of being cost-effective at the \$50,000 threshold fell to 48%. When all productivity costs were excluded, cost/QALY fell for all groups, to \$20,057 for physiotherapy plus placebo, \$26,500 for corticosteroid and \$153,750 for the combination intervention. Probabilities rose to 90% and 34% for physiotherapy plus placebo and corticosteroid injection plus physiotherapy respectively, while was unchanged (53%) for the corticosteroid group. Alternative analysis of medical costs showed similar cost/QALY estimates for physiotherapy plus placebo (\$29,371) and corticosteroid plus physiotherapy (\$226,250), with no change in their probabilistic estimates. However, self-reported data produced greater cost/QALY (\$45,500) and lower probability (50%) for corticosteroid.

DISCUSSION

Rigorous research relating to cost-effectiveness of treatments in sports medicine is a nascent field.[21] The cost-effectiveness of a single corticosteroid injection, eight weeks of physiotherapy, and a combination of the two interventions were each compared with a reference group receiving a blinded, placebo injection. Physiotherapy, had greater initial costs due eight treatment sessions, but was the only intervention that resulted in significantly greater quality of life. Corticosteroid injection demonstrated considerable variability in quality of life benefits over one year and higher non-protocol costs. Corticosteroid plus physiotherapy produced both high costs and considerable variability in outcomes.

Potential economic impact if implemented as policy

The resultant incremental cost/QALY ratios ranged from AUD20,057 to 29,371 (GDP12,961-18,980) for physiotherapy and from AUD26,500 to 56,500 (GBP17,125-36,512) for corticosteroid injection. Placed in perspective, these willingness to pay per QALY values would be unlikely to be rejected by the Australian Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee (PBAC)[22] or UK National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE)[23] and would be considered *highly* cost-effective by the World Health Organisation (WHO) (<1xGPD per capita).[24] [Australia's GDP per capita in 2013 was AUD75,348]. In contrast, cost/QALY ratios for corticosteroid injection plus physiotherapy ranged from AUD153,750 to 228,000 (GDP99,358-147,340), and would be considered *not* cost-effective, based on WHO (>3xGDP per capita)[24], PBAC[22] or NICE[23] guidelines.

Probabilistic sensitivity analyses suggest that physiotherapy is highly likely (81-90%) to be considered a cost-effective intervention for LE when a threshold of AUD50,000 or greater is applied. In comparison, we found much greater uncertainty (48-65% probability) as to

whether corticosteroid injection provides better value for money than placebo.

The results of this study have important implications for health economic policy. Conclusions are in agreement with a large body of clinical evidence,[5-7] that states corticosteroid injection should not be recommended as a first line intervention for LE. Given 48% of surveyed UK specialists continue to use corticosteroid injection as a first line intervention for LE, and half stated they had not changed their practice in light of recent evidence, it appears penetrance of the latest evidence remains poor.[4,25]

Economic analysis alongside another randomised controlled trial conducted in the Netherlands, estimated the societal cost/QALY for a six week physiotherapy program consisting of ultrasound, massage and exercise, to be 34,000Euro compared to a 'wait and see' approach.[9] Analysis of uncertainty showed 55% of cost-utility pairs were located in the northeast quadrant, indicating physiotherapy produced greater costs and QALYs, while 12% were located in the southeast quadrant indicating cost saving and improved QALY.

Corticosteroid injection was less costly, but also less effective than wait and see, with a resulting cost/QALY of approximately 7000Euro. There are likely several potential sources of heterogeneity when comparing the cost-effectiveness of interventions between these trials.

Differences in physiotherapy protocols and the reference group studied, as well as differences in recruitment and healthcare settings, may influence findings. The Dutch trial recruited patients who had visited a general medical practitioner for their elbow condition, while our trial recruited participants from the general community. We found much lower self-reported work absence than other published reports,[3,9,10] which may be in part due to our study eligibility requirements where participants were excluded if they had received treatments for their elbow within the preceding six months. Methodological differences between the two trials should also be considered. Korthals de Bos (2004) compared costs incurred over one

year with quality of life estimated at one year from baseline,[9] hence may not have captured the early benefits of treatments.

