

PET is an expensive technology, and its benefits in terms of detection and lives saved, over other imaging modalities must be compared against its additional costs.

Methods: We conducted a decision analysis in four areas of oncology: breast, cervical, lung and colonic. The care pathways and subsequent projected outcomes in each were evaluated for PET versus alternative diagnostic strategies. The costs and benefits were evaluated at each of four stages: presence of abnormality; determination of malignant or benign tumour, accurately staging the disease and early detection of recurrence. In each case based upon the best and worst sensitivities and specificities for PET and its alternatives.

Results: Considering results with regard to the number of cases detected per 1000 patients presenting with symptoms for each of the four cancer groups, PET was the dominant technology in the diagnosis (and subsequent treatment management) of lung cancer and breast cancer. In the diagnosis of colon and cervical cancer PET did not dominate over the alternative technologies (e.g. CT, MRI, biopsy, endoscopy, ultrasonography in combinations). For lung cancer, PET led to an increase of between 80 and 612 life years over the next best technology. The cost per life year saved of using PET was between £1,079 and £2,659 versus that of the next best alternative, in each case, of between £1,810 and £3,081. This translates into a cost advantage, for PET, of between £101 and £422 per life year saved. For breast cancer, PET led to an increase of between 278 and 1388 life years over the next best technology combination. The cost per life year saved of using PET was between £1,430 and £1,453 versus that of the next best alternative, which was between £1,019 and £1,502. This translates into a cost difference for PET, of between £72 less per life year saved over the next best alternative, to £434 more per life year saved.

Discussion: PET will not be the technology of choice at all four stages of the diagnostic process for each of the four cancers. While PET will frequently be a more accurate diagnostic technique compared to its alternatives, the marginal gain in accuracy will not be sufficient to justify the large increase in costs. The project identified the stages in each of the four oncological areas where PET contributed most in terms of cost effectiveness and should be the technology of first choice in the detection of cancer.

James M, Centre for Health Planning and Management, Darwin Building, University of Keele, Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BG, UK, E-mail: hma13@keele.ac.uk

OP15. Use of the EuroQoL among patients receiving radiochemotherapy for pancreatic cancer: Psychometrical tests and quality adjusted survival analysis

König HH, Stratmann D

Department of Health Economics, University of Ulm, Germany

Background: Cost-utility analysis of medical technologies applied to seriously ill patients requires health-related quality of life (QoL) measures that a) do not overstress the patient and b) provide reliable, valid and sensitive data from which utility weights for the calculation of QALYs can be obtained. The EuroQoL is a generic index measure that is easy to understand and can be self-completed by the respondent within less than 10 minutes. The reliability and validity of the EuroQoL has been shown in the general population as well as in patient groups with selected diseases. However, the EuroQoL has hardly been tested among seriously ill patients. In this study, the EuroQoL is applied to patients with inoperable pancreatic cancer who participate in a clinical phase II study of radiochemotherapy. The study was started in January 1997 and is still in progress. The purpose of our study is 1) to evaluate the practicability and psychometric characteristics of the EuroQoL among these patients, 2) to compare health-related utility weights of this patient group with those from the general population, 3) to assess the effect of subjective expectations with respect to treatment success and 4) to perform quality-adjusted survival analysis. Cost-measurement and cost-utility analysis are intended in another part of our study.

Methods: All inoperable pancreatic patients who present at the Ulm university hospital and meet the inclusion criteria of the clinical study

are consecutively enrolled in this study. QoL assessment is conducted during the entire course of therapy. Patients are interviewed during intra-arterial chemotherapy and complete the EuroQoL questionnaire during each of their stays at home between two treatment episodes. Practicability is assessed by rejection rates and patient comments. Test-retest reliability is evaluated by the ICC. Construct validity is shown by correlating QoL data with clinical parameters. Responsiveness of VAS values is judged by Guyatt's responsiveness statistic and ROC curves which are calculated on the basis of the results of a transition question. For each patient QALYs are computed by quality adjusted survival analysis.

Results (study still in progress): Preliminary results indicate that the EuroQoL is well accepted by this group of patients. However, results of a pilot study showed, that the original reliability test over-stressed the patients, and hence had to be abbreviated. The EuroQoL seems to be very responsive and able to well discriminate between stays in hospital and at home. Patients in our study tend to rate their health states on the VAS scale much higher than the general population rates these states.

Discussion: Preliminary results indicate good practicability and responsiveness of the EuroQoL in this group of seriously ill patients.

König HH, University of Ulm, Dpt of Health Economics, Albert-Einstein-Allee 47, 89081 Ulm, Germany, E-mail: hans-helmut.koenig@mathematik.uni-ulm.de

OP16. Cost-effectiveness and quality of life evaluation, in the context of current practice, of antiemetics used for the control of chemotherapy induced emesis

Lachaine J¹, Laurier C¹, Langleben A², Vaillant L²

¹Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada. ²Royal Victoria Hospital, Montreal, Canada

Emesis represents a major obstacle to cancer chemotherapy. To improve the control of emesis, serotonin antagonists, such as ondansetron, have been recently developed. These agents are considered more effective but more expensive than the traditional, metoclopramide based, antiemetic regimens. **Objectives :** The purpose of this study was to measure, in a context of current practice, the economic and quality of life impact of ondansetron based regimens, compared to metoclopramide based regimens in moderately emetogenic chemotherapy.

Methods: Female patients with breast cancer, naive to chemotherapy, scheduled to receive a cyclophosphamide based chemotherapeutic regimen (FAC, FEC or CNOE) were eligible for this prospective study. They received either an ondansetron or a metoclopramide based antiemetic regimen. The selection of the regimen was left to the physician to represent current practice. Because patients were naive, selection did not rest on predisposition to emesis, but depended upon access to treatment. Incidence of vomiting was recorded daily, in a patient diary, for five days following chemotherapy. Efficacy was measured in terms of complete control (0 vomiting episode) and major control (two or less vomiting episodes) a) during the first day and b) for the 5 day period immediately following chemotherapy. Quality of life was measured with the EORTC QLQ-C30 on three occasions : before the chemotherapy, 24 hours after and 72 hours after the chemotherapy. Costs related to emesis (medications, devices, pharmacy and nursing time), were collected for a 5 day period.

Results: Results for forty-nine patients (22 metoclopramide and 27 ondansetron) have been analyzed. Emesis control was significantly better in the ondansetron group: 74% had complete control the first day and 74% for the 5 day period compared to 32% (p=.004) and 27% (p=.002) respectively for metoclopramide. Major control was also superior with ondansetron at 93% for the first day and 85% for the 5 day period compared to 55% (p=.003) and 50% (p=.012) respectively with metoclopramide. Global quality of life decreased more substantially with metoclopramide than with ondansetron, but the difference did not reach statistical significance. For the 5 day period, average cost with ondansetron was higher than with metoclopramide, \$103 vs. \$70, but the cost effectiveness ratio for complete control was better with ondansetron,