

# Systematic review of health state utility values used in pharmacoeconomic evaluations for chronic hepatitis C: impact on cost-effectiveness results

## *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy*

Ru Han<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Clément François<sup>1,2</sup>, Mondher Toumi<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Aix-Marseille, Marseille, France;

<sup>2</sup>Creativ-Ceutical, Paris, France;

\*Corresponding author: [rha@creativ-ceutical.com](mailto:rha@creativ-ceutical.com)

Email address: [cfr@creativ-ceutical.com](mailto:cfr@creativ-ceutical.com); [mondher.TOUMI@univ-amu.fr](mailto:mondher.TOUMI@univ-amu.fr);

Address: 215, rue de Faubourg St-Honoré 75008 Paris

## Abstract

### Background

Health state utility values (HSUVs) identified from utility elicitation studies are widely used in pharmacoeconomic evaluations for chronic hepatitis C (CHC) and are particularly instrumental in health technology assessment (HTA) evaluation like the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE).

### Objective

The objective of this study is to identify HSUVs used in cost-utility analyses (CUAs) for CHC in Europe and evaluate the impact of HSUVs selection on cost-effectiveness results in terms of incremental cost per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained (ICER).

### Methods

A systematic search of pharmacoeconomic evaluations for CHC was updated in Medline and Embase from the period of 2012-2017 to the period of 2017-2020. Data on health states, HSUVs and utility elicitation studies were extracted. The difference in HSUVs of the same health state in different CUAs and the difference between HSUVs of one health state and of the interlink health state in the same CUAs were calculated. A quality assessment was performed to evaluate the selection of HSUVs in CUAs. Sets of HSUVs identified were used in a re-constructed CUA model to assess the impact on ICER.

### Results

Twenty-six CUAs conducted in European countries and referring to 17 utility elicitation studies were included. The difference in HSUVs of the same health states in different CUAs ranged from 0.021 (liver transplant) to 0.468 (decompensated cirrhosis). The difference between HSUVs of one health state and of the interlink health state of next disease severity level was calculated between health state of F0-F1/mild and F2-F3/moderate (n=11, 0.040 to 0.110), F2-F3/moderate and F4/compensated cirrhosis (n=18, 0.027 to 0.130), compensated cirrhosis and decompensated cirrhosis (n=22, 0.020 to 0.100), decompensated cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (n=24, 0.000 to 0.200), hepatocellular carcinoma and liver transplant in the first year (n=17, 0.329 to 0.170) and

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

liver transplant in the first year and in subsequent years (n=17, -0.340 to 0.000). The utility elicitation study selected by most CUAs (n=11) was recommended as the source of HSUVs, as least for the CUAs conducted in the UK, based on the results of quality assessment. Seven sets of HSUVs were generated to fit the re-constructed model and changed the results of incremental analysis from being cost-effective to not cost-effective (ICER ranging from £2,460 to £24,954 per QALY gained), and to dominated in the UK setting.

## Conclusions

The CUAs for CHC were found to apply various HSUVs from different utility elicitation studies in the same health state. This variability of HSUVs has the potential to significantly affect ICER and ICER-based reimbursement decision. A rigorous selection of HSUVs in CUAs to inform healthcare resource allocation is suggested for future studies of CUAs and guideline development.

## Keywords

Pharmacoeconomic evaluations; cost-utility analysis; health states utility values; chronic hepatitis C

## Introduction

Hepatitis C is a slowly progressing infectious disease of the liver arising from the hepatitis C virus (HCV). The burden of disease of chronic hepatitis C (CHC) is substantial in Europe [1] with more than 14 million people living with chronic HCV infection [2]. The seroprevalence of HCV infection varies widely between European countries among the general population and high-risk populations including people who inject drugs (PWID) and men who have sex with men (MSM) [3]. The dramatic improvement in sustained virological response (SVR) rates, once-daily dosing, and short therapies with interferon-free direct acting antiviral therapies (IFN-free DAAs) lead to the speculation that CHC treatment could feasibly be scaled-up sufficiently and target groups could be broadened [4]. However, the high acquisition costs of DAAs limit the access for patients and influence the costs of healthcare resource utilisation in CHC [5-7]. There have been a growing number of pharmacoeconomic evaluations performed in CHC to inform healthcare resource allocation [8-18].

Health state utility values (HSUVs) are widely applied in pharmacoeconomic evaluations. HSUVs are used as weights in the calculation of the quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs), which incorporates both quantity and quality of life and is considered as an ideal measure of health outcomes in pharmacoeconomic evaluations [19]. Cost-utility analysis (CUA), a type of pharmacoeconomic evaluation which uses incremental cost per QALY gained (ICER) as a health outcome, is preferred in many countries requiring health technology assessment (HTA) for drug reimbursement [20], such as in the United Kingdom (UK) [21], France [22], Canada [23], Japan [24] and recently in China [25].

Although many CUAs were conducted for pharmacoeconomic evaluations in CHC [13], different HSUVs associated with the same health state were applied in the estimation of QALYs gained [9]. Xie et al. [26] summarised the current issues related to HSUVs used in CUAs into the following 3 domains: 1) identification (large variations in HSUVs between studies), 2) quality (limited methodological standards for critical appraisal), and 3) appropriate use (context-specific process of reimbursement decision making). The heterogeneity in applying HSUVs due to the different selection of utility elicitation studies with different elicitation methods, such as the visual analogue scale (VAS), the standard gamble (SG), time trade-off (TTO) and indirect methods by EQ-5D and SF-6D etc., and different responders, such as patient, physician and layperson. The impact of HSUVs selection on resulting ICER were addressed by Zhou et al. [27] using the case of schizophrenia. However, the situation of identification and selection of HSUVs in CUAs for CHC remains unclear and the impact on ICER has not been investigated. The objective of this study is to identify HSUVs used in the CUA models for CHC conducted in European countries and evaluate the impact of HSUVs selection on ICER.

## Methods

### Systematic review of pharmacoeconomic evaluation models

A recently published systematic review [8] of pharmacoeconomic evaluations for CHC was updated to identify CUAs conducted in European countries and reporting the HSUVs of CHC. The systematic search of the previous review for the period from 2012 to 2017 identified 2,917 studies and included 69 unique studies. The search results were updated for the period from 2017 to 2020.

### Data source and data selection

Pharmacoeconomic evaluation models for CHC were retrieved from Medline and Embase for the period from 2017 to 2020. The search strategy is based on the previous review [8] and is presented

in Additional file 1.1. The search terms covered the following domains: 1) population (patients with CHC or HCV infection), 2) intervention (pharmaceutical treatment), 3) evaluation technique (modelling) and 4) evaluation type (cost analysis or cost minimisation analysis or cost-effectiveness analysis or cost-utility analysis or cost-benefit analysis). The inclusion/exclusion criteria are presented in Additional file 1.2. Studies were included if 1) they were conducted in adult patients (aged 18 years) with CHC; 2) they evaluated all pharmaceutical treatment strategies of CHC including DAAs and interferon; 3) they were model-based economic evaluations; 4) published after 2017 to the present; 5) conducted in European countries. The identified models were pooled with the models identified from the previous review [8] for a further screening to include the CUAs conducted in European countries and reporting the HSUVs of CHC. References of the identified models were screened and included when applicable.

#### Data extraction and data synthesis

The extracted information from the included CUAs covered two domains: 1) study design including country, population, objective, perspective, cost year, model design, time horizon, uncertainty analysis, subgroup analysis, intervention and comparator, and outcome; 2) health states and HSUVs including health states and their definitions, utility values for each health state, associated source, and an interpretation of HSUVs from the source into the CUA model. The following information was summarised: number of CUAs considering the health state, number of HSUVs per health state, number of utility elicitation studies used as the source of HSUVs, and the utility values (most common value and range of values) for each health state of CHC. The difference in HSUVs of the same health state in different CUAs and the difference between HSUVs of one health state and of the interlink health state in the same CUAs were calculated. Utility values for all health states of CHC within each CUA model were considered as one set of HSUVs.

#### Impact of HSUVs identification on ICER

##### Identification of utility elicitation study

The process of investigating the impact of HSUVs selection on cost-effectiveness results was reported by Zhou et al. [27]. The reported sources of HSUVs in included CUAs were screened to identify the utility elicitation studies which generated these HSUVs. If an associated source was another CUA, the references of this CUA would be screened. The following information was extracted from utility elicitation studies: country, population or responder, utility elicitation method and health states of CHC and their definitions when applicable.

##### Quality assessment of HSUVs used in CUAs

A framework to evaluate the identification and selection of HSUVs in CUAs was developed based on Xie et al. [26] and Nerich et al. [28]. Each included a CUA model and was evaluated for the following 3 domains covering 7 items: 1) identification of the source of HSUVs (selection based on systematic review and sensitivity analysis or reasonable justification); 2) methodological quality (HSUVs elicitation method and responder); 3) appropriate selection of HSUVs from the source (population comparability, health states comparability and discussion). Points of 0-2 were awarded in each item and indicated whether; no description (0), partial description (1), or complete description (2) in each item, was provided by the authors. The average point of all HSUVs in one CUA was calculated as the final point of the CUA in each item. More details of the quality assessment framework are presented in Additional file 1.3.

##### Evaluation of impact of HSUVs identification on ICER

A core Markov model from Shepherd et al. [29-31] over lifetime with one-year cycle length was used to investigate the impact of HSUVs selection on the cost-effectiveness result, which is reported as

ICER in the CUA for CHC. This Markov model was chosen because it was widely used with many adaptations [32-42] and easy to replicate based on its simplicity of approach and completeness of reporting in the publication. The model structure is presented in Figure 1: 1) 6 core health states including chronic HCV (Metavir F0-F3), compensated cirrhosis (Metavir F4), decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year and liver transplant in subsequent years; 2) 2 recovered states including SVR from chronic HCV infection without cirrhosis and SVR from compensated cirrhosis; 3) death (absorbing health states for liver and non-liver disease). The baseline characteristics, transition probability, clinical efficacy and costs were obtained from Johnson et al. [43], a CUA of ombitasvir/paritaprevir/ritonavir and dasabuvir ± ribavirin (ODR) versus pegylated interferon + ribavirin (PR) conducted in the UK, and are presented in Additional file 1.4. The HSUVs for 6 core health states were selected from the identified sets of HSUVs. The utility values for recovered states were not considered in the present analysis since they were rather collected from trials than elicited using utility weights to synthesise the multi-dimension impact of treatment [44]. To fit the HSUVs sets identified in all CUAs included, the following modifications were made: 1) when combined health states, such as a combined cirrhosis state of decompensated cirrhosis and compensated cirrhosis, and a combined liver transplant state of the first year and subsequent years, were used, each individual health state was assumed to have the same HSUV as the combined health state; 2) when multiple HSUVs were reported for one health state, the average value was used.

## Results

### Systematic review of pharmacoeconomic evaluation models

After the title/abstract screening of 923 publications, the present review identified an additional 39 pharmacoeconomic evaluation models (Figure 2) conducted in European countries which were not included in the 15 models identified in the previous review [8]. Out of 54 studies, 26 CUAs [18, 43, 45-68] reporting detailed HSUVs of CHC were included in the analysis of impact of HSUVs selection on ICER and the other 28 were excluded because they were not CUAs or did not report detailed HSUVs. The characteristics of all CUAs included (n=26) in the study design are presented in Table 1. The total CUAs included were conducted in 7 European countries (mostly in the UK, n=8). Most CUAs used the cohort-level Markov model (n=13), took the perspective of a public healthcare payer (n=22), adopted lifetime horizon (n=20) and reported ICER (n=24).

### Characteristics of health states and HSUVs used in CUAs

The characteristics of all CUAs included (n=26) in health states and HSUVs are presented in Table 2. Expanded health states of early chronic hepatitis and combined health states of advanced liver complications to the 6-health-state core model [29-31] were identified in most CUAs: 1) classifications of health states of early chronic hepatitis: F0-F3/chronic HCV infection, F4/compensated cirrhosis (n=6); F0-F1/mild, F2-F3/moderate, F4/compensated cirrhosis (n=5); F0, F1, F2, F3 (n=5); F0-F1, F2, F3-F4 (n=4); F0, F1-F2, F3, F4 (n=4); F0-F1, F2, F3, F4 (n=1); and F0-F2, F3-F4 (n=1); 2) classifications of health states of advanced liver complications: decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year, liver transplant in subsequent years (n=17); decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant (n=6); cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant (n=1); and decompensated cirrhosis, liver transplant (n=1). Overall there were 10 health states of early chronic hepatitis and 5 health states of advanced liver complications. The most numbers of HSUVs were reported in the health state of decompensated cirrhosis (n=24, 0.380-0.848), hepatocellular carcinoma (n=24, 0.380-0.867), liver transplant in the first year (n=17, 0.450-0.852), liver transplant in subsequent years (n=17, 0.450-0.910), and F4/cirrhosis (n=14, 0.550-0.877). The difference in HSUVs of the same health states in different CUAs ranged from 0.021 (liver transplant) to 0.468 (decompensated cirrhosis). The difference between

HSUVs of one health state and of the interlink health state was calculated between health state of F0-F1/mild and F2-F3/moderate (n=11, 0.040-0.110), F2-F3/moderate and F4/compensated cirrhosis (n=18, 0.027-0.130), compensated cirrhosis and decompensated cirrhosis (n=22, 0.020-0.100), decompensated cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (n=24, 0.000-0.200), hepatocellular carcinoma and liver transplant in the first year (n=17, -0.329-0.170) and liver transplant in the first year and in subsequent years (n=17, -0.340-0.000).

### Impact of HSUVs selection on ICER

#### Quality assessment of HSUVs used in CUAs

In total, 17 utility elicitation studies [9, 40, 57, 69-82] and 7 sets of HSUVs of CHC were used in all CUAs included. The characteristics of all utility elicitation studies included are presented in Table 3. Wright et al. [69] was the most referred study (n=11) for health states of mild, moderate, compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year and subsequent years with high comparability of population and between health states in utility elicitation studies and in CUAs. Most CUAs (n=22) derived the HSUVs from a single utility elicitation study, and the others (n=6) derived them from multiple sources. The results of quality assessment of HSUVs used in CUAs for CHC are presented in Table 4. Most CUAs (n=25) identified HSUVs from literatures and reported the sources and values and 2 of them identified HSUVs through a systematic review; only one CUA used assumed HSUVs. Most CUAs (n=21) conducted sensitivity analysis or scenario analysis of alternative HSUVs and only 2 of them did not report the range or source of alternative HSUVs. Most CUAs (n=20) did not describe the elicitation method and responder (n=23); the others provided an incomplete description without an explanation of choice of elicitation method and responder. Some CUAs (n=11) used the utility elicitation studies with the same population and country as in CUAs; the others used a different population, such as a population with a different diagnosis, severity level and risk behaviour, and different country. Half CUAs (n=13) used health states which were different from that applied in elicitation studies without an explanation and 5 CUAs used different health states but with an explanation on derivation method. Most CUAs (n=17) conducted an incomplete discussion on the limitations of the HSUVs source identification, the elicitation method and HSUVs selection; the others provided no discussion on HSUVs at all.

#### Evaluation of impact of HSUVs selection on ICER

After the modification of HSUVs based on the predefined rules to fit the model analysis, 7 sets of HSUVs of CHC in the re-constructed model [29-31] were generated. The selection of different HSUVs sets in the model changed the results of incremental analysis from being cost-effective to not cost-effective, and to dominated in the UK setting (Table 5). an incremental QALY increasing from 0.028 to 1.635 and an ICER raging from £3,483 to £200,940 per QALY gained in 3 HSUVs sets and decreasing from -1.270 to -0.607 in the other 4 HSUVs sets.

## Discussion

This study reviewed the HSUVs used in the CUA models for pharmacoeconomic evaluations of CHC and investigated the impact of HSUVs selection on resulting ICER. The CUAs for CHC were found to apply various HSUVs from different utility elicitation studies. This variability has the potential to significantly affect ICER. The findings of this study suggest that the HSUVs sources on which pharmacoeconomic evaluations are based on may not adequately reflect the patient population and may not be sufficient for the needs of current research questions, as long as there is no standard to identify and apply the utility elicitation studies and HSUVs to the CUAs.

In the CUAs included by this systematic review, 6-health-state core model of CHC were widely applied: F0-F3/chronic HCV infection, F4/compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year and liver transplant in subsequent years. Two common variations to core health states were identified: 1) expansion of chronic HCV infection health state to reflect varying levels of disease severity at model entry, either using broad categories such as “mild” and “moderate” or using a Metavir scoring system based on histological status of fibrosis; 2) combination of health states of decompensated cirrhosis and compensated cirrhosis, and liver transplant in the first year and in subsequent years into health states of cirrhosis and liver transplant. The first variation of health state of chronic HCV infection is consistent with a previous review [9] of structural frameworks of CUAs for CHC. Although some CUAs applied core health states with adaptations and variations, the underlying HSUVs are the same and derived from the same utility elicitation study. The value of the expansion of the early chronic HCV infection is to assess the cost-effectiveness of early treatment with antivirals at a time of higher SVR [9]. However, using the same HSUVs and utility elicitation studies and applying optimistic assumption without justification render the expansion of core health states worthless.