Strengths & limitations

The strengths of our trial are its methodological rigor, comprehensive estimation of costs and low missing data ($\leq 5\%$). To minimise recall bias, as well as burden on participants and researchers, we randomly sampled participants four times over one year, asking them to recall resources/costs over the previous month.[26] Several sources were used to determine costs, because there is no gold standard measurement.[26] Sensitivity analysis was used to examine the agreement between self-reported and administrative (Medicare) data. A limitation of data from the Medicare Benefits Schedule is that general practitioner and specialist services for LE cannot be distinguished from those for other conditions. Radiology services could be distinguished by their item codes, allowing only those listed as upper limb or forearm to be included in cost estimations. This may have led to conservative estimation of the utilisation of LE-related medical services. Sensitivity analysis using medical costs derived from interview resulted in a higher cost/QALY estimate for corticosteroid injection, but did not change those for physiotherapy or corticosteroid plus physiotherapy. We also evaluated the impact of productivity losses, by excluding the opportunity cost of lost leisure time. Whilst cost/QALY estimates improved for all interventions, study conclusions were robust to the different perspective.

Several caveats should be noted that might affect the generalizability of study findings. In this trial, incremental costs and benefits for each intervention were each compared with a reference group that received a blinded injection of a negligible volume of normal saline, as well as standardised advice and analgesic medication. Although a placebo injection is not consistent with either usual care or a 'wait and see' policy, the pattern of recovery of primary

clinical outcomes appears very similar.[6,7] Second, due to the nature of the physiotherapy intervention, it was not possible to blind the physiotherapists and patients, which may have introduced a bias, although both were blinded to the injection received. Third, costs could probably be reduced, and cost-effectiveness potentially improved, by reducing the number of physiotherapy sessions. Our protocol recommended eight sessions of physiotherapy, while others have used six.[6] Reducing the number of sessions reduces direct healthcare and non-healthcare costs, as well as opportunity costs from lost leisure time. Further research is needed to ascertain whether similar benefits can be achieved with fewer treatment sessions. Last, societal costs were found to be independently associated with baseline pain and disability, a known prognostic risk factor.[17,27] Future research should consider whether allocation to a wait and see policy or physiotherapy treatment based on risk of chronicity may allow for more cost-effective resource use. Such an approach for primary care management of low-back pain was found to be highly cost-effective when compared to current best practice.[28]

What is already known

- Corticosteroid injection leads to short term clinical benefits but poorer long term outcomes than wait and see or physiotherapy.
- There is little evidence for the cost-effectiveness of interventions for patients with lateral epicondylalgia

What this study adds

- Physiotherapy is highly likely to be considered a cost-effective treatment for lateral epicondylalgia.

- The cost effectiveness of corticosteroid injection is more uncertain, while the combination of corticosteroid injection and physiotherapy is neither clinically nor cost-effective.

How might this study impact on clinical practice

- Clinical and economic evidence both advise against use of corticosteroid injection as a first line intervention for lateral epicondylalgia.

Figure 1 Flow of participants from randomisation to economic analysis of 154 (93%) participants by intention to treat (ITT). QALY: Health-related quality of life.

Figure 2 Cost-utility planes for corticosteroid injection, physiotherapy or their combination, compared to the reference placebo group. Data represents 2000 bootstrapped cost and effect pairs. For the base-case analysis presented here, costs to society (AUD), excluding work absence were used. QALYs: Quality-adjusted life years.

Figure 3 Incremental cost-effectiveness acceptability curves for corticosteroid, physiotherapy or their combination, compared to the reference placebo group. For the base-case analysis presented here, costs to society, excluding work absence were used. Costs are reported in 2013 Australian dollars (1AUD =0.64623GDP, January 2013). QALYs: Quality-adjusted life years.

Acknowledgements

All authors designed data collection tools, drafted and revised the manuscript. B.K.C. and B.V. monitored data collection for the whole trial. B.C. and L.C. wrote the statistical analysis plan, cleaned and analysed the data. B.K.C. and L.B. had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Conflict of interest none

Financial support This study was supported by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council grant 511238 awarded to B.V., L.C, and L.B. The sponsor had no role in the design, collection, analysis or interpretation of data, or manuscript preparation. A University of Queensland Research Scholarship was received by B.K.C.

Reference list

1. Walker-Bone K, Palmer KT, Reading I et al. Prevalence and impact of musculoskeletal disorders of the upper limb in the general population. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2004;51:642-51.
2. Shiri R, Viikari-Juntura E, Varonen H et al. Prevalence and determinants of lateral and medial epicondylitis: a population study. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2006;164:1065-74.
3. Walker-Bone K, Palmer KT, Reading I et al. Occupation and epicondylitis: a population-based study. *Rheumatology* 2012;51:305-10.
4. Titchener AG, Booker SJ, Bhamber NS et al. Corticosteroid and platelet-rich plasma injection therapy in tennis elbow (lateral epicondylalgia): a survey of current UK specialist

practice and a call for clinical guidelines. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;10.1136/bjsports-2013-092674.

