

## Appendix 16f: Evidence tables for economic studies

### High intensity psychological interventions for Generalised Anxiety Disorder

#### Reference to included study

Heuzenroeder L, Donnelly M, Haby MM, Mihalopoulos C, Rossell R, Carter R, Andrews G, Vos T (2004) Cost-effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological interventions for generalized anxiety disorder and panic disorder. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 38, 602-612.

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Heuzenroeder et al, 2004  Australia  Cost-utility analysis	<p><u>Interventions:</u> CBT provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private psychologist</li> <li>• Public psychologist</li> <li>• Private psychiatrist</li> <li>• Public psychiatrist</li> </ul> <p>Standard care, defined as 27% evidence-based medicine (EBM), 28% non-EBM, and 45% no care</p>	<p>People with generalised anxiety disorder</p> <p>Decision analytic modelling</p> <p>Source of clinical effectiveness data: systematic review and meta-analysis</p> <p>Source of resource use: estimates and assumptions</p> <p>Source of unit costs: national sources</p>	<p><u>Costs:</u> Consultations with psychologists, psychiatrists, GPs</p> <p>Incremental cost for all adults with GAD in Australia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private psychologist: Aus\$140 million</li> <li>• Public psychologist: Aus\$50 million</li> <li>• Private psychiatrist: Aus\$170 million</li> <li>• Public psychiatrist: Aus\$160 million</li> </ul> <p><u>Primary outcome:</u> number of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) averted</p> <p>Incremental DALYs averted for all adults with GAD in Australia: 7200</p>	<p>ICER of CBT versus standard care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private psychologist: \$28,000/DALY averted</li> <li>• Public psychologist: \$12,000/DALY averted</li> <li>• Private psychiatrist: 32,000/DALY averted</li> <li>• Public psychiatrist: \$31,000/DALY averted</li> </ul> <p>Sensitivity analysis - range of ICERs (\$/DALY averted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private psychologist: 17,000-56,000</li> <li>• Public psychologist: 7,000-25,000</li> <li>• Private psychiatrist: 20,000-63,000</li> <li>• Public psychiatrist: 19,000-63,000</li> </ul>	<p>Perspective: healthcare sector (including patient expenses) Currency: Australian\$ Cost year: 2000 Time horizon: 12 months Discounting: not needed Applicability: non-applicable</p>

## Pharmacological interventions for Generalised Anxiety Disorder

### References to included studies

1. Guest JF, Russ J, Lenox SA (2005) Cost-effectiveness of venlafaxine XL compared with diazepam in the treatment of generalised anxiety disorder in the United Kingdom. *European Journal of Health Economics*, 6, 136-145.
2. Heuzenroeder L, Donnelly M, Haby MM, Mihalopoulos C, Rossell R, Carter R, Andrews G, Vos T (2004) Cost-effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological interventions for generalized anxiety disorder and panic disorder. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 38, 602-612.
3. Iskedjian M, Walker JH, Bereza BG, Le M, Einarson TR (2008) Cost-effectiveness of escitalopram for generalized anxiety disorder in Canada. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*, 24, 1539-48.
4. Jorgensen TR, Stein DJ, Despiegel N, Drost PB, Hemels ME, Baldwin DS (2006) Cost-effectiveness analysis of escitalopram compared with paroxetine in treatment of generalized anxiety disorder in the United Kingdom. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy*, 40, 1752-1758.
5. Vera-Llonch M, Dukes E, Rejas J, Sofrygin O, Mychaskiw M, Oster G (2010) Cost-effectiveness of pregabalin versus venlafaxine in the treatment of generalized anxiety disorder: findings from a Spanish perspective. *European Journal of Health Economics*, 11, 35-44.

