Table VI. Logistics regression report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Std error</th>
<th>Probability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days (in hospital)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt (1 = blunt)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital (1 = JH)</td>
<td>-0.463</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter (1 = helicopter)</td>
<td>-1.300</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

highly significant variable, only the patient's age is possibly significant (P = 0.076). Not surprisingly, the older the patient the less likely the TRISS methodology is to predict the probability of survival or death correctly.

**CONCLUSION**

Helicopters clearly deserve a place in the emergency care of trauma victims. However, this is only one link in the chain that will ultimately lead to either death or survival. For it to be successful, it must link reliable, efficient emergency medical services (road-based) and effective trauma centres that are staffed appropriately with a committed team of health care professionals. If used appropriately there appears to be little doubt that these expensive machines can play an important role in preventing certain unnecessary deaths while reducing costs for both individuals and health care facilities.**
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**EXPLORING THE COSTS OF A LIMITED PUBLIC SECTOR ANTIRETROVIRAL TREATMENT PROGRAMME IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Andrew Boulle, Christopher Kenyon, Jolene Skordis, Robin Wood

**Background.** The role of antiretroviral treatment for adults in the public sector in South Africa is debated with little consideration of programme choices that could impact on the cost-effectiveness of the intervention. This study seeks to explore the impact of these programme choices at an individual level, as well as explore the total cost of a rationed national public sector antiretroviral treatment programme.

**Methods.** Eight scenarios were modelled of limited national treatment programmes over the next 5 years, reflecting different programme design choices. The individual cost-effectiveness of these scenarios were compared. The total costs of the most cost-effective scenario were calculated, and the potential for savings in other areas of health care utilisation was explored.

**Results.** The direct programme costs per life-year saved varied between scenarios from R5 923 to R11 829. All the costs of the most cost-effective scenario could potentially be offset depending on assumptions of health care access and utilisation. The total programme costs for the most cost-effective scenario in 2007 with 107 000 people on treatment are around R409 million.

**Conclusion.** Specific policy choices could almost double the number of people who could benefit from an investment in a limited national antiretroviral treatment programme. Such a programme is affordable within current resource constraints. The consideration of antiretroviral treatment calls for a unique public health approach to the rationing of health services in the public sector.

The approach to costing ART provision is based on an health system, we explore the relative cost-effectiveness of a programme. Conceivably begin in implications of a limited national antiretroviral treatment infrastructure.

Individual number of ART-related policy options and the overall resource role extended preventive provide antiretroviral interventions. Whereas the role for antiretroviral therapy (ART) for HIV has been an issue for scientific and public debate in South Africa, a number of middle-income and poor countries have already initiated treatment programmes in spite of resource constraints (Brazil, Chile, Thailand, Nigeria, Senegal, Cote D’Ivoire). The recent publication by the World Health Organisation of guidelines for the scaling up of antiretroviral treatment programmes is indicative of both a convergence of clinical thinking and the increasing pressure on health care systems to provide antiretroviral interventions.

In addition to the survival and quality of life benefits for individual patients, many authors have pointed to the synergies between antiretroviral treatment programmes and preventive strategies. Others have compellingly described the role extended HIV survival could have in reducing the burden on society and preserving our human and social infrastructure.

The following model costs a rationed national antiretroviral treatment programme for adult South Africans that could conceivably begin in 2002. From the perspective of the public health system, we explore the relative cost-effectiveness of a number of ART-related policy options and the overall resource implications of a limited national antiretroviral treatment programme.

**METHODS**

**Service model**

The approach to costing ART provision is based on an emerging service model in which:

- Specific HIV/AIDS services are required to develop the relationships between patients and clinicians, to ensure continuity of care, and to provide a mechanism through which patients can be evaluated for potential enrollment onto an ART programme.
- Consequent on meeting predetermined eligibility criteria, which are a combination of clinical and (possibly) social assessment, patients are considered eligible for ART around the time that they become AIDS symptomatic.
- After commencing treatment, patients are managed through the HIV/AIDS service, but still attend regular services for other routine and acute care.

**Numbers on treatment**

A spreadsheet model with eight scenarios (Table I) was used to anticipate the numbers of people on antiretroviral treatment over the next 10 years. In the model, the number of new patients receiving treatment was gradually increased over 5 years. The cumulative number of people surviving on treatment in the model by the middle of 2007 varied between scenarios from 106 911 to 117 621, depending on survival assumptions and whether or not second-line treatment was offered to a proportion of those failing the first-line regimen (Fig. 1).

