Appendix R: Health economic evidence – completed health economics checklists

Contents

A .1	A.1 Support, training and education, and supervision programmes social care or criminal justice practitioners	for health,
A.1	A.1.1 Training for criminal justice practitioners	
A.2	A.2 Interventions for adults with mental health problems in contact criminal justice system	with the
A.2	A.2.1 Psychosocial interventions	5
A.2	A.2.2 Pharmacological interventions	7
A.3	A.3 Interventions for adults with a paraphilic disorder who are in co criminal justice system	
A.3	A.3.1 Psychosocial interventions	
A.4	A.4 Care plans and pathways, and organisation and structure of se people with mental health problems in contact with the crimina	
A.4	A.4.1 Jail diversion programmes	
A.4	A.4.2 Mental health courts	
A.4	A.4.3 Drug court programmes	24
A.4	A.4.4 Street triage	
A.4	A.4.5 Integrated Disorders Treatment Program (IDDT)	
A.4	A.4.6 Forensic assertive community treatment	
A.4	A.4.7 Therapeutic community treatment	
A.4	A.4.8 Probation and mandated treatment	41
A.4	A.4.9 Services for people with personality disorders	

Abbreviations

A&E BPRS	accident and emergency Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale
CAMI	Community Attitudes toward Mental Illness Scale
CBT	cognitive behavioral therapy
CCA	cost consequence analysis
CJS	criminal justice system
FACT	forensic assertive community treatment
GP	general practitioner
HCV	hepatitis C virus
ICER	incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
MSU	medium secure unit
QoL	quality of life
RCT	randomized controlled trial
SA	substance abuse
SDS	Social Distance Scale
SMI	serious mental illness
ТС	therapeutic community
WSAS	Work and Social Adjustment Scale

A.1 Support, training and education, and supervision programmes for health, social care or criminal justice practitioners

A.1.1 Training for criminal justice practitioners

Study identification: Kramedine YI, DeMarco D, Hassel R, Silverstone PH. A novel training program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill individuals and is cost-effective. Frontiers in Psychiatry. 2013;4-9. Question no: 5. Guidance topic: Support, training and education, and supervision programmes for health, social care or criminal justice practitioners Question no: 5. Economic question: Training for police officers Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review question 7.5) Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA Comments 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review question? Yes Police officers 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review question? Yes 1 day mental health awareness training 1.3 Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context? Partly Canada - public funded system 1.4 Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question? Partly Police service provider 1.5 Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects on individuals included, and are all other effects on individuals included, and appropriately? No A range of mental health awareness scales; hasn t' considered patient related outcomes 1.6 Are all future costs and outcomes discounted using NICE's preferred methods? I fnot, describe raionale and outcomes stow question? No <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>					
programmes for health, social care or criminal justice practitioners 5.1 Checklist completed by: Eric Slade Economic question: Training for police officers Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5) Yes/partly/no/u Comments 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review question? Yes Police officers 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review question? Yes 1 day mental health awareness training 1.3 Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context? Partiy Canada - public funded system 1.4 Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question? Partiy Police service provider 1.5 Are all direct effects included where they are material? No A range of mental health awareness scales; hean't considered patient related outcomes 1.6 Are all future costs and outcomes discounted and appropriately? No A range of other roon-health awareness scales; hean't considered patient related outcomes 1.7 Is OALY used as an outcome, and was it derived and appropriately? No And an arange of other roon-health awareness scales; health avareness scales; health avareness scales; hean't considered patient related outcomes <td colspan="4">training program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill</td>	training program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill				
Economic question: Training for police officers Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5) Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA Comments 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review question? Yes Police officers 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review question? Yes 1 day mental health awareness training 1.3 Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context? Partly Police service provider 1.4 Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question? Partly Police service provider 1.5 Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material? No A range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes 1.6 Are all future costs and outcomes discounted apropriately? NA Time horizon 7 months 1.7 Is OALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above). No CAMI, SDS and a range of other non-health outcomes 1.8 Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued? Yes Comments:					
Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments1.1Is the study population appropriate for the review question?YesPolice officers1.2Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?Yes1 day mental health awareness training1.3Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?PartlyCanada - public funded system1.4Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?PartlyPolice service provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and material?NoA range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesVes1.9Overall judgement: Partially applicableYesComments1.9Des the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NAComments2.1Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	Check	list completed by: Eric Slade			
questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)nclear/NA1.1Is the study population appropriate for the review question?YesPolice officers1.2Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?Yes1 day mental health awareness training1.3Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?PartlyCanada - public funded system1.4Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?PartlyPolice service provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?NoA range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesImage:1.9Uverrall judgement: Partially applicableYesImage:1.9Desc the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NaComments2.1Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	Econo	omic question: Training for police officers			
question?1.1.1Yes1 day mental health awareness training1.2Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?Yes1 day mental health awareness training1.3Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?PartlyCanada - public funded system1.4Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?PartlyPolice service provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?NoA range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesCommentsSection 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NATime horizon 7 months2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	quest	ions and the NICE reference case as described		Comments	
question?health awareness training1.3Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?PartiyCanada - public funded system1.4Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?PartiyPolice service provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?NoA range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?NATime horizon 7 months1.7Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesImage:1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicableVes/partity/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NoTime horizon 72.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.1		Yes	Police officers	
sufficiently similar to the current UK context?public funded system1.4Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?PartlyPolice service provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?NoA range of mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?NATime horizon 7 months1.7Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesImage: Sector 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NoTime horizon 72.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.2		Yes	health awareness	
appropriate for the review question?provider1.5Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?NoA range of mental health 	1.3		Partly	public funded	
are all other effects included where they are material?mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related outcomes1.6Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?NATime horizon 7 months1.7Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesImage: CommentsSection 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NoTime horizon 7 months2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.4		Partly		
appropriately?months1.7Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).NoCAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?YesImage: Comments1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicableYesImage: CommentsSection 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality of the topic under evaluation?Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NAImage: Comments2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.5	are all other effects included where they are	No	mental health awareness scales; hasn't considered patient related	
using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).and a range of other non- health outcomes1.8Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?Yes1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicableYesOther comments:Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NA2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.6		NA		
and appropriately measured and valued?Image: Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NAImage: Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NAImage: Section 2: Section 2: Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.7	using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with	No	and a range of other non- health	
Other comments: Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality) Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA Comments 2.1 Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation? NA Image: Colspan="3">Comments 2.2 Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all No Time horizon 7	1.8		Yes		
Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NAComments2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NA2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	1.9 Ov	verall judgement: Partially applicable			
quality)nclear/NA2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?NA2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	Other	comments:			
nature of the topic under evaluation?Time horizon 32.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect allNoTime horizon 7	qualit			Comments	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2.1		NA		
	2.2	, .	No		

