OBJECTIVES: To investigate the variation in resource utilization and treatment costs for moderate to severe RA patients in five countries (Australia, Canada, France, Germany, UK). METHODS: Resource utilization was collected alongside a 6-month multinational phase-III clinical trial assessing the safety and efficacy of Adalimumab (D2E7), a fully human anti-TNF antibody, among 325 established RA patients who failed previously 3.7 DMARDs and had a 11-year mean disease duration (DE011/DE026). Data on 54 resource utilization items were collected including direct costs (e.g. hospitalizations, procedures, medications); direct non-medical costs (e.g. transportation, devices), and indirect costs (e.g. productivity loss, family support) during 12 months of living with RA. Resources were valued using country-specific prices and standardized to 2001US$. A human-capital approach was employed to estimate productivity losses. RESULTS: Mean societal total cost was US$7174 (SEM471) per patient across all countries. However significant variation existed at the country-level. The UK had the highest societal total cost: US$9277 (SEM1876) followed by France US$9275 (SEM1155), Germany US$7448 (SEM951), Canada US$6347 (SEM855) and Australia US$5174 (SEM711). 95% of total costs were explained by direct costs in the UK compared to 70% in Germany, where lost productivity was a larger factor. Of direct costs, hospital inpatient costs contributed almost 44.5% (Germany), 40.3% (UK), 36.9% (Australia), 33.5% (France) and 13.1% (Canada). Medical to non-medical direct cost ratios varied from 1:1 in Australia to almost 1:2 in the UK. CONCLUSIONS: These results are consistent with the mean cost of US$6270 estimated from a systematic review of 11 US and 4 European studies (Cooper, Rheumatology 2000). Treatment costs are 2.5 times greater in this study of longstanding severe RA patients than in published studies of early RA patients. This study provides a comprehensive picture of healthcare services used for the treatment of RA patients and indicates that pronounced country differences exist.
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OBJECTIVES: COX-2 inhibitors (COXIBs) have been introduced in Italy in September 2000. We investigated and identified differences in history of claims for gastrointestinal disorders (GIDs) between COXIBs vs NSAIDs patients. METHODS: Prescriptions of anti-inflammatories made by 200 GPs to a population of 24,428 arthritis patients in a Northern Italian area were retrospectively investigated, focused on the first six months of COXIBs availability (1st October 2000–31st March 2001). COXIBs were prescribed to 6,204 patients and NSAIDs to 18,224 patients. We extracted the data of all 442 COXIB patients who received a co-prescription (i.e. simultaneously prescribed at least once in the observation period) of a gastroprotective agent (GPA). COXIB + GPAs patients were compared to a sample of 442 NSAIDs + GPAs patients, matched for age and gender. The two groups were compared in terms of history of claims for GIDs, including GPA prescription, diagnostic procedures, and hospitalizations, occurred in the course of the previous 2 years (1st October 1998–30th September 2000). Reimbursed prices, for drugs, and tariffs paid by NHS, for procedures and hospitalizations, were used to calculate costs. RESULTS: Prior to starting their COX-2 treatment, 84% of COXIB + GPAs patients vs 79% of NSAIDs + GPAs patients had a history of GID with significantly higher (p = .0026, U test) mean costs (€554.9 vs €362.6). All cost items were higher in the former group: hospitalizations (€185.8 vs 76.8), procedures (€52.5 vs 43.2), GPAs (€316.6 vs 242.6). CONCLU-
SIONS: Patients starting a treatment with COXIBs + GPAs are likely to have a previous history of GIDs significantly more severe and costly than patients who continue NSAIDs + GPAs. This constitutes a confounding factor when assessing therapy effectiveness and safety, in particular when evaluating co-prescription rates with GPAs in patients treated with antiinflammatories.
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**OBJECTIVES:** To focus on the Bulgarian market of M01 group for the period 1999–2001; the most consumptive active principles (APs) within M01; to determine the trend in M01 consumption and within. **METHODS:** M01 consumption at national level has been calculated by ATC/DDD methodology and expressed in DDD/1000/day. Data have been collected from: a) the import of wholesalers, b) the local industry sale reports for the domestic market. Comparison has been made with M01 consumption in Norway and Sweden (expressed in DDD/1000/day). **RESULTS:** M01 consumption at national level has been calculated as follows: 1999—14,216; 2000—13,764; and 2001—15,565. The most consumptive APs within M01 were: Diclofenac (D) 1999—8,448; 2000—8,728; and 2001—9,753; Piroxicam (P) 1999—3,380; 2000—2,892; and 2001—2,761; Indometacin (Ind) 1999—1,457; 2000—1,061; and 2001—1,104; Ketoprofen (K) 1999—0,192; 2000—0,439; and 2001—0,699; Tenoxiacam (T) 1999—0,598; 2000—0,172; and 2001—0,699. Ibuprofen (Ib) consumption was: 1999—0,189; 2000—0,030; and 2001—0. The coxib Rofecoxib (R) consumption was registered initially in 2001—0,054. **CONCLUSIONS:** M01 consumption 1999–2001 did not show significant variations. The national demand for M01 is approximately 14 DDD/1000/day. M01 consumption in Norway and Sweden was higher. D as the most consumptive AP at a national level was about 67% of M01 consumption due to 4 locally produced products. Dynamics within the group was: D and K increased slightly; Ind showed relatively steady-state position; P slightly decreased; the trend in T consumption could not be defined distinctly; Ib decreased in consumption; Coxibs were with limited place within M01. In comparison with Bulgaria, M01 consumption model in Norway and Sweden showed some differences.
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**OBJECTIVES:** Osteoporosis, breast cancer and cardiovascular diseases are the main health problems among postmenopausal women. We aimed to compare the cost-effectiveness of raloxifene, alendronate or nasal calcitonin in postmenopausal women, taking into account available evidence for their preventive effect on a hip, vertebral, wrist and ankle fractures, breast cancer, stroke and myocardial infarction risk. **METHODS:** Markov model was constructed to perform CEA and CUA over three years from a health-care payers perspective, based on Polish data on health-care resource utilisation and unit cost. Treatment efficacy and utility were derived from the literature. Target population were patients aged 60–70, without (group I) and with or without (group II) previous vertebral fracture. The outcomes measures were LYG and QALYs gained, calculated on the basis of available evidence for a preventive effect on an osteoporotic fractures, breast cancer and cardiovascular events risk. The cost-effectiveness threshold was calculated on basis of 1-year haemodialysis treatment cost (60000 PLN, 1 USD = 4 PLN). The one-way and two-way sensitivity analysis were performed. **RESULTS:** The highest effectiveness in terms of LYG and QALYs was achieved with alendronate treatment, calcitonin was the least effective and the most costly strategy. Incremental analysis suggests, that raloxifene compared to alendronate was cost-effective; the ICER was 15,975 PLN/LYG and 14,039 PLN/QALY gained in group I, and 20,730 PLN/LYG and 17,915 PLN/QALY gained in group II. Sensitivity analyses demonstrated robustness of the results in all cases calcitonin remained dominated strategy and ICER raloxifene vs alendronian was below cost-effectiveness threshold. **CONCLUSIONS:** Given the results of the analysis, in osteoporotic postmenopausal women calcitonin is less effective and more costly than alendronate and raloxifene. Raloxifene can be considered as cost-effective when compared with alendronate and within the Polish context offers substantial benefit at reasonable cost.
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