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BEST PRACTICES: EVALUATING MODELING RESEARCH AT ISPOR USING BMJ AND ISPOR GUIDELINES

Setyawan J, Patel VD, Nichol MB
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate whether the modeling posters presented at the 2002 ISPOR Seventh Annual International Meeting met the standard of good research practice criteria established by British Medical Journal (BMJ) and ISPOR.

METHODS: Posters presented at the meeting were collected onsite or from the ISPOR website. Of the total 337 posters presented, 133 posters (39%) were evaluated. Of the 133 posters collected, 26 were classified as modeling. Nine (9) modeling posters were excluded because they focused exclusively on the denominator or numerator. The remaining 17 posters were evaluated in 3 major sections: a) study design (7 items for BMJ; 3 for ISPOR); b) data validity (14 items for BMJ; 13 for ISPOR); c) analysis and interpretation (14 items for BMJ; 23 for ISPOR).

RESULTS: More than half of the posters satisfied 75% or more of the ISPOR and BMJ criteria for study design, and only 5 failed to satisfy at least 50% of the study design criteria. Only six posters satisfied 50% or more of the BMJ data validity criteria, and none of the posters satisfied 50% or more of the ISPOR data validity criteria. More than half of the posters satisfied 50% or more of the BMJ and ISPOR criteria for analysis and interpretation. Posters were slightly more likely to satisfy the BMJ, rather than ISPOR criteria for data validity. Overall, the 17 posters met 51% (18/35) of the BMJ criteria and 46% (18/39) of the ISPOR criteria.

CONCLUSIONS: The number of posters reviewed and the number of evaluators limit this study. Reviewed posters revealed satisfactory performance in the study design elements of the ISPOR and BMJ guidelines, but could be improved in data validity and analysis. Generally, the posters performed better when rated using the BMJ rather than the ISPOR guideline.

PMD 12

PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY: A REVIEW OF ITS EMERGING ROLE IN OUTCOMES RESEARCH

Richard L
Heron Evidence Development Ltd, Stevenage, Hertfordshire, United Kingdom

Pharmacoepidemiology is defined as the application of epidemiological reasoning methods and knowledge to the study of the uses and effects (beneficial and adverse) of drugs in human populations. OBJECTIVES: The purpose of this paper is to review the emerging role of pharmacoepidemiology in outcomes research. METHODS: This review has been based on a systematic literature search using Medline (PubMed), including the abstracts of the International Conference of Pharmacoepidemiology since 1990, and a review of core texts recommended by the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE). RESULTS: Three core functions were highlighted by review of the literature. The major role was found to be in the field of pharmacovigilance and its function in phase IV clinical trials or postmarketing surveillance. This was reflected by the predominance of pharmacovigilance abstracts accepted by the ISPE—90% (201/223) of abstracts in 1990 and 72% (222/309) in 2001. Pharmacovigilance, the process of identifying and responding to drug safety issues during phase IV of drug development, is a key requirement of many drug regulatory authorities, including the FDA. Pharmacoepidemiology was also found to play a role in drug utilisation review studies and decision analytic modeling, although its use was found to be less substantial, constituting the balance of the accepted abstracts. CONCLUSION: Although pharmacoepidemiology has mainly been used in the field of pharmacovigilance, its use in decision analysis and drug utilisation review was found to be on the increase.
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OPTIMIZING CLINICAL EFFECTIVENESS THROUGH ACTUARIAL MODELING IN HOSPITALS

Vogenberg FR1, Weinberg R1, Lichtig L1, Liebeskind D1, Larrat EP2

1Aon Consulting, Wellesley, MA, USA; 2University of Rhode Island College of Pharmacy, Kingston, RI, USA

OBJECTIVES: Current data support the use of low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) in lieu of unfractionated
Fukuda T, Tsutani K, Kobayashi Y
University of Tokyo, Bunkyo, Tokyo, Japan

OBJECTIVES: The Japan Economic Evaluation Database (JEED) project aims for critical appraisal of health economic evaluation studies in Japan and build a database with structured abstracts in collaboration with NESSE. With careful preparation in 2001, we performed hand-searching of all the scientific articles and reports in the health economic fields in Japan in 2002. We analyzed current status of economic evaluation studies and methodological issues. METHODS: Since January 2002, we started to hand-search all articles and reports published in Japanese journals. Key words for handsearching were types of economic evaluations such as cost-effectiveness analysis or cost-utility analysis and methodological terms such as utility score, willingness to pay, QOL measurement and costing. We also adopted words for study areas such as health economic evaluations and pharmacoeconomics. We classified the articles into some categories and picked up methodological issues in Japan.

RESULTS: Up to the end of September 2002, we identified 223 articles and reports related to health economic evaluations that appeared in a total of 4881 journals. Most of the articles were general remarks or proceedings. Thirty-four articles out of 233 were classified as original articles, only 6 of which could be identified as full economic evaluations. Nineteen articles were on costing and were on measuring effectiveness or utility. We picked up some issues in economic evaluation studies in Japan. Most of the studies used reimbursement fee though there were some studies for actual costing. Because QOL data for health status were limited in Japanese population, many studies adopted data from foreign countries. There were some articles which did not use terms for economic evaluation studies correctly. CONCLUSIONS: To promote good economic evaluation studies in Japan, systematic critical appraisals and dissemination of information of good studies are needed. We may have to consider methodological guidelines or recommendations for good economic evaluation studies.