trainin	Study identification: Krameddine YI, DeMarco D, Hassel R, Silverstone PH. A novel training program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill individuals and is cost-effective. Frontiers in Psychiatry. 2013;4-9.			
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	CAMI, SDS and a range of other non- health outcomes. Hasn't considered outcomes from service users' perspective	
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From observational before-after study	
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational before-after study	
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Partly	No consideration of wider healthcare, social care, and CJS costs	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational before-after study; and authors' assumptions	
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear		
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	CCA	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analysis conducted	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
	overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations			
Other	Other comments:			
1.	 Have all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative been quantified, where appropriate? Partly 			
2.	Were any assumptions of materiality made to restr	ict the number of co	onsequences	

- 2. Were any assumptions of materiality made to restrict the number of consequences considered? Unclear
- 3. Was any analysis of correlation between consequences carried out to help control for double counting? No
- 4. Was there any indication of the relative importance of the different consequences by a suggested weighting of them? No
- 5. Were there any theoretical relationships between consequences that could have been taken into account in determining weights? Unclear

Study identification: Krameddine YI, DeMarco D, Hassel R, Silverstone PH. A novel training program for police officers that improves interactions with mentally ill individuals and is cost-effective. Frontiers in Psychiatry. 2013;4-9.

- 6. Were the consequences considered one by one to see if a decision could be made based on a single consequence or a combination of a small number of consequences? No
- 7. Were the consequences considered in subgroups of all the consequences in the analysis to see if a decision could be made based on a particular subgroup? No
- 8. Was an MCDA (multiple criteria decision analysis) or other published method of aggregation of consequences attempted? No

A.2 Interventions for adults with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

A.2.1 Psychosocial interventions

Study identification: Daley M, Love CT, Shepard DS, Petersen CB, White KL, Hall FB. Cost-Effectiveness of Connecticut's In-Prison Substance Abuse Treatment. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 2004;39:69-92. Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems Question no: in contact with the criminal justice system 3.1 Checklist completed by: Eric Slade Economic question: Psychosocial interventions for people with mental health problems who are in prison Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review Yes/partly/ Comments questions and the NICE reference case as described in no/unclear/ section 7.5) NA Adult 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review Yes question? incarcerated offenders with SA problem 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review Yes In prison SA question? treatment 1.3 Is the system in which the study was conducted Partly US study sufficiently similar to the current UK context? 1.4 Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they Partly Healthcare appropriate for the review question? payer (substance abuse and mental health treatment) 1.5 Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are No No all other effects included where they are material? consideration of health effects 1.6 Are all future costs and outcomes discounted NA Time horizon 1 appropriately? year 1.7 Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived No Outcome using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe measure was rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical re-arrest perspectives taken (item 1.4 above). 1.8 Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and Partly appropriately measured and valued?

Study identification: Daley M, Love CT, Shepard DS, Petersen CB, White KL, Hall FB. Cost-Effectiveness of Connecticut's In-Prison Substance Abuse Treatment. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 2004;39:69-92.

1.9 Overall judgment: Partially applicable

Other comments: Hasn't considered wider healthcare, social care, and public sector costs

	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Cohort study
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 1 year
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	No consideration of health outcomes
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	No	No consideration of wider healthcare, social care and CJS costs
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study, taken from administrative records and databases, accounting data, plus authors' assumptions
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	No	Significance levels are not reported
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 0	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		
Other	comments:		

A.2.2 Pharmacological interventions

Study identification: Gisev N, Shanahan M, Weatherburn DJ, Mattick RP, Larney S, Burns L, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of opioid substitution therapy upon prison release in reducing mortality among people with a history of opioid dependence. Addiction. 2015: 110(12):1975-84.

Guidance topic: Interventions adults with mental health problems in	Question no:
contact with the criminal justice system	3.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic question: In prison methadone treatment for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

questi	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described tion 7.5)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with SA problems eligible for release
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Opioid substitution therapy (OST) upon prison release
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	Australia publicly funded healthcare system
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Healthcare and criminal justice sector
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of HRQoL
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 6 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Mortality
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
	erall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:	Vachartheire	Commonto
quality	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Retrospective matched-control study
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 6 months
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	No consideration of HRQoL

Study identification: Gisev N, Shanahan M, Weatherburn DJ, Mattick RP, Larney S, Burns L, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of opioid substitution therapy upon prison release in reducing mortality among people with a history of opioid dependence. Addiction. 2015: 110(12):1975-84.

2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Yes	Retrospective matched-control study	
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	Retrospective matched-control study	
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes		
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	Retrospective matched-control study	
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Partly	National and local sources	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes		
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
Other comments:				

Study identification: Warren E, Viney R, Shearer J, Shanahan M, Wodak A, Dolan K. Value for money in drug treatment: economic evaluation of prison methadone. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2006;84:160-66.

Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system	Question no: 3.1
Checklist completed by: Eric Slade	

Economic question: in prison methadone treatment for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

P. 0.010				
		Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments	
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult prisoners with SA problems	
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	In-prison methadone treatment	
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	Australia publicly funded healthcare system	
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Prison service provider (intervention costs only)	
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of HRQoL	

Study identification: Warren E, Viney R, Shearer J, Shanahan M, Wodak A, Dolan K. Value for money in drug treatment: economic evaluation of prison methadone. Drug and			
	ol Dependence. 2006;84:160-66.		
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 1 year
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Outcome measures included days of heroin use, deaths prevented due to SA, and HCV cases avoided/delayed
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 Ov	erall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:		
Section quality	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/un clear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Modelling
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 1 year
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	No consideration of mental health and HRQoL outcomes
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	No	Only intervention costs considered
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT and administrative databases, published sources, assumptions
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Partly	Sensitivity analysis undertaken on total cost only
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 C	overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		
Other	comments:		

A.3 Interventions for adults with a paraphilic disorder who are in contact with the criminal justice system

A.3.1 Psychosocial interventions

	y identification:		
Shanahan M, Donato R. Counting the cost: Estimating the economic benefit of pedophile treatment programs. Child Abuse and Neglect. 2001;25:541-55. AND Donato R, Shanahan M. The economics of child sex-offender rehabilitation programs: beyond Prentky & Burgess. Am J Orthopsychiatry. 2001;71:131-9; discussion 40-1.			
	ance topic: Interventions for adults with a paraphilic on contact with the criminal justice system	lisorder who	Question no: 3.2
	klist completed by: Eric Slade		
	nomic Question: Intensive in-prison paedophile treatmorphy) for incarcerated male adults with paedophilia	ent (cognitive	behavioural
ques	ion 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review tions and the NICE reference case as described in on 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Incarcerated male adults with paedophilia
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Prison-based CBT
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	Australian study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Societal
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon lifetime
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Health effects expressed in monetary terms
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Partly	
1.9 O	overall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other comments: Monetary valuation was achieved using two methods including revealed preferences and contingent valuation. When using revealed preferences approach intangible benefits were approximated using US study that reported the amounts compensated in child sex abuse cases. When using contingent valuation method intangible benefits were approximated by linking road traffic injuries and associated costs with injuries associated with sexual abuse.			
•			-

Sectio qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	

Study identification: Shanahan M, Donato R. Counting the cost: Estimating the economic benefit of pedophile treatment programs. Child Abuse and Neglect. 2001;25:541-55. AND Donato R, Shanahan M. The economics of child sex-offender rehabilitation programs: beyond Prentky & Burgess. Am J Orthopsychiatry. 2001;71:131-9; discussion 40-1.			
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Time horizon lifetime
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Yes	A range of health consequences relating to sexual abuse
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	Published sources and authors' assumptions
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	Published sources and authors assumptions
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare, criminal justice, and out of pocket expenses
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	Published international, federal and state sources, authors' assumptions
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Partly	National and local sources
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Deterministic sensitivity analysis
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations			

Other comments:

- 1. Are money-costs and 'benefits' which are savings of future money-costs evaluated? Yes
- 2. Have all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative been quantified in money terms? Yes. Productivity costs were considered as part of intangible benefits.
- 3. Has at least 1 of net present value, benefit/cost ratio and payback period been estimated? Yes net benefits are reported
- 4. Were any assumptions of materiality made? That is, were any items where costs and/or benefits were sufficiently small that their addition to the analysis would not have changed any recommendations in the guidelines? No

A.4 Care plans and pathways, and organisation and structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

A.4.1 Jail diversion programmes

Study identification: Hayhurst KP, Leitner M, Davies L, Flentje R, Millar T, Jones A, et al. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of diversion and aftercare programmes for offenders using class a drugs: A systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technology Assessment. 2015;19:1-198.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programme versus no diversion programme

questio	Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)		Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults opiate- and/or crack- using offenders
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Diversion plus treatment and/or aftercare programme
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Yes	UK study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare, social care, and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	Yes	
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	Yes	SF-12/SF-6D used to estimate utility weights
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Directly applicable		
	comments:		
Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)		Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Decision analytic model
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Time horizon 12 months; sensitivity

Mental health of adults in contact with the criminal justice system

Study identification: Hayhurst KP, Leitner M, Davies L, Flentje R, Millar T, Jones A, et al. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of diversion and aftercare programmes for offenders using class a drugs: A systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technology Assessment. 2015;19:1-198.

			analysis explored up to 10 years
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Yes	
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study, published studies and assumptions
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study, published studies and assumptions
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	Published studies
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources; published studies
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12	Overall assessment: Minor limitations		
Other comments:			

Study identification: Zarkin GA, Cowell AJ, Hicks KA, Mills MJ, Belenko S, Dunlap LJ, et al. Lifetime benefits and costs of diverting substance-abusing offenders from state prison. Crime & Delinquency. 2015;61:829-50.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and Question no: structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact 4.1 with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)		Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with SMI
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Jail diversion
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study

Mental health of adults in contact with the criminal justice system

Study identification: Zarkin GA, Cowell AJ, Hicks KA, Mills MJ, Belenko S, Dunlap LJ, et al. Lifetime benefits and costs of diverting substance-abusing offenders from state prison. Crime & Delinquency. 2015;61:829-50.

pricem			
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	Partly	3%
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other c	omments:		
Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Discrete event simulation
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Life time
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	Transition probabilities from survey data, published studies, and other databases
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	Cost data derived from published studies
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12	Overall assessment: Minor limitations		
Other c	omments:		

Study identification: Cowell AJ, Hinde JM, Broner N, Aldridge AP. The impact on taxpayer costs of a jail diversion program for people with serious mental illness. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2013;41:31-37.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

Question no:

4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with SMI
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Pre-booking component of a jail diversion programme
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 2 years
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Observational case-control study
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 2 years
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational case-control study, administrative

Study identification: Cowell AJ, Hinde JM, Broner N, Aldridge AP. The impact on taxpayer costs of a jail diversion program for people with serious mental illness. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2013;41:31-37.

			databases, unpublished studies, billing records
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analyses conducted
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		
Other comments:			

Study identification:

Cowell AJ, Broner N, Dupont R. The Cost-Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Diversion Programs for People With Serious Mental Illness Co-occurring With Substance Abuse: Four Case Studies. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 2004;20:292-315. AND Steadman HJ, Naples M. Assessing the effectiveness of jail diversion programs for persons with serious mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders. Behavioral Sciences & the Law. 2005;23:163-70.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQue
4.1with the criminal justice system

Question no: 4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

questio	Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)		Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with SMI and SA
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Jail diversion
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare, social care, and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon up to 1 year
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Measures of outcome included criminal behaviour,

