Regional, CRC-Distant, and Dead. Quality adjusted life years were used as the primary outcome measure. The base case analysis represents the overall cost and effectiveness associated with each screening strategy. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) were calculated for each screening strategy. One-way sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the factors that have the greatest effect on the cost-effectiveness of screening.

RESULTS: The most cost-effective screening strategy was Fecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT); followed by FOBT plus aspirin, colonoscopy, and colonoscopy plus aspirin. The ICER of FOBT was $13,014.85 compared to natural history or no intervention. The model was sensitive to the costs of FOBT, colonoscopy, and aspirin. The screening strategies were sensitive to the cost of aspirin, FOBT, and colonoscopy. CONCLUSION: Results from the analysis showed that the most cost-effective screening strategy was the use of FOBT yearly. In terms of only cost, FOBT was the least expensive screening strategy whereas the most expensive was colonoscopy plus COX-2 inhibitor. The results from the study suggest that FOBT and colonoscopy, as well as these strategies plus aspirin, are more the cost-effective for all of the screening strategies employed. FOBT plus aspirin and colonoscopy have similar cost-effectiveness with colonoscopy having an ICER of only $35.43.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF DOCETAXEL VERSUS OTHER REGIMENS IN THE ADJUVANT THERAPY OF EARLY AND LOCALLY ADVANCED BREAST CANCER IN POLAND

Walczak J1, Pawlik D1, Wójcik R1, Kaczor M1, Lis J1, Nogas G1
1. Arcana Institute, Cracow, Poland, 2. Sanofi-Aventis, Warsaw, Poland

OBJECTIVES: To compare cost effectiveness of docetaxel chemotherapy with other adjuvant treatment regimens in early and locally advanced breast cancer. METHODS: Cost-effectiveness Markov model from payer perspective (health insurance and patient), using costs information from published sources and the patient lifetime horizon. RESULTS: Two comparisons, TAC (docetaxel/doxorubicin/cyclophosphamide—75/50/500 mg/m2, 6 cycles) vs FAC (fluorouracil/doxorubicin/cyclophosphamide—500/50/500 mg/m2, 6 cycles) and FEC + T (fluorouracil/epirubicin/cyclophosphamide—500/100/500 mg/m2, 6 cycles + docetaxel 100 mg/m2, 3 cycles) vs FEC (fluorouracil/epirubicin/cyclophosphamide—500/100/500 mg/m2, 6 cycles), were performed. One randomized clinical trial was included for each comparison. Average costs of the treatment of early or locally advanced breast cancer (including adjuvant chemotherapy, additional treatment—tamoxyfen/radiotherapy, treatment of adverse events and disease recurrence) and treatment effects were per patient: TAC 42883 PLN/25,7 LYG vs FAC 8799 PLN/23,6 LYG; FEC + T 32828 PLN/26,1 LYG vs FEC 13505 PLN/24,7 LYG. ICER for TAC vs FAC comparison was 16558 PLN/LYG. ICER for FEC + T vs FEC was 13 904 PLN/LYG. CONCLUSION: Docetaxel regimens are more effective and more expensive in the treatment of patients with early and locally advanced breast cancer compared with FAC and FEC chemotherapies, ICER range 13904-16558 PLN/LYG.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF NEW TARGETED THERAPY SUNITINIB MALATE AS SECOND LINE TREATMENT IN METASTATIC RENAL CELL CARCINOMA IN ARGENTINA

Aiello EC1, Muszbek N2, Richardet E1, Lingua A3, Charbonneau C4, Renest E5

OBJECTIVES: To estimate the cost-effectiveness of sunitinib malate versus palliative/best supportive care (BSC) in the treatment of cytokine-refractory metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC) in patients failing on IL-2, interferon-alpha or combination of these. METHODS: A Markov model was developed and adapted to Argentinean circumstances. Effectiveness results were taken from a clinical trial and a US Medicare database. Data was adjusted with general population mortality estimates from Argentinean life tables. Utilities were collected with the help of EQ-SD questionnaire in the clinical trial. The main source of resource use and unit costs was an Oncology Institute in Argentina. Costs were calculated in 2006 Argentinean pesos (AR$). Both costs and effectiveness were discounted at a 3% annual rate. Incremental cost-effectiveness was calculated for progression-free month (PFM), life-year saved (LYS) and quality adjusted life years (QALY). Both deterministic and probabilistic sensitivity analyses were undertaken for effectiveness and cost variables. RESULTS: Compared to BSC, sunitinib resulted in 2.61 extra PFM, 1.32 LYS and 0.98 QALY; however, at an additional cost of AR$52,243. The cost of gaining one PFM, LYS and QALY was AR$9596, AR$39,518 and AR$53,445 respectively. The result was most sensitive to effectiveness parameters. The incremental cost/QALY was always under the US threshold of $50,000. CONCLUSION: Though treatment with sunitinib...