There was a high level of variation in HSUVs of the same health state in CHC applied in different CUAs. However, the relatively small difference between HSUVs of one health state and the interlink health state in the same CUAs was identified. No systematic pattern was found regarding how HSUVs have been selected from different utility elicitation studies and how the variation is distributed across the study. The utility elicitation studies differed in countries, elicitation methods, responders and classifications of health states of CHC. The HSUVs used in the CUAs frequently do not directly reflect the country-specific perspective of the research question and are derived from the different health states with different interpretations in the utility elicitation study and the CUA. Of all utility elicitation studies, Wright et al. [69] was most referred, where the HSUVs for patients at each predefined health state were collected as part of the multicentre, randomised, controlled, non-blinded trial in the UK National Health System setting and estimated using EQ-5D questionnaire. The descriptions of each patient’s health status were then translated into HSUV using a reference set of preference weights derived from a representative sample of the UK general population using the TTO technique. Compared with estimates from expert opinions and elicitation studies conducted in the other countries and with undefined health states, this study elicited responses from patients to estimate the HSUVs for the main health states included in the CUA model.

In the absence of utility elicitation studies conducted among high-risk populations such as PWID and MSM, most CUAs [45, 46] assumed that HSUVs were comparable between PWID/MSM and non-PWID/non-MSM which was not consistent with the reported result that there was a lower quality of life in terms of utility among high-risk populations [83]. One CUA among PWID [49] applied HSUVs in the general population multiplied by 0.85 to account for drug dependency. The limitation and validity of HSUVs should be fully discussed to interpret the results in CUAs given that the ICER achieved is significantly influenced by the HSUVs.

It is noteworthy that ICER varies considerably with different set of HSUVs when applying the exact same model, assumptions and input for the other parameters. The level of difference in ICER could significantly influence ICER-based reimbursement decisions. The variability in HSUVs incorporated in this CUA can change the resulting ICER of DAA versus PR from being cost-effective at the common UK threshold value of £20,000 per QALY gained to dominated, when all other considerations remain equal. These results are in line with results from Townsend et al. [9].

Given the results, a quality assessment of the identification and selection of utility elicitation studies and HSUVs in CUAs for CHC was applied. The value of the quality assessment is to serve as a guide of

rigorous conduct and proper use of HSUVs for future CUAs and generate disease-specific evidence for the currently developed systematic approach to appropriate use of HSUVs in CUAs [26].

This study has several limitations. First, the systematic review of CUAs focused on analyses conducted in European countries. It is possible that a difference between studies in country perspective may affect results. However, it is not necessary to control for possible country-specific variation because the underlying HSUVs sources were rarely directly relevant to the country perspective and commonly taken from pooled international studies. Next, modifications were made when the health states in the utility elicitation study did not completely match that used in the reconstructed model. However, these modifications still captured the major difference in HSUVs between health states when compared with HSUVs without modification. Last, a simplistic quality assessment of HSUVs used in CUAs was conducted. In the absence of rigorous standard for the identification and selection of utility elicitation studies and HSUVs, these results can provide guidance for future CUAs and the development of guidelines in pharmacoeconomic evaluations.

## Conclusion

The CUAs for CHC were found to apply various HSUVs from different utility elicitation studies on the same health state. This variability of HSUVs has the potential to significantly affect ICER and ICER-based reimbursement decision. A rigorous identification and selection of HSUVs in CUAs to inform healthcare resource allocation is suggested for future studies of CUAs and guideline development.

## Tables and figures

Table 1 Summary of characteristics in study design of all CUA models included

Comparison area	Description	n
Type of model	Cohort-level Markov model	13
	Dynamic transmission model	6
	Multicohort Markov model	4
	Semi-Markov	1
	Decision tree and Markov model	1
	Econometric model	1
Country	UK	8
	Italy	8
	Spain	3
	France	2
	Germany	2
	Netherlands	2
	Norway	1
Perspective	Payer	22
	Healthcare provider	1
	Societal	1
	Payer and patient	1
	NR	1
Time horizon	Lifetime	20
	50 years	3
	30 years	1
	15 years	1
	NR	1
Patient population	General patient with chronic hepatitis C	21
	PWID with chronic hepatitis C	3
	HIV-infected MSM with chronic hepatitis C	1
	HIV-infected patient with chronic hepatitis C	1
Type of comparison	Pharmacotherapy	23
	Treatment timing/priority	8
	Treatment uptake rate level	1
	HCV prevalence level	1
	SVR level	1
Outcomes	Time spent in status	
	• QALYs gains	26
	• LYs gains	7
	Number/percentage of patients with events*	7
	Mortality outcomes	1
	Cost outcomes	26
	Economic outcomes	
	• incremental cost per QALY gained	24
	• incremental net monetary benefit	5
	• incremental cost per life-year gained	1
• maximum acceptable financial expenditure	1	

\*Events represented advanced liver complications including compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma and liver transplant or dying from liver-related causes. CUAs: cost

utility analyses; LYs: life-years; NR: not reported; QALYs: quality-adjusted life-years; SVR: sustained virological response; UK: United Kingdom

Table 2 HSUVs of chronic hepatitis C in all CUA models included

Health state	Number of			Most common HSUVs	Range of HSUVs
	CUAs considering the health states	HSUVs	Elicitation studies		
<b>Early chronic hepatitis</b>					
F4/cirrhosis	14	5	6	0.550	0.550-0.877
F3	11	4	5	0.660	0.660-0.970
F2	8	4	4	0.660	0.660-0.920
F0	8	3	3	0.770	0.770-0.970
F0-F1/mild	7	4	4	0.770	0.770-0.980
F2-F3/moderate	4	1	1	0.660	0.660
F1-F2	4	2	2	0.880	0.880-0.970
F3-F4	3	3	3	0.740	0.670-0.760
F0-F3	2	2	2	0.840, 0.904	0.840-0.904
F0-F2	1	1	1	0.820	0.820
<b>Advanced liver complications</b>					
Decompensated cirrhosis	24	8	10	0.450	0.380-0.848
Hepatocellular carcinoma	24	8	10	0.450	0.380-0.867
Liver transplant in the first year	17	6	7	0.450	0.450-0.852
Liver transplant in subsequent years	17	7	7	0.670	0.450-0.910
liver transplant	6	2	4	0.730	0.709-0.730

CUAs: cost utility analyses; HSUVs: health state utility values

Table 3 Characteristics of the utility elicitation studies referred in all CUA models included

Author Year	Country	Elicitation method	Responder	Health states
Wright 2006 [69]	UK	EQ-5D	patient	mild, moderate, cirrhosis, HCC, treatment for mild, treatment for moderate, decompensated cirrhosis, post-liver transplantation
Kind 2008 [70]	UK	EQ-5D	resident	uninfected individual
Hzode 2014 [71]	international multicentre	NR	NR	NR
Sulkowski 2014 [72]	US	NR	NR	NR
McDonald 2013 [73]	UK	EQ-5D	patient	chronically infected and aware of infected status, chronically infected but unaware, not chronically infected
Townsend 2011 [9]	international multicentre	NR	NR	mild, moderate, F0-F3, compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, transplant in the first year, transplant in subsequent years
McLernon 2008 [74]	international multicentre	EQ-5D	patient	moderate, compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, and post-liver transplant
Sieber 2003 [75]	Germany	visual analogue scales	patient	mild, moderate, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplantation
Chong 2003 [76]	Canada	standard gamble	patient	no cirrhosis, mild to moderate chronic HCV infection, compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, transplant
Cossais 2015 [77]	France	EQ-5D	patient	F0, F1, F2, F3, F4
Pol 2015 [82]	France, the UK and Germany	EQ-5D	patient	F0, F1, F2, F3, F4, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year, liver transplant in subsequent years
Kondil 2017 [57]	Italy	NR	NR	F0, F1-F2, F3, F4, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant in the first year, liver transplant in subsequent years
Sullivan 2004 [40]	US	HUI 3	patient	chronic hepatitis C, compensated cirrhosis, decompensated cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma and liver transplantation
Tammy 2002 [78]	international multicentre	time trade-off	patient	asymptomatic HIV
McGrealBellone 2012 [79]	Ireland	EQ-5D	patient	HIV/HCV coinfecting patient with cirrhosis, without cirrhosis
Cortesi 2013 [80]	Italy	EQ-5D	patient	NR
Sullivan 2006 [81]	US	EQ-5D	patient	NR

\*EQ-5D scores were derived from SF-6D using mapping algorithm. HIV: human immunodeficiency viruses; NR: not reported; UK: United Kingdom; US: United States

Table 4 Quality assessment of HSUVs used in all CUA models included

Author year	Identification of source		Methodological quality		Appropriate selection		
	HSUVs selection	Sensitivity analysis	Elicitation method	Responder	Population comparability	Health states comparability	Discussion
Johnson 2016 [43]	1	2	0	0	2	2	2
Bennett 2016 [45]	2	0	0	0	2	1	1
Martin 2016 [46]	1	2	0	0	2	2	1
McEwan 2017a [47]	1	0	0	0	2	1	1
McEwan 2017b [48]	1	1	0	0	2	1	1
McEwan 2016 [68]	1	2	0	0	2	2	1
VanSanten 2016 [49]	1	2	0	0	0	2	1
Wisloff 2018 [50]	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sbarigia 2017 [51]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stahmeyer 2016 [52]	1	2	1	1	2	0	0
DeufficBurban 2016 [53]	1	2	1	1	2	2	0
Maunoury 2018 [54]	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ruggeri 2018 [18]	1	2	0	0	2	2	1
Ruggeri 2017 [55]	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
Rolli 2018 [56]	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
Kondili 2017 [57]	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
Turnes 2017 [58]	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
GimenoBalleste 2016 [59]	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
Ruggeri 2019 [60]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Heath 2018 [61]	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Popping 2019 [62]	1	2	1	0	0	0	1
Restelli 2016 [63]	1	2	0	0	1	0	1
Buti 2017 [64]	1	2	0	0	1	0	1
Cortesi 2015 [65]	1	2	1	1	2	1	0
Cure 2014 [66]	1	2	1	0	1	2	1
Cure 2015 [67]	1	2	1	0	2	2	0

HSUVs: health state utility values

Table 5 Impact of different HSUV sets of chronic hepatitis C

HSUVs set	HSUV						Incremental QALY	ICER (£)
	Chronic HCV	Compensated cirrhosis	Decompensated cirrhosis	Hepatocellular carcinoma	Liver transplant (first year)	Liver transplant (subsequent)		
Wright 2006 [69]	0.715*	0.550	0.450	0.450	0.450	0.67	1.635	3,483
Townsend 2011 [9]	0.747	0.733#	0.733#	0.380	0.709#	0.709#	0.673	8,467
Cossais 2015 [77]	0.820	0.760#	0.760#	0.600	0.550	0.820	0.028	200,940
Sieber 2003 [75]	0.935*	0.890	0.810	0.810	0.860	0.860	-1.254	Dominated
Kondil 2017 [57]	0.970	0.830	0.730	0.530	0.730#	0.730#	-1.270	Dominated
Sullivan 2004 [40]	0.880	0.830	0.730	0.530	0.730#	0.730#	-0.607	Dominated
Cortesi 2013 [80]	0.904	0.877	0.848	0.867	0.852	0.910	-1.011	Dominated

\*Calculated as the average value of mild and moderate chronic HCV based on modification rules.

#Assumed to equal to the HSUV of cirrhosis and liver transplant based on modification rules. HCV: hepatitis C virus; HSUVs: health state utility values; ICER: incremental cost per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained; QALYs: quality-adjusted life-years




Figure 1 Model structure




Figure 2 PRISMA diagram of selection process of pharmacoeconomic evaluations of chronic hepatitis C

## Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

## Permissions

Not applicable.

## Declarations

## Funding

Not applicable.

## Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## Ethics approval

Not applicable.

## Consent to participate

Not applicable.

## Consent for publication

Not applicable.

## Availability of data and material

Not applicable.

## Code availability

Not applicable.

