hydrochlorothiazide. Using the ACCOMPLISH results for valsartan/amlodipine, it is likely to have reasonably low costs per event avoided for the treatment of high risk patients with hypertension in Sweden.

PCV74

ONE-YEAR COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF CYTOCHROME P450 2C19 GENOTYPE-GUIDED ANTIPLATELET THERAPY IN PATIENTS WITH ACUTE CORONARY SYNDROMES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Charland SL[1], Agatep B[1], Malone D[2], Stanek E[1]
[1]Medco Health Services, Inc., Bethesda, MD, USA; [2]University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

OBJECTIVES: Cytochrome P450 2C19 (CYP2C19) genotype has been shown to affect cardiovascular (CV) outcomes for clopidogrel but not prasugrel. This study evaluates the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of CYP2C19-guided vs. routine antiplatelet therapy in acute coronary syndrome (ACS) patients in the UK. **METHODS:** We constructed a literature-based, decision analytic, Markov model to estimate the annual cost-effectiveness of CYP2C19-guided aspirin plus either clopidogrel or prasugrel therapy vs. no genotyping. Post-initial ACS CV events were based on the TRITON-TIMI 38 study and genetic substudy. Cost data sources were: National Health Service (NHS) reference cost for 2008–09—nonfatal MI and stroke, CV death, intracranial hemorrhage, other life-threatening bleed, and minor bleed; Drug Tariff 2009—drugs; www.genetic-health.co.uk/—CYP2C19 genotyping; or US-based reference pricing converted to £ using appropriate exchange rates -monthly CV disease maintenance cost. Disease-state utilities were obtained from published sources. The model allowed for clopidogrel/prasugrel discontinuation and aspirin monotherapy. Model sensitivity was assessed using 1-way analysis of parameters varied by quartile or at least +/– 25%. **RESULTS:** The analysis demonstrated an increase in incremental cost (£81); greater incremental QALY (0.05); and an ICER £1529/QALY for CYP2C19 genotype-guided therapy over 12 months. The model was most sensitive to monthly CV care cost, NFMI cost, proportion of patients on clopidogrel, and life-threatening bleeding cost. The model was least sensitive to the cost of clopidogrel, prasugrel, or CYP2C19 genotyping. **CONCLUSIONS:** The model-based ICER of £1,529/QALY for the CYP2C19 testing strategy is significantly less than the UK threshold of £20,000 that is considered good value. CYP2C19 genotype-guided clopidogrel or prasugrel therapy is cost-effective for up to 1 year in ACS patients in the UK.

PCV75

CANADIAN COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF DRONEDARONE VERSUS OTHER ANTI-ARRHYTMIC DRUGS IN PATIENTS WITH PAROXYSMAL AND PERSISTENT ATRIAL FIBRILLATION

Nilsson J[1], Åkerborg Ö[1], Lindgren P[1], Bascle S[2]
[1]i3 Innovus, Stockholm, Sweden; [2]Sanofi-Aventis, Paris, France

OBJECTIVES: Dronedarone is a novel anti-arrhythmic drug (AAD) that, unlike other AADs, was shown to reduce cardiovascular hospitalizations or death in the ATHENA clinical trial. In addition, dronedarone reduces AF recurrence, maintains rate control, and has a favorable safety profile with low pro-arrhythmic and organ-toxicity profile. The objective of this study was to construct a health economic model to assess the cost-effectiveness of dronedarone vs. other AADs in a Canadian setting. **METHODS:** A state transition model evaluated through patient-level simulation has been developed using Microsoft Excel. It allows comparisons over varying time horizons and treatment durations, and consists of health states for: treatment, off treatment, symptomatic AF recurrences, stroke, acute coronary syndromes, coronary heart failure and death. Transition probabilities were derived from the patient level data from the ATHENA trial, and relative risks between dronedarone and three commonly used comparators (amiodarone, sotalol and flecainide) identified by clinical experts were derived from a mixed treatment comparison (systematic review) of published clinical trials published between 1980 and 2009. Patients discontinuing treatments were assumed to progress according to the rates in the standard of care arm of ATHENA. Costs of monitoring and initiation were taken into account. Costs were applied to each adverse event (AE) observed (Canadian Costs [C$] 2007). Effectiveness was expressed as QALYs, using preference based utility weights for health states based on published data. Discounting was 5% and a lifetime horizon was taken. **RESULTS:** The model predicts higher quality adjusted survival for patients on dronedarone: between 1.13 and 2.01 QALYs depending on comparator. In Canada, the resulting ICERs (per QALY) are C$5600 compared to amiodarone, C$5300 compared to flecainide, and C$5300 compared to sotalol. Results were sensitive to differences in risk of mortality between treatment groups. **CONCLUSIONS:** Dronedarone represents a cost-effective treatment for patients with atrial fibrillation in Canada.

PCV76

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF DRONEDARONE IN PATIENTS WITH ATRIAL FIBRILLATION IN MEXICO: A WITHIN TRIAL ANALYSIS BASED ON ATHENA TRIAL

Martinez E[1], Lemus A[2], Soto H[3]
[1]Cardiology Hospital CMN Siglo XXI, Mexico City, D.F., Mexico; [2]Sanofi-Aventis, D.F., Mexico City, Mexico; [3]ESEA, Mexico City, D.F., Mexico

OBJECTIVES: To perform a cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) for the use of dronedarone in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) in order to prevent hospitalizations due to cardiovascular events or death (HCED), from the public health care system perspective in Mexico. **METHODS:** A CEA was made based on the clinical information from the multicenter, randomized, clinical study ATHENA, where dronedarone was compared to placebo on top of standard treatment in patients with AF. Overall, 2301 patients were randomized to dronedarone, and 2327 to placebo. The primary clinical endpoint was HCED. Only direct medical health care costs were calculated. The health resource utilization was elicited from the ATHENA trial. The unit costs of each event were obtained from the medical literature and/or validated by local experts, whenever information was not available. Most of the cost information is based on IMSS (Social Security) figures, and updated to year 2009 (1€ = MX$17.05). a discount rate of 5% was used. An incremental cost-effectiveness analysis was performed complemented by a deterministic sensitivity analysis (DSA) to assess robustness of the model. **RESULTS:** Patients randomized to dronedarone experienced 1190 events of HCED (average rate 0.51 [CI 95%: 0.47–0.55]) while patients in the placebo group had 1601 (average rate 0.69 [CI 95%: 0.64–0.74]), or –415 events, 18% less hospitalizations (CI 95%: 12–25%) for the dronedarone group. The average cost per patient in the dronedarone group was €3028 as compared to the placebo group of €2,941, yielding a cost difference of €87.4, and an avoided incremental cost per HCED of €477.00 of dronedarone vs. the placebo group. The DSA shows the analysis is robust. **CONCLUSIONS:** According to the ATHENA trial, dronedarone is a cost-effective treatment option for the reduction of HCED from the Mexican perspective. Dronedarone's value could be enhanced if indirect costs averted from the decreased rates of HCED included.

PCV77

A SIMULATION MODEL TO ASSESS COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF STATINS IN HIGH RISK PATIENTS WITH ELEVATED LDL-C IN SPAIN

Darba J[1], Restovic G[2], Kaskens L[2], Tunceli K[3], Plans P[4]
[1]Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; [2]BCN Health, Barcelona, Spain; [3]Merck, Whitehouse Station, NJ, USA; [4]Generalitat de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

OBJECTIVES: The aim of this study is to estimate cost-effectiveness of lowering low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) with statin monotherapy in patients with elevated LDL-C with two or more cardiovascular risk factors or either coronary heart disease (CHD) in Spain. **METHODS:** A Markov model was developed to represent the transition of a cohort of patients with elevated LDL-C or with CHD at risk of a cardiovascular event (CVE) through four health states: patients with LDL-C, CVE, death by CVE and death by other causes. Probabilities of a CVE in females and males were determined, based on CHD risks estimated trough locally-adjusted Framingham risk equations using data from the DORICA and PRIMULA study. LDL-C lowering efficacy of statins, mortality, and health-state utilities were obtained from published scientific literature. Cardiovascular risk factors included were age, systolic blood pressure, diabetes, smoking and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C). Treatment and CVE direct medical costs were obtained from a medication database and DRGs for public hospitals in 2009 in Spain. Deterministic results were estimated and a probabilistic sensitivity analysis was conducted. Results were expressed as expected cost per quality adjusted life-years (QALYs) gained. **RESULTS:** In deterministic analyses, expected costs per patient per year at age of 40 were higher for patients with 2 or more cardiovascular risk factors who were not treated than those who were treated (female: €41,300 vs. €40,106; male: €22,160 vs. €18,333). Effectiveness was higher for treated patients in both genders (female: 0.17 QALY; male: 0.37 QALY). Similar results were found for patients with CHD (female: €35,706 vs. €34,664, 0.10 QALY; male: €16,892 vs. €16,073, 0.12 QALY). **CONCLUSIONS:** From the perspective of the Spanish health care system, treatment with statin monotherapy is considered to be cost-effective versus no treatment in female and male patients with 2 or more risk factors or CHD.

PCV78

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF IVABRADINE IN CHRONIC STABLE ANGINA PATIENTS IN AN AUSTRIAN SETTING

Schwarz B[1], Wild R[2]
[1]Center for Public Health, Medical University Vienna, Baden bei Wien, Austria; [2]Servier Austria GmbH, Vienna, Austria

OBJECTIVES: High resting heart rate (HR) has been progressively accepted as a modifiable cardiovascular risk factor. Ivabradine (ProcoralanÒ) is a specific HR lowering agent. This study aimed estimating the cost-effectiveness of ivabradine in stable angina patients with a normal sinus rhythm and a resting HR above 70 beats per minute (bpm) from the Austrian health care perspective: 1) versus generic diltiazem when beta-blockers (BB) are contra-indicated or non tolerated; and 2) in combination with generic atenolol versus generic atenolol alone. **METHODS:** A Markov chain Monte Carlo stochastic simulation model was used to estimate the influence of HR lowering in cardiovascular morbidity and mortality and its economic consequences. Treatments considered are ivabradine, 7.5 mg twice a day, diltiazem, 240 mg once a day and atenolol 50 mg once a day. HR distribution, survival and time to hospitalization were modelled as weibull functions. Events considered were acute myocardial infarction, stroke, heart failure, death and revascularization procedures. Only direct medical costs were included. Effectiveness was measured in quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs). Time horizon was set at 20 years and discount rates for costs and effectiveness were 3%/year. **RESULTS:** The between-group difference in HR reduction was –6.4 bpm and –8.8 bpm in favour of ivabradine strategy in targeted patient populations 1) and 2) respectively. Incremental ivabradine strategy cost was €6789 versus generic diltiazem and €6749 versus generic atenolol. Incremental QALYs were 1.067 and 1.076 respectively. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for ivabradine strategy were €5800/QALY and €6273/QALY. Deterministic sensitivity analyses showed that