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Background

• Economic evaluation has been used as a strategic tool in the justification of harm reduction programmes in a politically difficult environment.
• Many studies indicate that broad societal benefits outweigh low implementation costs even when more expensive AIDS and hepatitis C treatments are considered.
• We carried out a systematic review to assess international evidence generated from these studies and the underlying quality in reporting and methods. This paper reports on the findings of the review of the costing methodologies.
Map 1.2: Global availability of opioid substitution therapy
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Methods

- Peer reviewed and grey literature was searched for studies published in English from 1990 until 2011.
- Search terms included ‘cost’ or ‘economic’ and ‘substance abuse’ or ‘injecting drug use*’ or ‘methadone’ or ‘substitution therapy’ or ‘needle exchange’.
- Cost analyses or economic evaluations were selected.
- Information was collected on author, year of costing, currency, country, intervention, analysis type, perspective, outcomes, data sources, and main results.
- Study methods were critiqued using the BMJ check list for economic evaluations and a quality score was developed.
RESULTS
Number of papers identified: 973

Papers selected for abstract review: 116

Papers included in quality review: 71

Substitution therapy: 27
Needle/syringe exchange: 21
HIV/HCV treatment/prevention: 11
Combined: 3
Cost of illness: 9

19 papers identified in grey literature

876 did not meet inclusion criteria

44 did not meet inclusion criteria
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Studies by income region (WB classification)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of analysis by region

HIC
- CBA: 17
- CUA: 11
- CEA: 18
- Cost: 11

LMIC
- CBA: 2
- CUA: 5
- CEA: 5
- Cost: 1
- COI: 0
No. of analyses by intervention & region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>HIC</th>
<th>LMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCVP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCVT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIVP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIVT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST, HCVT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST, HIVT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST, NSP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BMJ check list review

- 13% (9/71) scored greater than 90% on the BMJ check list
- 32/71 scored greater than 80%
- Most frequent problems in reporting were:
  - Lack of details on price adjustments (34)
  - Resource quantities not reported separately (30)
  - Perspective not clearly stated (28) (or justified – 61)
  - No justification for discount rate (26)
  - Economic importance not stated (25)
  - No justification for form of evaluation (22)
  - Currency and price data not recorded (21)
BMJ check list review – LMIC studies only

- 27% (3/11) scored greater than 90% on the BMJ check list
- 5/11 scored greater than 80%
- Most frequent problems in reporting were:
  - Resource quantities not reported separately (7)
  - No justification for discount rate (7)
  - Details of the meta analysis not given (5) *
  - Lack of details on price adjustments (5)
  - Major outcomes not presented in disaggregated and aggregated way (5)*
  - Economic importance not stated (4)
  - Unit cost estimation methods not clear (4) *
  - Currency and price data not recorded (4)
  - Perspective not clearly stated (3) (or justified – 9)

* Not identified as frequent problem in HIC studies
Studies by region (>80% score on check list) n=32 – where has our evidence gone?

![Bar chart showing studies by region and period](chart.png)
Costing methods – data

• Primary cost data collection was used in 54% of the studies.
• 18 studies used a bottom approach to costing – 2 of which used secondary cost data.
• Fifty-three studies used a provider perspective, 12 used a societal one.
• Ten studies used financial costing (including claims data and financial operating costs) and only 15 studies explicitly stated which type of costs were used.
## Costing methods - design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costing method</th>
<th>Number of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-costing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation survey plus cost data</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation (best practice) plus national prices</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation survey plus national prices</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation survey plus secondary costs</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National costing scheme</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme costing</strong></td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costing (accounts/ payer/ budget)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary cost data</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient information on sources</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of costing by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIC</th>
<th>LMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient detail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme costing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National guidelines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro costing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Insufficient detail
- Secondary data
- Financial costing
- Programme costing
- National guidelines
- Micro costing
The role of modelling in cost estimation

- Significant role of modelling (1/3 studies model costs)
- 3 of which used primary data
- Modelling requires good data.....
What role guidelines?

• U.S has been at forefront of developing costing tools – DATCAP, SASCAP
  – Not used extensively: overall - 5/71; for U.S. - 4/ 34
• UNAIDS and ADB have intervention specific guidelines
  – Not used in HICs
  – 4/11 studies in LMICs use UNAIDS or ADB guidelines
  – 1 uses U.S. tool
• Nor are generic tools such as BMJ checklist used extensively
Conclusions

• Harm reduction economic evaluations are focussed in U.S. – studies from Europe and LMICs are limited
• Economic evaluations are increasingly being published in LMICs (see e-poster: Harker and Guinness).
• BMJ check list provides information on the quality of reporting only but this is important if information to be used in further analyses
• It is possible to produce good quality evidence from LMICs
• Concern that guidelines are not being utilised
• As journal editors, peer reviewers, authors and researchers we have responsibility to improve the evidence base