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Timely and complete publication of economic evaluations alongside RCTs (work in progress)
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Economic evaluations

- Publication bias – well known problem for clinical effectiveness results
- Are economic evaluations
  - as likely to be published?
  - published as promptly?
  - published in journals with equivalent impact factors?
Methods

- ISRCTN database: “cost” or “economic”
- Exclude where
  - unfinished or recently finished
  - no plan to conduct an economic evaluation
- Find clinical and economic articles for a random 100 trials (360 met inclusion criteria)
- Contact PIs of unpublished results
Preliminary results

Please email joanna.thorn@bristol.ac.uk for further details
PI responses

- Contacted 45 PIs – 34 responded (76%)
- 23 will not be published
- Variety of reasons given
  - Health economist left the group
  - Intervention was not effective
  - Ran out of time
  - Not interested in financial calculations
Preliminary conclusions

- Publication rate is poor
- Economic results are subject to longer delays than clinical results
- Economic results are published in journals with lower impact factors
- Trial registration is not a complete solution
Clinical versus economic design and interpretations of RCT results - Mixed messages?
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Background

- Sample size formulas for cost-effectiveness have been available for many years, but may not be used in practice.
- Therefore recruitment may cease too soon or continue too long in relation to cost effectiveness.
- It is often assumed that RCTs are underpowered on economic outcomes (QALY too crude, costs too variable or missing cost data).
Objectives

- Review of literature of cost per QALY analysis (CUAs) conducted alongside RCTs to determine:
  - Extent to which cost-effectiveness is considered in sample size calculations
  - The frequency with which economic conclusions conflict with clinical conclusions
  - Whether economic evaluations are underpowered and so more likely to come to indeterminate results
Methods 1 – Search strategy

- Searched NHS Economic Evaluation Database to identify RCTs using Cost per QALY Analysis
  - 717 articles in 293 journals identified.

We selected:

- 50% random sample of the remaining journals that published 3 or more CUAs
Methods 2 - Flow chart

302 articles reviewed

- 262 articles excluded
  - Models (233)
  - Insufficient information on costs/QALYs (16)
  - Cost/QALYS not measured for individual patients (11)
  - Not an RCT (2)

- 40 articles included (41 RCTs).
  - 24 RCTs reviewed to date

- 40 articles included (41 RCTs).
  - 24 RCTs reviewed to date
Methods 3 – Data Extracted

- **Study Characteristics**: e.g. year of publication, funding source, number of patients in each arm, sample size calculation

- **Outcome Data**:
  - Primary clinical outcomes (SE, SD & CI)
  - QALY gain (SE, SD & CI)
  - Incremental costs (SE, SD & CI)

- **Interpretation of Data**:
  - Costs and Outcome - categorised as definitely/probably/probably not/definitely not effective
  - Cost per QALY - definitely/probably/probably not/definitely not efficient
Preliminary Key Findings:

Please email Denise.McKell-Redwood@bristol.ac.uk for further details