

Corrigendum to addendum report

It has come to our attention that there was an error in Table 18. The corrected version appears below. The only changes are in the four rows "ABT – RTX", "ADA – ABT", "ETN – ABT", and "IFX – ABT", in which the upper end of the 95% Credible Interval had been omitted and the values in the last two columns displaced by one column.

Table 18 ICERs for reference case analysis

Comparison	ICER	95% Credible Interval		Proportion of cases CE at	
				£20,000/QALY	£30,000/QALY
ADA - DMARDs	34300	20900	79100	0.02	0.30
ETN - DMARDs	38900	23500	89000	0.00	0.17
IFX - DMARDs	36100	21200	82000	0.02	0.24
RTX - DMARDs	21100	12800	49700	0.40	0.84
ABT - DMARDs	38400	23000	84700	0.00	0.17
ADA - RTX	RTX	Not meaningful		0.00	0.00
ETN - RTX	RTX	Not meaningful		0.00	0.00
IFX - RTX	RTX	Not meaningful		0.00	0.00
ABT - RTX	130600	47900	RTX	0.00	0.00
ADA - ABT	<i>46400</i>	<i>23100</i>	<i>152100</i>	0.99	0.90
ETN - ABT	<i>37800</i>	<i>20100</i>	<i>102300</i>	0.98	0.77
IFX - ABT	<i>41700</i>	<i>22000</i>	<i>113500</i>	0.99	0.84
ADA – ETN	ADA	Not meaningful		0.84	0.84
ADA – IFX	20500	Not meaningful		0.50	0.61
ETN – IFX	456700	Not meaningful		0.20	0.24

CE = cost-effective. The proportion of cases cost-effective relates to the strategy given first on each line. ICER in italics means that the strategy named second is more costly and more effective. Where a strategy name is given in place of an ICER, the named strategy dominates its comparator (less costly and more effective). A 95% credible interval for the ICER is not meaningful in cases where the cost-effectiveness scatterplot is not confined to one half of the plane.