Study identification: Cowell AJ, Broner N, Dupont R. The Cost-Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Diversion Programs for People With Serious Mental Illness Co-occurring With Substance Abuse: Four Case Studies. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 2004;20:292-315. AND Steadman HJ, Naples M. Assessing the effectiveness of jail diversion programs for persons with serious mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders.			
Denavi	oral Sciences & the Law. 2005;23:163-70.		QoL, mental health and SA levels
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:		
Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon up to 1 year (costs 1 year; outcomes 3 months & 1 year)
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Yes	Measures of outcome included criminal behaviour, QoL, mental health and SA
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare, social care, and CJS costs
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study, published studies, data from other sites where diversion programme has already been implemented
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Partly	ICERs reported only

17 Mental health of adults in contact with the criminal justice system

Study identification:	
-----------------------	--

Cowell AJ, Broner N, Dupont R. The Cost-Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Diversion Programs for People With Serious Mental Illness Co-occurring With Substance Abuse: Four Case Studies. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 2004;20:292-315. AND Steadman HJ, Naples M. Assessing the effectiveness of jail diversion programs for persons with serious mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders. Behavioral Sciences & the Law. 2005;23:163-70.

for selected

			outcomes			
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analyses conducted			
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No				
2.12	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations					
Other of	Other comments:					

Study identification: Hughes D, Steadman HJ, Case B, Griffin PA, Leff H. A simulation modeling approach for planning and costing jail diversion programs for persons with mental illness. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 2012;39:434-46.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments	
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with SMI	
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Jail diversion	
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study	
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare, social care, and CJS)	
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes		
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 2 years	
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis	
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes		
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable			
Other comments:				
Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)		Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments	

Study identification: Hughes D, Steadman HJ, Case B, Griffin PA, Leff H. A simulation modeling approach for planning and costing jail diversion programs for persons with mental illness. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 2012;39:434-46.

	···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Simulation model		
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Partly	Time horizon is 2 years		
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	Transition probabilities estimated from literature, and assumptions		
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare, social care, and CJS		
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study, and expert opinion		
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear			
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	No			
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
2.12	2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
Other c	omments:				

Study identification: Mitton C, Simpson L, Gardner L, Barnes F, McDougall G. Calgary Diversion Program: A community-based alternative to incarceration for mentally ill offenders. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2007;10:145-51.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:with the criminal justice system4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Jail diversion programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

quest	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review tions and the NICE reference case as described in on 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with SMI and co- occurring SA
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Post-booking diversion programme

Study identification: Mitton C, Simpson L, Gardner L, Barnes F, McDougall G. Calgary Diversion Program: A community-based alternative to incarceration for mentally ill offenders. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2007;10:145-51.

	uers. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics.		• • •
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	Canada – public funded system
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	Not clear how well BPRS and Wisconsin QoL scales capture health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 18 months for costs; 3 months for outcomes
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Outcome measures included BPRS and Wisconsin QoL scale
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgment: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Sectio qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Partly	Time horizon 18 months for costs and 3 months for outcomes
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	Outcome measures included BPRS, Wisconsin QoL scale
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From before- after study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From before- after study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From before- after study, health and police administrative

Study identification: Mitton C, Simpson L, Gardner L, Barnes F, McDougall G. Calgary Diversion Program: A community-based alternative to incarceration for mentally ill offenders. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2007;10:145-51.

			data, other published sources
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	CCA
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analyses conducted
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	

2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations

Other comments: Would be potentially possible to calculate ICERs however costs and outcomes reported at different time points.

- 1. Have all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative been quantified, where appropriate? Partly
- 2. Were any assumptions of materiality made to restrict the number of consequences considered? Unclear
- 3. Was any analysis of correlation between consequences carried out to help control for double counting? No
- 4. Was there any indication of the relative importance of the different consequences by a suggested weighting of them? No
- 5. Were there any theoretical relationships between consequences that could have been taken into account in determining weights? Unclear
- 6. Were the consequences considered one by one to see if a decision could be made based on a single consequence or a combination of a small number of consequences? No
- 7. Were the consequences considered in subgroups of all the consequences in the analysis to see if a decision could be made based on a particular subgroup? No
- 8. Was an MCDA (multiple criteria decision analysis) or other published method of aggregation of consequences attempted? No

A.4.2 Mental health courts

term	Study identification: Kubiak S, Roddy J, Comartin E, Tillander E. Cost analysis of long- term outcomes of an urban mental health court. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2015;52:96-106.			
Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system			Question no: 4.1	
Chec	klist completed by: Eric Slade			
	omic Question: Mental health courts for people with r act with the criminal justice system	nental health _l	problems in	
Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5) Yes/partly/ NA			Comments	
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with	

Study identification: Kubiak S, Roddy J, Comartin E, Tillander E. Cost analysis of longterm outcomes of an urban mental health court. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2015;52:96-106.

2010,	52.30-100.		
			a diagnosis of mental illness
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Mental health court
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 12 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Primary outcome measures: residential days, jail days, prison days
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgment: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Section qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Observational cohort study
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 12 months
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	Only crime related outcomes
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From observational study and published sources
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Partly	National and local sources; published studies, personal

Study identification: Kubiak S, Roddy J, Comartin E, Tillander E. Cost analysis of longterm outcomes of an urban mental health court. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2015;52:96-106.

			communicatio n	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	ICERs can be calculated	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analyses conducted	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
Other commente:				

Other comments:

Study identification: Ridgely MS, Engberg J, Greenberg MD, Turner S, DeMartini C, Dembosky JW. RAND study first to document costs and fiscal impact of a mental health court. Psychiatric services (Washington, DC). 2007;58:577.			
structu	nce topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisatior ire of services for people with mental health problem e criminal justice system		Question no: 4.1
Check	ist completed by: Eric Slade		
	mic question: mental health courts for people with m t with the criminal justice system	ental health p	problems in
	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear /NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with a diagnosis of mental illness (or co- occurring mental and SA)
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Mental health court
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 24 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 Ove	erall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other of	omments:		

Study identification: Ridgely MS, Engberg J, Greenberg MD, Turner S, DeMartini C, Dembosky JW. RAND study first to document costs and fiscal impact of a mental health court. Psychiatric services (Washington, DC). 2007;58:577.

Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear /NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Costs analysis
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	24 months
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From before- after study, various information systems, claims data, other published studies, authors' assumptions
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 0	verall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		
Other of	omments:		

A.4.3 Drug court programmes

Study identification: Cheesman FL, Graves SE, Holt K, Kunkel TL, Lee CG, White MT. Drug Court Effectiveness and Efficiency: Findings for Virginia. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly. 2016;34:143-69. Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and Question no: structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact 4.1 with the criminal justice system Checklist completed by: Eric Slade Economic question: Drug court programme for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review Yes/partly/ Comments questions and the NICE reference case as described in no/unclear/ section 7.5) NA

Study identification: Cheesman FL, Graves SE, Holt K, Kunkel TL, Lee CG, White MT. Drug Court Effectiveness and Efficiency: Findings for Virginia. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly. 2016;34:143-69.

Quan	City. 2010, 34. 143-03.				
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with SA problem		
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Drug court programme		
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study		
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Healthcare and CJS		
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes			
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 2 years		
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis		
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes			
1.9	Overall judgment: Partially applicable				
Other	comments:				
Section qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments		
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA			
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Time horizon 2 years		
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes			
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study, survey, other administrative databases		
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear			
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost study		
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	No	Levels of statistical significance not reported		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
2.12 (2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				

Study identification: Cheesman FL, Graves SE, Holt K, Kunkel TL, Lee CG, White MT. Drug Court Effectiveness and Efficiency: Findings for Virginia. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly. 2016;34:143-69.

Other comments:

Study identification: Carey SM, Finigan MW. A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 2004;20:315-38.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic question: Drug court programme for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

Coma	contact with the chininal justice system				
quest	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ions and the NICE reference case as described in on 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments		
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with SA problem		
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Drug court programme		
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study		
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Healthcare and CJS		
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes			
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 30 months		
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis		
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes			
1.9	Overall judgment: Partially applicable				
Other	comments:				
Section qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments		
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA			
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Time horizon 30 months		
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis		
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes			

Study identification: Carey SM, Finigan MW. A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 2004;20:315-38.

2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study, administrative databases, and claims data		
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear			
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost study		
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	No	Levels of statistical significance not reported		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
2.12 (Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
Other comments					

Other comments:

Study identification: Logan T, Hoyt WH, McCollister KE, French MT, Leukefeld C, Minton L. Economic evaluation of drug court: Methodology, results, and policy implications. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2004;27:381-96.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic question: drug court programme for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

001110	contact with the chininal justice system				
quest	Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5)		Comments		
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with SA problem		
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Drug court programme		
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study		
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Public sector (health and social care, CJS, and welfare)		
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes			
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 12 months		
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis		

Study identification: Logan T, Hoyt WH, McCollister KE, French MT, Leukefeld C, Minton L. Economic evaluation of drug court: Methodology, results, and policy implications. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2004;27:381-96.

1.8 Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued? Yes 1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicable Vers/partly Comments Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality) Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA Comments 2.1 Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation? Yes Observational cohort study and modelling (regression model to estimate economic benefits) 2.2 Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes? No Time horizon 12 months 2.3 Are all important and relevant outcomes included? NA Cost analysis 2.4 Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? NA Cost analysis 2.5 Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? NA Cost analysis 2.6 Are all important and relevant costs included? Yes From observational case-control study, sate-wide and local administrative databases, other source? 2.7 Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Yes From observational case-control study, state-wide and local administrative databases, other published source? 2.9 Is an apropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated fro		And a sector and and a sector and the sector full sector				
Other comments: Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality) Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA Comments 2.1 Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation? Yes Observational cohort study and modelling (regression model to estimate economic benefits) 2.2 Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes? No Time horizon 12 months 2.3 Are all important and relevant outcomes included? NA Cost analysis 2.4 Are the estimates of pasteline outcomes from the best available source? NA Cost analysis 2.5 Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? NA Cost analysis 2.6 Are all important and relevant costs included? Yes Health and social care, CJS, and welfare 2.7 Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Yes From observational case-control study, state-wide and local administrative databases, other published source? 2.8 Are the unit costs of resources from the best available Unclear 2.9 Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data? NA Cost analysis case-source statistical significance source? 2.10 Are the unit costs of r	1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes			
Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NAComments on/unclear/ NA2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?YesObservational cohort study and modelling (regression 	1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicable					
qualityno/unclear/ NA2.1Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?YesObservational cohort study and modelling (regression model to estimate economic benefits)2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?NoTime horizon 12 months2.3Are all important and relevant outcomes included?NACost analysis2.4Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?NACost analysis2.5Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?NACost analysis2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and welfare2.6Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sources2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?Unclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported						
nature of the topic under evaluation?cohort study and modelling (regression model to estimate economic benefits)2.2Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?NoTime horizon 12 months2.3Are all important and relevant outcomes included?NACost analysis2.4Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?NACost analysis2.5Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?NACost analysis2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and weffare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational study, state- wide and local sumministrative databases, other published2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?UnclearVes2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can the be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reproted2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?NoLevels of statistical significance not reproted			no/unclear/	Comments		
important differences in costs and outcomes?12 months2.3Are all important and relevant outcomes included?NACost analysis2.4Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?NACost analysis2.5Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?NACost analysis2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and weffare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sources2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best availableUnclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?NoNo	2.1		Yes	cohort study and modelling (regression model to estimate economic		
2.4Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?NACost analysis2.5Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?NACost analysis2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and welfare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sources2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available 	2.2		No			
available source?Intervention effects from the best available source?NACost analysis2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and welfare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sourcesYesForm cost analysis2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?UnclearUnclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.12Urcerall assessment: Potentially serious limitationsNo	2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis		
the best available source?Image: Constraint of the set available source?2.6Are all important and relevant costs included?YesHealth and social care, CJS, and welfare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state-wide and local administrative databases, other published source?2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best availableUnclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.11	2.4		NA	Cost analysis		
Social care, CJS, and welfare2.7Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?YesFrom observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sources2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?Unclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?NoImage: No2.12Urcerall assessment: Potentially serious limitationsNo	2.5		NA	Cost analysis		
available source?observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published sources2.8Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?Unclear2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NA2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?No2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.12User and potential conflict of interest?No	2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	social care, CJS, and		
source?NACost analysis2.9Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?NACost analysis2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?NoLevels of statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.12Verall assessment: Potentially serious limitations	2.7		Yes	observational case-control study, state- wide and local administrative databases, other published		
can it be calculated from the data?No2.10Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?No2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitationsNo	2.8		Unclear			
uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?statistical significance not reported2.11Is there any potential conflict of interest?No2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations	2.9		NA	Cost analysis		
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations	2.10	uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity	No	statistical significance		
	2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
Other comments:	2.12 0	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
	Other	comments:				

Study identification: Shanahan M, Lancsar E, Haas M, Lind B, Weatherburn D, Chen S. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the New South Wales adult drug court program. Evaluation Review. 2004;28:3-27.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic question: Drug court programme for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

quest	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review tions and the NICE reference case as described in on 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult SA criminal offenders
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Drug court programme
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	Australia publicly funded healthcare system
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 23 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Re-offending related outcomes
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 0	verall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:		
Section qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Economic analysis conducted alongside an RCT
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 23 months
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	Health outcomes not considered
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT

Mental health of adults in contact with the criminal justice system

Study identification: Shanahan M, Lancsar E, Haas M, Lind B, Weatherburn D, Chen S. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the New South Wales adult drug court program. Evaluation Review. 2004;28:3-27.

2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes				
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT, administrative databases, other information systems			
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear				
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes				
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes				
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No				
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations						
Other	Other comments:					

A.4.4 Street triage

Study identification: Heslin M, Callagham L, Packwood M, Badu V, Byford S. Decision analytic model exploring the cost and cost-offset implications of street triage. BMJ Open 2016;6:e009670. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009670 - A				
structu	nce topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation ire of services for people with mental health problems e criminal justice system		Question no: 4.1	
Check	ist completed by: Eric Slade			
	mic Question: Street triage programmes for people wi act with the criminal justice system	th mental he	alth problems	
questio	Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5) Yes/partl ear/NA			
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with MH problems who are in contact with CJS	
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Street triage	
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Yes	UK study	
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	NHS and criminal justice sector; NHS only; criminal justice sector only	
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes		

Heslin explori	dentification: M, Callagham L, Packwood M, Badu V, Byford S. Deci ng the cost and cost-offset implications of street triag e009670. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009670 - A		
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 1 day
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other of	comments:		
Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Decision analytic model
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 1 day
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	No	From before- after study and assumptions
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	No	From before- after study and assumptions
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare and CJS costs
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From before- after study
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		

Other comments:

Study identification:

Heslin M, Callagham L, Barrett B, Susan L, Eick S, Morgan J, et al. Costs of the police service and mental healthcare pathways experienced by individuals with enduring mental health needs. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2016;1–8. - B

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQue
4.1with the criminal justice system

Question no: 4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Street triage programmes for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

Heslin service	identification: M, Callagham L, Barrett B, Susan L, Eick S, Morgan J, and mental healthcare pathways experienced by ind health needs. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2016	ividuals with	
	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adults with MH problems who are in contact with CJS
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Street triage
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Yes	UK study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (NHS and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Yes	
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 1 year
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:		
Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Decision analytic model
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 1 year
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From small observational cohort study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From small observational cohort study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare and CJS costs
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From small observational cohort study
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis

Heslin service	Study identification: Heslin M, Callagham L, Barrett B, Susan L, Eick S, Morgan J, et al. Costs of the police service and mental healthcare pathways experienced by individuals with enduring mental health needs. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2016;1–8 B				
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes			
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
2.12	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations				
Other of	Other comments:				

A.4.5 Integrated Disorders Treatment Program (IDDT)

Chand psychi	identification: ler DW, Spicer G. Integrated treatment for jail recidivis atric and substance use disorders. Community Menta 2:405-25.		
structu	nce topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation are of services for people with mental health problems e criminal justice system		Question no: 4.1
	ist completed by: Eric Slade		
	mic Question: Integrated dual disorders treatment for ms in contact with the criminal justice system	people with	mental health
	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Jail recidivists with serious mental illness and substance use disorders
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Integrated treatment
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Healthcare payer; wider social care costs not considered
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	No	Hasn't considered health outcomes
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon year
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Measures of outcome included number of arrests, convictions, felony convictions, jail days

Study identification: Chandler DW, Spicer G. Integrated treatment for jail recidivists with co-occurring psychiatric and substance use disorders. Community Mental Health Journal. 2006;42:405-25.				
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	NA		
1.9	Overall judgement: Partially applicable			
	comments:			
Sectio quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological)	Yes/partl y/no/uncl ear/NA	Comments	
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Conducted alongside an RCT	
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 1 year	
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	No	Hasn't considered health outcomes	
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT	
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT	
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Partly	Mental healthcare costs only	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT	
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	No	Local sources	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	Can be calculated	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Partly		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
2.12	Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations			
-				

Other comments: levels of statistical significance reported only for within group changes but not between the groups (between the differences in baseline and study period changes)

A.4.6 Forensic assertive community treatment

Study identification: Cusack KJ, Morrissey JP, Cuddeback GS, Prins A, Williams DM. Criminal justice involvement, behavioral health service use, and costs of forensic assertive community treatment: A randomized trial. Community Mental Health Journal. 2010;46:356-63.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Forensic assertive community treatment for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

Study identification: Cusack KJ, Morrissey JP, Cuddeback GS, Prins A, Williams DM. Criminal justice involvement, behavioral health service use, and costs of forensic assertive community treatment: A randomized trial. Community Mental Health Journal. 2010;46:356-63.

2010,	40.000-00.		
quest	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ions and the NICE reference case as described in on 7.5)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult detainees with SMI; majority also had SA problem
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	FACT
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 24 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Crime related outcomes used (bookings, jail days, and convictions)
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9	Overall judgment: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Sectio qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/ no/unclear/ NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Conducted alongside RCT
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 2 years
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	Only crime related outcomes
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources

Study identification: Cusack KJ, Morrissey JP, Cuddeback GS, Prins A, Williams DM. Criminal justice involvement, behavioral health service use, and costs of forensic assertive community treatment: A randomized trial. Community Mental Health Journal. 2010;46:356-63.

2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analyses conducted
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	

2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations

Other comments: The study reports costs and outcomes and statistical significance at 1-12 months and 13-24 months. Statistical significance is not reported for overall costs and outcomes at 24 months.

