## Pharmacoeconomics Workshop 2022-2023

A Workshop is a class exercise based on group work. Students will be given a number of tasks alongside some reading materials. You will be asked to work through them with your group and this would be followed by feedback and class discussion.

There will be no marks assigned to your work, however this would be highly advised to help you master the skills required for the midterm and final exams.

You will be allowed to use the lecture notes, text books or your own notes

## Learning outcomes

By the end of the workshop you will be able to:

- Understand how economic evaluations can inform decision making in health care and policy


## Process

- Workshop introduction (5 minutes)
- In groups of 3-4 students; start to work through the worksheet of this workshop papers (40 minutes)
- During the workshop Dr R. Mousa will be available to advice and facilitate group discussions, please raise your hand and she will call up to your group.
- Final group discussion (all the class) (10 minutes)


## Exercise 1: Discounting

Part 1: The following table presents the costs of two TNF inhibitors proposed to your formulary

| Year | TNF A | TNF B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year 1 | 300 JDs | 550 JDs |
| Year 2 | 100 JDs | 50 JDs |
| Year 3 | 260 JDs | 50 JDs |
| Total | 660 JDs | 650 JDs |


| At year 1, which of these would |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| look more attractive to you ( less |  |
| costly) for the same indication |  |
| At the end of the program (total), |  |
| which of these would look more |  |
| attractive to you (less costly), |  |
| Why? |  |

Part 2: we should talk a little bit about the number above, the initial costs during year 1 for both TNFs related to drug acquisition costs and the costs of IV line required for administration. TNF A is given over a 1 hour infusion rate but TNF B given over 15 min only. The dose should be repeated yearly for three years.

In the table below discount the costs to the present values; use PV (present value) $=$ future costs $(1+r)^{n}$.

| Year | TNF A | PV at 5\% | TNF B | PV at 5\% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year 1 | 300 JDs | e.g. 300/ <br> $(1+.05)^{1}$ | 550 JDs |  |
| Year 2 | 100 JDs |  | 50 JDs |  |
| Year 3 | 260 JDs |  | 50 JDs |  |
| Total | 660 JDs |  | 650 JDs |  |


| At the end of the programme, which |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| of these would look more attractive |  |
| to you (less costly), use discounted |  |
| value? |  |
| Comment on how discounting <br> might/might not change conclusion <br> on costs over time? |  |

## Exercise 2: Sensitivity analysis

Now we will be performing a sensitivity analysis, challenging whether the conclusion will be changing with the change of the probability of having an adverse event when taking TNF A was $10 \%$ and for TNF B was $15 \%$.

The range of probability to experience adverse effect is $7 \%-15 \%$ for TNF A and TNF B 10-25\%

Have a careful look on the table below:

| Variable | Range <br> L=Low Estimate <br> H=High Estimate | TNF A <br> Overall Costs (\$) | TNF B <br> Overall Costs (\$) | $\triangle$ Overall Costs: $A-B(\$)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base case |  | 700 | 650 | +50 |
| Cost of treating adverse events | $L=\$ 500$ | 650 | 575 | +75 |
|  | $H=\$ 2,500$ | 850 | 875 | -25 |
| Cost per course of therapy for antibiotic A | $l=\$ 400$ | 500 | 650 | -150 |
|  | H = \$800 | 900 | 650 | +250 |
| Cost per course of therapy for antibiotic B | $L=\$ 350$ | 700 | 500 | +200 |
|  | $H=\$ 750$ | 700 | 900 | -200 |
| Probability of adverse events for antibiotic A | $l=7 \%$ | 670 | 650 | +20 |
|  | $H=15 \%$ | 750 | 650 | $+100$ |
| Probability of adverse events for antibiotic B | $L=10 \%$ | 700 | 600 | +100 |
|  | $\mathrm{H}=25 \%$ | 700 | 750 | -50 |

Comments on the following statements:

- For the entire range ( $7-15 \%$ ) the cost of TNF A was higher, so the results are insensitive to the range of $\%$ of adverse effects.
- The total cost of TNF A- TNG B at a probability of $10-25 \%$ for B was $100 \$$ if the \% of adverse event was close to $10 \%$. There was cost saving of $50 \$$ when the $\%$ of adverse event was close to $25 \%$.