## Contributors

All authors contributed to study conception and design. Ru Han contributed to the literature search, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data and first draft of the manuscript. Clément François and Junwen ZHOU contributed to critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. Clément François and Mondher Toumi contributed to supervision of the study. Marcus Bashford contributed to writing or technical editing of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## References

1. Han R, Z.J., *PIN11 -Comparison of clinical burden of hcv infection between asia and europe: an overview of systematic review*, in *ISPOR Asia Pacific 2018*. 2018, Elsevier: Tokyo, Japan.
2. *World Health Organization. Global Hepatitis report, 2017*. . 2017 [cited 2018 30 August]; Available from: <http://www.who.int/hepatitis/publications/global-hepatitis-report2017/en/>.
3. Han, R., et al., *Prevalence of hepatitis C infection among the general population and high-risk groups in the EU/EEA: a systematic review update*. *BMC Infect Dis*, 2019. **19**(1): p. 655.

4. Martin, N.K., et al., *The hepatitis C virus epidemics in key populations (including people who inject drugs, prisoners and MSM): the use of direct-acting antivirals as treatment for prevention*. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*, 2015. **10**(5): p. 374-80.
5. Han R, Z.J., *PIN19 - A COST COMPARISON OF TREATING CHRONIC HEPATITIS C PATIENTS WITH SOFOSBUVIR-BASED REGIMENS*. *Value in Health*, 2018. **21**: p. S224.
6. de Graaff, B., et al., *Uptake of and Expenditure on Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents for Hepatitis C Treatment in Australia*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2018. **16**(4): p. 495-502.
7. McDonald, S.A., et al., *Projections of the Healthcare Costs and Disease Burden due to Hepatitis C Infection under Different Treatment Policies in Malaysia, 2018-2040*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2018. **16**(6): p. 847-857.
8. Cipriano, L.E. and J.D. Goldhaber-Fiebert, *Population Health and Cost-Effectiveness Implications of a "Treat All" Recommendation for HCV: A Review of the Model-Based Evidence*. *MDM Policy Pract*, 2018. **3**(1): p. 2381468318776634.
9. Townsend, R., et al., *Structural frameworks and key model parameters in cost-effectiveness analyses for current and future treatments of chronic hepatitis C*. *Value Health*, 2011. **14**(8): p. 1068-77.
10. Chhatwal, J., T. He, and M.A. Lopez-Olivo, *Systematic Review of Modelling Approaches for the Cost Effectiveness of Hepatitis C Treatment with Direct-Acting Antivirals*. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 2016. **34**(6): p. 551-67.
11. Luhnén, M., et al., *Health Economic Evaluations of Sofosbuvir for Treatment of Chronic Hepatitis C: a Systematic Review*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2016. **14**(5): p. 527-43.
12. Castro, R., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of diagnostic and therapeutic interventions for chronic hepatitis C: a systematic review of model-based analyses*. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 2018. **18**(1): p. 53.
13. Puig-Junoy, J., et al., *Cost-utility analysis of second-generation direct-acting antivirals for hepatitis C: a systematic review*. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2018. **12**(12): p. 1251-1263.
14. Szilberhorn, L., Z. Kalo, and T. Agh, *Cost-effectiveness of second-generation direct-acting antiviral agents in chronic HCV infection: a systematic literature review*. *Antivir Ther*, 2019. **24**(4): p. 247-259.
15. Vellopoulou, A., et al., *Cost utility of telaprevir-PR (peginterferon-ribavirin) versus boceprevir-PR and versus PR alone in chronic hepatitis C in The Netherlands*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2014. **12**(6): p. 647-59.
16. Leidner, A.J., et al., *Assessing the Effect of Potential Reductions in Non-Hepatic Mortality on the Estimated Cost-Effectiveness of Hepatitis C Treatment in Early Stages of Liver Disease*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2017. **15**(1): p. 65-74.
17. Elbasha, E.H., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of boceprevir for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C virus genotype 1 infection in Portugal*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2013. **11**(1): p. 65-78.
18. Ruggeri, M., et al., *Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Early Treatment of Chronic HCV with Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir in Italy*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2018. **16**(5): p. 711-722.
19. Weinstein, M.C. and W.B. Stason, *Foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis for health and medical practices*. *N Engl J Med*, 1977. **296**(13): p. 716-21.
20. Mathes, T., et al., *Methods of international health technology assessment agencies for economic evaluations--a comparative analysis*. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 2013. **13**: p. 371.
21. *National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). 7. Assessing cost effectiveness. The guidelines manual PMG6*; 2012 [Last accessed on 2019 Apr 04]; Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg6/chapter/assessing-costeffectiveness>.
22. *Haute Autorite de Sante (HAS). Choices in methods for economic evaluation. France: HAS*. 2012 [Last accessed on 2019 Apr 04]; Available from: <https://www.has->

