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OBJECTIVES: To evaluate the cost-effectiveness of three tobacco cessation pharmacotherapy strategies: varenicline only, nicotine transdermal patch plus nicotine polacrilex gum (NRT), and bupropion plus nicotine transdermal patch. All patients also received multiple individual sessions of cognitive behavioral and motivational intervention, as part of the Tobacco Treatment Program (TTP) for cancer patients at M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. Patients with psychiatric disorders were assessed and treated by the program psychiatrist.

METHODS: A decision-analytical model was developed and populated with retrospective cost and outcomes data from the TTP databases. The model estimated the incremental cost-effectiveness of the three aforementioned strategies for the treatment of tobacco addiction. Costs included direct institutional medication costs, and the direct costs plus institutional overhead for counseling and psychiatric sessions. All costs were adjusted to January 2008 dollars. The model was evaluated for two outcomes of interest: 1) tobacco cessation—defined as seven-day abstinence after 12 weeks of therapy, and 2) tobacco use reduction of at least 50% after 12 weeks. RESULTS: Efficacy and utilization data from 281 patients in the TTP were used to populate the model. The results showed that NRT (patch plus gum) was the least costly strategy for quitting. However, varenicline was more effective, with an incremental cost-effectiveness of $3,778 per quit event. For reducing tobacco use by at least 50%, NRT was most cost-effective, being the least costly and most effective; dominating the other two strategies for that outcome. CONCLUSIONS: In this sample of cancer patients, NRT in the form of the nicotine transdermal patch and gum appears to be a cost-effective option for reducing tobacco use, although varenicline was found to be most effective when only considering quit rates. The results of this study provide preliminary evidence to guide decision making regarding pharmacotherapy options in tobacco cessation programs.
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OBJECTIVES: To model the cost-effectiveness of sunitinib versus sorafenib, temsirolimus and bevacizumab + interferon (IFN) as first-line therapy for mRCC in the Swedish health service setting.

METHODS: An adapted Markov model was created using data collected from clinical trials. Patient-level data and parametric survival curves obtained from a comparative trial of sunitinib versus IFN were extrapolated to 10 years. Indirect comparison of the efficacy of sorafenib, temsirolimus and bevacizumab + IFN versus the IFN arm of clinical trials generated progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) data. First-line therapy determined the choice of second-line therapy and the proportion of patients receiving best supportive care after progression. Resources specific to Sweden included drugs, tests, scans, monitoring, physician visits, hospitalisations and AE management. Outcome measures included life-years (LY), progression-free LY (PFLY), and quality-adjusted LY (QALY) gained. RESULTS: Sunitinib had the greatest projected PFS and OS. Incremental 10-year cost-effectiveness ratios for sunitinib versus sorafenib were Swedish krona (SEK) 120,300/PFLY, SEK177,900/LY and SEK210,200/QALY gained. Sunitinib dominated temsirolimus and bevacizumab + IFN, since both were more costly and less effective. At a threshold for societal willingness to pay of SEK500,000/QALY gained, sunitinib has the highest probability of being the most cost-effective therapy. In this model, key drivers were hazard ratios for PFS and OS, drug costs and the percentage of patients with second-line therapy. The update on PFS and OS for sunitinib and IFN presented at the ASCO 2008 meeting is in line with predicted values in the model and hence confirms the robustness of the results. CONCLUSIONS: In the Swedish health service setting, sunitinib is a cost-effective option for first-line mRCC therapy compared with sorafenib, temsirolimus and bevacizumab + IFN. Sunitinib had the highest probability of being the most cost-effective treatment at a SEK500,000/QALY threshold for societal willingness to pay for clinical benefit.