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
<p>Guest <i>et al.</i>, 2005</p> <p>UK</p> <p>Cost effectiveness analysis</p>	<p><u>Interventions:</u> Venlafaxine XL 75mg/day</p> <p>Diazepam 5mg x 3 times/day</p>	<p>Adults with Generalised Anxiety Disorder</p> <p>Decision-analytic modelling</p> <p>Source of clinical effectiveness data: RCT [HACKET2003]</p> <p>Source of resource use estimates: expert opinion</p> <p>Source of unit costs: national sources</p>	<p><u>Costs:</u> Medication, visits to GPs, psychiatrists, psychologists, community mental health team, counsellor</p> <p>Mean cost per person: Venlafaxine XL: £352 Diazepam: £310</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> percentage of successful treatment, defined as percentage of people in remission at 6 months; remission defined as a score on CGI = 1</p> <p>Successful treatment: Venlafaxine XL: 27.6% Diazepam: 16.8% (p=0.07)</p>	<p>ICER of Venlafaxine XL versus diazepam: £381 per successfully treated person</p> <p>Results sensitive to rates of response, remission, relapse, discontinuation, plus resource use</p> <p>Probabilistic analysis: venlafaxine XL dominated diazepam in at least 25% of iterations</p>	<p>Perspective: NHS Currency: UK£ Cost year: 2000/01 Time horizon: 6 months Discounting: not needed Applicability: partially applicable Quality: potentially serious limitations Funded by Wyeth Pharmaceuticals</p>

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Heuzenroeder et al, 2004  Australia  Cost-utility analysis	<u>Interventions:</u> Venlafaxine 74 or 150mg/day  Standard care, defined as 27% evidence-based medicine (EBM), 28% non-EBM, and 45% no care	People with generalised anxiety disorder  Decision analytic modelling  Source of clinical effectiveness data: meta-analysis of 2 RCTs [ALLGULANDER2001; DAVIDSON1999]  Source of resource use: assumptions  Source of unit costs: national sources	<u>Costs:</u> Medication, doctor consultations  Incremental cost for all adults with GAD in Australia: Aus\$ 77 million  <u>Primary outcome:</u> number of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) saved  Incremental DALYs for all adults with GAD in Australia: 3300	ICER of venlafaxine versus standard care: \$30,000/DALY  Sensitivity analysis: ICER between \$20,000/DALY and \$51,000/DALY	Perspective: healthcare sector (including patient expenses) Currency: Australian\$ Cost year: 2000 Time horizon: 12 months Discounting: not needed Applicability: non-applicable

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Iskedjian <i>et al.</i> , 2008  Canada  Cost-effectiveness analysis	<u>Interventions:</u> Escitalopram 10-20mg/day  Paroxetine 20-50mg/day  Both drugs were augmented with 0.5mg clonazepam, if needed; psychotherapy was provided if drug treatments failed	Newly diagnosed people with generalised anxiety disorder, with HAMA score $\geq 18$ , treated in a primary care setting  Decision analytic modelling  Source of clinical effectiveness data: double-blind RCT for response rates [BIELSKI2005], literature review and expert opinion  Source of resource use: expert opinion  Source of unit costs: Canadian national sources	<u>Costs:</u> Medication, physician visits Productivity losses  Total costs per person: Ministry of Health perspective Escitalopram: \$724; paroxetine: \$663 Societal perspective Escitalopram: \$3527; paroxetine: \$3676  <u>Primary outcome:</u> number of symptom-free days (SFDs), defined by a score of 1 or 2 in CGI-1  Number of SFDs per person: Escitalopram: 86.4 Paroxetine: 77.0	Ministry of Health perspective: ICER of escitalopram vs. paroxetine: \$6.56 per SFD (or \$2362 per symptom free year)  Societal perspective: Escitalopram dominated paroxetine  Results robust to changes in rates of response, tolerance, adherence	Perspectives: Ministry of Health and societal Currency: Canadian\$ Cost year: 2005 Time horizon: 24 weeks Discounting: not needed Applicability: partially applicable Quality: potentially serious limitations Funded by H Lundbeck

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
<p>Jørgensen <i>et al.</i>, 2006</p> <p>UK</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness analysis</p>	<p><u>Interventions:</u> Escitalopram 10-20mg/day</p> <p>Paroxetine 20-50mg/day</p> <p>Switching between the 2 drugs was allowed in case of intolerance or non-response; venlafaxine was provided as 3rd line treatment if the sequence of the 2 drugs failed</p>	<p>Newly diagnosed people with generalised anxiety disorder, with HAMA score <math>\geq 18</math>, treated in a primary care setting</p> <p>Decision analytic modelling</p> <p>Source of clinical effectiveness data: double-blind RCT for response and discontinuation rates [BIELSKI2005], other RCTs for relapse data &amp; other input parameters, and further assumptions</p> <p>Source of resource use: estimates based on recommendations from the previous NICE guideline on anxiety; plus expert opinion</p> <p>Source of unit costs: UK national sources</p>	<p><u>Costs:</u> Medication, GP and/or psychiatrist visits Productivity losses</p> <p>Total costs per person: NHS perspective Escitalopram: £447; paroxetine: £486 Societal perspective Escitalopram: £8434; paroxetine: £9843</p> <p><u>Primary outcome:</u> initial response and maintained response (i.e. initial response + no relapse) at the end of the time horizon; initial response defined as a reduction of score at 1 or 2 in CGI-1; relapse defined as an increase in the HAM-A total score to <math>\geq 15</math>, an increase of CGI-S to 4 or more, or discontinuation due to lack of efficacy</p> <p>Initial response: Escitalopram: 49.6% Paroxetine: 35.2% Maintained response: Escitalopram: 7.7% more responders than Paroxetine</p>	<p>NHS and societal perspective: Escitalopram dominated paroxetine</p> <p>Results robust to changes in rates of response, tolerance, acquisition cost of paroxetine</p>	<p>Perspective: societal Currency: UK£ Cost year: 2005 Time horizon: 9 months Discounting: not needed Applicability: directly applicable Quality: potentially serious limitations Funded by H Lundbeck</p>

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Vera-Llonch <i>et al.</i> , 20010  Spain  Cost-utility analysis	<u>Interventions:</u> Pregabalin 300- 600mg/ day  Venlafaxine XL 75-225mg/ day	Adults with moderate to severe Generalised Anxiety Disorder  Decision-analytic modelling  Source of clinical effectiveness data: RCT [KASPER2009]  Source of resource use estimates: published and unpublished data  Source of unit costs: national sources	<u>Costs:</u> Medication, primary care visits, specialist visits (psychiatrist, psychologist), inpatient care, emergency room, lab tests (blood counts, electrocardiogram, thyroid function)  Mean cost per person: Pregabalin: €3,871 Venlafaxine XL: €3,234  <u>Outcome:</u> number of QALYs gained  Number of QALYs per person: Pregabalin: 0.740 Venlafaxine XL: 0.713	ICER of pregabalin versus venlafaxine XL: €23,909 per QALY  Results sensitive to utility values, time horizon, discontinuation  Probabilistic analysis: pregabalin had a (roughly) 95% probability of being cost- effective compared with venlafaxine XL at a cost effectiveness threshold of approximately €25,000 per QALY	Perspective: third-party payer Currency: Euros (€) Cost year: 2007 Time horizon: 12 months Discounting: not needed Applicability: partially applicable Quality: potentially serious limitations Funded by Pfizer, Inc.

## Computerised Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for panic disorder

### References to included studies

1. Kaltenthaler E, Brazier J, De NE, Tumur I, Ferriter M, Beverley C, Parry G, Rooney G, Sutcliffe P (2006) Computerised cognitive behaviour therapy for depression and anxiety update: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology Assessment*, 10(33). 1-186.
2. Klein B, Richards JC, Austin DW (2006) Efficacy of internet therapy for panic disorder. *Journal of Behavioural Therapy*, 37, 213-238.
3. McCrone P, Marks IM, Mataix-Cols D, Kenwright M, McDonough M (2009) Computer-Aided Self-Exposure Therapy for Phobia/Panic Disorder: A Pilot Economic Evaluation. *Cognitive Behavioural Therapy*, 18, 1-9.
4. Mihalopoulos C, Kiropoulos L, Shih S-TF, Gunn J, Blashki G, Meadows G (2005) Exploratory economic analyses of two primary care mental health projects: implications for sustainability. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 183, S73-S76.



## FearFighter

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Kaltenthaler <i>et al.</i> , 2006  UK  Cost-utility analysis	<u>Interventions:</u> cCBT (FearFighter, FF)  Clinician-led CBT  Relaxation	People with panic phobia presenting in a primary care setting  Decision analytic modelling  Source of clinical effectiveness data: double-blind RCT for response rates [MARKS2004], other published literature  Source of resource use: published literature, information from manufacturers of cCBT package, assumptions  Source of unit costs: UK national sources	<u>Costs:</u> Therapist time, computer hardware Plus for cCBT: license fees, screening of patients for suitability, capital overheads, training of staff  Total costs per person: FF: £217 Clinician-led CBT: £410 Relaxation: £78  <u>Primary outcome:</u> QALYs  Total QALYs per person: FF: 0.794 Clinician-led CBT: 0.805 Relaxation: 0.736	ICER of clinician-led CBT vs. FF: £17,608/QALY  ICER of FF vs. relaxation: £2,380/QALY  Probability of being cost- effective at a cost effectiveness threshold of £30,000/QALY FF 39% Clinician-led CBT: 61% Relaxation: 0%  Results sensitive to cCBT costs	Perspective: NHS and personal social services  Currency: UK£  Cost year: 2003  Time horizon: 12 months  Discounting: not needed  Applicability: partially applicable  Quality: minor limitations  Analysis informed the NICE TA on cCBT

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
<p>McCrone <i>et al.</i>, 2009 [MARKS2004]</p> <p>UK</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness analysis</p>	<p><u>Interventions:</u> cCBT (FearFighter, FF)</p> <p>Clinician-led CBT</p> <p>Relaxation</p>	<p>People with panic or phobic disorder</p> <p>RCT (N=93)</p> <p>Source of clinical effectiveness data: RCT (n=62 for main problem ratings and 60 for global phobia ratings)</p> <p>Source of resource use: RCT (based on n=62 and n=60 people with main problem and global phobia ratings, respectively); plus assumptions based on published literature</p> <p>Source of unit costs: UK national sources</p>	<p><u>Costs:</u> Therapist time, cost of cCBT package</p> <p>Total costs per person: FF: £243-£328 (main problem ratings) or £248-£333 (global phobia ratings); range depending on usage of package by PCT or GP practice, respectively Clinician-led CBT: £445 Relaxation: £122</p> <p><u>Measures of outcome:</u> improvement in main problem and global phobia ratings</p> <p>Mean improvement in main problem ratings FF: 3.95 Clinician-led CBT: 3.93 Relaxation: 0.71 (differences non-significant between FF and clinician-led CBT; both significantly better than relaxation)</p> <p>Mean improvement in global phobia ratings: FF: 2.95 Clinician-led CBT: 3.59 Relaxation: 1.07 (differences non-significant between FF and clinician-led CBT; both significantly better than relaxation)</p>	<p><u>Main problem rating:</u> FF dominant over clinician-led CBT ICER of FF vs. relaxation: £37-£64/unit of improvement</p> <p>Probability of FF being more cost-effective than relaxation: 50% at a threshold of £35-£65 per unit of improvement</p> <p>Probability of clinician-led CBT being more cost-effective than relaxation: 50% at a threshold of £100 per unit of improvement</p> <p><u>Global phobia rating:</u> ICER of clinician-led CBT vs. FF: £175-£308/unit of improvement ICER of FF vs. relaxation: £67-£112/unit of improvement</p> <p>Probability of FF being more cost-effective than relaxation: 50% at a threshold of £65-£115 per unit of improvement</p> <p>Probability of clinician-led CBT being more cost-effective than relaxation: 50% at a threshold of £130 per unit of improvement</p> <p>Probabilistic analyses directly comparing FF vs. clinician-led CBT not conducted</p>	<p>Perspective: NHS (intervention costs only)</p> <p>Currency: UK£</p> <p>Cost year: likely 2004</p> <p>Time horizon: 14 weeks</p> <p>Discounting: not needed</p> <p>Applicability: partially applicable</p> <p>Quality: potentially serious limitations</p> <p>One of the authors claimed intellectual property rights on FearFighter</p>

