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OBJECTIVES: To evaluate the cost-effectiveness, from the Mexican Health Care System perspective, of Truvada versus Combivir and Kivexa in the treatment of antiretroviral naive HIV-1 infected patients. METHODS: A Markov model was developed to assess the incremental cost effectiveness of Truvada vs Combivir and Kivexa. Clinical data was derived from published clinical trials (Study 903 and CNA30024) and other secondary sources to create a model of disease progression and treatment patterns. Both health care and treatment costs were considered. Costs were reported in 2008 US dollar. Costs and health outcomes were discounted at 5%. A second-order sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess the effects of parameter uncertainty on the study findings. RESULTS: The model projects an accumulated discounted cost to the Mexican health care system per patient receiving Truvada of US$28,776 compared to US$24,605 for the Kivexa regimen and US$22,999 for the Combivir regimen. The accumulated discounted cost is 5.83 QALYs per patient receiving Truvada compared to 4.89 QALYs for Kivexa and 4.81 QALYs for Combivir. This results in an incremental cost for Truvada vs. Combivir of US$5,805 per QALY and US$19,436 per QALY respectively. Considering a willingness to pay (WTP) threshold of US$10,000 per QALY there is a 98% probability that treatment with Truvada is cost-effective relative to Combivir. CONCLUSIONS: Results from these analyses suggest that in the Mexican setting, use of Truvada in place of standard Combivir and Kivexa for treatment of HIV is likely to be cost effective. These conclusions are supported by conservative assumptions and sensitivity analyses.
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OBJECTIVES: To compare treatment persistence and incremental cost-persistence ratios across individual new antidepressants (SSRIs and atypical antidepressants) as well as the associated direct health care costs in the adult population covered with the public drug program of Quebec. METHODS: A retrospective cohort was conducted in a random sample of 13,936 adults age 18-64 years old covered by the Quebec public drug program and who initiated an antidepressant treatment in 2003. Persistence was defined as treatment duration of at least 6 months regardless of whether a product switch occurred. Economic impact was assessed over the first year of treatment through drug costs (antidepressants and all other drugs), medical services costs (psychiatric- or non-psychiatric), hospitalization costs, and total health care costs. Comparisons across products were conducted using the incremental cost-persistence ratio (ICPR). RESULTS: Treatment non-persistence ranged from 60.4% (paroxetine) to 63.4% (fluoxetine). The product associated with the highest non-persistence was citalopram (CDN$2663) and the lowest was venlafaxine (CDN$2168). Fluvoxamine had the lowest mean antidepressant costs (CDN$215) and venlafaxine (CDN$309) the highest; fluoxetine was associated with the lowest medical services costs (CND$6702), and citalopram with the highest for both types of costs: CND$559 for medical services and CND$970 for hospitalizations, respectively. Antidepressant costs, other drug costs, medical services costs and hospitalization costs accounted for, respectively, 10.5% (CND$249, 95% CI: 245-251), 21.2% (CND$599, 95% CI: 585-614) and 34.5% (CDN$816, 95% CI: 769-862) of the total costs. The ICPR for total health care costs ranged from CDN$119 (fluoxetine) to CDN$238 (paroxetine). CONCLUSIONS: Total costs were similar across products except for citalopram, which was more costly. In our ICPR analyses, paroxetine, fluoxetine and venlafaxine appear to be the best choice compared to the other antidepressant alternatives.
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OBJECTIVES: Although serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) are considered cost-effective medications to treat major depressive disorders, they often require significant dosage adjustments at treatment initiation. This study examined whether dose-titration for SSRIs at initiation was associated with increased resource utilization and costs. METHODS: A nationally representative cohort of individuals in the United States with MDD was identified in a large managed care database between January 2001 and December 31, 2006. A study-specific titration-algorithm was used to identify patients who had dose-titration vs. not, within the first eight weeks of SSRI therapy initiation. We calculated propensity scores and identified a 1:1 matched cohort using propensity score matching. We used univariate and multivariate statistical tests to compare mean therapeutic days, health care service utilization and costs between the two groups during the first 8 weeks and first 6 months of treatment initiation. RESULTS: At 8 weeks, The dose-titrated cohort was estimated to have a 30% increase in adjusted mean number of therapeutic days (38 vs. 54, p < 0.001), a 74% increase in depression-related outpatient visits (1.18 vs. 1.1, p < 0.001), a 14% increase in depression-related physician visits (1.30 vs. 1.15, p = 0.02), and a 38% increase in other physician visits (1.72 vs. 1.25, p < 0.001). CONCLUSIONS: Significant differences in the same outcomes at 6 months were also observed. CONCLUSIONS: MDD patients who are dose-titrated with SSRIs at initiation consume more medical and pharmacy resources and have more days at a sub-therapeutic dose. Thus, antidepressants that do not require dose-titration may be cost-beneficial to payers of health care.
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OBJECTIVES: To estimate the cost effectiveness and long-term combined effects of Posaconazole versus fluconazole/itraconazole (standard azole) therapy in the prophylaxis against invasive fungal infections among high-risk neutropenic patients in Mexico. METHODS: A previously validated Markov model was used to compare the projected lifetime costs and effects of two theoretical groups of patients, one receiving Posaconazole and the other receiving standard azole. The model estimates total costs, numbers of IFIs, and QALY per patient in each prophylaxis group. To extrapolate trial results to a lifetime horizon, the model was extended with one-month Markov cycles in which mortality risk is specific to the underlying disease. Data on the probabilities of IFI were obtained from Study Protocol PO1899. Drug costs were taken from average wholesale drug reports for 2008. Cost and health effects were discounted at 5% according to the Mexican guideline. The analysis was conducted from the Mexican health care perspective using 2008 unit cost prices RESULTS: Our model projects an accumulated cost to the Mexican health care system per patient receiving the Posaconazole regimen of US$634 compared to US$7463 for the standard azole regimen. The accumulated discounted cost effect is 1.13 LY or 2.25 QALY per patient receiving Posaconazole, compared to 2.96 LY or 2.13 QALYs per patient receiving standard azole. Posaconazole remained the dominant strategy across each scenario. Probabilistic sensitivity analysis tested numerous assumptions about the model cost and efficacy parameters and found that the results were robust to most changes CONCLUSIONS: