

Appendix T: Health economic evidence – economic profiles

Contents

A.1 Interventions aimed at the prevention of behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities	3
A.1.1 Psychosocial interventions for adaptive behaviour	3
A.1.1.1 Clinical / economic question: Early intensive behavioural intervention versus control for children and young people with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges	3
A.1.2 Health awareness	5
A.1.2.1 Clinical / economic question: Health-check intervention versus standard care for adults with learning disabilities	5
A.3 Interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities	6
A.3.1 Psychosocial interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities	6
A.3.1.1 Clinical / economic question: psychological intervention versus standard care for adults with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges	6
A.3.1.2 Clinical / economic question: parent training versus wait list for children and young people with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges	7
A.3.1.3 Clinical / economic question: interventions for the management of sleep problems in children and young people with learning disabilities	8
A.3.2 Pharmacological interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities	10
A.3.2.1 Clinical / economic question: antipsychotics for the management of behaviour that challenges in adults with learning disabilities	10
A.3.2.2 Clinical / economic question: antipsychotics for the management of behaviour that challenges in children and young people with learning disabilities	11

Abbreviations

ABC	Aberrant Behavior Checklist
CI	confidence interval
EIBI	early intensive behavioural intervention
HCHS	hospital and community health services
HUI	Health Utilities Index
ICER	incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
MOAS	Modified Overt Aggression Scale
n	number of studies
N/A	not applicable
NHS	National Health Service
PPP	prices and purchasing power parities
PPS	purchasing power standard
PSA	probabilistic sensitivity analysis
PSS	personal social services
QALY	quality adjusted life year
QOL-Q	Quality of Life Questionnaire
RCT	randomised controlled trial
TAU	treatment as usual
WTP	willingness to pay

A.1 Interventions aimed at the prevention of behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities

A.1.1 Psychosocial interventions for adaptive behaviour

A.1.1.1 Clinical / economic question: Early intensive behavioural intervention versus control for children and young people with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£) ¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Chasson et al., 2007 US	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Cost analysis Time horizon: 18 years	- £101,353	N/A	N/A	Not estimated
Motiwala et al., 2006 US	Potentially serious limitations ⁴	Partially applicable ⁵	Measure of outcome: number of dependency-free years Time horizon: up to 65 years of age	- £38,325	4.4	Intervention dominant	Findings sensitive to discount rate and EIBI efficacy (net costs and not savings, with discount rate of 5%)
Peters-Scheffer et al., 2012 Netherlands	Potentially serious limitations ⁶	Partially applicable ⁷	Time horizon: up to 65 years of age	- £946,957	N/A	N/A	Using more optimistic TAU efficacy data: -£215,273

1. Costs converted and uplifted to 2013 UK pounds – converted using PPP exchange rates and UK PPS local authorities' adults and children's services pay and prices inflation index (Curtis, 2013^a).
2. Simple economic model including education costs only, cost estimates based on personal communication and further assumptions, clinical model parameters based on published literature and further assumptions; local state costs, no sensitivity analysis.
3. Population not directly relevant (children with autism instead of learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges), conducted in the US, public perspective including state, local, federal and private costs, no discounting although time horizon was 18 years.
4. Economic model over lifetime, provincial government resource use estimates and prices, all relevant costs included, but efficacy estimates were judgements based on literature review.
5. Population not directly relevant (children with autism instead of learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges), conducted in Canada, public perspective, discounting 3%, no QALYs but intervention dominant.
6. Economic model over lifetime, resource use and unit cost data based on national sources and assumptions, all relevant costs included, efficacy estimates based on review of meta-analyses, selection of studies based on their applicability to the Dutch context, and naïve addition of meta-analytic data across same treatment arms.
7. Population not directly relevant (children with autism instead of learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges), conducted in the Netherlands, public sector perspective, no discounting.

^a Curtis L. Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2013 - PSSRU. University of Kent: Canterbury; 2013.