## Panic Online

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Klein <i>et al.</i> , 2006 [KLEIN2006]  Australia  Cost- consequence analysis	<p><u>Interventions:</u> cCBT (Panic Online, PO)</p> <p>Therapist- assisted, self- administered CBT (self-CBT)</p> <p>Information control (IC)</p>	<p>People with panic disorder (with or without agoraphobia)</p> <p>RCT (N=55)</p> <p>Source of clinical effectiveness data: RCT (n=55, Intention to treat analysis)</p> <p>Source of resource use: RCT (n=46, completers only)</p> <p>Source of unit costs: probably local costs</p>	<p><u>Costs:</u> Therapist time, server and website hosting costs, cost of CBT manual, post and telephone calls</p> <p>Total costs per person: PO: \$350 Self-CBT: \$379 IC: \$55</p> <p><u>Measures of outcome:</u> Panic Disorder Severity Scale; panic frequency; Agoraphobic Cognitions Questionnaire; Anxiety Sensitivity Profile; Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale; Body Vigilance Scale</p> <p>PO significantly better than IC in all panic parameter measures, cognitive variables, anxiety and stress variables</p> <p>PO significantly better than self-CBT only in clinician agoraphobic ratings</p>	Non-applicable	<p>Perspective: health service (intervention costs only)</p> <p>Currency: Australian\$</p> <p>Cost year: not reported</p> <p>Time horizon: 6 weeks</p> <p>Discounting: not needed</p> <p>Applicability: partially applicable</p> <p>Quality: potentially serious limitations</p>

Study Country Study type	Intervention details	Study population Study design Data sources	Costs: description and values Outcomes: description and values	Results: Cost-effectiveness	Comments
Michalopoulos <i>et al.</i> , 2005  Australia  Cost-utility analysis	<u>Interventions:</u> cCBT (Panic Online, PO) provided by either a psychologist or a GP  Standard care, defined as 27% evidence-based medicine (EBM), 28% non-EBM, and 45% no care	People with panic disorder  Decision-analytic modelling  Source of clinical effectiveness data: literature review  Source of resource use: estimates and assumptions  Source of unit costs: national sources	<u>Costs:</u> Therapist time, GP visits, cCBT package, computer and software  Total incremental cost for all adults with panic disorder in Australia: PO by psychologist: Aus\$3.8 million PO by GP: Aus\$2.8 million  <u>Measure of outcome:</u> number of DALYs averted  Total number of DALYs averted for all adults with panic disorder in Australia: PO: 870	ICER of PO versus standard care: PO by psychologist: \$4,300/DALY averted PO by GP: \$3,200/DALY averted  Sensitivity analysis – range of ICERs (\$/DALY averted):  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PO by psychologist: 3,500-5,400</li> <li>• PO by GP: 2,700-3,900</li> </ul>	Perspective: health sector (including patient expenses)  Currency: Australian\$  Cost year: 2004  Time horizon: 12 weeks  Discounting: not needed  Applicability: not applicable