

spondylitis (AS). **METHODS:** Infliximab and etanercept significantly improve signs and symptoms of AS. We analyzed their cost-efficacy based on incremental benefit versus placebo in their respective AS pivotal trials. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were similar for both trials except for permitted concomitant medications. The base model estimates cost efficacy for maintenance therapy, compared to placebo. Costs were estimated based on average dose for a patient receiving maintenance therapy over a 1-year period. The average number of infliximab vials per dose (4) and total doses/year per patient (8) were obtained from ASSERT trial data. Etanercept was assumed to be administered at 25 mg/dose twice weekly. The ASAS 20, ASAS partial remission, DCART 20 response rates, and percent improvement in BASFI at week 24 were used as efficacy measures. **RESULTS:** In the infliximab trial, 201 patients received infliximab (5 mg/kg) and 78 patients received placebo. In the etanercept trial, 138 patients were treated with etanercept 25 mg twice weekly and 139 received placebo. The cost per responder for infliximab as measured by ASAS 20, ASAS partial response, and DCART 20 was \$44,790, \$89,156, and \$54,057, respectively. The corresponding costs per responder for etanercept were \$43,271, \$116,500, and \$58,250. The mean percent improvement in BASFI in the infliximab and placebo arms were 38.5% and 0.1% respectively, leading to a cost per percent BASFI improvement of \$490. The corresponding numbers for etanercept were 30% and 2%, leading to a cost per percent BASFI improvement of \$541. **CONCLUSIONS:** The cost-efficacy ratios of infliximab and etanercept maintenance therapies compared to placebo were similar. The cost-effectiveness in clinical practice will depend on the actual dose and effectiveness achieved. Incremental cost-effective comparisons cannot be reliably estimated without a head-to-head trial.

#### PAR12

##### HOW ADEQUATE DO RA-PATIENTS REPORT INDIRECT COSTS?—THE EXAMPLE OF A GERMAN COHORT

Mittendorf T<sup>1</sup>, Merkesdal S<sup>2</sup>, Greiner W<sup>1</sup>, Ruof J<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Hannover, Hannover, Germany; <sup>2</sup>Medical School of Hannover, Hannover, Germany

**OBJECTIVES:** To render information on the accuracy of patient-reported indirect cost data. By comparing questionnaire-derived data to payer-derived data on a patient-by-patient basis disease related productivity losses in rheumatoid arthritis (RA) are being validated. **METHODS:** The assessment of indirect cost data was part of a clinical multicenter randomized RA-trial in Germany. For 234 RA-patients at working age (1987 ACR criteria, membership in the regional statutory health insurance plan, mean age 53 (±9) years, mean disease duration 8 (±7) years, 76% females) every three months corresponding indirect cost data were derived from (i) a health economic questionnaire for cost assessment in patients with RA and (ii) the payer's database (insurance and physicians' association) over a period of 18 months. Comparative statistical analyses were performed between patient reported and insurance claims data. **RESULTS:** The mean annual productivity losses due to sick leave amounted to 14 and 17 days per patient (questionnaire versus payer data), productivity losses due to work disability to 3 days (both); monetary valuation renders overall costs of 1240€ and 1590€, respectively. The difference of 17% in overall productivity losses is not significant. Comparison of productivity losses reveals a strong correlation of  $r = 0.83$  in those due to sick leave and of  $kappa = 0.84$  in those due to work disability between questionnaire and payer data. **CONCLUSIONS:** The comparison of questionnaire and payer data shows that RA-patients report their productivity losses adequately. Indirect cost assessment should therefore be included in

further RA-trials and observational studies, even if payer-derived data is not available.

#### PAR13

##### COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF VALDECOXIB COMPARED TO DICLOFENAC IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS (RA) IN THE UK (UK) AND GERMANY

Alten RH<sup>1</sup>, von Scheele B<sup>2</sup>, Gaffney L<sup>3</sup>, Maciver F<sup>3</sup>, Niculescu L<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Schlossparkklinik, Berlin, Germany; <sup>2</sup>RTI Health Solutions, Södra Sandby, Sweden; <sup>3</sup>RTI Health Solutions, Manchester, UK; <sup>4</sup>Pfizer Inc, New York, NY, USA

**OBJECTIVE:** To compare the cost-effectiveness of valdecoxib 20 mg once daily (qd) and diclofenac 75 mg slow release (SR) twice daily (bid) in the treatment of RA based on prospectively collected data of Health Care resource utilization in a randomized controlled trial (RCT, study 062) over 6 months. The cost-effectiveness evaluations were calculated for the UK from a National Health Service payer perspective, and for Germany from a Sickness funds payer perspective. **METHODS:** Study 062 compared efficacy and safety of valdecoxib 20 mg qd ( $n = 246$ ) with diclofenac 75 mg SR bid ( $n = 237$ ) in adult patients with RA. The cost-effectiveness of valdecoxib and diclofenac was compared using country-specific unit costs for resource use (hospital days, medications, unscheduled procedures and health care visits) in the UK and Germany. The cost-effectiveness ratios were calculated for cost/averted gastroduodenal (GD) ulcer, cost/averted withdrawal due to treatment failure and/or adverse event, cost/averted gastrointestinal (GI) serious adverse event (SAE), and cost/averted ulcer with GI SAE. **RESULTS:** The study showed comparable efficacy and a superior safety profile for valdecoxib, resulting in fewer GI adverse events and hospital days. The cost/averted GD ulcer in the UK was -£1104 and 386€ in Germany. The cost/averted withdrawal due to treatment failure and/or adverse event was -£1580 in the UK and 553€ in Germany. The cost/averted GI SAE was -£2709 in the UK and 947€ in Germany, and the cost/averted ulcer with GI SAE was -£3522 in the UK and 1436€ in Germany. **CONCLUSIONS:** The superior safety profile of valdecoxib compared with diclofenac translates into lower total health care costs for patients treated with valdecoxib, and overall cost effectiveness in both countries.

#### PAR14

##### COSTS OF RA IN GERMANY ON A MICRO-COSTING LEVEL

Mittendorf T<sup>1</sup>, Ruof J<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Hannover, Hannover, Germany; <sup>2</sup>Medical School of Hannover, Hannover, Germany

**OBJECTIVES:** To develop a systematic set of German cost data in RA based solely on valid health care payer's cost data sources on a patient—per—patient micro-costing level. **METHODS:** Retrospectively one-year cost data of 338 RA patients were generated and analyzed. The cost data were derived from a major statutory health insurance plan ("Allgemeine Ortskrankenkasse Niedersachsen") and the regional physicians' association ("Kassenärztliche Vereinigung Niedersachsen"). A matrix of cost domains in RA was applied to structure the analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. **RESULTS:** The total direct costs for the 338 patients during the one year period (3rd quarter 2000—2nd quarter 2001) were 3815€ per patient-year. RA-related direct costs were 2312€ per patient-year. Outpatient costs accounted for 73.7%, inpatient costs for 24.0%, and other disease-related costs for 2.3% of RA-related direct costs. Outpatients costs drivers were: RA-related medication (1019€ per patient-year), physician visits (323€ per patient-year), diagnostic and therapeutic procedures and tests (185€ per patient-year), and devices and aids (168€ per patient-year). Ninety-eight patients