

Appendix 4. Calculating Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratios (ICERs)

Compared to Status Quo

ICER for option 6 as compared to status quo = \$154^a

IC^b of option 6 (\$299,611) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB^b of option 6 (1,942 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

ICER for option 3 as compared to status quo = \$434

IC of option 3 (\$523,487) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB of option 3 (1,205 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

ICER for option 2 as compared to status quo = \$192

IC of option 2 (\$643,487) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB of option 2 (3,346 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

ICER for option 5 as compared to status quo = \$236

IC of option 5 (\$812,457) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB of option 5 (3,348 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

ICER for option 1 as compared to status quo = \$826

IC of option 1 (\$874,512) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB of option 1 (1,059 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

ICER for option 4 as compared to status quo = \$225

IC of option 6 (\$892,931) – IC of the status quo (\$0)

IB of option 6 (3,960 patients) – IB of the status quo (0 patients)

Compared to Option 6

ICER for option 3 as compared to option 6^c = -\$304

IC of option 3 (\$523,487) – IC of option 6 (\$299,611)

IB of option 3 (1,205 patients) – IB of option 6 (1,942 patients)

ICER for option 2 as compared to option 6^d = \$245

IC of option 2 (\$643,487) – IC of option 6 (\$299,611)

IB of option 2 (3,346 patients) – IB of option 6 (1,942 patients)

ICER for option 5 as compared to option 6 = \$340

IC of option 5 (\$812,457) – IC of option 6 (\$299,611)

IB of option 5 (3,348 patients) – IB of option 6 (1,942 patients)

ICER for option 1 as compared to option 6^c = -\$651

IC of option 1 (\$874,512) – IC of option 6 (\$299,611)

IB of option 1 (1,059 patients) – IB of option 6 (1,942 patients)

ICER for option 4 as compared to option 6 = \$294

IC of option 6 (\$892,931) – IC of option 6 (\$299,611)

IB of option 6 (3,960 patients) – IB of option 6 (1,942 patients)

Compared to Option 2

ICER for option 5 as compared to option 2 = \$1,664

IC of option 5 (\$812,457) – IC of option 2 (\$643,487)

IB of Option 5 (3,448 patients) – IB of the Option 2 (3,346 patients)

ICER for option 4 as compared to option 6^e = \$406

IC of option 4 (\$892,931) – IC of option 2 (\$643,487)

IB of option 4 (3,960 patients) – IB of option 2 (3,346 patients)

^aThe most cost-effective as compared to status quo.

^bIC, incremental cost; IB, incremental benefit.

^cMore costly and less effective than another available option.

^dThe most cost-effective as compared to option 6.

^eThe most cost-effective as compared to option 2.