

Health Economics *News*

issue 37 • March 2020 www.york.ac.uk/che

Welcome to the CHE Newsletter

If you are viewing this newsletter electronically and would like further details on particular topics, click on the icon marked www, or if reading from a hard copy go to our website www.york.ac.uk/che/publications

Follow us on and



Courses and Workshops

The Centre for Health Economics (CHE) offers a programme of short courses and workshops in health economics.

More details here www





Is an ounce of prevention worth a pound of cure?

Project Team: Stephen Martin (Department of Economics and Related Studies), James Lomas, Karl Claxton (CHE)

The NHS spends about 5% of its annual budget on preventive activity with most of the remainder on treatment. However, most observers agree that prevention is better than cure and three recent government publications emphasise the importance of prevention, with calls for the proportion spent on prevention to increase to 15%, if the government's target gains in healthy life expectancy by 2035 are to be realised.

Looking at variations between local authorities in 2013, our econometric model estimates that it costs the NHS around £13,500 to improve population health by one quality-adjusted life year (QALY), while for the public health grant from local authorities it costs only £3,800.

An increase in public health expenditure is therefore more productive of health than a change in NHS healthcare expenditure, and hence the recent proposal to shift resources away from the latter and towards the former is an evidence-based one. Our cost per QALY calculations reveal that public health expenditure appears to be about three to four times more productive at the margin than healthcare expenditure. Thus Benjamin Franklin's axiom – that 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure' – is correct in this context in the sense that prevention is more productive than cure but, with 16 ounces to the pound, the adage rather exaggerates the size of this advantage.

For more details see CHE Research Paper 166: www

CHE Research Fellowship

Written by Rachel Meacock, University of Manchester



I am currently just over half way through my CHE Research Fellowship, and it has been a fantastic experience so far. I spend one week each month visiting CHE, which gives me uninterrupted time to work on my Fellowship project. Having worked at the University of Manchester for nine years, the CHE Research Fellowship has been a great way of widening my network of collaborators and gaining exposure to new ways of thinking.

I am collaborating with Simon Walker, Susan Griffin, and Nils Gutacker to develop a method for estimating the impact of health policy interventions in terms of QALYs. This builds on work I started as part of my PhD, and it has been a great opportunity to take these ideas forward. My Fellowship finishes in July when I will present the results at a CHE seminar, another valuable chance to receive feedback on my ideas.

The CHE Research Fellowship has been a great experience, both professionally and personally. I hope that the collaborative relationships we are currently building will carry on long after the Fellowship ends. To anyone considering applying for the 2020 round, I would definitely recommend it.

Further details of how to apply for the 2020 Fellowship are here: www

What is the impact of a service to support carers of people with dementia?

Project Team: Francesco Longo, Rita Faria, Helen Weatherly (CHE) Kate Gridley, Gillian Parker (Social Policy Research Unit), Fiona Aspinal (UCL), Bernard van den Berg (VU University Amsterdam)

Informal unpaid carers provide essential support to enable people with dementia to remain living in the community. Caring may have a negative impact on carers' own wellbeing and health, but evidence on how best to support carers is scarce.

Admiral Nursing (AN) is the only specialist nursing service in the UK to focus on supporting carers of people with dementia. This study

explored the



Photo shows Paulette Winchester-Joseph, Deputy Clinical Lead, Admiral Nurse Dementia Helpline

feasibility of collecting data from carers, who can find it difficult to be involved in research. It used a one-off survey to compare the quality of life and costs for carers with and without AN. It provides an indication of the cost-effectiveness of AN and informs future studies on support services for

Carers who used AN were older and more heavily involved in caring than other carers. Taking differences across carers into account, the quality of life of carers using AN appeared slightly better than that of carers without AN. This benefit, however, may have been due by chance. The costs of the health and social care services used by both groups were similar.

The full report is here www

and Journal Article here www

Shocks to health and labour market responses

Project Team: Andrew Jones (Department of Economics and Related Studies), Nigel Rice (CHE), Francesca Zantomio (Ca' Foscari University of Venice)

Health is an important determinant of labour

market participation and productivity. Policy initiatives around maintaining employment opportunities, and reducing the employment gap between individuals with and without long-term health conditions relies on understanding the link between labour supply decisions and changes in health.