Those on treatment were stratified into a number of subgroups, reflecting those on a first-line regimen, those on a second-line regimen, and those failing treatment. The first 6 months of a new regimen were distinguished from the remaining time on the regimen. The model was run for a
Further 5 years with constant assumptions in order to explore the medium-term impact of deferring costs. By 2007 the numbers of people accessing treatment in the model could represent 10% of those becoming AIDS-symptomatic that year (compared with estimates of adult deaths in the subsequent 2 years). The combined impact on new infections of extended survival, reduced viral load and altered behaviour for those on treatment was assumed to be neutral compared with a no-treatment scenario. Additional or averted new infections are likely to have little impact on the total direct treatment costs in the timeframe of this analysis.

Direct programme costs

Medicines

The biggest cost-driver of ART is undoubtedly the medicine costs. In this model, the limited number of medicines selected is sufficient for a single regimen or for two independent regimens, while still sufficiently restricted to limit costs in both the generic and patent pricing scenarios. It is assumed that all rationally selected starting regimens have equivalent treatment outcomes.

The estimated proportion of patients likely to switch from any single medicine due to intolerance is based on the experience to date in Khayelitsha validated by HIV clinicians. In cases of single-medicine changes, the first 6 months of treatment are apportioned to the starting medicine, while the remaining time on the regimen is apportioned to the medicine to which the patient changes. In effect virological failure and intolerance are modelled separately, with the crude assumption that 6 months is the average time at which a medicine is changed for reasons of intolerance. It was necessary to include intolerance-driven individual medicine switches within first- and second-line regimens as they impact significantly on overall medicine costs in the baseline scenario (where generic pricing is utilised). Where a combination tablet could substitute for individual medicines, the price of the combination tablet was included. Future price changes are another important variable in anticipating medicine costs. The model presented assumes an annual price reduction in real terms of 10% per year for the first 3 years and 5% annually thereafter. Sensitivity analysis explores the impact of no reduction in price and a 15% initial reduction (for the first 3 years) followed by 7.5% per annum.

Laboratory monitoring

Based on the WHO recommendations, the model incorporates two testing scenarios. The first provides for all tests (including a twice-yearly CD4 count and a CD4 count before enrolment) except for viral load testing. The second is an optional scenario in which viral load tests and CD4 counts are conducted three times a year.

Visit costs for the antiretroviral treatment programme

Allowing that consultation costs (including additional staff training) may be higher than for standard primary care consultations, a factor of 1.5 is applied to the average cost of a primary care consultation in the Western Cape metropole (where there are doctor- and nurse-driven services). This factor is varied between 1 and 2.5 in the sensitivity analysis.

The visit schedule applied is that used in the current Medicin Sans Frontieres treatment protocol to estimate the additional visits required as a result of ART. Again two scenarios are built; one in which a proportion of the visits are at a lower cost structure as the visit is principally to ensure adherence and dispense medicines, and another where the majority of the visits are with a doctor.

Provision is also made for visits to HIV/AIDS services by a proportion of HIV-infected people in WHO clinical stage 3. This proportion is set equal to the proportion of patients accessing treatment when becoming AIDS-symptomatic. The model assumes an average of 3 visits per year for those not on antiretrovirals but attending the HIV/AIDS services as a prelude to possible enrolment in an ART programme. These visits are costed at the existing clinic consultation costs, and form a substantial component of the workload.

Anticipating the individual benefits of treatment

The survival benefits of ART are not yet fully described. Published data at 3 years since the initiation of therapy, however, suggest a remarkable reduction in the anticipated
mortality.\textsuperscript{23} UNAIDS currently recommend that a survival benefit of 5 - 7 years be used for HIV modelling in rich countries.\textsuperscript{4} Early indications suggest that a rationed programme in South Africa is likely to have comparable benefits to rich countries, taking into account baseline immunological characteristics at the onset of treatment.\textsuperscript{56} The model below uses a median survival from initiating treatment of 4.5 years if two regimens are offered (weibull distribution, mean of 6.06 years of which the benefit is 4.46 years). The model assumes that treatment is failing for a period at the end of treatment of equivalent duration to WHO stage 4. It is further assumed that, of the survival benefit, 60% is derived from the first regimen, and the remainder from an alternative regimen. For the scenarios in which second-line treatment is included, it is assumed that not everyone in whom a first regimen fails will be offered a second regimen, either because they have exhausted their affordable treatment options through intolerance-driven individual medicine changes, or because they do not meet additional eligibility criteria for second-line treatment.

The life-years gained derive directly from the survival benefit assumptions, and are calculated as life-years gained per year on treatment while treatment is not failing (Fig. 2).

**Benefits on broader health care utilisation**

Although antiretroviral treatment does not prevent the eventual morbidity and associated health care utilisation that occurs in the terminal stages of HIV infection, this utilisation is deferred by the duration of the survival benefit. Within the realistic timeframes of any planning exercise of this nature, this deferral could result in a real benefit to the health care system. The key contributors to the cost saving are the principal cost drivers of hospital inpatient days, ambulatory consultations and tuberculosis treatment. No discounting was applied to deferred costs.

The estimates used (Table II) are similar to those used in other HIV costing studies.\textsuperscript{10\textsuperscript{14}}

---

**Table II. Cost and utilisation assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-ARV/HIV-related clinical costs</th>
<th>Utilisation</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitlisation (1)</strong></td>
<td>Inpatient days</td>
<td>Stage 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinic consultations (2)</strong></td>
<td>Extra consults</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuberculosis (3)</strong></td>
<td>Annual risk</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARV-related costs</strong></td>
<td>ARV utilisation</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARV laboratory costs (5)</strong></td>
<td>Extra tests</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARV visit costs (6)</strong></td>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 2. Survival and effectiveness assumptions.**
RESULTS

Direct treatment costs

The direct costs of treatment for the baseline (A and D) scenarios were stratified by regimen and by the first 6 months on each regimen (Fig. 3). The first 6 months of treatment are disproportionately expensive compared with the subsequent annual costs, especially with respect to laboratory and consultation costs. The differential between first-line and second-line medicine prices when accessing generic medicines is clearly evident. The costs per treatment year (after the first 6 months) vary between scenarios and regimens from R5 890 (A: first-line) to R15 288 (G: second-line). Medicine costs dominate expenditure across all scenarios and regimens.

Cost per life-year gained

The use of generic versus patented medicines is the single most important factor impacting on the costs per life-year gained at 5 years (Table III). The cost per life-year gained is 48–53% greater when patented medicine prices are utilised. Additional testing and switching most of the consultations to doctors increased costs by a further 45%. Combining patented medicines with optional laboratory monitoring and consultation schedules yielded a 99% increase in the cost per life-year saved (F).

In those scenarios where second-line treatment is included at generic prices (D and E), the marginal cost per life-year saved when adding this treatment is 36–39% higher than the baseline cost (A: first-line only).

Sensitivity analysis reinforced the pivotal role of assumed changes in future medicine pricing (S1 and S2: 23% increase in the baseline cost per life-year saved over 5 years if no price reductions). It also demonstrated the relatively small impact of changing assumptions on the services required before enrolment (S7), the cost-structure for consultations (S3 and S4), or the duration of the survival benefit on treatment (S5 and S6).

Total costs and potential resource savings as a result of deferred treatment

In the most cost-effective scenario, the total direct costs of a programme of this size are estimated to be R409 million in the year 2006–2007. Taking into account the deferred hospitalisation and consultation costs for those on ART, there is a considerable impact on resource utilisation. When quantified financially over 5 years, this covers the cost of antiretroviral treatment (135% of direct programme costs averted). At 10 years some of the deferred costs have re-entered the system, reflected by a reduction in cumulative savings as a percentage of the direct intervention costs over this period (90% of intervention costs).

DISCUSSION

This exercise illustrates how policy choices impact on the benefits of a rationed ART programme and how those benefits are distributed. It is immediately apparent that accessing cheaper medicines could significantly extend the impact of such an intervention. We used generic pricing in our baseline scenario based on the sincere belief that it is a realistic policy option which has been successfully applied in a number of countries (generics of zidovudine and lamivudine have recently been registered by the Medicines Control Council, although they are still inaccessible due to patent restrictions).

It is sometimes argued that medicine costs are over-emphasised. This analysis supports a strong emphasis on medicine costs. While the cost of monitoring patients on ART has fallen over the past year, some investigations (viral load testing in this analysis) remain prohibitively expensive for the benefit they add, and should not necessarily be an automatic component of a public sector programme until their costs are reduced.

