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COST EFFICACY OF AMISULPRID IN THE TREATMENT OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Dardzinski W1, Pawlik D1, Walczak I1, Lis J2, Nogas G1

1Arcana Institute, Cracow, Poland, 2Sanofi-Aventis, Polska, Warsaw, Poland

OBJECTIVES: To estimate cost-effectiveness of various therapy scenarios of treating schizophrenia with amisulprid (Solian), a medicine of 2nd generation, in comparison with haloperidol.

METHODS: Cost-effectiveness decision model was prepared. Treatment with amisulprid vs haloperidol was compared in following scenarios: O Scenario 1—amisulprid vs haloperidol (with change for risperidon in case of recurrence in any arm) O Scenario 2—amisulprid vs haloperidol for 1 year (as first line medicine) followed by treatment with new atypical medicine (olanzapine or risperidone) in case of recurrence. The target population was patients suffered from chronic schizophrenia, at the moment of exacerbation of disease. Analysis was performed from the payers’ perspective (the National Health Budget and patient), with a time horizon of 1 year. Estimates of effectiveness were expressed with QALY (quality adjusted life years). Following parameters were considered: risk of extrapyramidal symptoms, recurrence, suicide and rates of compliance. Costs of medicines (first line therapy with amisulprid or haloperidol and possibly second line therapy with olanzapina or risperidone in case of recurrence in haloperidol arm), correcting therapy with olanzapine or rispridone in case of recurrence), treatment of EPS, hospitalisation due to recurrence and outpatient consultations were taken into account. RESULTS: In the scenario 1 cost of 1 QALY due to replacing standard first line therapy with haloperidol by amisulprid is 1601 PLN. In scenario 2, using amisulprid during one year instead of haloperidol as first line therapy followed by olanzapina in case of recurrence, brings additional costs of 275 PLN and gives additional QALY 0.056 year. Cost of quality adjusted life year is 4935 PLN. CONCLUSION: Treatment of schizophrenia with amisulprid during whole year, instead of haloperidol as first line therapy followed by risperidon in case of recurrence, is a cost effective therapy.
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USING THE NET-BENEFIT REGRESSION APPROACH TO COMPARE THE COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF HALOPERIDOL, OLANZAPINE AND RISPERIDONE IN THE TREATMENT OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

De Ridder A1, De Graeve D1

University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

OBJECTIVES: This study determines the cost-effectiveness of 3 antipsychotics for the treatment of schizophrenia in Belgium.

METHODS: Data were retrieved from a prospective observational non randomized follow-up survey. Clinical investigators included 293 schizophrenic patients; 136 of those patients were assigned to Olanzapine, 129 to Risperidone and 28 to Haloperidol. Patients were followed for 2 years. Total health care costs were determined from the perspective of the public payer and calculated by multiplying resource use with official tariffs; effectiveness of the drugs was measured with EQ-5D. Several studies have already compared the cost-effectiveness of different antipsychotics for the treatment of schizophrenia, most of them are however flawed by methodological issues. This study therefore uses a new method that was developed to address these limitations but is not widely used yet: the net-benefit regression approach (NBRA). We show its merits by performing a cost-effectiveness analysis of Olanzapine, Risperidone and Haloperidol.

RESULTS: Models were checked for selection bias but drug choice was not endogenous; we therefore proceeded with simple OLS regressions. The results indicate that the drugs provide similar net monetary benefits to the patient (H vs. O ~4452.53 (p = 0.645), R vs. O 4439.54 (p = 0.425), R vs. H 8892.07 (p = 0.366)). When we control for several patient characteristics R moves away further from H and O but the difference does not reach statistical significance (R vs. O 5857.73 (p = 0.332), R vs. H 15233.53 (p = 0.178)). Several important patient subgroups were also identified; they indicate that a drug performs better in a specific patient group. Numerous sensitivity analyses confirm the robustness of the results. CONCLUSION: We conclude by confirming that the NBRA is an important enrichment to the CEA methodology. As was demonstrated in this paper, it is often important to correct cost-effectiveness results for patient characteristics and to identify significant patient subgroups.
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COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF DULOXETINE VS. VENLAFAXINE XR AND SSRIS IN PATIENTS WITH MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDER IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CARE IN SPAIN

De Cock E1, Benedict A1, Le TK2, Sacristán del Castillo JA2, Dilla T3

1United BioSource Corporation, Barcelona, Spain, 2United BioSource Corporation, Budapest, Hungary, 3Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN, USA

OBJECTIVES: Major depressive disorder (MDD) remains highly under-treated and accounts for substantial health system costs. Duloxetine, a selective serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor, has been shown to be effective and safe in treatment of depression. This study examined the cost-effectiveness of duloxetine vs. Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs: fluoxetine, paroxetine, sertraline, citalopram and escitalopram) and venlafaxine extended-release (XR) from the Spanish health system perspective.