Employing panel data from the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) this research investigates the labour supply response of individuals following an acute shock to their health (incidence of cancer, stroke or heart attack). We find a substantial increase in the probability of labour market exit and reduced hours and earnings following a health shock. Impacts are stronger for women, older workers, and those who experience more severe health impairments. Individuals who remain in employment display greater employer attachment than their non-shocked counterparts measured through feelings about their job.

These results are particularly pertinent given concerns about population ageing, the need to prolong working lives, and recent policies to limit the fiscal burden of social security provision and the need to promote the labour market inclusion of disabled individuals.

Published version of the paper is here: www

Funding: This work originated through a visit to CHE by Francesca Zantomio under the CHE Research Fellowship scheme.

Festival of Social Science: War and Peace engagement event

Written by Kay Fountain

The War and Peace project team were delighted to take part in the ESRC Festival of Social Science in November 2019, designed to promote social sciences to a wide audience, including the general public. 'Building peace, improving health: an evening event with perspectives from Colombia' showcased some of the project's findings so far and included short films, an interactive map of Colombia showing conflict events and initiatives, and a timeline of the conflict. The evening also included a panel discussion involving members of the project team from both the University of York and the Universidad de los Andes, a British journalist based in Bogota, a Colombian visual artist and a representative from the Colombian Ministry of Health.

The War and Peace research project focuses on the consequences for health and health systems of longterm conflict. The project's conclusions, due later in 2020, will support evidence-based health policy recommendations in Colombia and other conflict-affected countries. More details here www

Why are there long waits at English emergency departments?

Project Team: James Gaughan, Panos Kasteridis, Anne Mason (CHE) Andrew Street (LSE)

Long waiting times in hospital Accident and Emergency (A&E) departments are a concern for patients, hospitals, and policy makers. To try to minimise the number of long waits, there is a target that 95% of patients should be admitted, discharged or transferred within four hours of arriving at an A&E. Reports of long waits regularly make national headlines, especially in recent years when the target has been repeatedly breached.

Our study investigates the drivers of two type of long waits: overall waits and waits following a decision to admit ('trolley waits'). We use weekly data from 2011/12 to 2015/16 and adjust for a range of supply and demand factors including patient demographics, A&E staffing and hospital bed occupancy. Our analysis

extends previous work by modelling potential drivers jointly rather than individually.

Higher rates of overall and trolley waits are linked to higher patient age, more patients leaving without being treated, higher death rates and higher bed occupancy rates. Minor injury units are associated with long overall waits but not with trolley waits. However, substantial variation between hospitals remains after accounting for these factors. Further investigation of providers with unusually good or poor performance may provide additional insights.

Further information here www

Staff news



Congratulations
to Claire de
Oliveira who
was elected to
the iHEA Board
of Directors
in December

2019 and Vanessa King, who recently achieved promotion success.



Please visit our website for more of CHE's latest news items

CHE hosted a visit from a Japanese delegation on February 18 2020. The delegation comprised of officials from the Ministry of Health and Welfare (MHW), the National Institute of Public Health and university-based researchers. They visited UK academic groups and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to gain an understanding of how academic centres like CHE and the Centre for Reviews and Dimssemination at the University of York support

the activities of NICE's Technology Appraisal process.



See our website for full details of CHE staff presentations and visits.

CORONAVIRUS INFORMATION:

The current issues with Covid-19 have produced a fast-moving, changing situation which is challenging the organisation of many events internationally. In the light of these circumstances, we have come to the reluctant conclusion that we must cancel our Spring Short Courses.

Spring Short Courses.
With respect to our various short courses held during the summer, we are continuing to monitor the situation closely and this information will be updated should it be necessary for us to postpone these to later in the year.

Please refer to each specific course for further coronavirus information here.

We apologise for any inconvenience caused in these extraordinary circumstances, and we look forward to continuing to provide our short course offerings to you in the future.

