VENICE ARRYTHMIAS 2015

Venice, 17th October 2015

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF DABIGATRAN EXILATE IN TREATMENT OF ATRIAL FIBRILLATION

Giovanni Galvani, MSc - Investment Analyst at SC Löwy, London Dr. Giampaolo Zoffoli - MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice Dr. Alberto Grassetto - MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice Dr. Stefania Sterlicchio, MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice Dr. Sakis Themistoclakis - MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice Dr. Andrea Venturini - MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice Dr. Domenico Mangino - MD at Ospedale dell'Angelo, Venice



- Background and purpose of the work
- Anticoagulant therapies
- Cost analysis
- The "RE-LY" study
- Our model
- Results and optimal use of Dabigatran



Background and purpose of the work



Background and purpose of the work

STUDY BACKGROUND

- Increase in incidence and prevalence of AF imposes a big burden on public finances (€13.5bn in European Union in 2013)
- Safe and effective antithrombotic therapy is a primary objective to be pursued without delay

PURPOSE OF THE WORK

 Determination of relative convenience, in terms of cost and overall utility, of oral anticoagulants therapies for each category of AF patients (i.e. at high risk of embolic stroke and at high risk of ischemic stroke)



Anticoagulant therapies



Anticoagulant therapies

ORAL TREATMENTS CONSIDERED IN OUR WORK:



Purpose

Cost-analysis

RE-LY Study

Cost Analysis



Cost-Analysis: the QALY and the ICER

KEY CONCEPTS

 The QALY (Quality-Adjusted Life Years). Represents the equivalent of years lived in perfect health:

*QALY value=U[given state of health]***years lived in that state*

 The ICER (Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio). Defines the marginal increase in cost for a determined increase in efficacy:

ICER=E[Δ *cost*]/ Δ *efficacy*

Cost-Analysis: A practical example

EXAMPLE

- Incremental cost: €100,000
- Survival 5 Years
- Quality of life factor: 0.8x
- ICER: €100,000 / 5 X 0.8 =
 €25,000 / QALY



Purpose

Cost-analysis

RE-LY Study

Our model



The RE-LY Study



The "RE-LY" study: Overview

DESCRIPTION

- Massive authoritative trial conducted between 2006 and 2008 to test the noninferiority of Dabigatran vs. Warfarin
- Over 18,000 patients from 44 countries were treated with either Dabigatran or Warfarin (with target INR of 2.0-3.0)

CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION OF PATIENTS

- AF within 6 months from screening plus at least one of:
 - Previous stroke/transient ischemic attack
 - Left ventricular ejection fraction of less than 40%,
 - NYHA class II or higher heart-failure symptoms within 6 months before screening
 - Age >75 or between 65 and 74 with diabetes mellitus/hypertension/coronary artery disease.

The "RE-LY" study: Results

DABIGATRAN ≥ WARFARIN

- Non-inferior for stroke or systemic embolism in both low and high dose subministration
- Superior to Warfarin for patients at high risk of stroke in high dose
- Superior to Warfarin for patients at high risk of hemorrhagic stroke in high dose

DABIGATRAN < WARFARIN

 Both doses of Dabigatran were associated with a higher rate of myocardial infarction

RE-LY Study

The "RE-LY" study: Results

DABIGATRAN ≥ WARFARIN

- Non-inferior for stroke or systemic
 embolism in both low and high dose
 subministration
- Superior to Warfarin for patients at high risk of stroke in high dose
- Superior to Warfarin for patients at high risk of hemorrhagic stroke in high dose

DABIGATRAN < WARFARIN

 Both doses of Dabigatran were associated with a higher rate of myocardial infarction

RE-LY Study

Our model

Our model



Our model: Overview

OBJECTIVE

 Determination of most cost-effective oral anticoagulant drug for each category of patients (at high risk of embolic stroke, at high risk of ischemic stroke, etc.)

FEATURES

- 1,000 virtual patients with average age of 75 years, grouped into subsets according to HEMORR₂AGES and CHADS₂ scores
- Use of Markovian model to determine progression of patients' health state
- Ischemic and hemorrhagic risks periodically adjusted to factor in morbidity and mortality related to age and gender

ASSUMPTIONS

- Cost-effectiveness threshold set at €50,000/QALY
- Dabigatran treatment cost set at €2,190/yr (€6.00/day)
- Warfarin treatment cost set at €630/yr (including INR monitoring)

Our model: Building the model



16

Results

Results: All patients



Results: High risk of Bleeding



Results: High risk of Stroke



Results: Cost effectiveness in detail

HIGH DOSE DABIGATRAN VS. WARFARIN





Warfarin (incl. INR monitoring)





Results: To sum up...

- Unless INR management is excellent (top quartile), high dose Dabigatran is the most clinically safe solution for patients at high risk of stroke,
- Provided an excellent TTR, Warfarin is the best choice overall and especially for patients with high risk of stroke



RE-LY Study



Appendix 1: HEMORR₂AGES score

- HEMORR₂AGES is the acronym of a 11item scoring system¹ for estimating the risk of major bleeding in patients
- It is based on
 - o Hepatic or renal disease
 - o Ethanol abuse
 - o Malignancy
 - o Older age (≥75)
 - o Reduced platelet count or function
 - Rebleeding risk (ie: prior bleed)
 - o Anemia
 - Genetic factors (CYP2C9 variant)
 - Excessive fall risk
 - o Stroke

¹ developed by Gage BF, Yan Y Milligan PE, et al.

Every risk factor contributes 1 point to the final score (except prior bleeding which is assigned a weight of 2) which will be between 0 and 12.

Risk Score	Incidence of Major Bleeding (per 100 patient-yrs)	95% CI
0	1.9	(0.6-4.4)
1	2.5	(1.3-4.3)
2	5.3	(3.4-8.1)
3	8.4	(4.9-13.6)
4	10.4	(5.1-18.9)
≥5	12.3	(5.8-23.1)

Appendix 2: CHADS₂ score

- CHADS₂ is a clinical prediction rule¹ for estimating the risk of stroke in patients with non-rheumatic atrial fibrillation (AF).
- It is based on the following conditions It is based on
 - o Congestive heart failure
 - Hypertension: blood pressure consistently above 140/90 mmHg
 - o Age ≥75 years
 - o Diabetes mellitus
 - Prior stroke or Transient Ischemic Attack (TIA)

Every condition contributes 1 point (with the exception of prior stroke or TIA which is assigned a weight of 2) to the final score.

Risk Score	Incidence of Stroke (%)	95% CI
0	1.9	(0.6-4.4)
1	2.8	(1.3-4.3)
2	4.0	(3.4-8.1)
3	5.9	(4.9-13.6)
4	8.5	(5.1-18.9)
≥5	12.5	(5.8-23.1)
6	18.2	(10.5-27.4)

¹ developed by Gage BF, Waterman AD et al.

Appendix

Appendix 3: Adjusting for TTR

- TTR is the percentage of time the patients treated with vitamin K antagonists manage to stay inside their prescribed INR
- Patients treated with Warfarin had their overall utility also affected by the TTR
- Little benefit over antiplatelet therapy if the TTR falls below a 58%-65% range

[U] W adjusted=[U] W in range*p(in range)+[U] W not in range*p(not in range)

Where

[U] W not in range=[U] no AF -([U] no AF- [U] W in range)*RR.



Cumulative risk of stroke, myocardial infarction, systemic embolism, or vascular death for patients treated at centers with a TTR below or above the study median (65%). RR indicates relative risk (C+A, clopidogrel plus Aspirin).