A.1.2 Health awareness

A.1.2.1 Clinical / economic question: Health-check intervention versus standard care for adults with learning disabilities

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£) ¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Romeo et al., 2009B UK	Potentially serious limitations ²	Directly applicable ³	Cost consequence analysis Time horizon: 12 months Outcomes: levels of health need detection, met new health needs, met health promotion and monitoring needs	-£919 (service cost)	All outcomes favour intervention	N/A	95% CI in service costs: -£4,639 to £3,101 Improvement in outcomes statistically significant

1. Costs uplifted to 2013 UK pounds using the hospital and community health services (HCHS) pay and prices inflation index (Curtis, 2013).
2. Cohort study with matched controls; intermediate outcomes relating to detected and met health needs, costs collected prospectively for intervention group and retrospectively for control group, small study sample (n = 100), relatively short time-horizon.
3. UK study on adults with learning disabilities, societal perspective but service costs (NHS and PSS) reported separately, no discounting needed, no QALYs but intervention dominant.

A.3 Interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities

A.3.1 Psychosocial interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities

A.3.1.1 Clinical / economic question: psychological intervention versus standard care for adults with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£) ¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Hassiotis et al., 2009 & 2011 UK	Potentially serious limitations ²	Directly applicable ³	Primary measure of outcome: challenging behaviour measured by total and subscale scores on the Aberrant Behavior Checklist (ABC) Time horizon: 2 years	-£3,356 -£943	6 months: -0.89 24 months: -0.88	Not combined	Incremental cost: 6 months: 95% CI: -£7,856 to £1,142 24 months: 95% CI = -£6,515 to £4,613 Incremental effect: 6 months: 95% CI = -1.74 to -0.04 24 months: 95% CI = -1.66 to -0.11
Felce et al., 2014 UK	Potentially serious limitations ⁴	Directly applicable ⁵	Time horizon 10 months Costs measured over 12 weeks Primary outcome measure: provocation Index Various secondary measures	Mean weekly cost £-23	Secondary outcomes favour intervention	N/A	Incremental cost 95%CI: -£201 to £154, p = 0.795 Incremental effect: No statistically significant difference in primary outcome Improvement in some secondary outcomes statistically significant

1. Costs uplifted to 2013 UK pounds using the hospital and community health services (HCHS) pay and prices inflation index (Curtis, 2013).

2. Conducted alongside RCT, duration 2 years but costs reported for 2 time periods: 0-6 and 18-24 months; costs and outcomes measured over different periods of time thus not synthesised, small study sample (n = 63).
3. UK study on adults with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges, NHS and PSS perspective, no discounting needed, no QALYs but intervention dominant.
4. Conducted alongside RCT, duration 10 months but costs measured over a 12-week period cost consequence analysis, small study sample (n = 143).
5. UK study on adults with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges, NHS and PSS perspective, no discounting needed, no QALYs but intervention likely dominant.

A.3.1.2 Clinical / economic question: parent training versus wait list for children and young people with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£) ¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Guideline model	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Time horizon: 61 weeks Group parent training modelled Some clinical input parameters (relapse) based on assumptions	£362	0.013	£27,148 /QALY	PSA: probability of parent training being cost-effective at £20,000/QALY: 0.29 PSA: probability of parent training being cost-effective at £20,000/QALY: 0.52 Reducing relapse for parent training: £24,895/QALY Severe behaviour that challenges at baseline: £13,037/QALY

1. Costs expressed in 2013 UK pounds.
2. Only intervention costs considered, resource use from RCTs included in guideline systematic review, efficacy data from 8 trials, PSA performed.