The marginal cost per life-year saved when adding second-line treatment to the baseline scenario was considerably higher.
Table III. Cost-effectiveness and sensitivity analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/life-year</th>
<th>% change from baseline</th>
<th>Marginal cost/life-year</th>
<th>% change from first line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Baseline</td>
<td>R5 923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Optional</td>
<td>R8 595</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>R8 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Patent pricing</td>
<td>R9 089</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: 50% second-line access</td>
<td>R6 082</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R8 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: 75% second-line access</td>
<td>R6 136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: B &amp; C combined</td>
<td>R11 761</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: B, C &amp; D combined</td>
<td>R11 829</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>R12 736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: 5 &amp; D combined</td>
<td>R8 775</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensitivity analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity analysis</th>
<th>Cost/life-year</th>
<th>% change from baseline</th>
<th>Marginal cost/life-year</th>
<th>% change from first line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A with no medicine discount</td>
<td>R7 266</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with medicine discounts 50% higher</td>
<td>R5 388</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with no additional cost for consultations</td>
<td>R5 571</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with visit cost factor 2.5</td>
<td>R6 627</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with first-line survival 4 years</td>
<td>R5 675</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with combined survival of 6.5 years</td>
<td>R5 797</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>R8 184</td>
<td>44 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with non-ARV visit costs</td>
<td>R5 398</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A with no medicine discounts</td>
<td>R7 528</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>R11 048</td>
<td>52 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39%) than the cost without this option. This increase is partially masked by the reductions in medicine prices over time, as those accessing second-line treatment are doing so a few years into the programme. One sensitivity analysis (68) demonstrates that the marginal increase could be as high as 52% without the effect of the medicine price reductions.

Although clinicians baulk at limiting ART to a single tier of therapy, the option of spreading a smaller benefit to a greater number of patients needs serious consideration, bearing in mind the additional health system implications of enrolling additional new patients. We are not necessarily advocating that only one tier of therapy be considered. A gradual implementation of ART would have relatively few people on second-line treatment by 5 years, with the total programme costs not being considerably more expensive than the baseline programme cost presented. It is also likely that the differential cost between first- and second-line treatment will reduce over time as a greater number of antiretrovirals are produced by generic manufacturers. If the price differential remains large and financial resource constraints are considered the limiting factor to more widespread treatment, and if maximal diffusion of treatment is a policy goal, then an examination of the marginal costs of second-line treatment will remain important.

Even without offsets, the total costs of a programme of this size are a small fraction of anticipated health sector expenditure on HIV/AIDS. Although many may find the size of this programme unpalatably small, a programme that is approaching 100 000 people on treatment within 5 years would be a significant achievement.

This study has a number of limitations. Importantly, in the absence of an existing policy to provide antiretrovirals as treatment for adults in the public sector, it was necessary to piece together assumptions from many different sources. Some assumptions should be treated with great caution, in particular those anticipating health service utilisation in the absence of antiretroviral treatment.

Although estimates of health care utilisation that derive from cohort studies may not apply to the whole population due to unequal access, it is likely that those who do access the ART programme would have been able to access clinical services had they not received the intervention. Given the large excess demand for services, it is unlikely that averted utilisation will result in financial savings in any but the least-affected provinces, resulting instead in better quality of care for those who would otherwise be unable to access services. The re-entry into the system of deferred utilisation only partially erodes these gains even at 10 years, and should not deter health planners from comprehensively responding to the immediate crisis.

It has been demonstrated that with the correct policy choices, the cost of providing an ART intervention could be considerably cheaper per year of treatment than has been quoted by many of the studies that have deemed ART to be unaffordable.\(^1^7\)\(^-\)\(^2^0\) It has been further demonstrated that the averted costs could result in savings that make the intervention cost-saving, or at least significantly more cost-effective than an examination of the direct costs yields. This is only from the perspective of the health sector without consideration of
possible synergistic prevention gains. Even with the averted costs factored in, when the modelled intervention is scaled up to cover much greater percentages of those in need, it demands extraordinary expenditures. How can a cost-saving intervention be unaffordable?

The public health system is implicitly rationing services through reduced access to care, and the extent of this is likely to increase. A modelled ART programme that assumes more extensive access than is implicitly provided for non-ART services at present, will appear unaffordable even if it is cost-saving at an individual level.

Conclusions

There are very clear policy choices, political and clinical, which for the same expenditure could double the number of people benefitting from a rationed ART programme. A programme that utilises generic medicines, is pragmatic with respect to laboratory monitoring and consultations, and maximises the diffusion of benefits, is the most cost-effective, and is considerably cheaper than many previous estimates suggest.

Whereas we should strive to provide treatment to as many of those in need as possible through the future mobilisation of additional resources and campaigning for price reductions in medicines and laboratory tests, a rationed treatment programme is currently affordable within existing resource constraints, and would have enormous benefits. We should not make our provision of this intervention consequent on raising additional resources, and the decision to proceed could in fact aid our attempts to mobilise external financial resources. The public good resulting from the broader impact on prevention and morale, which is arguably one of the major benefits of introducing a rationed programme now, could be substantially realised with relatively small numbers on treatment.

The present and anticipated HIV burden on the public health care system is such that rationing is inevitable, with the prospect of planning for a new intervention such as ART requiring us to be explicit about our inability to meet demand. This paper serves to highlight the need for a revised public health discourse around rationing to deal with the unique challenges faced in providing antiretroviral interventions where they are most needed.
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