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OBJECTIVES: To estimate the indirect cost burden of migraine on U.S. employers, in terms of workplace absence, short-term disability (STD) and workers compensation (WC) payments.

METHODS: The data source for this study was the MEDSTAT Health and Productivity Management database, composed of medical, pharmaceutical, enrollment, workplace absence, STD, and WC information on employees for 10 large employers in the U.S. for the calendar years 2002 and 2003. Subjects with a diagnosis for migraine or use of a migraine-specific abortive drug were identified as the migraine cohort. A random sample of patients without migraine was propensity score matched, based on demographic characteristics and comorbidity index, to the migraine cohort to yield a matched control group. Indirect costs between migraine and matched control cohorts were compared to derive the indirect burden of illness attributable to migraine.

RESULTS: The analyses included 5037 subjects in the migraine cohort, and equal number of subjects in the control group. The mean age was 39 (SD = 9.3), and 71% were female. After matching, the cohorts were similar with respect to age, gender, geographic region, urban residence, insurance type, the number of psychiatric diagnostic groups and Charlson comorbidity index. The migraine cohort incurred significantly higher indirect costs than the control cohort in all categories (absence, STD, and WC).

Total indirect costs were $2834 per patient per year (PPPY) higher in the migraine group ($4453 versus $1619 PPPY in the control group; p < 0.001). Absence costs made up the largest component of this difference at 75%, with STD and WC making up 21% and 4%, respectively. CONCLUSIONS: The migraine cohort was associated with significantly higher indirect costs compared to a matched control based on recent data from a sample of commercially insured individuals. This data suggest that US employers are bearing a considerable indirect cost burden as a consequence of migraine.
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OBJECTIVES: In a previously published study dose increases have been shown to be significantly more pronounced with transdermal (TD) fentanyl compared to TD buprenorphine. The purpose of this study was not only to re-evaluate these results because of the high economic impact but also to qualitatively evaluate the dose development as a measure of ease of dosing and dose adjustment during therapy with TD fentanyl and TD buprenorphine in cancer and non-cancer patients. METHODS: Retrospective analysis of the German "IMS Disease Analyzer—mediplus" database covering patient data from May, 2002 to April, 2005. Patients on long-term treatment (≥3 months) with TD fentanyl or TD buprenorphine had received similar analgesic pre-medication and were considered as identical cohorts with similar pain intensity, expecting comparable drug utilization patterns. Dose changes over the treatment duration were evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively. RESULTS: From dose changes over the whole treatments mean daily dose increases per patient were calculated to be 0.47% (TD fentanyl) and 0.19% (TD buprenorphine) in cancer patients, and 0.25% and 0.10% in non-cancer patients, respectively. Despite the overall dose increases, qualitative evaluations revealed dose changes in both directions, i.e. dose increases and decreases during therapy in 30.6% of TD fentanyl and 11.8% of TD buprenorphine patients with cancer pain. In non-cancer pain 22.7% of TD fentanyl and 13.1% of TD buprenorphine patients had alternating dose changes. All differences between TD fentanyl and TD buprenorphine were statistically significant (p < 0.05). CONCLUSIONS: The more pronounced dose increases with TD fentanyl in comparable pain patients confirm previous findings, indicating a higher tolerance development with TD fentanyl. Regardless of the overall dose increases, alternating dose changes, i.e. changes in both directions are more frequent with TD fentanyl. This also suggests a less convenient and more complicated dose adjustment with TD fentanyl compared to TD buprenorphine.