CONCLUSIONS: Based on a willingness to pay threshold of 500,000 SEK per QALY, somatropin (Norditropin®) is a cost-effective treatment for GHD children.

PDB24
A COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF IRBESARTAN IN THE TREATMENT OF HYPERTENSIVE PATIENTS WITH DIABETIC RENAL DISEASE

Lee TJ[1], Han DS[2], Sohn HS[3]
[1]Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea, [2]Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea, [3]Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, NJ, USA

OBJECTIVES: To project the cumulative incidence of end-stage renal disease (ESRD), life expectancy (LE) and costs of treating hypertensive patients suffering from diabetic renal disease with either irbesartan treatment or standard hypertension treatment in South Korea. **METHODS:** A Markov model that simulated progression from microalbuminuria to nephropathy, doubling of serum creatinine, ESRD and all-cause mortality in hypertensive patients with diabetic renal diseases was adapted to South Korea. Three strategies were compared: 1) early use of irbesartan (ie, start treatment in subjects with microalbuminuria); versus 2) late use of irbesartan (ie, as from overt nephropathy); or 3) standard hypertension care (with comparable blood pressure control). Cumulative incidence of ESRD, LE and costs were projected for a hypothetical cohort of 1000 subjects. Treatment-specific progression and mortality probabilities were derived from published trials: IRMA-2 (in microalbuminuria) and IDNT (in overt nephropathy). Medical management and cost data per state as well as ESRD outcomes data were obtained from local sources. A flexible time horizon up to 25 years and third party payer perspective were used. Future LE and costs were discounted at 5% yearly. **RESULTS:** When compared to standard blood pressure control, early use of irbesartan was projected to reduce the cumulative incidence of ESRD from 23.9% to 5.5%, save KW 9,383,748 (US$8,988), and add 0.39 life years per treated patient. Late use of irbesartan produced higher net monetary benefit than control but was dominated by early use. The superiority of early use of irbesartan over standard care was robust for most variables, except for the time horizon. Break-even occurred after 12 years. **CONCLUSIONS:** Early use of irbesartan in hypertensive patients with diabetic renal diseases was projected to reduce the incidence of ESRD, extend life and reduce costs; treating patients with irbesartan at a later stage is still beneficial, but to a lesser extent.

PDB68
LONG-TERM COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF INSULIN DETEMIR COMPARED TO NEUTRAL PROTAMINE HAGEDORN INSULIN IN PATIENTS WITH TYPE 1 DIABETES USING A BASAL–BOLUS REGIMEN IN SWEDEN

Valentine WJ[1], Lammert M[2], Aagren M[3], Gschwend MH[4]
[1]IMS Health, Basel, Switzerland, [2]Novo Nordisk Scandinavia AB, Copenhagen, Denmark, [3]Novo Nordisk A/S, Virum, Denmark, [4]IMS Health, Allschwil, Switzerland

OBJECTIVES: The aim of this analysis was to evaluate the long-term clinical and economic outcomes associated with insulin detemir and Neutral Protamine Hagedorn (NPH) insulin in combination with mealtime insulin aspart in patients with type 1 diabetes in Sweden, based on data from a recently published 2-year, multi-national, open-label, randomized, controlled trial (RCT). **METHODS:** Long-term projections of the trial results were based on a published and validated computer model (CORE Diabetes Model). In the trial, insulin detemir was associated with significant improvements in glycemic control after 24 months (HbA1c 7.36% versus 7.58%, mean difference –0.22%, P = 0.022) and major hypoglycemic events (69% risk reduction, P = 0.001) versus NPH. Patients treated with detemir gained less weight (1.7 versus 2.7 kg, P = 0.024). Based on these findings, the model was used to estimate life-expectancy, quality-adjusted life expectancy and both direct medical costs and indirect costs (human capital approach). Future costs and clinical benefits were discounted at 3% per annum. **RESULTS:** Basal-bolus therapy with insulin detemir was projected to improve life expectancy by approximately 0.14 years (15.02 ± 0.19 versus 14.88 ± 0.18 years) and quality-adjusted life expectancy by 0.53 QALYs versus NPH (8.35 ± 0.11 versus 7.82 ± 0.10 QALYs). Improvements in QALYs were driven by avoided or delayed diabetes-related complications and fewer insulin side effects. Direct medical costs over patient lifetimes were approximately SEK 26,144 higher in the insulin detemir arm (SEK 995,025 ± 19,580 versus 968,881 ± 19,769), leading to an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of SEK 49,757 per QALY gained. Capturing indirect costs associated with lost productivity led to insulin detemir being cost saving, by approximately SEK 106,257, compared to NPH (SEK 1,964,884 ± 45,147 versus 2,071,142 ± 42,548). **CONCLUSIONS:** The findings of this analysis suggest that, compared to NPH, insulin detemir is likely to be highly cost-effective from a healthcare payer perspective and dominant from a societal perspective in patients with type 1 diabetes in Sweden.