New funding

Accountability for informal urban equity hub

Sumit Mazumdar Funder: MRC GCRF 2019 - 2024

Harnessing cross-country administrative data to evaluate national policy impacts on maternal, infant and child health and health inequalities-MatCHNet

Richard Cookson Funder: MRC 2019 - 2023

Policy Research Unit in cancer awareness, screening and early diagnosis

Mark Sculpher Funder: NIHR PRU 2019 - 2023

CHE Publications November 2019 - February 2020

Al-Hanawi M, **Chirwa G**, Pemba L, Qattan A. Does prolonged television viewing affect body mass index? A case of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *PLOS ONE* 2020;doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0228321.

Catalá-López F, Caulley L, Ridao M, Hutton B, Husereau D, **Drummond MF** et al. Reproducible research practices, openness and transparency in health economic evaluations: study protocol for a cross-sectional comparative analysis. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:(2)e034463.

Chirwa G, Mazalale J, Likupe G, Nkhoma D, et al. An evolution of socioeconomic related inequality in teenage pregnancy and childbearing in Malawi. *PLoS ONE* 2019;14(11):e0225374.

Clemes S, Varela-Mato V, Munir F, Edwardson C, et al. (includes **Richardson G**). A cluster randomised controlled trial to investigate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a Structured Health Intervention For Truckers (The SHIFT Study): Study Protocol. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(11):e030175.

Collins B, Kypridemos C, **Cookson R** et al. Universal or targeted cardiovascular screening? Modelling study using a sector-specific distributional cost effectiveness analysis. *Preventive Medicine* 2020;130:105879.

Corbacho Martín B, **Drummond M**, **Santos R**, Jones E et al. Does the use of health technology assessment have an impact on the utilisation of health care resources? Evidence from two European countries. *The European Journal of Health Economics* 2020;doi:10.1007/s10198-020-01160-5.

Cox E, Saramago P, Kelly J, Porta N, Hall E, Tan WS, **Sculpher M, Soares M**. The impacts of bladder cancer on UK healthcare costs and patients' health-related quality of life: Evidence from the BOXIT trial: Bladder cancer cost and health-related impacts. *Clinical Genitourinary Cancer* 2019;doi:10.1016/j.clgc.2019.12.004.

Cuadrado C, Dunstan J, Silva-Illanes N, Mirelman A, Nakamura R, **Suhrcke M**. Effects of a sugar-sweetened beverage tax on prices and affordability of soft drinks in Chile: A time series analysis. *Social Science & Medicine* 2020:245:112708.

Drummond MF. Modeling in early stages of technology development: Is an iterative approach needed? Comment on "problems and promises of health technologies: The role of early health economic modeling". *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 2020;doi:10.15171/ijhpm.2019.118.

Gabani J, Guinness L. Households forgoing healthcare as a measure of financial risk protection: an application to Liberia. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 2019;18:193.

Gravelle H, Schroyen F. Optimal hospital payment rules under rationing by waiting. *Journal of Health Economics* 2020;doi:10.1016/j. jhealeco.2019.102277.

Griffin S, Walker S, Sculpher M. Distributional cost effectiveness analysis of West Yorkshire low emission zone policies. *Health Economics* 2020;doi:10.1002/hec.4003.

Grosso A, Faria R, Bojke L, Donohue C, et al. Cost-effectiveness of strategies preventing late-onset infection in preterm infants. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2019;doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-317640.

Hinde S, Bojke L, Horsfield L, **Richardson G**. The relevant perspective of economic evaluations informing local decision makers: an exploration in weight loss services. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* 2019;doi: 10.1007/s40258-019-00538-8.

Hinde S, Bojke L, Richardson G. Understanding and addressing the challenges of conducting quantitative evaluation at a local level: a worked example of the available approaches. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(11):e029830.

Iragorri N, Hazlewood G, Manns B, **Bojke L**, Spackman E, The PROMPT study group. A model to determine the cost-effectiveness of screening psoriasis patients for psoriatic arthritis. *Arthritis Care & Research* 2019;doi:10.1002/acr.24110.

L'Esperance V, **Gravelle H**, Schofield P, **Santos R**, Ashworth M. Relationship between general practice capitation funding and the quality of primary care in England: a cross-sectional, 3-year study. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(11);e030624.

Love-Koh J. How useful are early economic models? Comment on "problems and promises of health technologies: The role of early health economic modelling". *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 2019;doi:10.15171/ijhpm.2019.119.

Love-Koh J, Cookson R, Claxton K, Griffin S.Estimating social variation in the health effects of changes in healthcare expenditure. *Medical Decision Making* 2020;doi:10.1177/027298 9X20904360.

Love-Koh J, Griffin S, Kataika E, **Revill P,** Sibandze S, **Walker S.** Methods to promote equity in health resource allocation in lowand middle-income countries: an overview. *Globalization and Health* 2020;16:6.

Makhani L, Moran V, Sadique Z, Singh N, **Revill P**, Roberts B. Examining the use of economic evaluations in health-related humanitarian programs in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Health Policy and Planning* 2019;doi:org/10.1093/heapol/czz144.

McGuire F, Vijayasingham L, Vassall A et al. Financing intersectoral action for health: a systematic review of co-financing models. *Globalization and Health* 2019;15:86.

Ngaage D, Mitchell N, Dean A, Hirst C et al (includes **Hinde S**). Feasibility study of early outpatient review and early cardiac rehabilitation after cardiac surgery: Mixed methods research design – a study protocol. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(12):e035787.

Ochalek J, Lomas J. Reflecting the health opportunity costs of funding decisions within value frameworks: Initial estimates and the need for further research. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2020;doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2019.12.002.

Ochalek J, Manthalu G, **Smith PC**. Squaring the cube: towards an operational model of optimal universal health coverage. *Journal of Health Economics* 2020;doi:10.1016/j. jhealeco.2019.102282.

O'Neill S, **Kreif N**, Grieve R, Sutton M. A comparison of methods for health policy evaluation with controlled prepost designs. *Health Services Research* 2020;doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13274.

Phillips A, Bansi-Matharu L, Venter F, Havlir D, et al (includes **Revill P**). Updated assessment of risks and benefits of dolutegravir versus efavirenz in new antiretroviral treatment

initiators in sub-Saharan Africa: modelling to inform treatment guidelines. *The Lancet HIV* 2020;doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(19)30400-X

Phillips A, Cambiano V, Johnson L et al (includes **Revill P**). Potential impact and cost-effectiveness of condomless-sex-concentrated PrEP in KwaZulu-Natal accounting for drug resistance. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2019;doi:10.1093/infdis/jiz667.

Reckers-Droog V, Federici C, Brouwer W, **Drummond M**. Challenges with coverage with evidence development schemes for medical devices: A systematic review. *Health Policy and Technology* 2020;doi:10.1016/j. hlpt.2020.02.006.

Ride J, Kasteridis P, Gutacker N, Aragon MJ, Jacobs R. Healthcare costs for people with serious mental illness in England: an analysis of costs across primary care, hospital care, and specialist mental healthcare. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy 2019;doi:10.1007/s40258-019-00530-2.

Sculpher M, **Palmer S**. After 20 years of using economic evaluation, should NICE be considered a methods innovator? *PharmacoEconomics* 2020;doi:10.1007/s40273-019-00882-6.

Stuttard L, Hewitt C, Fairhurst C, **Weatherly H**, **Walker S**, **Longo F** et al. Partnerships between deaf people and hearing dogs (PEDRO): Protocol for a single-centre randomised superiority study to investigate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of receiving a hearing dog on mental wellbeing and health. *JMIR Research Protocols* 2020;doi:10.2196/15452.

Whitty J, de Bekker-Grob E, Cook N, Terris-Prestholt F, Cleemput I, **Drummond M** et al. Patient preferences in the medical product lifecycle. *The Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes Research* 2019;doi:10.1007/s40271-019-00400-y.

Yang F, Walker S, Richardson G, Stephens T, Phull M, Thompson A et al. Reply letter to: A Commentary on "Cost-effectiveness of a national quality improvement programme to improve survival after emergency abdominal surgery, Health Economic Evaluation" (Int J Surg 2019; Epub ahead of print). International Journal of Surgery 2019;doi:org/10.1016/j. ijsu.2019.11.020.

These and other CHE publications can be found on our website here:

Latest CHE research papers

171 Productivity of the English National Health Service: 2017/18 update. Adriana Castelli, Martin Chalkley, James Gaughan, Idaira Rodriguez Santana.

Free to download here: www