A.4.7 Therapeutic community treatment

Study identification: McCollister KE, French MT, Inciardi JA, Butzin CA, Martin SS, Hooper RM. Post-Release Substance Abuse Treatment for Criminal Offenders: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. 2003;19:389-407. - A

Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems	Question no:
in contact with the criminal justice system	4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic question:	Therapeutic community	treatment	t for adult offender	'S

quest	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ions and the NICE reference case as described tion 7.5)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult SA criminal offenders
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	TC and post- release programme
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Prison service provider (intervention costs only)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 18 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Measure of outcome was number of days incarcerated
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 Ov	verall judgement: Partially applicable		

Study identification: McCollister KE, French MT, Inciardi JA, Butzin CA, Martin SS, Hooper RM. Post-Release Substance Abuse Treatment for Criminal Offenders: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. 2003;19:389-407. - A Other comments:

Other comments.			
Section quality	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Conducted alongside RCT
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Partly	Time horizon 18 months
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	No	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	No	Analysis considered only intervention costs
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT and other published sources
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analysis conducted
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 C	verall assessment: Potentially serious limitations		
Other	comments:		

Study identification: McCollister KE, French MT, Prendergast M, Wexler H, Sacks S, Hall E. Is In-Prison Treatment Enough? A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Prison-Based Treatment and Aftercare Services for Substance-Abusing Offenders. Law & Policy. 2003;25:63-82. - B Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems Question no: in contact with the criminal justice system 4.1 **Checklist completed by: Eric Slade** Economic question: Therapeutic community treatment for adult offenders Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review Yes/partly/no/u Comments nclear/NA questions and the NICE reference case as described in section 7.5) 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review Yes Adult drugquestion? abusing criminal offenders

1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	In prison therapeutic community and post-release community treatment
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Prison service provider
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 1 year
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Measure of outcome was number of days incarcerated
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	NA	
1.9 Ov	verall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Section qualit	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	RCT
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all	Yes	Time horizon 5
	important differences in costs and outcomes?		years
2.3	important differences in costs and outcomes? Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	years No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes
2.3 2.4	Are all important and relevant outcomes	Partly Partly	No consideration of mental health,
	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the		No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes
2.4	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects	Partly	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT
2.4 2.5	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly Yes	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT
2.42.52.6	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best	Partly Yes Yes	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published
2.42.52.62.7	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Are the unit costs of resources from the best	Partly Yes Yes Partly	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published
2.42.52.62.72.8	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source? Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented	Partly Yes Yes Partly Unclear	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published
 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8 2.9 	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source? Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data? Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity	Partly Yes Yes Partly Unclear Yes	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published sources Statistical analysis
2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.10 2.11	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source? Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data? Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Partly Yes Yes Partly Unclear Yes Yes	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published sources Statistical analysis
2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.10 2.11 2.12 C	Are all important and relevant outcomes included? Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source? Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source? Are all important and relevant costs included? Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source? Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source? Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data? Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis? Is there any potential conflict of interest?	Partly Yes Yes Partly Unclear Yes Yes	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes From RCT From RCT From RCT and other published sources Statistical analysis

Study identification: McCollister KE, French MT, Prendergast ML, Hall E, Sacks S. Longterm cost effectiveness of addiction treatment for criminal offenders. Justice Quarterly. 2004;21:569-679. Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems Question no:

in contact with the criminal justice system			4.1	
	Check	list completed by: Eric Slade		
	Econo	mic question: Therapeutic community treatmen	t for adult offende	rs
	questi	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described tion 7.5)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
	1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult drug- abusing criminal offenders
	1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	In prison therapeutic community and post-release community treatment
	1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
	1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Public sector (healthcare and social care)
	1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	No consideration of health effects
	1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 5 years
	1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Measure of outcome was number of days incarcerated
	1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	NA	
	1.9 Ov	erall judgement: Partially applicable		
	Other	comments:		
	Section quality	n 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
	2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	RCT
	2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Yes	Time horizon 5 years
	2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	No consideration of mental health, QoL outcomes
	2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From RCT
	2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT
	2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	

2.7 From RCT and Are the estimates of resource use from the best Partly available source? interlinked

			criminal justice records, other published sources
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analysis conducted
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No	
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations			
Other comments:			

Study identification: Economic analysis conducted for this guideline		
Guidance topic: Interventions for adults with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system	Question no: 4.1	
Checklist completed by: Eric Slade		

Economic question: Therapeutic community treatment for people with substance misuse

questi	on 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ions and the NICE reference case as described tion 7.5)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult prisoners with SA problem
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Therapeutic community treatment
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Yes	UK study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Partly	Criminal justice sector
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	no consideration of health outcomes
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	Time horizon 15 months
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	Cost analysis
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 Ov	rerall judgement: Partially applicable		
	comments:		
Section quality	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	Yes	Decision analytical model
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	No	Time horizon 15 months

Study	Study identification: Economic analysis conducted for this guideline			
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	No	Re- incarcerations only considered	
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From 1 RCT	
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From 1 RCT	
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Partly	No consideration of healthcare and social care costs	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From RCTs and expert opinion	
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources	
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes		
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
2.12 0	verall assessment: Potentially serious limitations			
Other comments:				

A.4.8 Probation and mandated treatment

Study identification: Anglin MD, Nosyk B, Jaffe A, Urada D, Evans E. Offender diversion into substance use disorder treatment: the economic impact of California's proposition 36. American journal of public health. 2013;103:1096-102.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contactQuestion no:
4.1with the criminal justice system

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Economic Question: Combination of probation and substance abuse for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system

	n 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review ons and the NICE reference case as described in n 7.5)	Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments
1.1	Is the study population appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Adult offenders with SA problems
1.2	Are the interventions appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Mandated probation combined with SA treatment
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Partly	US study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector (healthcare and CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	NA	Cost analysis

Study identification: Anglin MD, Nosyk B, Jaffe A, Urada D, Evans E. Offender diversion into substance use disorder treatment: the economic impact of California's proposition 36. American journal of public health. 2013;103:1096-102.