METHODS: A Markov decision model simulated clinical management of MDD patients during six 2-month cycles in primary or secondary care. Patients on acute treatment could experience remission, response without remission, no response, or discontinuation of initial therapy. Non-responders and partial responders could continue therapy or switch to another therapy. Efficacy data and utility data were derived from clinical trials. Treatment patterns were obtained...
from interviews with practising Spanish GPs and psychiatrists. Costs from official price/tariff lists were applied. Model outcomes included total treatment cost, quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) and symptom-free days (SFD). The robustness of findings was assessed in sensitivity analyses. RESULTS: In primary care, incremental cost per QALY for duloxetine vs Venlafaxine XR was €29,457 and for duloxetine vs SSRIs was between €11,867–€21,957 (extreme values vs paroxetine and fluoxetine, respectively). Incremental cost per SFD was €136 vs Venlafaxine XR and ranged from €146 to €266 vs. paroxetine and fluoxetine respectively. In secondary care duloxetine was dominant vs. all the drugs except for the comparison with fluoxetine (cost per QALY gained was 650€ and cost per additional SFD was 1€). Results were sensitive to changes in the trial remission and response rates, and in the distribution of switch therapy options. CONCLUSION: Duloxetine showed a reasonable cost-effectiveness ratio vs. the comparator drugs and could therefore be considered a cost-effective treatment for MDD patients in primary and secondary care in Spain.

PMH28
A PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION OF ESCITALOPRAM VS. PAROXETINE IN THE TREATMENT OF GENERALIZED ANXIETY DISORDER IN NORWAY
Danchenko N1, Mahmum B2, Hansen K3, Despiegel N4, Holsten F4
OBJECTIVES: To assess the cost-effectiveness of escitalopram versus generic paroxetine in the treatment of generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) in Norway. METHODS: Cost-effectiveness analysis was based on a decision-tree model, reflecting the current guidance for the treatment of GAD. Escitalopram 10–20 mg/day was compared to paroxetine 20–50 mg/day, the only SSRIs licensed for the treatment of GAD in Norway. Initial treatment started in primary care; failure to respond to a second-line SSRI after switch from initial treatment resulted in referral to a psychiatrist. The evaluation was performed over a 9-month time horizon. Model data sources included published clinical trials and standard national data sources. The main effectiveness outcome was first-line treatment success, defined as a response after 12 weeks of treatment (≥50% reduction in HAM-A) and absence of relapse during the following 24 weeks. Other outcomes included quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), rate of maintained treatment response (response at week 12 maintained at week 36) and rate of referrals to secondary care. The analysis was performed from the societal perspective and evaluated direct treatment costs, including out-of-pocket payments and costs covered by health insurance. RESULTS: Patients treated with escitalopram had 11.3% higher first-line success and 5.4% higher maintained response rates compared with paroxetine-treated patients. Rates of referrals to secondary care were 5.5% lower with escitalopram compared with paroxetine. Per patient direct treatment costs associated with escitalopram and paroxetine treatment amounted to NOK 4424 and NOK 4172, respectively. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) was NOK 2,230 per first-line treatment response and NOK 37,612 per QALY. Sensitivity analyses demonstrated robustness of the model to changes in key input parameters. CONCLUSION: Escitalopram appears to be cost-effective compared with paroxetine in the treatment of GAD in Norway, based on direct treatment costs.
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SWITCHING FROM BRANDED TO GENERIC RISPERIDONE IN PATIENTS WITH SCHIZOPHRENIA: AN ESTIMATION OF POTENTIAL ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES IN THE NETHERLANDS
Van Nooten F1, Rijnders C2, Brown R3, Van Agthoven M4
OBJECTIVES: The oral variant of the antipsychotic drug risperidone will lose patent protection at the end of 2007, which opens the market for generic variants. However, since many schizophrenic patients suffer from paranoia, some of them will be less willing to take a different drug. Switching might therefore cause non-compliance, which is in its turn the most important predictor of relapse and hospitalisation in schizophrenia. We therefore made an estimation of potential economic consequences regarding drug and hospitalisation costs when stable patients in The Netherlands currently using branded risperidone are switched to the generic version. METHODS: A simple health economic model was developed, based on published data regarding hospitalisation durations, rates of compliance, relapse, and additional relapse resulting from switching to generics. A one-year perspective was applied. RESULTS: Due to a somewhat higher relapse rate after switching to generics in the first year after the switch, total per-patient drug and hospitalisation costs were estimated to be higher for the generic product as compared to the branded product (€5110 and €4680, respectively). Sensitivity analyses showed the stability of the relative result. CONCLUSION: Switching patients who are stabilised on branded risperidone to the generic version might cause higher health care costs. The analysis is dependent on assumptions, but given their evidence-based character, there is sufficient reason to believe that the relative result will hold in countries where only a little difference will exist between the price of branded and generic risperidone after the patent expiry.
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DIRECT COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH MILD COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT IN PRIMARY CARE
Luppa M1, Heinrich S2, Matschinger H3, Hensel A4, Luck T5, Kaduszkiewicz H2, Riedel-Heller SG1, Koenig HH1
1University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Saxony, Germany, 2University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
OBJECTIVES: Little is known about the direct costs of individuals with mild cognitive impairment (MCI). This study investigates the direct costs associated with MCI according to recent diagnostic criteria from a societal perspective. METHODS: A total of 452 primary care patients aged 75+ from Leipzig, Germany, were investigated in face-to-face interviews regarding MCI according to the current diagnostic criteria of the International Working Group on MCI, resource utilisation and costs (cost diary), as well as chronic medical illness (Chronic Disease Score). Resource utilisation was monetarily valued using 2004/2005 prices. RESULTS: Mean annual direct costs were EUR 4443 for patients with MCI (N = 39) and EUR 3,814 for patients without MCI (N = 413) (p = 0.34). Looking at the cost components, patients with and without MCI only significantly differed regarding pharmaceutical costs (EUR 1210 vs. EUR 1062; p < 0.05) not caused by antidementive drugs. CONCLUSION: Direct costs of individuals having MCI are not significantly increased in comparison to direct costs of individuals without cognitive deficits.