addition, the Dutch National Health Care Institute commented on usefulness for decision makers, while a separate group of 50 HE experts could comment during a workshop at ISPOR Montreal 2014. **RESULTS:** 35 Validation techniques were identified and grouped into four categories: conceptual model validation, computerized model validation, data validation and operational validation. Around 30 HE experts commented in each of the first three Delphi rounds, resulting in a 15 item draft tool. The Dutch health care advisory institute suggested to add one more item. Participants from the ISPOR workshop delivered 19 filled-in questionnaires. A fourth round resulted in 17 responses. This led to a refined version containing 16 items, which is currently sent out for a final, fifth round. **CONCLUSIONS:** When filled out by the modellers, AdVISHE (Assessment of the ValIdation Status of Health-Economic decision models) supports model users in assessing the validation status of a model It will be useful as part of reimbursement dossiers, by providing systematic and transparent insight into the validation efforts performed and their results.

PRM80

MODELLING SURVIVAL IN THE PRESENCE OF DIFFERENT MECHANISMS OF ACTION: IPILIMUMAB AND VEMURAFENIB IN ADVANCED MELANOMA

Lee D[1], Porter J[1], Hertel N[2], Hatswell AJ[1]
[1]*BresMed, Sheffield, UK,* [2]*Bristol Myers Squibb, Uxbridge, UK*

OBJECTIVES: Traditional indirect treatment comparison methods assume the underlying survival profiles of treatments are similar (i.e. proportional hazards). This assumption is unlikely to hold for the comparison of ipilimumab and vemurafenib: Whereas vemurafenib exhibits improved short-term survival compared with ipilimumab, pooled study data for ipilimumab consistently show that patients achieve durable long-term survival. We present a method to compare across trials with differing survival profiles by accounting for follow-on treatments and different patient baseline characteristics. **METHODS:** Comparative survival estimates for ipilimumab and vemurafenib were produced using patient-level data from trial CA184-024 for ipilimumab and published survival curve fits from BRIM-3 (along with registry data) for vemurafenib. The BRIM-3 vemurafenib overall survival curve was adjusted to account for (a) the effect of second-line ipilimumab (via a tunnel-state methodology) and (b) differences in patient baseline characteristics between BRIM-3 and CA184-024, by means of a model (Korn model), constructed to predict the outcomes for dacarbazine-treated patients. The resulting survival estimates were compared with naïve unadjusted survival curve fits, and estimates produced using a hazard ratio (from an indirect comparison) to the ipilimumab data. **RESULTS:** Estimated survival for ipilimumab was 3.3 years (mean). Predicted survival for vemurafenib, using a naïve comparison, was 3.0 years (mean). Adjusting for second-line ipilimumab and different baseline characteristics resulted in an estimate of 2.8 years for vemurafenib. When a hazard ratio was applied to the ipilimumab data, which underlies the here strong assumption that the vemurafenib overall survival profile is similar to that of ipilimumab, predicted survival for vemurafenib increased to 4.2 years.**CONCLUSIONS:** Depending on the methodology used, the mean predicted survival for vemurafenib varied from 2.8 to 4.2 years. Alternative methods that incorporate the long-term survival profile of ipilimumab (naïve comparison or more sophisticated adjustment methodology) demonstrate a higher number of life years with ipilimumab versus vemurafenib.

PRM81

HEALTH ECONOMIC MODELS IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Walzer S[1], Droeschel D[1], Kaier K[2]
[1]*MArS Market Access & Pricing Strategy GmbH, Weil am Rhein, Germany,* [2]*University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany*

OBJECTIVES: Alzheimer's Disease destroys brain cells, causing problems with memory, thinking, and behavior severe enough to affect work, family and social relationships, and, eventually, the most basic activities of daily living. Different treatment options have been introduced and evaluated from a health economic perspective. However, given the specific characteristics of the disease an evaluation of existing models is needed. **METHODS:** The following databases were searched systematically: PubMed, Health Technology Assessment Database, NHS Economic Evaluation Database, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, DAHTA-database, PSYNDEX and PsycINFO. For the abstracts that met the pre-defined inclusion criteria, full text articles were obtained and evaluated for inclusion in the assessment. **RESULTS:** After eliminating duplicates the search indicated yielded 1'219 articles of which another 940 were excluded based on the title selection. Finally 59 articles have been reviewed in full text after abstract review. Out of those articles 39 were deemed to be relevant based on the research question. The majority of models (48%) have been Markov models, other methods being used were various statistical analysis applications, micro-simulation, and discrete-event simulations. Limitations of existing models include the following: Focus on cognitive function as disease progression only; lack of inclusion of correlation between disease progression and other factors (e.g. residential status); lack of complete structure of diagnosis and treatment of disease (e.g. including non-drug treatments). Based on the Drummond checklist for health economic models the quality of models proved generally to be high but the majority of those lack presenting a comprehensive pathway of the natural history of the disease. **CONCLUSIONS:** Current models do not allow decision makers optimally characterizing the disease, to better assess the costs and benefits of a wide range of potential interventions. Potential new models need to take the disease characteristics and specifics more appropriate into account.

PRM82

APPROACHES USED TO MODEL THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRESSION-FREE SURVIVAL (PFS) / TIME-TO-PROGRESSION (TTP) AND OVERALL SURVIVAL (OS) WITHIN HEALTH ECONOMIC MODELS OF CANCER THERAPIES

Rafia R, Ward SE
University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

OBJECTIVES: Within health economic models of metastatic cancer therapies assumptions on the relationship between progression-free survival (PFS) / time-to-progression (TTP) and overall survival (OS) are typically required; notably when OS data are immature or unavailable. A review was undertaken to identify the methods that have been used within health economic models regarding this relationship and to identify the rationale given for the approach taken, specifically in those situations where OS data were not available or immature. **METHODS:** All NICE technology appraisals in the advanced and/or metastatic cancer setting completed by December 2013 were reviewed. The review included all relevant appraisal documents publicly available on the NICE website containing information on the methods used and/or rationale for the approach taken to model the relationship between OS and PFS/TPP within the health economic model. This included the sponsor submission and updated analyses, the independent Assessment Report, and other reports/analyses in relation to the appraisal process. **RESULTS:** In those instances where OS data were immature or not available, PFS/TTP was typically assumed to be a valid surrogate of OS. Justification for this assumption was inconsistently reported. In some health economic models a quantification of the assumed relationship was informed by published evidence and/or expert judgement. In some cases attempts were made to explore the potential impact of this relationship in sensitivity analysis. **CONCLUSIONS:** The methods and/or rationale given for the approach used to model the relationship between OS and PFS/TTP in health economic models has been inconsistently reported and justified. Whilst some health economic models attempted to quantify this relationship, further transparency is required. A consensus needs to emerge on the most appropriate approaches to be used within health economic models to quantify this relationship, specifically when OS data are not available or immature and to identify the circumstances when particular approaches may be most relevant.

PRM83

COMPARISON OF METHODS TO ESTIMATE HEALTH STATE UTILITIES IN METASTATIC BREAST CANCER (MBC)

Hudgens S[1], Briggs A[2], Tremblay G[3], Forsythe A[3], Lloyd A[4]
[1]*Clinical Outcomes Solutions, Tucson, AZ, USA,* [2]*University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK,* [3]*Eisai Inc, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA,* [4]*ICON Plc, Oxford, UK*

OBJECTIVES: Patient-level utility values for different stages of MBC and toxicities commonly associated with chemotherapy regimens are useful for health economic assessments. Three methods to estimate utilities exist when direct utility data are not available: utility 'mapping' from existing disease-specific scales, vignette studies that describe the health states; or derivation of preference-based measures from an existing condition-specific scale. This study compares utility estimates in MBC utilizing the above methods. **METHODS:** Based on data from a phase 3 clinical trial in MBC (N=1102) utility mapping was conducted using a published regression algorithm to convert the EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire to the EQ-5D utility. Mean utility values were estimated for relevant health states: stable disease (SD), tumor response (TR), disease progression (DP) and common toxicities. Results were compared to previously published values obtained for a vignette study conducted in one hundred members of the general public. **RESULTS:** Observed MBC utilities were similar in mapping vs. vignette studies for SD: 0.697 vs. 0.715, and TR: 0.782 vs. 0.790. General public respondents in the vignette study assigned much lower utility to symptomatic DP (0.443) vs. imaging-based DP in mapping study (0.679); and disutility for toxicities: vomiting: 0.103 vs. 0.050; fatigue 0.115 vs. 0.029; febrile neutropenia 0.150 vs. 0.012 (vignette vs. mapping respectively). Hand-foot syndrome, stomatitis and hair loss were not associated with disutility in the mapping study (potentially due to small sample size) while disutility of 0.116; 0.151; and 0.114 were reported by the vignette study. **CONCLUSIONS:** Utilization of different methods to estimate utilities in MBC may lead to a wide range of estimated values with potentially significant implications for health economic evaluation. Caution must be exercised when comparing utility values derived using different methods. It is preferable to collect such data from patients directly and use vignettes as a last resort.

PRM84

COST-EFFECTIVENESS MODELS FOR CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD): CROSS-MODEL COMPARISON OF HYPOTHETICAL TREATMENT SCENARIOS

Hoogendoorn M[1], Feenstra T[2], Asukai Y[3], Borg S[4], Hansen RN[5], Jansson SA[6], Samyshkin Y[3], Wacker M[7], Briggs A[8], Lloyd A[3], Sullivan SD[9], Rutten-van Mölken MP[1]
[1]*Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands,* [2]*RIVM /UMCG, Bilthoven, The Netherlands,* [3]*IMS Health, Economics and Outcomes Research, London, UK,* [4]*The Swedish Institute for Health Economics, Lund, Sweden,* [5]*School of Pharmacy, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA,* [6]*The OLIN Studies, Luleå, Sweden,* [7]*Helmholtz Zentrum Munchen, Neuherberg, Germany,* [8]*University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK,* [9]*University of Washington, Pharmaceutical Outcomes Research and Policy Program, Seattle, WA, USA*

OBJECTIVES: To compare different COPD cost-effectiveness models with respect to structure and input parameters and to cross validate the models by running the same hypothetical treatment scenarios. **METHODS:** COPD modeling groups simulated four hypothetical interventions with their model and compared the results with a reference scenario of no intervention. The four interventions modeled assumed: 1) 20% reduction in decline in lung function, 2) 25% reduction in exacerbation frequency, 3) 10% reduction in all-cause mortality and 4) all these effects combined. The interventions were simulated for a five-year and lifetime horizon with standardization, if possible, for sex, age, COPD severity, smoking status, exacerbation frequencies, mortality due to other causes, utilities, costs and discount rates. Furthermore, uncertainty around the outcomes of intervention four was compared. **RESULTS:** Seven out of nine contacted COPD modeling groups agreed to participate. Differences in 5-year QALY gains ranged from 0.00020 to 0.039 for intervention one, 0.0089 to 0.075 for intervention two and 0.017 to 0.048 for intervention three. The difference in costs ranged from €561 to €912 for intervention one, €739 to €1350 for intervention two and €1140 to €1618 for intervention three. The 5-year cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) for the most comprehensive intervention, intervention four, was €17,000/QALY for two models, €25,000-€28,000/QALY for three models