Humphreys SC[1], Elbasha EH[2], Ferrante SA[2], Lion M[1], O'Regan C[1]
[1]Merck Sharp & Dohme Ltd., Hoddesdon, UK, [2]Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., Whitehouse Station, NJ, USA

OBJECTIVES: Despite available treatment options, chronic infection of individuals with the hepatitis C virus (HCV), together with associated chronic liver diseases, remains a significant public health burden in England and Wales. Fewer than half of patients with genotype 1 chronic hepatitis C (CHC) achieve sustained virologic response (SVR) following the current standard treatment with peginterferon alfa and ribavirin. The aim of this analysis was to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of boceprevir, a protease inhibitor, in combination with peginterferon alfa and ribavirin, compared to peginterferon alfa and ribavirin alone, among treatment naïve and previously treated patients with genotype 1 CHC in England and Wales. **METHODS:** Specific treatment strategies for boceprevir have been outlined in the UK licence for different patient groups. A Markov model was developed to evaluate these treatment strategies for boceprevir triple-therapy compared to peginterferon alfa and ribavirin alone, and to estimate the expected costs and health-related quality of life benefits associated with them. The incremental cost-effectiveness of including boceprevir in a new triple-therapy standard of care was assessed from the perspective of the National Health Service and Personal Social Services over the lifetime of the patient cohort. Clinical data inputs for each treatment strategy were estimated based on subgroup analyses of the phase III trials for boceprevir. **RESULTS:** The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for treatment-naïve patients was £11,601 when boceprevir triple-therapy was compared to current standard treatment with peginterferon alfa and ribavirin. For treatment-experienced patients, the ICER with boceprevir triple-therapy was £2,909. These results were robust to sensitivity analyses and below a threshold of £20,000. **CONCLUSIONS:** The inclusion of boceprevir as part of a new triple-therapy standard of care for patients with genotype 1 CHC is clinically efficacious and cost-effective, irrespective of whether patients have been previously treated. The use of boceprevir in this setting is recommended by NICE.

PGI19

COSTS AND EFFECTS OF DUAL THERAPY WITH PEGYLATED INTERFERON AND RIBAVIRIN IN PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC HEPATITIS C IN GERMANY

Berg T[1], Buggisch P[2], Mauss S[3], Wedemeyer H[4], Benter U[5], Decker-Burgard S[6]
[1]Universitätsklinikum Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany, [2]I fi-Institut Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany, [3]Center for HIV and Hepatogastroenterology, Duesseldorf, Germany, [4]Medizinische Hochschule Hannover, Hannover, Germany, [5]INC Research LLC, Munich, Germany, [6]Janssen-Cilag GmbH, Neuss, Germany

OBJECTIVES: Dual therapy with ribavirin and peg-interferon over a duration of up to 72 weeks (W) has been the former standard of care in patients with chronic Hepatitis C (HCV) genotype 1 and is still used in some patients. The aim of this analysis is to evaluate the direct HCV-related costs and effects of dual therapy in therapy-naïve and pretreated patients in Germany. **METHODS:** In this retrospective chart review study, dual therapy in patients with chronic HCV genotype 1 in 2008/2009 was evaluated in Germany. Data from patients treated with a combination of ribavirin and peg-interferon were retrospectively documented during the treatment period and thereafter (on average 61 W of post-treatment follow-up). A total of 208 therapy-naïve and 182 pretreated patients from 31 study sites were included in the analysis. **RESULTS:** Mean time since first diagnosis of HCV was 6.0 years and 10.4 years in therapy-naïve and pretreated patients, respectively. 33.0% of pretreated patients were prior non responders, 37.9% were relapsers. The average treatment duration during study was 42 W (SD 22W) both in therapy-naïve and pretreated patients. Sustained virological response (SVR) was demonstrated in 58.1% of therapy naïve and 36.6% of pretreated patients with HCV-RNA measurements available (167 and 142 patients with measurement, respectively). Mean per patient costs related to HCV during therapy from the statutory health insurance perspective were 14,554€ (SD 9,139€) for therapy-naïve and 14,590€ (SD 10,443€) for pretreated patients. Main cost-driver of treatment was medication cost, accounting for 87% of total costs, followed by sick leaves and diagnostics. Hospitalizations and physician visits played a less important role in terms of costs. **CONCLUSIONS:** Especially in pretreated patients, HCV dual therapy is costly due to the low treatment success rate. This emphasizes the need for treatments with improved efficacy, minimizing costly non-response resulting in potential cost savings.

PGI20

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF ADALIMUMAB FOR TREATMENT OF CROHN'S DISEASE IN GERMANY

Yang M[1], Yang M[2], Skup M[2], Zhou ZY[1], Hengst N[3], Wolff M[3], Mulani PM[2], Chao J[2]
[1]Analysis Group, Inc., Boston, MA, USA, [2]Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL, USA, [3]Abbott GmbH & Co. KG, Ludwigshafen, Germany

OBJECTIVES: To assess cost-effectiveness of adalimumab versus standard care (SC) for treating patients with severely active Crohn's disease (CD) in Germany from a societal perspective. Additionally, cost-per-remitter for adalimumab was estimated and compared with infliximab 5mg/kg maintenance therapy. **METHODS:** To compare adalimumab to SC, a 4-disease-state clinical model (ie, remission, moderate, severe, very severe) based on the Crohn's Disease Activity Index (CDAI) was constructed tracking patients over their lifetimes. The model estimated direct costs, indirect costs, and quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) from the German societal perspective. Efficacy inputs for adalimumab were based on actual observations from CHARM (Crohn's Trial of the Fully Human Antibody Adalimumab for Remission Maintenance). Using data from CLASSIC I (Clinical Assessment of Adalimumab Safety and Efficacy Studied as Induction Therapy in Crohn's Disease), a regression model was used to predict efficacy of SC. Direct/indirect costs and utility inputs were derived from public sources and literature. To compare adalimumab to infliximab, cost-per-remitter was estimated by dividing costs by the percentage of patients in remission on a yearly basis. Remission rates of adalimumab and infliximab upon baseline matching adjustment for patients with moderate-to-severe CD came from CHARM and ACCENT I (A Crohn's Disease Clinical Trial Evaluating Infliximab in a New Long-Term Treatment Regimen), respectively. **RESULTS:** The incremental costs per QALY gained for adalimumab versus SC were €37,270 (2012 Euro) over a lifetime horizon in the base case. One-way sensitivity analyses varying key parameters produced incremental costs per QALY gained ranging from €23,011–€51,528 when compared with SC. An average of 47.2% adalimumab-treated and 37.1% infliximab-treated patients were in remission yearly. The corresponding cost-per-remitter was €54,823 for adalimumab and €88,506 for infliximab. **CONCLUSIONS:** Adalimumab appears to be cost-effective compared with SC for treating patients with severely active CD. The cost-per-remitter for maintenance therapy was less for adalimumab than for infliximab.

PGI21

COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMBINATION OF BOCEPREVIR PLUS PEGINTERFERON ALPHA AND RIBAVIRIN VERSUS TELAPREVIR PLUS PEGINTERFERON ALFA AND RIBAVIRIN IN THE RETREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC HEPATITIS C VIRUS GENOTYPE I INFECTION

Fonseca M[1], Garran V[2], Araujo GT[3]
[1]Federal University of São Paulo/Axia.Bio Consulting, São Paulo, Brazil, [2]MSD, São Paulo, Brazil, [3]Axia.Bio Consulting, Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil

OBJECTIVES: In patients with chronic infection with hepatitis C virus (HCV) genotype 1 who did not achieve a sustained response to the standard therapy with peginterferon/ribavirin (PR) the combination of boceprevir (B) or telaprevir (T) plus peginterferon alpha/ribavirin have shown to produce a higher rate of sustained virologic response (SVR) than the retreatment with PR. The aim of this study is to assess the cost effectiveness of these two (BPR and TPR) antiviral regimens. **METHODS:** We developed a Markov model to describe the clinical history of previously treated HCV genotype 1 patients who did not achieve SVR in which one cohort (1) receives PR for 4 weeks followed by BPR for 32 weeks and, those patients with a detectable HCV RNA level at week 8 receive PR for an additional 12 weeks; cohort 2 patients receive 12 weeks TPR followed by 36 weeks PR. All patients are followed for their expected lifetime. The reference patient is 30-year-old with CHC without cirrhosis. The SVRs to BPR and TPR cohorts came from RESPOND 2 and REALIZE studies. Quality of life for each health state was based on literature. Costs for each health state were based on three Delphi panels, one with hepatologists, one with intensivists and another with oncologists. Costs in 2011 Brazilian Reais and benefits were discounted at 3%. **RESULTS:** The combination BPR increases life expectancy by 0.60 years and quality adjusted life years (QALY) by 0.89 years compared to TPR. BPR is cheaper than TPR (-23,428 Brazilian Reais). **CONCLUSIONS:** In Brazil, for the treatment of previously treated patients with HCV genotype 1 infection boceprevir plus peginterferon alpha/ribavirin is dominant compared with telaprevir plus peginterferon alpha/ribavirin.

PGI22

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF DEXLANSOPRAZOLE FOR THE TREATMENT OF EROSIVE ESOPHAGITIS COMPARED TO CONVENTIONAL PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS

Valencia-Romero A[1], Gay-Molina JG[2], Chiu-Ugalde J[3], Figueroa-Rodriguez A[3], López-Alvarenga JC[4], Sánchez-Kobashi R[2], Vargas JA[3]
[1]Hospital de Alta Especialidad PEMEX Sur, Mexico City, Mexico, [2]Tecnología e Informática para la Salud, S.A. de C.V., Mexico City, Mexico, [3]Nycomed: A Takeda Company, Naucalpan, Edo. Mexico, Mexico, [4]Hospital General de México O.D., Mexico City, Mexico

OBJECTIVES: The study compares the cost-effectiveness (CE) of dexlansoprazole with other proton pump inhibitors (PPI) currently included in the Mexico National Formulary (Positive List) for treatment of erosive esophagitis (EE). **METHODS:** A decision tree with the 8-week temporal horizon was designed for patients over 18 with EE confirmed by endoscopy. The perspective taken is that of second-level public health institutions. Treatment alternatives modelled are dexlansoprazole 60 mg/day, esomeprazole 40 mg/day; omeprazole 20 mg/day, pantoprazole 40mg/day, rabeprazole 20 mg/day. Possible outcomes considered were healing or not healing, the latter possibly leading to surgery. Costs included in the model were treatment regimens, consult, endoscopy, surgery (when necessary), and hospitalization days (when necessary) and were taken from official or published sources. Effectiveness was measured in terms of percentage of patients with healed oesophagus. A weighted average of effectiveness was calculated for use in the model. One-way sensitivity analyses of cost and effectiveness variables and a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation of a 1000 cohorts were also conducted to test the robustness of the results. **RESULTS:** Compared to all PPIs modelled/tested, dexlansoprazole was highly dominant, being more effective (0.9270) and less costly (USD$ 1.27 per day), even when compared to omeprazole's USD$ 0.015 per DDD. It was therefore not considered necessary to calculate the Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER) since these would be negative. The sensitivity analyses and Monte Carlosimulations found omeprazole to be the second-best alternative, and actually dominant in 16.7% of the MC simulations. **CONCLUSIONS:** Dexlansoprazole was found to be dominant compared to all PPIs evaluated for EE, being both more effective and less costly for public institutions in Mexico.

PGI23

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF EPISODIC OR MAINTENANCE INFLIXIMAB VERSUS STANDARD TREATMENT IN AN INCIDENCE COHORT OF CROHN'S DISEASE PATIENTS WITH 10-YEARS FOLLOW-UP