••••				
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 30 months	
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	NA	Cost analysis	
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes		
1.9 Ove	erall judgement: Partially applicable			
Other c	omments:			
Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological quality)		Yes/partl y/no/unc lear/NA	Comments	
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	Observational cohort study	
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Partly	Time horizon 30 months	
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	NA	Cost analysis	
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis	
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	NA	Cost analysis	
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes		
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From observational cohort study, administrative databases, other published sources	
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Unclear		
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	NA	Cost analysis	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Statistical analysis conducted	
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No		
2.12 Overall assessment: Minor limitations				
Other comments:				

Study identification: Alemi F, Taxman F, Baghi H, Vang J, Thanner M, Doyon V. Costs and benefits of combining probation and substance abuse treatment. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2006;9:57-70.

Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and
structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact
with the criminal justice systemQuestion
no: 4.1

Checklist completed by: Eric Slade

Study identification: Alemi F, Taxman F, Baghi H, Vang J, Thanner M, Doyon V. Costs and benefits of combining probation and substance abuse treatment. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2006;9:57-70.

Economic question: Combination of probation and substance abuse for people with mental health problems in contact with the criminal justice system Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review Yes/partly/ Comments questions and the NICE reference case as described in no/unclear/ NA section 7.5) Substances 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review Yes question? abusing offenders 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review Yes Probation in question? combination with treatment 1.3 Is the system in which the study was conducted US study Partly sufficiently similar to the current UK context? 1.4 Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they Yes Public sector appropriate for the review question? (healthcare, social care, and CJS) 1.5 Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are Partly Hasn't considered all other effects included where they are material? health effects 1.6 Are all future costs and outcomes discounted No Time horizon appropriately? 2.75 years 1.7 Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived No Non-health using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe outcomes rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical including perspectives taken (item 1.4 above). arrests. hospital attendances, prison, employment, housing Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and 1.8 Yes appropriately measured and valued? 1.9 Overall judgement: Partially applicable Other comments: Yes/partly/ Section 2: Study limitations (level of methodological Comments no/unclear/ quality) NA Does the model structure adequately reflect the Modelling 2.1 Yes nature of the topic under evaluation? and RCT 2.2 Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all Time horizon Partly important differences in costs and outcomes? 2.75 years 2.3 Are all important and relevant outcomes included? A range of Partly non-health outcomes 2.4 Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best Partly From RCT available source? 2.5 Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from Probabilities Yes

the best available source?

of events

from RCT and

and benefits of combining probation and substance abuse treatment. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2006;9:57-70.					
			published studies		
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	Healthcare, social care, and CJS costs		
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Yes	From RCT, state and county information systems, other published sources, and authors' assumptions		
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Partly	National and local sources, published studies		
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes			
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Yes	Deterministic sensitivity analysis		
2.11	Is there any potential conflict of interest?	No			
2.12 Overall assessment: Potentially serious limitations					
Other comments:					

Study identification: Alemi F, Taxman F, Baghi H, Vang J, Thanner M, Doyon V. Costs and benefits of combining probation and substance abuse treatment. Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics. 2006;9:57-70.

A.4.9 Services for people with personality disorders

Study identification: Fortune Z, Barrett B, Armstrong D, Coid J, Crawford M, Mudd D, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes from the UK pilot psychiatric services for personality-disordered offenders. International Review of Psychiatry. 2011;23:61-9. Guidance topic: Care plans and pathways, and organisation and Question no: structure of services for people with mental health problems in contact 4.1 with the criminal justice system Checklist completed by: Eric Slade Economic question: an inpatient MSU and a residential service versus community and residential service Section 1: Applicability (relevance to specific review Yes/partly/no/u Comments questions and the NICE reference case as described nclear/NA in section 7.5) 1.1 Is the study population appropriate for the review Yes Personalitydisordered question? male offenders 1.2 Are the interventions appropriate for the review Yes Inpatient question? medium secure unit. and community

Study identification: Fortune Z, Barrett B, Armstrong D, Coid J, Crawford M, Mudd D, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes from the UK pilot psychiatric services for personality-disordered offenders. International Review of Psychiatry. 2011;23:61-9.

perso	nanty-disordered offenders. International Review	of PSychiatry. 20	11,23.01-9.
			and residential treatment
1.3	Is the system in which the study was conducted sufficiently similar to the current UK context?	Yes	UK study
1.4	Are the perspectives clearly stated and are they appropriate for the review question?	Yes	Public sector perspective (healthcare, social care an CJS)
1.5	Are all direct effects on individuals included, and are all other effects included where they are material?	Partly	WSAS measure does not captures all relevant effects
1.6	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	No	Time horizon 2 years
1.7	Is QALY used as an outcome, and was it derived using NICE's preferred methods? If not, describe rationale and outcomes used in line with analytical perspectives taken (item 1.4 above).	No	WSAS scale
1.8	Are costs and outcomes from other sectors fully and appropriately measured and valued?	Yes	
1.9 Ov	erall judgement: Partially applicable		
Other	comments:		
Sectio quality	on 2: Study limitations (level of methodological y)	Yes/partly/no/u nclear/NA	Comments
2.1	Does the model structure adequately reflect the nature of the topic under evaluation?	NA	
2.2	Is the time horizon sufficiently long to reflect all important differences in costs and outcomes?	Partly	Time horizon 2 years
2.3	Are all important and relevant outcomes included?	Partly	Outcome measure was WSAS
2.4	Are the estimates of baseline outcomes from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.5	Are the estimates of relative intervention effects from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.6	Are all important and relevant costs included?	Yes	
2.7	Are the estimates of resource use from the best available source?	Partly	From observational cohort study
2.8	Are the unit costs of resources from the best available source?	Yes	National sources
2.9	Is an appropriate incremental analysis presented or can it be calculated from the data?	Yes	
2.10	Are all important parameters whose values are uncertain subjected to appropriate sensitivity analysis?	Partly	Statistical analysis conducted on outcomes but not costs

Study identification: Fortune Z, Barrett B, Armstrong D, Coid J, Crawford M, Mudd D, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes from the UK pilot psychiatric services for personality-disordered offenders. International Review of Psychiatry. 2011;23:61-9.

2.11 Is there any potential conflict of interest?

No

2.12 Overall assessment: Very serious limitations

Other comments: