THE COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF DEPRESSION SCREENING FOR THE GENERAL ADULT POPULATION

Melike Yildirim[1,2], PhD, Bradley N Gaynes[3,4], MD, MPH, Pinar Keskinocak[1,5], PhD, Brian W Pence[4], PhD, Julie Swann[6], PhD

[1] *School of Industrial and Systems Engineering and Center for Health and Humanitarian Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA.*
[2] *Institute for Technology Assessment, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.*
[3] *Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.*
[4] *Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.*
[5] *Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA.*
[6] *Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA.*

Corresponding Author: Julie Swann, Ph.D., Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, 111 Lampe Drive CB7906, Raleigh, NC 27695. Tel.: 919-515-6423; e□mail: jlswann@ncsu.edu

Conflicts of Interest: None reported.

Financial Support: This research was supported in part by the Center for Health and Humanitarian Systems, the William W. George Endowment at Georgia Tech, the following Georgia Tech benefactors: Andrea Laliberte, Claudia L. and J. Paul Raines, and Richard E. "Rick" and Charlene Zalesky, and the Allison Distinguished Professorship at NC State University.

Key words: Cost-effectiveness, major depression, minor depression, routine screening, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio

ABSTRACT

Objective.

Screening has an essential role in preventive medicine. Ideally, screening tools detect patients early enough to manage the disease and reduce symptoms. We aimed to determine the cost-effectiveness of routine screening schedules.

Methods.

We used a discrete-time nonstationary Markov model to simulate the progression of depression. We adopted annual transition probabilities, which were dependent on patient histories, such as the number of previous episodes, treatment status, and time spent without treatment state based on the available data. We used Monte Carlo techniques to simulate the stochastic model for 20 years or during the lifetime of individuals. Baseline and screening scenario models with screening frequencies of annual, 2-year, and 5-year were compared based on incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER).

Results.

In the general population, all screening strategies were cost-effective compared to the baseline. However, male and female populations differed based on cost over quality-adjusted life years (QALY). Females had lower ICERs, and annual screening had the highest ICER for females, with 11,134 $/QALY gained. In contrast, males had around three times higher ICER, with annual screening costs of 34,065$/QALY gained.

Conclusions.

Considering the high lifetime prevalence and recurrence rates of depression, detection and prevention efforts can be one critical cornerstone to support required care. Our analysis combined the expected benefits and costs of screening and assessed the effectiveness of screening scenarios. We conclude that routine screening is cost-effective for all age groups of females and young, middle-aged males. Male population results are sensitive to the higher costs of screening.

Key words: Cost-effectiveness, major depression, minor depression, routine screening, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio

INTRODUCTION

Depression is one of the most common mental health conditions and a leading cause of disability that results in substantial impairment. (1) It co-occurs highly with other physical illnesses, which causes health and economic burdens to individuals and society. It is estimated that depression cost $210 billion in 2010, including direct medical and indirect costs (e.g., loss of productivity). (2)

On average, 22.9% of females and 15.1% of males experience at least one episode of major depression in their lifetime, and 43.3% of patients are not receiving any treatment. (3) Considering high prevalence and low detection rates, improved management of disease reduces health spending and improves patients' quality and quantity of life.

Both major depression and minor depression present with either depressed mood or loss of interest or pleasure in usual activities along with other symptoms, and the signs are present for two weeks or longer. Minor depression, with a few mild symptoms, can be resolved without treatment, but it may evolve into major depression. Major depression with moderate or severe symptoms significantly impacts life quality and may require treatment from a mental health specialist. However, most depression cases are treated in general medical settings in practice. (3) Depression is a recurrent disease, and at least full or partial remission is required to distinguish episodes. (4)

Between 1998 and 2018, suicide rates increased by 35% in the overall population. (5) A 50% increase in suicide rates was observed among women from 2000 to 2016. (6) Due to the high cost and the negative impacts on patients' overall health, improved detection efforts attract policymakers and healthcare agencies.

Routine depression screening can be used to improve the recognition of depressive episodes. The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) suggests screening of patients with a system that accurately diagnoses, treats, and follows up with the patients. Still the net benefit of screening, optimal screening interval, and timing is unknown. (7) Studies in literature questioned the USPSTF recommendations, (8) and most of them are limited to show the impact of screening. (9)

In some health systems, screening is commonly used; in other settings, implementation is limited. (10) Therefore, in current clinical practice, screening measures are variable. According to the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS) in the United States, only 2.29 percent of primary care visit patients were screened for depression in 2010. (11) Whereas, in postpartum populations, screening is implemented on a large scale (79%). (12) Given this uncertainty, exploring the benefits of screening can provide insight into decisions about routine depression screening.

In this study, we aimed to determine the cost-effectiveness of routine screening schedules. A natural history model was introduced where probabilities were assigned to each health state based on patient characteristics such as age, gender, and history of depression. We used Monte Carlo simulation to evaluate disease progression over the years. We assessed the various routine screening frequencies based on cost and benefits.

METHODS

Model Structure

We used a discrete-time nonstationary Markov chain model. The model consists of ten health states: healthy, major depression without treatment, major depression with treatment, partial remission, full remission from major depression, minor depression without treatment, minor depression with treatment, full remission from minor depression, suicide, and death from other causes (Figure 1). States were similar to Valenstein et al.'s (9) model. But distinct from their work, we used more detailed remission states, e.g., partial and full remission from different types of depression.

We classified the existence of 2 to 4 depressive symptoms as minor depression. (13) We considered patients in partial remission of current major depression when they had some symptoms of major depression; however, the full diagnostic criteria of major depression were not satisfied. (4) Healthy state included individuals who were never depressed (minor or major).

We used Monte Carlo techniques to simulate the stochastic model for 20 years or during the lifetime of individuals. We ran each scenario for 1000 replications. At the entry, patients were assigned their initial states based on prevalence, and they transitioned between states at the end of each year. The initial population of 100,000 individuals was introduced to the system based on U.S. age distribution (14) and a constant number of people preserved in the system. In

each time unit, the number of 18-year-old individuals entering the system was equal to the number of people leaving the system from states of suicide or death from other causes.

Model Parameters

We derived the model parameters from published data. Time-sensitive transition probabilities were used, where the mortality probabilities were increased by age. We used annual transitions that depend on patient history, such as the number of previous episodes, treatment status, time spent without treatment, and demographics (age, gender) if applicable. Table 1 shows the parameters that were used in the baseline model and their sources.

When there was no consensus in the literature for a parameter value, we chose conservative estimates. For example, for the incidence of major depression, we used the lower bound of rates reported in the ECA study. (15) Consequently, our results were not biased towards screening.

We obtained all the varying values of sensitivity analysis parameters from the literature (Supplementary Table S1). We used the medium and high values of incidence and prevalence (3, 15) and matched two of these with using recall bias rates. (16)

Prevalence and Incidence

The ECA study's incidence rates yield a 50% lifetime prevalence of major depression, (17) which is higher than reported in the literature. There are arguments around the potential discordance between incidence and lifetime prevalence rates of major depression. (18)

To be consistent with the reported incidence rates from national surveys, we used a lower bound of incidence. (15) We integrated the matching lifetime prevalence using a recall bias of 31.9% for females and 16.3% for males, and a 12-month prevalence recall bias of 25.5% for females and 9% for males, which were obtained from the literature. (16, 19)

Detection and treatment

We had a detection rate of 45% for major depression and 30% for minor depression in the baseline model. (9) 43 to 60% (3) of patients who initiated the treatment from major depression depend on the age of onset, whereas 20% (9) of cases with minor depression received treatment.

The multiplication of these two probabilities ((detection rate)*(initiation of treatment)) represent the transitions from without treatment to with treatment state.

Treatment increased the full remission rate by 35% (0.37 without treatment vs. 0.50 with treatment) for major depression and 29% (0.55 without treatment vs. 0.71 with treatment) for minor depression. (Table 1)

Early treatment efforts had an impact on the outcome of antidepressant treatment. (20) Duration of untreated illness (DUI) longer than 6 months decreased the effect of antidepressant treatment. Patients who spent more than 12 months without treatment status have reduced remission likelihood by one third. (21)

Transition to remission state depended on the healthcare provider and the type of treatment. We assumed that 31% of major depression and 25% of minor depression cases were treated by a specialist. (9) Patients were treated with medications in primary care (9) Psychotherapy, medication, or a combination of these two was used during the treatment of a specialist.

Relapse and recurrence

Major depression is a recurrent mental health condition; around 67% of patients have at least one recurrence every 10 years. (22) Patients with residual symptoms were 3 times more likely to relapse than the fully recovered patients (0.76 from partial remission vs. 0.25 from full remission). (23) The number of previous episodes and treatment status affected the probability of recurrences. We obtained base recurrence rates for patients who had a history of cases pertaining to depression from (22) and patients who had one previous case and determined that they indicated an increased risk of recurrence by 16% compared to the base. Patients with 2 or more previous episodes had an additional 32% risk of recurrence. (22)

Patients who recovered from major remission without appropriate medication or other treatments were more likely (relative risk of 1.52 to 2.69 (24-27) for 52 weeks) to relapse. We increased the recurrence rate by 30% for patients transitioning to a remission state from major depression without treatment. (28)

Suicide and Death

We assumed that depression-related suicides occur only among major depressive patients regardless of treatment status. We derived the transition probabilities for suicide from the modifications noted in (9) for age and gender-specific rates. The validity of suicide rates was ensured by comparing the suicide prevalence ratios from 2001 to 2018. (29, 30) We assumed that at least 50% of suicides related with depression and 50-80% of older adults who die by suicide have been shown to have major depression. (29)

Age-specific death from other causes was utilized, (31) and we assumed that the major depressive patients had increased their risk of death based on other reasons by a ratio of 1.58. (32)

Screening Tools

For the baseline model, the detection rate of depression in usual care settings increased by 50% (9) for major depression (baseline 45% vs. with screening 68%) and 23% (9) for minor depression (baseline 30% vs. 37% with screening). (Table 1)

Costs and Utilities

We conducted our analysis from the societal perspective, which took into account direct and indirect costs. (Table 2) We assumed that patients who received treatment from primary care settings had 4 visits plus a follow-up visit in a year. (9) Patients treated by mental health specialists had around 11 visits. (9) 31% of patients received treatment from mental health specialists (26% self-refer and 5% referred by primary care physician) in a year. (9) Additionally, 1% of patients have inpatient visits in a 12-month period with an average of 11.6 days of stay. On the other hand, the cost of minor depression was estimated as two-thirds of major depression. (33) We calculated the average treatment cost of partial remission (34) as $1095, based on the number of remaining symptoms. We assumed there is no direct or indirect cost to capture during full remission states, as for the healthy state.

The indirect cost was 20% lower in untreated patients ($1600 for treated vs. $3360 for untreated). The overall cost of major depression with treatment was estimated at $3087 vs. $3360 for major depression without treatment, which was similar to the estimates from Cuijpers. (33)

Utility estimates for all health states were obtained from the literature. (Table 2) We assumed that depression with and without treatment states had the same QALYs. We ignored the discount rate of utilities.

Incremental Cost-effectiveness Ratio (ICER)

For all screening scenarios, costs and effects were compared to a situation without screening. Strategies were evaluated based on the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), which was calculated as the incremental costs per incremental QALY gained (Equation (1)). The scenario up to the willingness-to-pay threshold of $50 000/QALY gained was classified as optimal. (35)

$$ICER = \frac{\text{Cost}_{Screening} - Cost_{Baseline}}{\text{QALY}_{Screening} - QALY_{Baseline}} \qquad (1)$$

RESULTS

We considered the following scenarios i) baseline (no screening), ii) annual screening, iii) screening in every 2 years, and iv) screening in every 5 years. We evaluated the case of screening for the overall population, starting at the age of 18 and over 20 years or the patient's lifetime.

Screening Impact on Outcome Measures

The mean duration in treatment was estimated from the simulation model as 1.26 years for major depression and 1.32 months for minor depression among females. The suicide rates in the baseline model were 5.11 for females and 18.08 for males per 100,000 people in a year. Annual screening could prevent 24.3 cases of suicide per 10,000,000 people in a year (Table 3). Annual screening also shortened the initiation of the treatment time by 5.3 (vs. 2.8 for 2-year screening and 1.1 for 5-year screening) months for females and 3.2 (vs. 1.7 for 2-year screening and 0.6 for 5-year screening) months for males. Annual screening increased the depression-free months up to 5.5 months per year. All the screening scenarios extended time spent in remission (11 days to 1.9 months for females and 7 to 29 days for males based on screening schedule).

Table 3 shows that, in the general population, all screening frequencies were cost-effective compared with the baseline. However, there exists a difference between the male and female population based on cost/QALY gained. Females had lower ICERs, and the annual

screening had the highest ratio, with 11,134 $/QALY gained. On the other hand, males had around 3 times higher ICER, with annual screening costs of 34,072 $ per QALY gained.

Uncertainty among Monte-Carlo Simulations

Figure S2 (in supplementary) showed every single average incremental cost and QALY pairs for 1000 replications. For the female population, simulation results showed that all ICERs were less than the willingness-to-pay threshold of $50,000. Additionally, less than 10 percent of simulation runs for males were greater or equal to the willingness-to-pay threshold in every scenario.

Sensitivity Analysis

We performed a one-way sensitivity analysis on critical parameters. (9) In our baseline analysis, we observed that screening was cost-effective for both genders with low incidence and prevalence (conservative case). Consequently, the screening cost under medium and high incidence rates was cost-saving for females (2 and 5-year screening). For females, lower ICERs were observed compared to those for males.

Additional analysis on the other parameters such as the remission rate from major depression treatment, QALY of major depression, cost of screening, treatment, and indirect costs showed that female ICERs were not sensitive to any changes in these parameters. However, the ICERs of the male population was higher than $50,000 by using the upper limit of the screening. (Figure 2)

Age-Specific Analysis

Three different age groups, young (18-34), middle (35-64), and old (65+) were analyzed by evaluating differences in cost-utilities among these subgroups; see Figure S3 (in Supplementary).

All scenarios were cost-effective for each age group of the female population. For the oldest population, about 10% of the simulations have ICERs between $50,000 and $75,000. (please see Supplementary Figure S1)

Young and middle age groups of the male population had ICER values up to $32,090/QALY gained. On average, screening with any frequency was not cost-effective for the oldest male population.

DISCUSSION

Annual screening of all adults 18 years old or older for depression would cost $11,134 and $34,065 per QALY gained for females and males, respectively. In comparison, screening every 5-years resulted in $8627 per QALY earned for females and $26,892 per QALY gained for males. We found that the benefit of early detection and treatment results in the improvement of quality of life. For both genders, annual screening produced greater costs. The ICER decreased with increasing screening frequency for males, whereas it rose from 2-year to 5-year screening in the female population.

In the literature, the combined results from trials showed that the depression screening increased the treatment rates between 2 to 50%. (36) In our model, patients spent an average of 3.65 years to initiate treatment for first-onset major depression. The World Health Organization's (WHO's) World Mental Health Survey showed that 35% of patients had 4 years of untreated time before initiating the treatment. (37) We observed that screening decreased the detection time up to 5 months and increased the remission time up to 1.9 months.

The age-specific analysis showed that screening of old populations had higher ICERs than the young and middle age groups. In the old male population, ICERs of all screening scenarios were below the willingness-to-pay threshold of $50,000. The main reason for gender differences in the cost-effectiveness of screening was the varying incidence and prevalence of major depression. In literature, men had lower incidence rates than women, (15) although there is concern that these rates were not reflecting the truth. (38) There were a couple of factors that may cause the underestimation of the rates for males. Firstly, the measurement bias was observed in data because of the inadequate attendance to surveys and lower primary care visits. (38) Secondly, men were less likely than women to have symptoms of depression that fit standard measurement tools. They experienced more externalizing symptoms, such as aggression, violence, and substance abuse. Studies showed that including these alternative symptoms with traditional symptoms as diagnosis criteria had increased the male prevalence rates to have equal proportions with females. (39) We evaluated the alternative incidence, prevalence, and screening

scenarios for males with the same frequency as females. Our results are summarized in the Supplementary file.

We evaluated the external consistency of our model. By running the open network model for a longer time, where new individuals were introduced into the system at the age of 18 with the mortality rate, we observed that our initial distribution was equal to steady-state distribution. This was the case when transient behavior was not observed in the system. To obtain a consistent system, we adjusted the lifetime prevalence of major depression using reported recall bias rates. (16)

This paper evaluated the general U.S. population during non-crises period (e.g., economic problems, or pandemics). Recent studies showed that during COVID-19, incidence and prevalence were reported three times higher for moderate and severe depression. (40) We further included the prevalence rate changes between 2020 and 2021 in our analysis. Our results indicated that the depression screening is cost-saving for females at 2 and 5-year screening frequencies and around $11,000 to $15,000 cost per QALY gained for males based on the screening interval between 2020 to 2040 (please see Supplementary file).

LIMITATIONS

The cost-effectiveness of screening may be enhanced by targeting groups with a higher incidence of depression based on ethnicity, comorbidities, or poverty level. However, we analyzed screening scenarios that are valid for the general adult population. Because of incidence, disease progression, and suicide rate difference between females and males, we only considered the gender-specific model. We also extended our analysis for different age groups.

Our model did not consider the differences among the screening tools; we used average test sensitivity for 9 standard screening instruments. We assumed that the screening frequency was not changing at any time during the screening scenario. In our calculations, false-positive cases were not taking into account.

We did not consider the severity of major depression; however, we included the details about elevated risk based on age, gender, history of depression (major or minor), number of previous episodes, remaining symptoms for onset depression, treatment status, type of treatment and time spent without treatment states. We did not exclusively include medication drop-out rates (transition from treatment to without treatment) in our analysis. However, the treatment

rates obtained from the literature implicitly include the response of adherent and non-adherent patients who are not fully complied the clinical treatment guidelines.

Like Valenstein's model, (9) we assumed that suicide might happen when the patient had active major depression. Patients did not have medical and nonmedical costs when they were in full remission; however, staying there for a long time decrease the risk of relapses. We did not consider the medication costs that arose when patients were in remission. In the annual transition model, patients spent at least one year in treatment when they transition to treatment states, which is more than suggested acute therapy (6-12 weeks) and continuation therapy (4-8 months). We assumed that patients in partial remission with residual symptoms had receive maintenance treatment.

CONCLUSIONS

Depression is a common health condition that affects an individual's everyday life. Considering the high lifetime prevalence and recurrence rates of depression, detection and prevention efforts play an essential role. Furthermore, the increasing trend in suicide rates becomes an emerging public health problem. We conclude that routine screening is cost-effective for all age groups of females and young and middle-aged males. Male population results are sensitive to the higher costs of screening, which indicates that if the screening cost is 44% higher than the average costs, the screening of the male population is not cost-effective. Our analysis combines the expected benefits and costs of screening and assesses the effectiveness of screening scenarios. Screening can be one of the cornerstones to support required care. Our baseline model could be utilized to evaluate the potential consequences of medication strategies or alternative intervention scenario.

REFERENCES

1. Goodwin GM. Depression and associated physical diseases and symptoms. Dialogues Clin Neurosci. 2006;8(2):259-65.
2. Greenberg PE, Fournier AA, Sisitsky T, Pike CT, Kessler RC. The economic burden of adults with major depressive disorder in the United States (2005 and 2010). J Clin Psychiatry. 2015;76(2):155-62.
3. Kessler RC, Birnbaum H, Bromet E, Hwang I, Sampson N, Shahly V. Age differences in major depression: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). Psychol Med. 2010;40(2):225-37.
4. Depression: The Treatment and Management of Depression in Adults (Updated Edition). National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: Guidance. Leicester (UK)2010.
5. NIH. Suicide [December 25, 2020]. Available from: https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/suicide.shtml.
6. APA. By the numbers: An alarming rise in suicide [Available from: https://www.apa.org/monitor/2019/01/numbers.
7. USPSTF. Depression in Adults: Screening [December 25, 2020]. Available from: https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/recommendation/depression-in-adults-screening.
8. Thombs BD, Coyne JC, Cuijpers P, de Jonge P, Gilbody S, Ioannidis JP, et al. Rethinking recommendations for screening for depression in primary care. CMAJ. 2012;184(4):413-8.
9. Valenstein M, Vijan S, Zeber JE, Boehm K, Buttar A. The cost-utility of screening for depression in primary care. Ann Intern Med. 2001;134(5):345-60.
10. O'Connor E, Rossom RC, Henninger M, Groom HC, Burda BU, Henderson JT, et al. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Evidence Syntheses, formerly Systematic Evidence Reviews. Screening for Depression in Adults: An Updated Systematic Evidence Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2016.
11. CDC. NAMCS and NHAMCS Web Tables [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/web_tables.htm.
12. Sleath BL, Thomas N, Jackson E, West SL, Gaynes BN. Physician reported communication about depression and psychosocial issues during postpartum visits. N C Med J. 2007;68(3):151-5.
13. Fils JM, Penick EC, Nickel EJ, Othmer E, Desouza C, Gabrielli WF, et al. Minor versus major depression: a comparative clinical study. Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry. 2010;12(1):PCC 08m00752.
14. J. HLM. Age and Sex Composition: 2010 [Available from: https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-03.pdf.
15. Eaton WW, Kalaydjian A, Scharfstein DO, Mezuk B, Ding Y. Prevalence and incidence of depressive disorder: the Baltimore ECA follow-up, 1981-2004. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 2007;116(3):182-8.
16. Yildirim M, Gaynes BN, Keskinocak P, Pence BW, Swann JL. DIP: Natural History Model for Major Depression with Incidence and Prevalence. medRxiv. 2021:2021.03.11.21253279.

17. Eaton WW, Anthony JC, Gallo J, Cai G, Tien A, Romanoski A, et al. Natural history of Diagnostic Interview Schedule/DSM-IV major depression. The Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area follow-up. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1997;54(11):993-9.
18. Takayanagi Y, Spira AP, Roth KB, Gallo JJ, Eaton WW, Mojtabai R. Accuracy of reports of lifetime mental and physical disorders: results from the Baltimore Epidemiological Catchment Area study. JAMA Psychiatry. 2014;71(3):273-80.
19. Yildirim M, Keskinocak P, Swann JL. Natural History Model of Major Depression 2019 [Available from: http://meetings2.informs.org/wordpress/healthcare2019/files/2019/07/Healthcare_2019_Program_Back_Matter.pdf.
20. Kraus C, Kadriu B, Lanzenberger R, Zarate CA, Jr., Kasper S. Prognosis and improved outcomes in major depression: a review. Transl Psychiatry. 2019;9(1):127.
21. Bukh JD, Bock C, Vinberg M, Kessing LV. The effect of prolonged duration of untreated depression on antidepressant treatment outcome. J Affect Disord. 2013;145(1):42-8.
22. Solomon DA, Keller MB, Leon AC, Mueller TI, Lavori PW, Shea MT, et al. Multiple recurrences of major depressive disorder. Am J Psychiatry. 2000;157(2):229-33.
23. Judd LL, Akiskal HS, Maser JD, Zeller PJ, Endicott J, Coryell W, et al. Major depressive disorder: a prospective study of residual subthreshold depressive symptoms as predictor of rapid relapse. J Affect Disord. 1998;50(2-3):97-108.
24. Gelenberg AJ, Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, Thase ME, Howland R, Klein DN, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of nefazodone maintenance treatment in preventing recurrence in chronic depression. Biol Psychiatry. 2003;54(8):806-17.
25. Lustman PJ, Clouse RE, Nix BD, Freedland KE, Rubin EH, McGill JB, et al. Sertraline for prevention of depression recurrence in diabetes mellitus: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2006;63(5):521-9.
26. Montgomery SA, Entsuah R, Hackett D, Kunz NR, Rudolph RL, Venlafaxine 335 Study G. Venlafaxine versus placebo in the preventive treatment of recurrent major depression. J Clin Psychiatry. 2004;65(3):328-36.
27. Terra JL, Montgomery SA. Fluvoxamine prevents recurrence of depression: results of a long-term, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Int Clin Psychopharmacol. 1998;13(2):55-62.
28. Hansen R, Gaynes B, Thieda P, Gartlehner G, Deveaugh-Geiss A, Krebs E, et al. Meta-analysis of major depressive disorder relapse and recurrence with second-generation antidepressants. Psychiatr Serv. 2008;59(10):1121-30.
29. PREVENTION CFS. Depression and Suicide Prevention [February 24, 2020]. Available from: https://www.suicideinfo.ca/resource/depression-suicide-prevention/.
30. Health NIoM. Suicide 2019 [February 24, 2020]. Available from: https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/suicide.shtml.
31. CDC. United States Life Tables, 2017 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr68/nvsr68_07-508.pdf.
32. Cuijpers P, Vogelzangs N, Twisk J, Kleiboer A, Li J, Penninx BW. Comprehensive meta-analysis of excess mortality in depression in the general community versus patients with specific illnesses. Am J Psychiatry. 2014;171(4):453-62.
33. Cuijpers P, Smit F, Oostenbrink J, de Graaf R, Ten Have M, Beekman A. Economic costs of minor depression: a population-based study. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 2007;115(3):229-36.

34. Israel JA. The Impact of Residual Symptoms in Major Depression. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2010;3(8):2426-40.
35. Cohen DJ, Reynolds MR. Interpreting the results of cost-effectiveness studies. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2008;52(25):2119-26.
36. Pignone MP, Gaynes BN, Rushton JL, Burchell CM, Orleans CT, Mulrow CD, et al. Screening for depression in adults: a summary of the evidence for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Ann Intern Med. 2002;136(10):765-76.
37. Wang PS, Berglund P, Olfson M, Pincus HA, Wells KB, Kessler RC. Failure and delay in initial treatment contact after first onset of mental disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2005;62(6):603-13.
38. Smith DT, Mouzon DM, Elliott M. Reviewing the Assumptions About Men's Mental Health: An Exploration of the Gender Binary. American journal of men's health. 2018;12(1):78-89.
39. Martin LA, Neighbors HW, Griffith DM. The experience of symptoms of depression in men vs women: analysis of the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. JAMA Psychiatry. 2013;70(10):1100-6.
40. Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of Depression Symptoms in US Adults Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3(9):e2019686-e.
41. Tuithof M, Ten Have M, van Dorsselaer S, Kleinjan M, Beekman A, de Graaf R. Course of subthreshold depression into a depressive disorder and its risk factors. J Affect Disord. 2018;241:206-15.
42. Frank E, Rucci P, Katon W, Barrett J, Williams JW, Jr., Oxman T, et al. Correlates of remission in primary care patients treated for minor depression. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2002;24(1):12-9.
43. Hermens ML, van Hout HP, Terluin B, van der Windt DA, Beekman AT, van Dyck R, et al. The prognosis of minor depression in the general population: a systematic review. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2004;26(6):453-62.
44. Broadhead WE, Blazer DG, George LK, Tse CK. Depression, disability days, and days lost from work in a prospective epidemiologic survey. JAMA. 1990;264(19):2524-8.
45. Kessler RC, McGonagle KA, Zhao S, Nelson CB, Hughes M, Eshleman S, et al. Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders in the United States. Results from the National Comorbidity Survey. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1994;51(1):8-19.
46. Paykel ES. Partial remission, residual symptoms, and relapse in depression. Dialogues Clin Neurosci. 2008;10(4):431-7.
47. Whiteford HA, Harris MG, McKeon G, Baxter A, Pennell C, Barendregt JJ, et al. Estimating remission from untreated major depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychol Med. 2013;43(8):1569-85.
48. Goldberg D, Privett M, Ustun B, Simon G, Linden M. The effects of detection and treatment on the outcome of major depression in primary care: a naturalistic study in 15 cities. Br J Gen Pract. 1998;48(437):1840-4.
49. Brodaty H, Harris L, Peters K, Wilhelm K, Hickie I, Boyce P, et al. Prognosis of depression in the elderly. A comparison with younger patients. Br J Psychiatry. 1993;163:589-96.

50. Rodriguez MR, Nuevo R, Chatterji S, Ayuso-Mateos JL. Definitions and factors associated with subthreshold depressive conditions: a systematic review. BMC Psychiatry. 2012;12:181.
51. Kessler RC, Zhao S, Blazer DG, Swartz M. Prevalence, correlates, and course of minor depression and major depression in the National Comorbidity Survey. J Affect Disord. 1997;45(1-2):19-30.
52. Forsell Y. A three-year follow-up of major depression, dysthymia, minor depression and subsyndromal depression: results from a population-based study. Depress Anxiety. 2007;24(1):62-5.
53. Alexopoulos GS, Reynolds CF, 3rd, Bruce ML, Katz IR, Raue PJ, Mulsant BH, et al. Reducing suicidal ideation and depression in older primary care patients: 24-month outcomes of the PROSPECT study. Am J Psychiatry. 2009;166(8):882-90.
54. Ceroni GB, Rucci P, Berardi D, Ceroni FB, Katon W. Case review vs. usual care in primary care patients with depression: a pilot study. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2002;24(2):71-80.

***Figure 1**. Markov Health State Model*



Figure 2. *One-way sensitivity analysis results*



Table 1. *Major and minor depression parameters*

Major Depression					
Definition	**Probability**	**Age Group**	**Gender-specific**	**Related States or Transitions**	**Reference**
Point Prevalence %					
Major depression without treatment	Female 10.72, 8.91, 7.17, 2.92, Male 5.08, 5.22, 4.3, 0.85	18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+	Yes	25	Calculated Kessler (2010) (3), Yildirim (2021) (16)
Major depression with treatment	Female 6.28, 5.22, 4.2, 1.71 Male 2.77, 2.85, 2.35, 0.46	18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+	Yes	25	Calculated Kessler (2010) (3), Yildirim (2021) (16)
Partial remission	3	No	No	25	Assumed
Full remission	Female 9.09, 19.14, 20.59, 24.71 Male 7.93, 11.71, 11.56, 14.76	18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+	Yes	25	Calculated Kessler (2010) (3), Yildirim (2021) (16)
Death from other causes	0.16 female, 0.17 male	No	Yes	25	Life tables 2017
Suicide	0.000486 female, 0.00189 male	No	Yes	25	(5), Depression and Suicide Prevention
Incidence					
Major depression among never depressed patients	Male 0.0002, 0.002, 0.0001, 0.00004 Female 0.0019, 0.0045 0.0011, 0.0002	18-29, 30-44, 45-64, 65+	Yes	2	Eaton (2007) (15)
Major depression in patients with minor depression	0.127	No	No	4	Tuithof (2018) (41) Frank (2002) (42) Hermens (2004) (43) Broadhead (1990) (44)
Recurrence					
Recurrence of major depression (History = 1 previous episodes)	Female 0.29, 0.24, 0.29, 0.26 Male 0.35,0.22,0.23,0.08	18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45+	Yes	23	Calculated from Kessler (1994) (45) and Solomon (2000) (22)
- History = 2 previous episodes	Increased 0.16	No	No		Solomon (2000) (22)
- History >= 3 previous episodes	Increased 0.32	No	No		Solomon (2000) (22)
- From without treatment state risk multiplier	1.3	No	No		Hansen (2008) (28)
Relapse from partial remission	0.76		No	19	Paykel (2008) (46)
Recovery from partial remission	0.22	No	No	21	Brodaty (1993) (46)
Recurrence from minor remission	0.055	No	No	9	Assumed

Treatment					
Initiation of treatment	0.451,0.602,0.5071,0.433	18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+	No	12	Calculated Kessler (2010) (3), Valenstein (2001) (9)
Detection of disease	Without screening 0.45, with screening 0.68	No	No	12	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Without care full remission	0.37	No	No	13	Whiteford (2013) (47)
Without care partial remission	0.1	No	No	11	Goldberg(1998) (48)
In usual care full remission	0.503	No	No	16	Judd (1998) (23)
DUI illness (to reach full remission)	1.3	No	No		Bukh (2013) (21)
In usual care partial remission	0.21, 0.29, 0.24	18-39, 40-59, 60+	No	18	Judd (1998) (23), Brodaty (1993) (49)
Mortality					
Mortality rate for general population	Refer for full list	20 to 100	Yes	24	(31)
Mortality risk multiplier	1.58	No	No		Cuijpers (2014) (32)
Suicide	Female 0.0001375, 0.0001, 0.000575, Male 0.0003875, 0.00204, 0.0022, 0.0032, 0.0038	18-34, 35-54, 55-64, 65+	Yes	14, 17	(5, 9)

Minor Depression					
Definition	**Probability**	**Age Group**	**Gender-specific**	**Related States or Transitions**	**Reference**
Point Prevalence (%)					
Minor depression	5.86	No	No	25	Rodríguez (2012) (50)
Depression without treatment	5.494	No	No	25	Kessler (1997) (51)
Minor depression with treatment	0.366	No	No	25	Kessler (1997) (51)
Full remission	13	No	No	25	Kessler (1997) (51)
Incidence					
Minor depression among never depressed patients	0.0087	No	No	1	Tuithof (2018) (41)
Minor depression among major depressive patients	0.040	No	No	10	Forsell (2007) (52)
Minor depression among partial remission	0.019	No	No	20	Forsell (2007) (52)

Minor depression among full remission from major depression patients	0.03	No	No	22	Assumed
Recurrence					
Recurrence of Minor depression	0.16	No	No	8	Broadhead (1990) (44) Hermens (2004) (43)
Treatment					
Initiation of treatment	0.2	No	No	3	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Detection of disease	Without screening 0.3, with screening 0.37	No	No	3	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Without care full remission	0.55	No	No	5	Frank (2002) (42)
In usual care full remission	0.714	No	No	7	Hermens (2004) (43), Broadhead (1990) (44), Alexopoulos (20 09) (53), Frank 2002 (42), Ceroni (2002) (54)

Table 2. *Cost and utilities for each health state.*

COSTS			
Variable	**Description**	**Point Estimate**	**Reference**
Initial visit to primary care physician		45.85	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Administration of screening cost		4.88	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Screening cost		50.73	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Treatment of depression in primary care settings	4 visits and follow-up visits in a year	398.72	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Treatment of depression by mental health specialist	11 visit/year	1020.14	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Medication cost (outpatient)		677.16	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Hospitalization cost	Average length of stay 11.61 days	11610	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Physician professional fees (hospital)	Daily inpatient physician visits (based on average length of stay)	878.99	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Medication in hospital	Based on average length of stay	21.83	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Indirect costs	Extrapolated from lost workdays of treated and untreated patients with major depression 1 year	1600 for patients receiving treatment; 3360 for patients not receiving treatment	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Minor depression with treatment	2/3 of major depression cost	2141	Cuijpers (2007) (33)
Minor depression without treatment	Indirect non-medical cost	2101	Cuijpers (2007) (33)
Partial remission	on average 2-3 symptoms	1095	Cuijpers (2007) (33), Israel (2010) (34)
UTILITIES			
State	**Description**	**Utilities**	**Reference**
Major depression	Same for with and without treatment	0.63	Valenstein (2001) (9)

Minor depression, partial remission	Same for with and without treatment	0.7	Valenstein (2001) (9)
Full remission	Same for full remission from minor and major depression	0.89	Valenstein (2001) (9)

Table 3. Cost-effectiveness measures of screening scenarios (average of 1000 replications)

Scenario	*Costs,$ (SE)*	*QALYs (SE)*	*ICER Cost/QALY gained, $ compared to Baseline*	*Average Annual Depression-related Suicides (/100,000)*	*Total Depressive Time (yr)*	*Minor Depression Without Treatment Time (yr)*	*Minor Depression With Treatment Time (yr)*	*Major depression Without Treatment Time (yr)*	*Major depression With Treatment Time (yr)*	*Total Remission Time (Full, Partial, Minor or Major) (yr)*
					FEMALE					
Baseline	14,317 (61)	18.265 (0.01)	Reference	5.107	7.23	2.61	0.11	3.26	1.26	6.84
5-year	14,391 (61)	18.274 (0.01)	8627	5.086	7.13	2.54	0.11	3.17	1.31	6.87
2-year	14,503 (60)	18.287 (0.01)	8600	5.065	7.01	2.50	0.12	3.03	1.36	6.93
Annual	14,751 (58)	18.304 (0.009)	11,134	5.036	6.77	2.43	0.13	2.82	1.40	7.00
					MALE					
Baseline	8864 (50)	18.963 (0.009)	Reference	18.078	5.95	2.93	0.14	2.05	0.84	5.72
5-year	9002 (50)	18.969 (0.009)	26,913	18.036	5.86	2.84	0.14	2.00	0.88	5.74
2-year	9213 (49)	18.975 (0.009)	29,768	18.026	5.78	2.83	0.15	1.91	0.88	5.76
Annual	9587 (48)	18.985 (0.009)	34,072	17.906	5.60	2.74	0.17	1.78	0.92	5.80

SE: Standard error

ICER: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio