years, was 95.1% in the case of GCSF-plerixafor therapy compared to 42.6% for GCSF. Additionally, the average reported cost for GCSF-plerixafor treatment in successful cases was $35,020, and in the case of a GCSF treatment the cost totaled $US39,325, which represents a 62% saving for an actual year of therapy. Therefore, the GCSF-plerixafor study concluded that the results are cost-saving and is the most viable alternative. CONCLUSIONS: The GCSF-plerixafor treatment is a cost effective alternative, from a Mexican institutional perspective for Non Hodgkin’s Lymphoma patients in preparation for an autologous hematopoetic stem cell transplantation.

Abstracts

years, was 95.1% in the case of GCSF-plerixafor therapy compared to 42.6% for GCSF. Additionally, the average reported cost for GCSF-plerixafor treatment in successful cases was $35,020, and in the case of a GCSF treatment the cost totaled $US39,325, which represents a 62% saving for an actual year of therapy. Therefore, the GCSF-plerixafor study concluded that the results are cost-saving and is the most viable alternative. CONCLUSIONS: The GCSF-plerixafor treatment is a cost effective alternative, from a Mexican institutional perspective for Non Hodgkin’s Lymphoma patients in preparation for an autologous hematopoetic stem cell transplantation.

Abstracts

years, was 95.1% in the case of GCSF-plerixafor therapy compared to 42.6% for GCSF. Additionally, the average reported cost for GCSF-plerixafor treatment in successful cases was $35,020, and in the case of a GCSF treatment the cost totaled $US39,325, which represents a 62% saving for an actual year of therapy. Therefore, the GCSF-plerixafor study concluded that the results are cost-saving and is the most viable alternative. CONCLUSIONS: The GCSF-plerixafor treatment is a cost effective alternative, from a Mexican institutional perspective for Non Hodgkin’s Lymphoma patients in preparation for an autologous hematopoetic stem cell transplantation.