Katarzyna Smilowska PhD^{1,2}

Tomasz Pietrzykowski PhD³

Alexander Calvano^{4,5}

K Ray Chaudhuri DSc^{4,5}

Daniel J van Wamelen PhD^{2,4,5}

¹ Silesian Center of Neurology, Katowice, Poland

² Radboud University Medical Center; Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour; Department of Neurology; Centre of Expertise for Parkinson & Movement Disorders; Nijmegen, the Netherlands

³ Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland

⁴ Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience; Department of Basic & Clinical Neuroscience, Division of Neuroscience; King's College London; London, United Kingdom

⁵ Parkinson Foundation Centre of Excellence at King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust; and Kings College London, United Kingdom

Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for Parkinson's disease patients comparing advanced therapies to best medical treatment

Introduction

The advanced stage of Parkinson's disease (PD) manifests with progressively increasing disabilities. These usually present as fluctuations between akinetic periods (off phenomenon) and mobile periods (on phenomenon) with or without dyskinesia. At this stage of the disease, treatment aims should shift from oral medication to more continuous dopaminergic stimulation in the form of device-aided therapies, not in the least as these therapies also have a positive effect on many nonmotor symptoms, and thus improve quality of life for PD patients. Currently available device-aided therapies are Deep brain stimulation (DBS), intrajejunal Levodopa-carbidopa infusion (IJLI) and continuous subcutaneous apomorphine infusion (CSAI). Here, we aimed to perform a systematic review of the available literature on economic analyses of device-aided therapies in patients with PD in order to assess the cost-effectiveness of these therapies.

References used in the current review were identified by performing a systematic search in the PubMed and Web of Science databases in accordance with the PRISMA statement [1]. The search query was based on the PICO strategy and included Parkinson's disease representing 1) Population: Parkinson's disease 2) Intervention: CSAI, IJLI, or DBS; 3) Context/setting: all countries; and 4) Outcomes: cost-effectiveness (of device-aided therapies). As universal guidelines on what is considered cost-effective are lacking, and marked differences in reimbursement policies exist between countries, we decide to use the gross domestic threshold (GDP) as a threshold for costineffectiveness [2]. The GDP of each country in the year in which a study was performed was used to determine whether the device-aided therapy studied was cost-effective (defined by a cost beneath the GDP of the respective country). Information on GDP was downloaded from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (www.oecd.org)

Methods

DBS	Country	Cost of Intervention	QALYs intervention	Comparator	Cost of Comparator	QALYs Comparator	Temporal Horizon	Discount Rate	ICER	Difference in QALY	Incremental Cost	GDP/capita threshold
Study												
Tomaszewski and Holloway, [2001]	United States	\$452,000 (€502,222)	7.8	BMT	\$417,000 (€463,333)	7.08	Lifetime	3%	\$49,194 (€54,660)	0.72	\$35,000 (€38,889)	\$37,100
Gerzeli et al. [2002]	Italy	€20,033	NA	BMT	€8,976	NA	1y	NA	NS	NA	€11,057	\$28.716
Meissner et al. [2005]	Germany	€28,305	NA	BMT	€15,991	NA	2 y	5%	NS	NA	€12,314	\$32,237
Valldeoriola et al.[2007]	Spain	€27,614	0.7611	BMT	€20,013	0.5401	1 y	NA	€34,389	0.221	€7,601	\$32,429
Dams et al. [2013]	Germany	€133,174	11.62	BMT	€126,180	10.58	Lifetime	3%	€6,677	1.05	€6,994	\$44,994
Valldeoriola et	Spain	€103,730	NA	IJLI	€247,918	NA	5 y	NS	NS	NA	€-144,188	N/A
al.[2013]				CSAI	€160,150	NA				NA	€-56,420	N/A
Eggington et al.	United	£68,970	2.21	BMT	£48,243	1.21	5 y	3.5%	£20,678	1,002	£20,727	\$41,269
[2014]	Kingdom	(€101,426)			(€70,946)				(€30,409)		(€30,481)	
Zhu et al. [2014]	China	\$398,110	0.855	BMT	\$107,258	0.5	2 y	3%	\$24,868	0.355	\$1,347	\$13,459
		(€299,331)			(€80,645)				(€18,698)		(€1,013)	
Walter & Odin et	UK	£87,730	2.75	BMT	£76,793	2.62	3 years	3.5%	NS	0.13	£10,937	\$42,522
al. [2015]		(€120,178)			(€105,196)						(€14,982)	
	Germany	€105,737	2.85	BMT	€90,012	2.73	3 years	3%	NS	0.12	€15,725	\$47,684
Pietzsch et al.	USA	\$130,510	3.19	BMT	\$91,026	1.50	10y	3%	\$23,404	1.69	\$19,571	\$57,884
[2016]		(€117,577)			(€82,005)				(€21,085)		(€17,632)	
Fundament et al.	UK	£73,077	6.69	BMT	£46,278	5.35	15y	3,5%	£19,887	1.34	£26,799	\$44,138
[2016]		(€89,118)			(€56,437)				(€24,252)		(€32,682)	
Kawamoto et al.	Japan	\$144,600	NS	BMT	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	6.7	\$25,600	\$39,990
[2016]		(€130,270)									(€23,063)	
Dams et al. [2016]	Germany	€151,800	13.84	BMT	€115,400	12.25	Lifetime	3%	€22,710	1.59	€36,400	\$50,564
Vivancos-	Spain	€89,477	2.80	IJLI	€234,643	3.12	5 years	3.5%	NS	-0.32	-€145,166	N/A
Matellano et al. [2016]				CSAI	€110,348	2.89			€245,541	-0.09	-€20,817	N/A
McIntosh et al.	UK	£19,069	0.0286	BMT	£9,813	0.0088	1 year	3.5%	£468,528	0.02	£9,256	\$44,138
[2016]		(€23,255)			(€11,967)				(€571,376)		(€11,288)	
		£113,075	4.66	BMT	£71,146	4,06	10 years	3.5%	£70,537	0.60	£41,929	\$44,138
		(€137,896)			(€86,763)				(€86,021)		(€51,133)	