5. Coombes BK, Bisset L, Vicenzino B. Efficacy and safety of corticosteroid injections and other injections for management of tendinopathy: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2010;376:1751-67.
6. Bisset L, Beller E, Jull G et al. Mobilisation with movement and exercise, corticosteroid injection, or wait and see for tennis elbow: randomised trial. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)* 2006;333:939.
7. Smidt N, van der Windt DA, Assendelft WJ et al. Corticosteroid injections, physiotherapy, or a wait-and-see policy for lateral epicondylitis: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002;359:657-62.
8. (SBU) SCoHTa. Treating tennis elbow (lateral epicondylalgia) with corticosteroid injections are beneficial in the short term but harmful in the long term 2014.
9. Korthals-de Bos IB, Smidt N, van Tulder MW et al. Cost effectiveness of interventions for lateral epicondylitis: results from a randomised controlled trial in primary care. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2004;22:185-95.
10. Struijs PA, Korthals-de Bos IB, van Tulder MW et al. Cost effectiveness of brace, physiotherapy, or both for treatment of tennis elbow. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2006;40:637-43.
11. Coombes BK, Bisset L, Brooks P et al. Effect of corticosteroid injection, physiotherapy or both on clinical outcomes in patients with unilateral lateral epicondylalgia. A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2013;309:461-9.
12. Coombes BK, Bisset L, Connelly LB et al. Optimising corticosteroid injection for lateral epicondylalgia with the addition of physiotherapy: A protocol for a randomised control trial with placebo comparison. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2009;10.

13. Price R, Sinclair H, Heinrich I et al. Local injection treatment of tennis elbow--hydrocortisone, triamcinolone and lignocaine compared. *British Journal of Rheumatology* 1991;30:39-44.
14. Goossens ME, Rutten-van Molken MP, Vlaeyen JW et al. The cost diary: a method to measure direct and indirect costs in cost-effectiveness research. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2000;53:688-95.
15. Connelly LB. Economic Evaluations with Prescored Health Status Instruments. In: Mpfu E, Oakland TD, editors. *Rehabilitation and Health Assessment. Applying ICF Guidelines*. New York: Springer; 2010:163-88.
16. Manca A, Hawkins N, Sculpher MJ. Estimating mean QALYs in trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis: the importance of controlling for baseline utility. *Health Economics* 2005;14:487-96.
17. Coombes BK, Bisset L, Vicenzino B. Cold Hyperalgesia Associated with Poorer Prognosis in Lateral Epicondylalgia: A One Year Prognostic Study of Physical and Psychological Factors. *Clinical Journal of Pain* 2015;31:30-5.
18. Fenwick E, Claxton K, Sculpher M. Representing uncertainty: the role of cost-effectiveness acceptability curves. *Health Economics* 2001;10:779-87.
19. Smith KJ, Wateska AR, Nowalk MP et al. Cost-effectiveness of adult vaccination strategies using pneumococcal conjugate vaccine compared with pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine. *JAMA* 2012;307:804-12.
20. Krol M, Brouwer W, Rutten F. Productivity costs in economic evaluations: past, present, future. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2013;31:537-49.
21. Lin CW, Uegaki K, Coupe VM et al. Economic evaluations of diagnostic tests, treatment and prevention for lateral ankle sprains: a systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;47:1144-9.

22. George B, Harris A, Mitchell A. Cost-effectiveness analysis and the consistency of decision making: evidence from pharmaceutical reimbursement in australia (1991 to 1996). *Pharmacoeconomics* 2001;19:1103-9.
23. Dakin H, Devlin N, Feng Y et al. The Influence of Cost-Effectiveness and Other Factors on Nice Decisions. *Health Economics* 2014 Sep 23. doi: 10.1002/hec.3086.10.1002/hec.3086.
24. (WHO) WHO. Threshold Values for Intervention Cost-effectiveness by Region. Choosing Interventions that are Cost Effective (WHOCHOICE). 2014; Available from: http://www.who.int/choice/costs/CER_levels/en/.
25. Scott A, Docking S, Vicenzino B et al. Sports and exercise-related tendinopathies: a review of selected topical issues by participants of the second International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium (ISTS) Vancouver 2012. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;47:536-44.
26. Petrou S, Murray L, Cooper P et al. The accuracy of self-reported healthcare resource utilization in health economic studies. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 2002;18:705-10.
27. Smidt N, Lewis M, Van Der Windt D et al. Lateral epicondylitis in general practice: course and prognostic indicators of outcome. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2006;33:2053-59.
28. Whitehurst DG, Bryan S, Lewis M et al. Exploring the cost-utility of stratified primary care management for low back pain compared with current best practice within risk-defined subgroups. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2012;71:1796-802.