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BACKGROUND: Established methods exist for evaluating the effects of uncertainty around model structure and parameters on the results generated by threshold CEA. However, there are critical aspects of cost-effectiveness analyses (CEAs) and include one-way and probabilistic sensitivity analyses (SAs). In contrast to the primary outcome of a traditional CEA—the ICER—the primary outcomes of a threshold CEA conducted for a product early in development include (1) the value-based price opportunity given a hypothetical or target product profile and (2) the magnitude of effect required to justify a target price. Because the outputs of a threshold model pertain to a new drug or indication where little or no data have been collected, and because the outputs are multiple, representing the set of product attributes, including price, that will define drug value, there is a need to explore the sensitivity of the results to factors that go beyond uncertainty. In analyses that generate potential value-based price or product attribute levels, new methods and applications of SA are required.

METHODS: We present example one-way and probabilistic SAs, highlighting problems in interpretation that arise when traditional sensitivity analyses are applied to threshold models. We propose alternative SA methods and analyses and present interpretations of results. A Pricing Contribution Diagram is presented as a means of characterizing the extent to which each product attribute (efficacy, safety, tolerability, quality of life, position in care pathway) influences the value-based price opportunity. Probabilistic SAs are presented to examine the relationship between price (value-based and target) and individual product attributes, and the influence of uncertainty in other model inputs.

CONCLUSIONS: Traditional methods of conducting SA are insufficient when applied to the threshold application of CEA. Instead, SAs specific to threshold models supporting decisions regarding early stage development should be employed.
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Lacey L

1University of Milano—Bicocca, Monza (MI), Monza, Italy; 2University of Milan, Milano, Italy;

OBJECTIVES: To compare two statistical approaches for analyzing longitudinal data with missing observations: 1) imputation using Last Observation Carried Forward method (LOCF) and 2) Mixed-effects Model Repeated Measures method (MMRM) to analyze the change from baseline in health-related quality of life (HRQoL) by medication adherence level. METHODS: HRQoL via SF-12 Health Survey and medication adherence via a 5-level categorical response was measured monthly for one-year for patients who had completed at least 6 measurements during 1-year of compliance. Patients who had completed at least 6 measurements during 1-year of compliance were excluded. LOCF used the last available change from baseline to impute the missing values for early drop-out. MMRM is a likelihood-based approach which models all actual observations jointly, with no attempt at imputation. RESULTS: Of 558 patients included in this analysis, the 12-month change from baseline in PCS-12 comparing patients with GT90 compliance vs. LT90 compliance using MMRM was 0.86 (p = 0.277) and using LOCF was 1.30 (p = 0.339). For MCSI-12, the improvement among patients with GT90 compliance over LT90 compliance using MMRM was 2.04, while the corresponding improvement using LOCF was 0.87. CONCLUSIONS: MMRM and LOCF yielded not only different results but also different statistical significance in the 12-month change from baseline in MCSI-12. Since the approach to estimate and model is different between two methods, the patterns and shape of data must be investigated to find the right method to produce valid estimates.
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OBJECTIVES: It is generally agreed that calculation of means after non-linear data transformations (e.g., log-transformation) does not result in a comparison of arithmetic means, and so is not appropriate for cost data in pharmacoeconomic evaluations. This would seem to preclude the use of log-normal distributions for cost data in probabilistic sensitivity analysis. The study objective was to use the objectives to investigate the statistical properties of arithmetic mean costs derived from an underlying log-normal distribution, log (X) ~ N(μ, σ²), where μ = log(100), σ = 1.5 (range 0.5 to 2.5). An underlying log-normal distribution was used because cost data are typically highly positively skewed. Microsoft Excel was used to perform the Monte Carlo simulations generating 1,000 arithmetic means, each from a sample of N = 100, for each value of s investigated. RESULTS: The distribution of arithmetic means increased in positive skewness as increased. For s ≥ 1.5, the distribution of arithmetic means deviated considerably from normality. The level of skewness was greatly reduced by use of the log-normal distribution. The Gamma distribution was similar to the log-normal distribution in representing the distribution of arithmetic mean costs.
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OBJECTIVES: Intention-To-Treat (ITT) analysis is an established method used in randomized experiments. However, analyzing data where crossover occurs (leaving subjects in the control or treatment arms when they have crossed from one group to another) prevents the true comparison of treatment and placebo effects. When subject’s crossover and ITT analysis methods are used, the true effect of the treatment cannot be determined as data from many groups are used with treatment. The purpose of this research is to determine Type I and II error rates computed by simulation results with and without crossover. METHODS: A simulation study was conducted to determine the impact of Type I and II error given six crossover percentages (1, 5, 7, 9, 11%), four effect sizes of treatment based on standard deviation (ES = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6 and 0.8 SD), and four sample sizes (n = 50, 100, 200 and 300). Simulations were conducted using “R” and included 1,000 replications for each sample size, effect size and crossover combination. RESULTS: When ES were small (<0.2SD), Type I error rates were below 1%. When ES were larger, and crossover increased Type I rates increased above 4%. Large samples with high crossover and large ES had the highest Type I rates. Type II error rates, which are perhaps more critical, were higher. For 5% crossover, the Type II error rates were 2.4% and for 11% crossover 5.5%. When the ES are very large statistical significance can be observed regardless of crossover percent, even up to 11%. CONCLUSIONS: When crossover rates are low and ES are small, researchers can abandon ITT analysis methods and analyze samples as they were treated with little risk of additional Type I and II errors occurring. The benefit of “as-treated” analysis is that the true treatment effect can be determined with little risk of error.