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OBJECTIVES: to identify factors affecting cost-effectiveness threshold calculation in Korea.
METHODS: as a pilot study of the Korean cost-effectiveness threshold study, a survey questionnaire using EQ-5D to measure QALY improvements and WTPs in hypothetical scenarios were developed. 219 Koreans from general population were interviewed with this questionnaire in 2009. Each person’s WTPs were asked for five scenarios chosen from each level of Korean EQ-5D tariff (KDCD: 0.0–0.2, 0.2–0.4, 0.4–0.6, 0.6–0.8, 0.8–1.0). The same WTP questions were repeated for the QALY improvement of a family member instead of self. The questionnaire also included questions regarding the cost sharing attribute, and a visual analog scale to measure of each scenario presented. Consistency of each respondent was checked by matching ranks of five scenarios between WTPs and QALY improvements either by VAS or KDCD tariff. The distribution of WTP values can provide random starting values for a large-scale double-bounded dichotomous choice survey in 2010.
RESULTS: the WTP for an additional QALY (calculated by VAS and three existing Korean EQ-5D tariffs) was around 10–25 million KRW (9164–22927 USD, 1 USD = 1150 KRW) for average on those (N = 150) who passed consistency check and not under medical assistance program (zero or low copayment). The averages of WTP for a family member were 2.6–3.4 million KRW (2328–4913 USD) higher than WTP for self. Respondents from Seoul (N = 112) showed significantly higher WTP averages (5–12 million KRW higher, 4103–10787 USD higher; p < 0.05) than nonresidents of Seoul (N = 38). The relationship between WTP and QALY improvements measured by VAS was approximately (people more appreciate significant improvements) and the relationship between WTP and QALY improvements measured by Korean tariffs were highest at 0–0.2 level. CONCLUSIONS: the choice of method to calculate QALY improvement seems crucial in cost-effectiveness threshold study in Korea. Other important factors include WTP for whom and living in Seoul.
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OBJECTIVES: to 1) identify the types and characteristics of economic models plans are using, 2) identify concerns, desires and thoughts on the future importance of modeling. In 2000 the AMCP introduced its template for dossiers, which includes an economic model. Little is known about how payers use economic models, their perceived limitations, and how recent health care initiatives, such as comparative effectiveness research (CER), might impact use of economic models by health-plan decision-makers. METHODS: A web-based survey of 60 managed care payers was conducted in September 2009 to assess perceptions and roles of economic models in decision-making. RESULTS: a total of 60 responses (35 pharmacy directors, 17 medical directors, 4 consultants, and 4 others) representing more than 35 million lives, was received. 50% of respondents reported that they only used in-house models, 22% used both in-house and industry models, while 23% did not use economic models. Budget impact models were preferred by 23% of respondents, cost-effectiveness models by 15% (people more appreciating significant improvements) and cost sharing attributes when they considered drug benefit plans. 67% thought both were equally important. Microsoft Excel (65%) was the preferred software platform; AWP (25%) and WAC (27%) were the preferred drug pricing references. The majority believed that models should include the costs of treating AEs (50%) and off-label use (62%). Over half (55%) felt QALYs are not a trustworthy measure and a majority (75%) had little trust in industry sponsored models, largely due to a lack of credible inputs and data sources (37%). Most decision-makers (37%) believe that models will become more important over the next 2 to 3 years, and 72% believe that CER will increase the relevance of models. CONCLUSIONS: Results indicate that the majority of payers use economic models, believe that economic models will become more important in the near future, and think that CER will make models more relevant.
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OBJECTIVES: Health care stakeholders invest significant resources into developing and disseminating comparative effectiveness information. One of the primary goals is to provide health care decision-makers with unbiased information on which to base their decisions. The study purpose was to determine the types of comparative effectiveness information that would be most useful to formulary decision-makers. METHODS: In-depth interviews were conducted with formulary decision-makers in ten health plans. Between two to four interviews were conducted with each plan and included at least one medical director and one pharmacy director. Participants were provided with two published articles describing cost effectiveness models for secondary stroke prevention. Interviews then explored the following topics: what types of comparative effectiveness information are typically used for decision-making, which of the two models were most salient and the characteristics that made that model more useful, what types of comparative effectiveness information would be most useful in the future. RESULTS: Most, but not all, participants used some type of comparative effectiveness information in their decision making process. Including cost information into comparative effectiveness information was essential to them. The vast majority of the participants preferred a more simple methodological approach rather than models that use advanced statistical methods. Participants felt that the appropriate timeframe for models was approximately 1–3 years. The source of the information was important as participants wanted unbiased information and did not trust information provided by industry. Finally, most participants seemed to favor a single source for reliable cost effectiveness information. CONCLUSIONS: Comparative effectiveness researchers must be mindful of the needs of one of the primary audiences, health care decision-makers, to ensure that the information is salient to them. Current approaches for the development of complex and advanced methods seem to be counter to what health care decision-makers want.