CSAI	Country	Cost of Intervention	QALYs intervention	Comparator	Cost of Comparator	QALYs Comparator	Temporal Horizon	Discount Rate	Difference in QALY	Incremental Cost	ICER per QALY	GDP/capita threshold
Study												
Kristiansen et al. [2009]	Sweden	SEK 562,000	1.48	BMT	SEK 172,000	1.42	2 years	3%	0.06	SEK 390,000	SEK 6,100,000 (€665,213)	\$40,187
Lowin et al. [2011]	UK	£201,192	1.88	BMT	£161,548	0.78	Lifetime	NS	1.10	£39,644	£36,024 (€41,407)	\$37,146
Kamusheva et al. [2013]	Bulgaria	BGN 5,655.91	57.42 (UPDRS)	BMT	BGN 143.49	22.67 (UPDRS)	NS	NS	34.75 (UPDRS)	BGN 1903.56	BGN 158.63 (€81.45) per point UPDRS	\$16,582
Lundqvist et al. [2014]	Norway	NOK 890,920	0.68	BMT	NOK 419,160	0.63	1 year	NS	0.05	NOK 471,760	NOK 9,200,000 (€1,180,000)	\$65,986
Walter & Odin [2015]	UK	£130,011	3.06	BMT	£76,793	2.62	3 years	3.5%	0.44	£53,218	£120,950 (€165,685)	\$42,522
	Germany	€175,004	3.18	BMT	€90,012	2.73	3 years	3%	0.45	€84,989	€188,864	\$47,684
Vivancos-	Spain	€234.643	3.12	CSAI	€110,348	2.89	5 years	3.5%	0.23	€124,295	€75,206	\$37,310
Matellano et al. [2016]				DBS	€89,477	2.80			0.32	€146,166		\$37,310
Lowin et al. [2017]	UK	€537,687	4.37	BMT	€514,037	3.49	Lifetime	NS	0.88	€23,650	€26,944	\$45,998
Kalabina et al. [2019]	UK	£433,154	4.56	BMT	£367,653	3.30	20 years	NS	1.26	£65,501	£52,110 (€59,216)	\$48,092

IJLI	Country	Cost of Intervention	QALYs intervention	Comparator	Cost of Comparator	QALYs Comparator	Temporal Horizon	Discount Rate	Difference in QALY	Incremental Cost	ICER per QALY	GDP/capita threshold
Study												
Walter & Odin [2015]	UK	£78,251	2.85	BMT	£76,793	2.62	3 years	3.5%	0.23	£1,458	£6,440 (€8,822)	\$42,522
	Germany	€104,500	2.92	BMT	€90,012	2.73	3 years	3%	0.19	€14,488	€74,696	\$47,684
Vivancos-	Spain	€110,348	2.89	IJLI	€234,643	3.12	5 years	3.5%	-0.23	-€124,295	€38,249	\$37,310
Matellano et al. [2016]				DBS	€89,477	2.80			0.09	€20,871		\$37,310

Results

Discussion & Conclusion

As evidenced in the tables nearly all studies with a temporal horizon of five years or over show that the ICER for the three device-aided was less than the GDP for the countries where the respective studies were conducted. As such, all three device-aided therapies for PD can be considered cost-effective. The cost-effectiveness for DBS appears to be better than for the infusion therapies, but differences in PD populations and more stringent selection criteria for DBS should be acknowledged and studies directly comparing these three device-aided therapies are limited.

Whether or not therapies are deemed cost-effective often depends on health authority regulations in individual countries. In the UK, where many of the included studies in this review were performed, the National institute for Health and Care excellence will often only appraise new medication if the ICER is less than £20,000-£30,000/QALY. However, this situation is not uniform and the 'willingness to pay' per QALY differs vastly across countries [3]. Although fixed criteria to assess whether an intervention is cost-effective are lacking and differ from country to country, some studies, e.g. by Laupacis et al., proposed that treatment ought to be considered cost-effective if the costs were below €50,000/QALY [49]. However, the benchmark recommended by WHO and deployed in this review, uses rather GDP-ICER comparison as the basic measure of therapy's cost-effectiveness.[2].

References

1. Liberati A et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J Clin Epidemiol 2009; 62: e1-34. 2. Kamusheva MS et al. Intestinal gel Levodopa+ Carbidopa in Parkinson's patients with frequent and prolonged akinesia-an economic evaluation. Int J Pharm Sci Rev Res 2013; 22: 244-246.

3. Cameron D et al. On what basis are medical costeffectiveness thresholds set? Clashing opinions and an absence of data: a systematic review. Global health action 2018; 11: 1447828.

Acknowlegdements

KS was supported by the CoCoCare programme of the European Academy of Neurology