

Cost Benefit Analysis

ECN 240

CMD

What is economic evaluation?

If the government is going to take on a project or intervene, we need ways to compare the costs and benefits of the project/intervention for decision-making:

- ▶ whether to take on a project or not
- ▶ which of several possible projects is best

Prevention is often not cheaper than cure

- ▶ Prevention targets more people than will ever get the disease, so even if per person prevention is cheaper, there are more people involved.
- ▶ Some interventions aren't very effective at changing behavior.
- ▶ Prevention makes people live longer, thus increasing health care expenses, social security and Medicare, but not economic productivity.

Implications:

- ▶ Need economic evaluation before decisions are made.
- ▶ Careful economic evaluation should take into account the appropriate costs and benefits.

Costs of interventions

Intervention	Costs per Life -year (\$1993)
Influenza vaccine for all citizens	140
Mammography for women age 50	810
Random motor vehicle inspections	1,500
Water chlorination	4,200
Pneumonia vaccination	12,000
Strengthening of buildings in earthquake-prone areas	18 million

Cost Benefit Analysis

- ▶ Compare costs (C) and benefits (B) of public investment
- ▶ If $B - C > 0$, then invest
- ▶ Or choose approach with highest B/C ratio

CBA – details

- ▶ Opportunity costs:
 - ▶ what you pay (flu shot costs)
 - ▶ what you give up (time of workers getting shot)
- ▶ Benefits:
 - ▶ to recipient (person who got flu shot)
 - ▶ to external party (not immunized who has less exposure to flu)

CBA – details

- ▶ Take into account ALL costs:
 - ▶ Direct medical care costs
Def:
 - ▶ Direct nonmedical costs
Def:
 - ▶ Indirect costs
Def:
- ▶ Examples of Total Costs:

Discounting

Which would you prefer?

- 1) \$100 today or \$100 in two months?

Discounting

Which would you prefer?

- 1) \$100 today or \$100 in two months?
- 2) \$50 today or \$100 in two months?

Discounting

Which would you prefer?

- 1) \$100 today or \$100 in two months?
- 2) \$50 today or \$100 in two months?

Money today and money in two months may have a different value to you. This is called discounting.

Discounting

If project has future costs and benefits, need to discount

$$NPV = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{B_t - C_t}{(1+r)^t} \quad (1)$$

- ▶ NPV - Net Present Value
- ▶ B_t - Benefit at time t
- ▶ C_t - Cost at time t
- ▶ r - discount rate (ex. annual rate of interest)
- ▶ T number of years in calculation

Discounting

- ▶ discount rate r is important- determines the rate at which the benefits fall off
- ▶ if too high then the future doesn't matter as much and you'll choose short-term benefit projects
- ▶ if too low then you only care about the future and choose long-term benefit projects

Example of CBA

Should college students be vaccinated again meningococcal disease?

Costs:

- ▶ cost of vaccine+admin cost = \$30.53 per dose
- ▶ 2.3 million freshmen enter college every year
- ▶ 80 percent would receive vaccine
- ▶ 1 severe reaction per 100,000 students vaccinated at cost of \$1830 per case

What is the total cost?

Example of CBA, cont.

Benefits:

- ▶ direct medical benefits per case (diverted costs) = \$8145
- ▶ Suppose college student rate of disease = 2.6*national average (76 nonfatal cases avoided)
- ▶ value of life of 20 year old = \$1 million
- ▶ 12 lives saved

What is the total benefit?

Example of CBA, cont.

- ▶ $\text{Benefit} - \text{Cost} = ?$
- ▶ program would save lives, but do the benefits outweigh the costs?

Example of CBA, cont.

- ▶ $\text{Benefit} - \text{Cost} = ?$
- ▶ program would save lives, but do the benefits outweigh the costs?

Rate of infection needs to be at least 13x the national average.

Cost Effectiveness Analysis

- ▶ Estimates costs associated with 2 or more medical treatment options for a given health care objective
 - ▶ cost effectiveness ratio = $\frac{C_1 - C_0}{E_1 - E_0}$
 - ▶ $C_1 - C_0$ = change in social costs incurred due to treatment
 - ▶ $E_1 - E_0$ = gain in health outcome
 - ▶ in life-years or quality-adjusted life years
- ▶ Advantage over CBA: don't need to convert *benefit* to dollars
Note: still need to discount because life in 2 years is worth less than life today

QALYs

QALY (quality-adjusted life years) = life expectancy * measure of the quality of remaining life-years

- ▶ health utility index usually between 0 (death) and 1 (full health)
- ▶ developed from survey answers (respondents rate various health outcomes, or have to choose between 2 alternative health outcomes)
- ▶ mostly US, UK, and Canada surveys

Drawbacks of QALYs

- ▶ survey methods may be biased
- ▶ does not tell us whether society is better off (as with CBA)
- ▶ values older people less because successful treatment of older person saves fewer life-years

CEA Calculations

Treatment option	cost	life-years gained	health-utility index	QALY
Current procedure	\$20,000	2 years	0.7	1.4
New procedure	\$110,000	8 years	0.4	3.2

CEA Calculations

Treatment option	cost	life-years gained	health-utility index	QALY
Current procedure	\$20,000	2 years	0.7	1.4
New procedure	\$110,000	8 years	0.4	3.2

- ▶ CE ratio (w/o quality adjustment) =
$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{8 - 2} = \$15,000$$

CEA Calculations

Treatment option	cost	life-years gained	health-utility index	QALY
Current procedure	\$20,000	2 years	0.7	1.4
New procedure	\$110,000	8 years	0.4	3.2

- ▶ CE ratio (w/o quality adjustment) =

$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{8 - 2} = \$15,000$$

new medical option costs \$15,000 per life-year gained; low so
new procedure should be adopted

CEA Calculations

Treatment option	cost	life-years gained	health-utility index	QALY
Current procedure	\$20,000	2 years	0.7	1.4
New procedure	\$110,000	8 years	0.4	3.2

- ▶ CE ratio (w/o quality adjustment) =
$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{8 - 2} = \$15,000$$

new medical option costs \$15,000 per life-year gained; low so new procedure should be adopted
- ▶ CE ratio (w/ quality adjustment) =
$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{3.2 - 1.4} = \$50,000$$

CEA Calculations

Treatment option	cost	life-years gained	health-utility index	QALY
Current procedure	\$20,000	2 years	0.7	1.4
New procedure	\$110,000	8 years	0.4	3.2

- ▶ CE ratio (w/o quality adjustment) =
$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{8 - 2} = \$15,000$$

new medical option costs \$15,000 per life-year gained; low so new procedure should be adopted
- ▶ CE ratio (w/ quality adjustment) =
$$\frac{\$110,000 - \$20,000}{3.2 - 1.4} = \$50,000$$

higher cost per QALY because quality of life is lower with new procedure; maybe shouldn't be adopted

Example of CEA/CUA

Autologous vs. traditional community blood donations

- ▶ autologous donation (donor and recipient are same person) are safer but admin and collection costs are higher
- ▶ Is the increased safety worth the costs? Case is total hip replacement surgery
- ▶ additional cost per unit of autologous blood transfused = \$68
- ▶ QALY saved per unit transfused = 0.00029 (2.5 hours of perfect health)
- ▶ CU ratio = $\frac{\$68}{0.00029} = \$234,483$
- ▶ costly way of saving a life