3. NHS and PSS perspective, QALYs based on HUI3 (valuations elicited from Canadian population).

A.3.1.3 Clinical / economic question: interventions for the management of sleep problems in children and young people with learning disabilities

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost versus wait list (£) ¹	Incremental effect versus wait list	NMB ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Guideline model	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Time horizon: 38 weeks Some clinical input parameters (relapse) based on assumptions 4 scenarios for 4 different baseline probabilities of non-improvement for wait list Results presented here are for baseline probability of 0.90	Combo oral suspension: £1,115 Combo oral solution: £921 Combo tablets: £ 779 Melatonin oral suspension: £721 Melatonin oral solution: £532 Melatonin tablets: £393 Psychosocial intervention: £362	Combo: 0.044 Melatonin: 0.025 Psychosocial intervention: 0.01	Melatonin - tablets: £9,153 Combination – tablets: £9,144 Wait list: £9,039 Melatonin – oral solution: £9,014 Combination – oral solution: £9,001 Psychosocial intervention: £8,966 Melatonin – oral suspension: £8,825 Combination – oral suspension: £8,808	PSA: probability of combination therapy being cost-effective at £20,000/QALY: 0.39-0.53

1. Costs expressed in 2013 UK pounds.

2. Only intervention costs considered, resource use from RCTs included in guideline systematic review, efficacy data from 3 trials for psychosocial intervention, 1 trial for melatonin and combination therapy; PSA performed.
3. NHS and PSS perspective, QALYs based on HUI3 (valuations elicited from Canadian population).

A.3.2 Pharmacological interventions aimed at reducing and managing behaviour that challenges in people with learning disabilities

A.3.2.1 Clinical / economic question: antipsychotics for the management of behaviour that challenges in adults with learning disabilities

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost versus placebo (£) ¹	Incremental effect versus placebo	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Romeo et al., 2009A UK	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Measures of outcome: total Modified Overt Aggression Scale (MOAS) score; total quality of life (QOL-Q) Time horizon: 26 weeks	Risperidone: £508 Haloperidol: -£1,257	MOAS: Risperidone: 1.5 Haloperidol: -2.1 QOL-Q: Risperidone: 2.5 Haloperidol: -2.2	MOAS: Risperidone dominated Haloperidol versus placebo: £614 /MOAS point change QOL-Q: Haloperidol dominated Risperidone versus placebo: £996 / QOL-Q point change	MOAS: Probability of haloperidol being more cost-effective than placebo: ≈50% for WTP = 0, ≈89% for WTP = £3000 /point improvement in MOAS QOL-Q: Probability of risperidone being more cost-effective than placebo: ≈52% for any WTP per point improvement in QOL-Q

1. Costs uplifted to 2013 UK pounds using the hospital and community health services (HCHS) pay and prices inflation index (Curtis, 2013).
2. Conducted alongside RCT, duration 26 weeks; small study sample (n = 86).
3. UK study on adults with learning disabilities and behaviour that challenges, societal perspective (service and informal care), no discounting needed, no QALYs measured.

A.3.2.2 Clinical / economic question: antipsychotics for the management of behaviour that challenges in children and young people with learning disabilities

Economic evidence profile							
Study and country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost versus placebo (£) ¹	Incremental effect versus placebo	ICER	Uncertainty ¹
Guideline model	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Time horizon: 34 weeks	Risperidone tablets: £1,636 Risperidone oral solution: £9,671 Risperidone orodispersible tablets: £26,321 Aripiprazole tablets: £48,838	Risperidone: 1.17 Aripiprazole: 0.58	Risperidone tablets versus placebo: £1,401/QALY All other options dominated by risperidone tablets	Probability of cost effectiveness at £20,000/QALY risperidone tablets: 0.85 risperidone oral solution: 0.73 risperidone orodispersible tablets: 0.40 aripiprazole: 0.00 Probability of cost effectiveness at £30,000/QALY risperidone tablets: 0.86 risperidone oral solution: 0.79 risperidone orodispersible tablets: 0.57 aripiprazole: 0.05

1. Costs expressed in 2013 UK pounds.
2. Only intervention costs considered, resource use from RCTs included in guideline systematic review, efficacy data from 2 trials on aripiprazole and 2 trials on risperidone, PSA performed.
3. NHS and PSS perspective, QALYs based on HUI3 (valuations elicited from Canadian population).