PDB25
COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF HUMAN PREMIX INSULIN REGIMENS COMPARED WITH A PREMIX ANALOGUE INSULIN IN THE PRIVATE HEALTH CARE SECTOR IN SOUTH AFRICA

White J[1], Stoustrup M[2], Aagren M[3]
[1]Novo Nordisk International Operations A/S, Zurich, Switzerland, [2]Novo Nordisk Region Europe, Zurich, Switzerland, [3]Novo Nordisk A/S, Virum, Denmark

OBJECTIVES: The aim of the analysis was to estimate the cost-effectiveness of human insulin treatment (current standard care) in patients with type 2 diabetes compared with biphasic insulin aspart (BIAsp) in those treated with insulin +/− OADs, from the perspective of third party payers in the South African private health care sector. **METHODS:** Clinical outcomes and baseline characteristics were taken from an observational study of 208 patients. A baseline mean HbA1c of 10.1% was recorded in patient whose average age was 52.8 years. The cost-effectiveness ratio was estimated as the incremental cost per life-year and quality-adjusted life-year gained of BIAsp treatment. Research was conducted to collect cost data in type 2 diabetics: resource utilisation, treatment costs, complication costs at year 1 and subsequent years were investigated using insurance data. Life-years gained were based on a 30-year follow-up using a published and validated Markov diabetes outcomes model, adjusted for South African risks and non-specific mortality. **RESULTS:** In the base-case analysis the BIAsp group had better clinical outcomes and lower lifetime costs. The estimated discounted gain in life-years of biphasic insulin aspart was 0.25 years, and 0.39 years with utility adjustment. The incremental cost per life-year gained and cost per-QALY were dominant. Total costs were 7% lower in the BIAsp group; treatment cost associated with BIAsp was 39% higher; cost savings were greatest in patients experiencing cardiovascular, renal or major hypoglycaemic complications. The acceptability curve showed a 99.8% probability that of biphasic insulin aspart is cost effective in the base case scenario at the WHO's suggested threshold of three times GDP per capita. HbA1c effects were the most sensitive variable to final outcomes.

In sensitivity analysis BIAsp remained dominant at half the study HbA1c effect. **CONCLUSIONS:** For patients with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes receiving current standard human insulin treatment, the use of BIAsp represents a cost-effective treatment.

PDB26

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF ROSIGLITAZONE COMBINATION THERAPY FOR THE TREATMENT OF TYPE 2 DIABETES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Doležal T[1], Skoupá J[2], Taylor MJ[3], Whitehead S[3], Rausova V[4], Pavlikova P[4]

[1]Charles University, Praha, Czech Republic, [2]Pharma Projects, Prague, Czech Republic, [3]University of York, York, UK, [4]GlaxoSmithKline, Prague, Czech Republic

OBJECTIVES: The Diabetes Decision Analysis of Cost—Type 2 (DiDACT) model is an established long-term model of disease progression and health care resource utilisation for people with Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). The objective of this project was to adapt the DiDACT model to the Czech Republic health care system taking the perspective of the payer, and to employ the model to carry out comparative health economic evaluation of Avandia (Rosiglitazone) in various therapeutic contexts. The analyses focus on overweight and obese patients. **METHODS:** The DiDACT economic model requires epidemiological, medical resource use and medical cost data. These were updated to reflect the Czech Republic setting where possible, such as for outpatient costs, inpatient costs, cardio-vascular disease data and prevalence of complications at diagnosis. However, due to data availability constraints, some costs, resource use and epidemiology data were drawn from previous analyses, undertaken in Germany and the UK. The threshold for switching therapies was 7% HbA1c. In order to test the robustness of our results, univariate sensitivity analyses were performed. **RESULTS:** The resulting model allows assessment of the impact of new treatment strategies or programmes in modifying risk factors for diabetic complications and performing comparative cost-effectiveness and cost-utility analysis. The model predicts that adding Rosiglitazone to Metformin delays the onset of insulin and produces better glycaemic control (HbA1c). The undiscounted (discounted) lifetime incremental cost-effectiveness ratios per QALY gained were 156,512 CZK (152,811 CZK) for overweight patients, and 177,346 CZK (175,445 CZK) for obese patients. **CONCLUSIONS:** The analyses yield incremental cost-effectiveness ratios which fall below commonly accepted willingness to pay thresholds. Rosiglitazone in combination with Metformin is therefore a cost-effective option for the treatment of T2DM when compared with conventional care of Metformin in combination with sulphonylurea (SU) in overweight and obese patients in the Czech Republic.

PDB27

INSULIN GLARGINE AND NPH INSULIN-BASED REGIMENS REVEAL COMPARABLE TOTAL DIRECT TREATMENT COSTS IN TYPE 2 DIABETES PATIENTS. THE LONG-ACTING INSULIN GLARGINE VS. NPH INSULIN COST EVALUATION STUDY IN GERMANY (LIVE-DE)

Scholten T[1], Holle R[2], Landgraf W[3], Spiesecke A[4], Hauner H[5]

[1]University of Witten-Herdecke, Hagen, Germany, [2]Institute of Health Economics & Health Care Management, Helmholtz Center Munich, Neuherberg, Germany, [3]Sanofi-Aventis Germany, Berlin, Germany, [4]IMS Health HEOR, Nuremberg, Germany, [5]Else Kröner-Fresenius-Center for Nutritional Medicine, Technical University Munich, Munich, Germany

OBJECTIVES: To compare the direct diabetes treatment costs (DTC) in type 2 diabetes (T2D) patients treated with insulin

Glargine (GLA) to those with NPH insulin-based regimens (NPH) in Germany. **METHODS:** A cost-minimization analysis from the statutory health insurance (SHI) perspective was conducted. Resource use data were collected within a cross-sectional, retrospective study performed between February and May 2007 in 199 primary care centres. Consecutive T2D patients with SHI status treated with either GLA- or NPH-based regimens for at least 6 months prior to study were enrolled. For costing public price lists were used. DTC were calculated as summarized costs of antidiabetic medications, blood glucose self-monitoring (test strips, lancets), glucagon use and needles for a 6 months period. Sensitivity analyses for cost variables were performed. **RESULTS:** A total of 1602 (982 GLA and 620 NPH) patients were included. Mean DTC were €658 ± 258 and €685 ± 242 per patient during 6 months in GLA and NPH patients, respectively. NPH was mainly used in a basal-bolus (ICT) (79%) whereas GLA was more frequently prescribed in a basal-oral (BOT) antidiabetic regimen (43%). Higher basal insulin costs for GLA vs. NPH (€194 ± 97 vs. €116 ± 74) during 6 months were compensated by lower costs for co-prescribed short-acting insulins (€96 ± 133 vs. €158 ± 133). Further cost compensations were due to a lower consumption of test strips (375 ± 249 vs. 447 ± 251 units) and needles (159 ± 142 vs. 185 ± 176 units) per 6 month in GLA- vs. NPH-based regimens, respectively. Hypoglycemia with consecutive glucagon use was only reported for NPH (4 patients). Within the sensitivity analyses the DTC for GLA remained lower vs. NPH. **CONCLUSIONS:** Under real-life conditions direct diabetes treatment costs are similar in GLA and NPH treated T2D patients. As GLA is advantageous for a patient due to reduced hypoglycemic risk, less injection frequency and flexible dosing compared to NPH, GLA can be regarded as first-line insulin approach in BOT and ICT.

PDB28

DIABETES MELLITUS BURDEN AND RELATIONSHIP WIH THE DEGREE OF PATIENT*x*S GLYCEMIC CONTROL

Banegas JR[1], Franch J[2], De Pablos PL[3], Fernández S[4], Díaz S[4]

[1]Public Health and Preventive Medicine Department, UAM, Madrid, Spain, [2]Raval Sud Primary Care Centre, Barcelona, Spain, [3]Service of Endocrinology & Nutrition, Hospital Universitario Dr. Negrín, Las Palmas, Spain, [4]Pfizer Spain, Madrid, Spain

OBJECTIVES: To assess the health resource consumption and the illness labour impact in diabetic patients and to study its possible relation to patient's glycemic control. **METHODS:** An epidemiological, cross sectional, naturalistic study was carried out in Spanish Primary Care centres. Patients >18 years with diabetes mellitus type 1 (T1DM) or type 2, with insulin treatment (T2DM-i) or not (T2DM-n.i), were enrolled in the study (consecutive cases sampling). The last value of glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) of each patient, reported in 2006, defined the glycemic control as satisfactory (HbA1c ≤ 7%) or unsatisfactory (HbA1c > 7%). Health resource use due to illness monitoring, acute and chronic complications and absenteeism days were collected. **RESULTS:** A total of 679 patients were enrolled in the study: 52.4% female; age 65.2 (13.7); BMI 28.81 (4.66); type of diabetes: 11.5% T1DM, 26.2% T2DM-i and 62.3% T2DM-n.i; mean time from diagnoses 11.9 (9.25) years. 53% of patients achieved satisfactory control (T1DM: 29.5%, T2DM-i: 31.5% and T2DM-n.i: 63.8%; p < 0.001). Mean number of annual resource used related to Illness monitoring were: 11.4 primary care medical visits, 8.9 nursing visits, 0.8 endocrine visits, 0.3 home visits, 4.4 blood analysis and 404.5 reactive strips. Acute complications caused a mean annual use of 0.4 emergency visits and 0.1 hospitalizations; and chronic complications 1.6 specialised visits (ophthalmology, nephrology and cardiology). Mean