structures vary by IOP threshold values. Day-time IOP control with PGAs is associated with night-time IOP control whatever the IOP threshold.

PEY2

INTRA-OCULAR PRESSURE CONTROL OF XALACOM ® (FIXED LATANOPROST AND TIMOLOL COMBINATION) AND DUOTRAV ® (FIXED TRAVOPROST AND TIMOLOL COMBINATION) IN DAILY PRACTICE

Lafuma A1, Jeanbat V1, Laurenteau C1, Berdeaux C2
1Cemka-Eval, Bourg-la-Reine, France, 2Alcon France, Rueil-Malmaison, France

OBJECTIVES: To confirm, in everyday practice, results from randomized clinical trials indicating that DuoTrav (a fixed travoprost and timolol combination) controls intra-ocular pressure (IOP) better than Xalacom (a fixed latanoprost and timolol combination), even when measured >24 hours after last instillation.

METHODS: Patients with ocular hypertension or primary open angle glaucoma and treated by one of the above combinations were included in this cross-sectional study. Demographics, medical history and previous treatments were abstracted from medical records. IOP and treatment time were collected during an office visit. Analyses of variance, logistic regressions and propensity scores were used to adjust for confounding factors.

RESULTS: In total, 328 patients were included, 127 treated with DuoTrav and 201 with Xalacom. The mean age was 64.6 years and 51.5% were female. Most (273: 84.6%) had last instilled treatment the previous day. Treatment groups were comparable except that Xalacom-treated patients had longer disease and treatment durations. Overall mean IOPs were 24.9 mmHg at diagnosis and 21.1 mmHg upon starting the fixed combination treatment. There was no significant difference between the groups as they started their second line therapy. DuoTrav-treated patients experienced better IOP control (17.1 versus 19.1 mmHg; p < 0.001). A difference was also noted for patients who missed their last scheduled treatment (17.2 versus 20.1 mmHg; p < 0.006). Better IOP control with DuoTrav was further supported by patients whose last instillation was 9.00–12.00 hours before IOP measurement (16.5 versus 19.3 mmHg; p < 0.001). According to the practitioners, 83.1% of the DuoTrav-treated patients attained their IOP targets, as compared to 51.3% of Xalacom-treated patients (p < 0.001). All these differences persisted after adjustment for confounding factors. CONCLUSION: This everyday practice study paralleled the published corresponding prostaflagin results of Topouzis and Dubiner, i.e. compared to Xalacom, IOP control with DuoTrav is better and has a longer residual effect when measured >24 hours later.

EYE—Cost Studies

RANIBIZUMAB (LUCENTIS®) IS A COST-EFFECTIVE TREATMENT OF AGE-RELATED MACULA DEGENERATION (AMD) IN THE GERMAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Neubauer A3, Back E4, Ruehm T5, Thomas VS5
3Eye-Hospital of the Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany, 4Novartis Pharma GmbH, Nuremberg, Germany, 5Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland

OBJECTIVES: The rationale for this study was to provide data for the German health care system in order to investigate the assumption that ranibizumab is a cost-effective option for the treatment of neovascular AMD. METHODS: We modeled cost-effectiveness for ranibizumab-treatment of the patient’s “better” eye based on the development of visual acuity in our phase III studies (ANCHOR/MARINA) compared to a control group who received best supportive care (e.g. visual aids, regular check-ups). In the base-case, we computed 6 treatments per year for 2 years and used the same patient entry age (77 years) and distribution of visual acuity of the model population as in our phase III studies. Utility values came from a study by Brazier et al. Costs and benefits were discounted annually at 5%. Costs of drugs and treatment procedures were determined based on German pharmacy retail prices, the German code book for physicians’ fees (EBM 2000plus) and German DRGs. We conducted a sensitivity analysis in order to test the stability of our model assumptions. Variations of the base-case scenario included e.g. patient age: 50–85 years, visual acuity at start of therapy: bwt. > 4.0 and 0.05–0.1 or duration of therapy: 1–3 years. RESULTS: The base-case scenario yielded the following costs per QALY: 16,882 € for predominantly classic lesions, 24,766 € for minimally classic or occult neovascularization (CNV) and 26,170 € for occult CNV. When weighing the costs per QALY according to the distribution of these lesion type (18%–25%–57%), the mean costs per QALY for the therapy of wet AMD with ranibizumab amount to 24,147 €. The treatment was cost-effective even under adverse conditions, e.g. longer treatment duration, high visual acuity at start of treatment, high patient age, increased costs per injection. CONCLUSION: Therapy of neovascular AMD with ranibizumab is cost-effective for all angiographic subtypes assuming a realistic variation of model parameters.

PEY4

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF FIXED COMBINATION THERAPIES GANFORT, DUOTRAV AND XALACOM IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Hommer AB1, Friis M2, Wickstrom J2, Poulsen PB2, Walt JG3, Buchholz P4
1Krankenhaus Hera Vienna, Vienna, Austria, 2MUSSMANN Research & Consulting AS, Kolding, Denmark, 3Allergan Inc, Irvine, CA, USA, 4Allergan Europe, Ettlingen, Germany

OBJECTIVES: Ganfort is a fixed combination product containing bimatoprost 0.03% and timolol 0.5% indicated for lowering IOP of patients with glaucoma or ocular hypertension. Other fixed combination products such as Xalacom (latanoprost 0.005% and timolol 0.5%) and Duotrav (travoprost 0.004% and timolol 0.5%) are also available on the market. All products have the advantage of being more convenient for the patient due to once-daily administration. Since no head to head studies compare the three combination products, an indirect comparison is used based on available clinical data. The purpose was to investigate the cost-effectiveness of the three fixed combination therapies in eight European countries. METHODS: A systematic literature search was conducted in order to identify randomized clinical trials of Duotrav and Xalacom. Studies were selected which had reduction in IOP as primary endpoint and which were comparable with data from randomized controlled trials of Ganfort with respect to study design, diagnosis and population. So that an indirect comparison could be conducted. A decision analytic cost-effectiveness model was constructed. The cost evaluated was cost of medication and clinical visits to an ophthalmologist. All drug costs are market prices inclusive of VAT and visit costs are priced using official tariffs. Patients discontinuing treatment due to adverse events were assumed to change therapy and had an extra clinical visit. RESULTS: The cost-effectiveness analysis showed that the cost per percentage reduction in IOP was least costly for Ganfort. By using Ganfort therapy, savings per percentage reduction in IOP ranged from €0.06 to €0.22 compared to Duotrav and €0.02 to €0.36 compared to Xalacom. CONCLUSION: This analysis concludes that
Ganfort is more cost effective than Duotrat and Xalacom in UK, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, France, Italy and Spain. Thus, the cost per percentage reduction in IOP is lower for Ganfort compared to Duotrat and Xalacom.

**PEY6**

**COST- EFFECTIVENESS OF FIRST EYE CATARACT SURGERY IN ELDERLY WOMEN: A RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL**

Sach TH1, Foss AJ2, Gregson RM2, Zaman A3, Osborn P4, Masud T5, Harwood RH2

1University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK, 2Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK

**OBJECTIVES:** Whilst the sight-restoring effects of surgery in patients with severe bilateral cataract are obvious, there has been a significant trend over the last two decades of performing cataract surgery at an increasingly earlier stage with a rising proportion having 6/12 vision or better at the time of listing. In these circumstances, the cost-effectiveness of surgery is open to question. Therefore, this study evaluated the cost-effectiveness of first-eye cataract surgery compared to no surgery from a Health Service and Personal Social Services perspective. **METHODS:** An economic evaluation was undertaken alongside a randomised controlled trial of first-eye cataract surgery in secondary care ophthalmology clinics. A total of 306 women over 70 years old with bilateral cataracts were randomised to cataract surgery (expedited, approximately 4 weeks) or control (routine, 12 months wait). Seventy-five percent of participants had baseline acuity of 6/12 or better. Health and social service contacts were collected at individual patient level from diaries ascertained at 3 and 9 months via telephone interviews, and at 6 and 12 months via face-to-face interviews. Outcomes included falls and Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALYs). **RESULTS:** The mean difference in cost between the operated and control group was £204 (bootstrapped 95% CI £1,363 to £2,833, p < 0.001) over one year (UK £2004). However, those in the operated group experienced, on average, 0.456 fewer falls, representing an incremental cost per fall prevented of £4,390. The bootstrapped mean gain in QALYs per patient was 0.056 (95% CI 0.006 to 0.108, p < 0.001). The incremental cost utility ratio was £35,704, above the currently accepted UK threshold level of willingness to pay per QALY of £30,000. However, in a model of the costs and benefits over patients’ expected lifetime, the incremental cost per QALY was £13,172, under conservative assumptions. **CONCLUSION:** First-eye cataract surgery, whilst cost-ineffective over the trial period, appeared cost-effective over participants’ remaining lifetime.

**PEY7**

**COST OF CATARACT SURGERY AFTER IMPLANTATION OF THREE INTRAOCULAR LENSES WITH SQUARE EDGES**

Smith AP1, Lafuma A2, Jeanbat V3, Boureau C4, Dubois V5

1Alcon Laboratories Ltd, Hemel Hempstead, Herts, UK, 2Cemka-Eval, Bourg-la-Reine, France, 3Ophthalmologist, Paris, France, 4Laboratoire Alcon, Rueil Malmaison, France

**OBJECTIVES:** To compare the lifetime costs of complications due to posterior capsule opacification after cataract surgery in three types of IOLs, namely two hydrophobic lenses SA60AT, AR40E and one hydrophilic lens the XL-Stabi. **METHODS:** Costs were estimated from the results of a retrospective study of patients who underwent cataract surgery in 2001 and 2002 as well as from data in the literature. Data were analysed after a minimum of 3 years post-surgery using Kaplan-Meier survival curve analysis with the end event being time to Nd:Yag laser capsulotomy. Costs were calculated using two methods of extrapolation. The economic perspective was that of the French Sickness Fund. **RESULTS:** After 3 years of follow-up, the percentage of patients who had undergone Nd:Yag laser capsulotomy was 12.0% with the SA60AT, 25.2% with the AR40E and 51.0% with the XL-Stabi lenses (P < 0.001). The total cost of capsulotomy and management of complications per patient lifetime was estimated to be 142.6 Euros for SA60AT, 273.4 Euros for AR40E and 347.1 Euros for XL-Stabi using the first method of extrapolation, while using the second method of extrapolation, the costs were 242.8, 317.6 and 347.2 Euros, respectively. **CONCLUSION:** Lower costs for cataract surgery and management of related complications were observed with the SA60AT and AR40E IOL’s with the lowest overall costs being observed in the SA60AT lens.