

MT192 Debrisoft monofilament debridement pad: Addendum to EAC report, economic analysis - 10/10/13

Louise Longworth and Eleonora Lovato, Birmingham & Brunel EAC

EAC scenario analysis – clarification to NICE technical team

The Technical Team at NICE have requested further clarification regarding Table 24 of the EAC report, including why the values for gauze and larvae change. This is provided below.

The EAC re-ran the sponsor's sensitivity analysis (Table 23) and scenario analysis (Table 24). These analyses varied the same variables/assumptions as the sponsor's analyses but used the starting point of the EAC cumulative base case results which are reported in Table 22. The scenario analysis examined the impact of two key variables, separately and in combination. These are:

- The proportion of patients whose wounds are successfully debrided with Debrisoft and do not switch to hydrogel (base case: 77%; scenario analysis: 50% and 90%)
- The number of visits needed for hydrogel application (basecase: 11.2 home/10.2 clinic; scenarios analysis: 5 home/5 clinic; 7 home/7 clinic; 12 home/12 clinic; 15 home/15 clinic)

The EAC analysis varied from the sponsor's (Table 17) in four main aspects:

- The starting point for the analysis is the cumulative EAC re-analysis presented in Table 22.
- The EAC applied the scenario analysis to the analysis for home visits as well as clinic visits (not considered in the sponsor's analysis);
- The number of visits needed for hydrogel application was varied more widely.
- In the sponsor's scenario analysis, the variation in the number visits to apply hydrogel was applied only in the hydrogel group, and not for the proportion of patients in the Debrisoft group who receive hydrogel (basecase 23% of patients). In the EAC analysis the variation in the number visits to apply hydrogel is applied for all patients who receive hydrogel.

Table 24 shows the incremental cost results for Debrisoft relative to each of the three comparators. The incremental cost values for larvae and gauze change because the cost estimates for Debrisoft have changed. The costs for Debrisoft have changed in up to two ways (depending on the specific analysis): (i) the percentage of wounds completely debrided after three applications of Debrisoft and (ii) the number of nurse visits required for hydrogel application (clinic and home) for patients' whose wounds have not fully debrided after 3 visits.

Debrisoft remains the most cost saving technology in all scenarios except where the proportion of patients whose wounds debride after 3 applications is 50% and the number of visits for hydrogel application is 5 or 7 (at home or in clinic), or where the proportion of patients whose wounds debride after 3 applications is 77% and the number of visits for hydrogel application is 5 (home visits only). In these circumstances hydrogel is the most cost saving technology.

MT192 Debrisoft monofilament debridement pad: Additional scenario analysis - Louise Longworth and Eleonora Lovato, Birmingham & Brunel EAC

At the request of the NICE team, we have provided an additional scenario analysis varying three additional assumptions simultaneously. The starting point for this analysis is the cumulative base case results (reported in Table 22 of the EAC report). Additional parameters and variations are:

- To include an additional five nurse visits for each larvae application, each with an average duration of 15 minutes
- Only one home visit for the first application of Debrisoft (to reflect the assumption that nurses have immediate access to Debrisoft at their first home visit and there is no need to order it)
- Only two home visits for the first application of Hydrogel (to reflect the assumption that nurses have immediate access to hydrogel at their first home visit and there is no need to order it)

Results of this additional sensitivity analysis are reported in Table 1 below.

A further scenario analysis was requested from NICE to include all three of the assumptions listed above, plus assumptions that 100% of wounds are completely debrided after 1 application of Debrisoft, and that hydrogel and gauze require 10 applications. The results are reported in Table 2. Debrisoft remains the cheapest technology in all scenarios.

Table 1: Results from the additional scenario analysis 1 (costs and incremental costs for Debrisoft relative to each comparator).

	Saline & gauze		Hydrogel		Larvae		Debrisoft	
	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic
Cost of debridement	£621	£291	£497	£238	£744	£623	£275	£139
Debrisoft incremental cost	-£347	-£152	-£222	-£99	-£469	-£484		

Table 2: Results from the additional scenario analysis 2 (costs and incremental costs for Debrisoft relative to each comparator).

	Saline & gauze		Hydrogel		Larvae		Debrisoft	
	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic	Home	Clinic
Cost of debridement	£526	£246	£536	£256	£528	£436	£53	£28
Debrisoft incremental cost	-£472	-£218	-£482	-£228	-£474	-£408		