- [sante.fr/portail/upload/docs/application/pdf/2012-10/choices\\_in\\_methods\\_for\\_economic\\_evaluation.pdf](https://sante.fr/portail/upload/docs/application/pdf/2012-10/choices_in_methods_for_economic_evaluation.pdf).
23. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH). *Guidelines for the economic evaluation of health technologies: Canada. 4th. Canada: CADTH. 2017* [Last accessed on 2019 Apr 04]; Available from: <https://www.cadth.ca/dv/guidelines-economic-evaluationhealth-technologies-canada-4th-edition>.
  24. Fukuda, T., *Analysis guidelines for cost-effectiveness evaluation at the central social insurance medical council*. 2016.
  25. *China Guidelines for Pharmacoeconomic Evaluation Working Group. China Guidelines for Pharmacoeconomic Evaluation 2019*.
  26. Xie, F., et al., *Toward a Centralized, Systematic Approach to the Identification, Appraisal, and Use of Health State Utility Values for Reimbursement Decision Making: Introducing the Health Utility Book (HUB)*. *Med Decis Making*, 2019. **39**(4): p. 370-378.
  27. Zhou, J., et al., *Systematic review of utility values used in the pharmacoeconomic evaluations for schizophrenia: implications on cost-effectiveness results*. *J Mark Access Health Policy*, 2019. **7**(1): p. 1648973.
  28. Nerich, V., et al., *Critical appraisal of health-state utility values used in breast cancer-related cost-utility analyses*. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*, 2017. **164**(3): p. 527-536.
  29. Shepherd, J., N. Waugh, and P. Hewitson, *Combination therapy (interferon alfa and ribavirin) in the treatment of chronic hepatitis C: a rapid and systematic review*. *Health Technol Assess*, 2000. **4**(33): p. 1-67.
  30. Shepherd, J., et al., *Pegylated interferon alpha-2a and -2b in combination with ribavirin in the treatment of chronic hepatitis C: a systematic review and economic evaluation*. *Health Technol Assess*, 2004. **8**(39): p. iii-iv, 1-125.
  31. Shepherd, J., et al., *Interferon alpha (pegylated and non-pegylated) and ribavirin for the treatment of mild chronic hepatitis C: a systematic review and economic evaluation*. *Health Technol Assess*, 2007. **11**(11): p. 1-205, iii.
  32. Annemans, L., et al., *A health economic model to assess the long term effects and cost-effectiveness of PEG IFN alpha-2a in hepatitis C virus infected patients*. *Acta Gastroenterol Belg*, 2004. **67**(1): p. 1-8.
  33. Garcia-Contreras, F., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of chronic hepatitis C treatment with thymosin alpha-1*. *Arch Med Res*, 2006. **37**(5): p. 663-73.
  34. Hornberger, J., et al., *The economics of treating chronic hepatitis C patients with peginterferon alpha-2a (40 kDa) plus ribavirin presenting with persistently normal aminotransferase*. *J Viral Hepat*, 2006. **13**(6): p. 377-86.
  35. Lidgren, M., et al., *Productivity improvements in hepatitis C treatment: impact on efficacy, cost, cost-effectiveness and quality of life*. *Scand J Gastroenterol*, 2007. **42**(7): p. 867-77.
  36. Lin, W.A., Y.H. Tarn, and S.L. Tang, *Cost-utility analysis of different peg-interferon alpha-2b plus ribavirin treatment strategies as initial therapy for naive Chinese patients with chronic hepatitis C*. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*, 2006. **24**(10): p. 1483-93.
  37. Nakamura, J., et al., *The cost-effectiveness of the new protocol reflecting rapid virologic response to peginterferon alpha-2b and ribavirin for chronic hepatitis C*. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2007. **19**(9): p. 733-9.
  38. Salomon, J.A., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of treatment for chronic hepatitis C infection in an evolving patient population*. *Jama*, 2003. **290**(2): p. 228-37.
  39. Sullivan, S.D., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of combination peginterferon alpha-2a and ribavirin compared with interferon alpha-2b and ribavirin in patients with chronic hepatitis C*. *Am J Gastroenterol*, 2004. **99**(8): p. 1490-6.
  40. Sullivan, S.D., et al., *Cost effectiveness of peginterferon alpha-2a plus ribavirin versus interferon alpha-2b plus ribavirin as initial therapy for treatment-naive chronic hepatitis C*. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 2004. **22**(4): p. 257-65.

41. Wong, J. and F. Nevens, *Cost-effectiveness of peginterferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin compared to interferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin as initial treatment of chronic hepatitis C in Belgium*. *Acta Gastroenterol Belg*, 2002. **65**(2): p. 110-11.
42. McEwan, P., R. Kim, and Y. Yuan, *Assessing the cost utility of response-guided therapy in patients with chronic hepatitis C genotype 1 in the UK using the MONARCH model*. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*, 2013. **11**(1): p. 53-63.
43. Johnson, S.J., et al., *Economic evaluation of ombitasvir/paritaprevir/ritonavir and dasabuvir for the treatment of chronic genotype 1 hepatitis c virus infection*. *J Med Econ*, 2016. **19**(10): p. 983-94.
44. Buxton, M.J., et al., *Modelling in economic evaluation: an unavoidable fact of life*. *Health Econ*, 1997. **6**(3): p. 217-27.
45. Bennett, H., et al., *Hepatitis C disease transmission and treatment uptake: impact on the cost-effectiveness of new direct-acting antiviral therapies*. *Eur J Health Econ*, 2017. **18**(8): p. 1001-1011.
46. Martin, N.K., et al., *Prioritization of HCV treatment in the direct-acting antiviral era: An economic evaluation*. *J Hepatol*, 2016. **65**(1): p. 17-25.
47. McEwan, P., et al., *A clinician's guide to the cost and health benefits of hepatitis C cure assessed from the individual patient perspective*. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2017. **29**(2): p. 208-214.
48. McEwan, P., et al., *Estimating the cost-effectiveness of daclatasvir + sofosbuvir versus sofosbuvir + ribavirin for patients with genotype 3 hepatitis C virus*. *Cost Eff Resour Alloc*, 2017. **15**: p. 15.
49. van Santen, D.K., et al., *Cost-Effectiveness of Hepatitis C Treatment for People Who Inject Drugs and the Impact of the Type of Epidemic; Extrapolating from Amsterdam, the Netherlands*. *PLoS One*, 2016. **11**(10): p. e0163488.
50. Wisloff, T., et al., *Economic Evaluation of Direct-Acting Antivirals for Hepatitis C in Norway*. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 2018. **36**(5): p. 591-601.
51. Sbarigia, U., et al., *Economic study of the value of expanding HCV treatment capacity in Germany*. *BMJ Open Gastroenterol*, 2017. **4**(1): p. e000130.
52. Stahmeyer, J.T., et al., *Cost-Effectiveness of Treating Hepatitis C with Sofosbuvir/Ledipasvir in Germany*. *PLoS One*, 2017. **12**(1): p. e0169401.
53. Deuffic-Burban, S., et al., *Cost-effectiveness and budget impact of interferon-free direct-acting antiviral-based regimens for hepatitis C treatment: the French case*. *J Viral Hepat*, 2016. **23**(10): p. 767-79.
54. Maunoury, F., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of elbasvir-grazoprevir regimen for treating hepatitis C virus genotype 1 infection in stage 4-5 chronic kidney disease patients in France*. *PLoS One*, 2018. **13**(3): p. e0194329.
55. Ruggeri, M., et al., *Economic Evaluation of the Hepatitis C Virus Treatment Extension to Early-Stage Fibrosis Patients: Evidence from the PITER Real-World Cohort*. *Value Health*, 2018. **21**(7): p. 783-791.
56. Rolli, F.R., et al., *Economic evaluation of Zepatier for the management of HCV in the Italian scenario*. *Eur J Health Econ*, 2018. **19**(9): p. 1365-1374.
57. Kondili, L.A., et al., *Modeling cost-effectiveness and health gains of a "universal" versus "prioritized" hepatitis C virus treatment policy in a real-life cohort*. *Hepatology*, 2017. **66**(6): p. 1814-1825.
58. Turnes, J., R. Dominguez-Hernandez, and M.A. Casado, *Value and innovation of direct-acting antivirals: long-term health outcomes of the strategic plan for the management of hepatitis C in Spain*. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig*, 2017. **109**(12): p. 809-817.
59. Gimeno-Ballester, V., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of therapeutic options for chronic hepatitis C genotype 3 infected patients*. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2017. **11**(1): p. 85-93.

60. Ruggeri, M., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of Daclatasvir/Sofosbuvir for the treatment of the HCV patients failed after the first line with second generation of DAAs in Italy*. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*, 2019. **19**(3): p. 363-374.
61. Heath, K., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of treatment timing considering the future entry of lower-cost generics for hepatitis C*. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res*, 2018. **10**: p. 539-550.
62. Popping, S., et al., *Early treatment of acute hepatitis C infection is cost-effective in HIV-infected men-who-have-sex-with-men*. *PLoS One*, 2019. **14**(1): p. e0210179.
63. Restelli, U., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of the use of daclatasvir + sofosbuvir + ribavirin (16 weeks and 12 weeks) vs sofosbuvir + ribavirin (16 weeks and 24 weeks) for the treatment of cirrhotic patients affected with hepatitis C virus genotype 3 in Italy*. *Eur J Health Econ*, 2018. **19**(1): p. 37-44.
64. Buti, M., et al., *Cost-effectiveness analysis of ledipasvir/sofosbuvir in patients with chronic hepatitis C: Treatment of patients with absence or mild fibrosis compared to patients with advanced fibrosis*. *J Viral Hepat*, 2017. **24**(9): p. 750-758.
65. Cortesi, P.A., et al., *Management of treatment-naive chronic hepatitis C genotype 1 patients: a cost-effectiveness analysis of treatment options*. *J Viral Hepat*, 2015. **22**(2): p. 175-83.
66. Cure, S., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of sofosbuvir plus ribavirin with or without pegylated interferon for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C in Italy*. *J Med Econ*, 2015. **18**(9): p. 678-90.
67. Cure, S., I. Guerra, and G. Dusheiko, *Cost-effectiveness of sofosbuvir for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C-infected patients*. *J Viral Hepat*, 2015. **22**(11): p. 882-9.
68. McEwan, P., et al., *The cost-effectiveness of daclatasvir-based regimens for the treatment of hepatitis C virus genotypes 1 and 4 in the UK*. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2016. **28**(2): p. 173-80.
69. Wright, M., et al., *Health benefits of antiviral therapy for mild chronic hepatitis C: randomised controlled trial and economic evaluation*. *Health Technol Assess*, 2006. **10**(21): p. 1-113, iii.
70. Paul Kind, G.H., Susan Macran, *UK population norms for EQ5D*, C.f.H.E. The University of York, Editor. 1999.
71. Hzode, C., et al., *Daclatasvir in Combination with Peginterferon Alfa-2a and Ribavirin for Treatment-Naive Patients with HCV Genotype 4 Infection: Phase 3 COMMAND-4 Results*. 2014.
72. Sulkowski, M.S., et al., *Daclatasvir plus sofosbuvir for previously treated or untreated chronic HCV infection*. *N Engl J Med*, 2014. **370**(3): p. 211-21.
73. McDonald, S.A., et al., *Decrease in health-related quality of life associated with awareness of hepatitis C virus infection among people who inject drugs in Scotland*. *J Hepatol*, 2013. **58**(3): p. 460-6.
74. McLernon, D.J., J. Dillon, and P.T. Donnan, *Health-state utilities in liver disease: a systematic review*. *Med Decis Making*, 2008. **28**(4): p. 582-92.
75. Siebert, U., et al., *Cost effectiveness of peginterferon alpha-2b plus ribavirin versus interferon alpha-2b plus ribavirin for initial treatment of chronic hepatitis C*. *Gut*, 2003. **52**(3): p. 425-32.
76. Chong, C.A., et al., *Health-state utilities and quality of life in hepatitis C patients*. *Am J Gastroenterol*, 2003. **98**(3): p. 630-8.
77. Schwarzinger, M., et al., *P0745 : EQ-5D utility index in French patients with chronic hepatitis C (CHC) infection: severe comorbidities and perceived progression of CHC infection matter more than actual liver disease stage*. *Journal of Hepatology*, 2015. **62**: p. S605.
78. Tengs, T.O. and T.H. Lin, *A meta-analysis of utility estimates for HIV/AIDS*. *Med Decis Making*, 2002. **22**(6): p. 475-81.
79. McGreal-bellone, A., et al., *PHS60 Health-Related Quality of Life in HIV/HCV Co-Infected Patients in Ireland*. *Value in Health*, 2012. **15**(7): p. A528-A529.
80. Cortesi, P.A., et al., *The Impact of Type of Liver Conditions on the Patients' Health Related Quality of Life*. *Value in Health*, 2013. **16**(7): p. A500.

81. Sullivan, P.W. and V. Ghushchyan, *Preference-Based EQ-5D index scores for chronic conditions in the United States*. Med Decis Making, 2006. **26**(4): p. 410-20.
82. Pol, S., et al., *P0747 : Health related quality of life and utility values in chronic hepatitis C patients: A cross-sectional study in France, the Uk and Germany*. Journal of Hepatology, 2015. **62**: p. S606.
83. Fischer, J.A., et al., *Quality of life of people who inject drugs: characteristics and comparisons with other population samples*. Qual Life Res, 2013. **22**(8): p. 2113-21.