Personalised medicine for Crohn's disease is a cost-effective strategy

Vanessa Buchanan¹, Susan Griffin¹, Warda Tahir¹, Karen Hills², Miles Parkes, Kenneth GC Smith, ^{2,3,4,5}, Paul A Lyons^{2,3,5}, James C Lee^{6,7} Eoin F McKinney^{2,3,4,5}

- 1. Cogentia Healthcare Consulting, 22 Station Road, Cambridge, CB1 2DB,UK.
- PredictImmune Ltd, Maia Building 260, Babraham Research Campus, Cambridge, CB22 3AT, UK.
 Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge, UK, CB2 200
- 4. Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, CB2 0QQ, UK
- 5. Cambridge Institute of Therapeutic Immunology and Infectious Disease, Jeffrey Cheah Biomedical Centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge, UK, CB2 0AW
- 6. The Francis Crick Institute, 1 Midland Road, London, UK, NW1 1AT
- 7. Royal Free Hospital, Pond St, London, UK, NW3 2QG

Conflict of Interest

VB, SG and WT of Cogentia Healthcare Consulting were contracted to build the economic model by PredictImmune (PI) Ltd who funded the work. KGCS, PAL, JCL and EFM received consultancy fees from PI and KGCS, PAL and EFM are academic co-founders of and hold equity in PredictImmune Ltd.

KEY SUMMARY

Established Knowledge

- Currently there are no validated prognostic test that can stratify IBD patients based on long term outcomes at the point of diagnosis used routinely in the UK
- It therefore remains unclear which patients with Crohn's disease should be treated with early anti-TNF based therapy as part of a 'top-down' regimen.
- As a consequence, the majority of IBD patients in the UK are currently treated with an accelerated step-up approach

Significant new findings:

- We show here that the use of biomarkers at diagnosis to guide personalised use of such treatment is a cost-effective approach for treatment of Crohn's disease.
- Use of a prognostic test to deliver personalised medicine for Crohn's disease results in positive QALY of 0.330
- The approach is cost effective with an incremental cost of £717 and an ICER of 2,176
- The model's conclusions were unaffected by a wide range of sensitivity analyses

ABSTRACT:

Objective

To evaluate the cost-effectiveness of a personalised medicine strategy for Crohn's disease in the UK, using early targeted top-down therapy compared to standard of care.

Materials & Methods

A decision tree leading into a Markov state-transition model was constructed, allowing comparison of two treatment approaches: 1) standard of care therapy following established UK clinical guidelines ('step-up' treatment) and 2) a personalised medicine strategy in which patients identified as high-risk of subsequent relapse using a prognostic biomarker receive 'top-down' anti-TNF treatment at diagnosis. The model facilitated comparison of both costs and Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) in a hypothetical cohort of newly diagnosed Crohn's disease patients with sensitivity analyses undertaken to model the impact of key assumptions.

Results

Early personalised treatment with anti-TNF based combination therapy resulted in an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of £2,176 per quality-adjusted life year (QALY), with £717 incremental costs and 0.330 incremental QALYs, substantially below the NICE cost-effectiveness threshold of between £20,000 and £30,000 per QALY. Additional costs relating to earlier biologic use were offset by incremental QALYS and reductions in costs driven by fewer disease flares and hospitalisations. Sensitivity analysis across a wide range of parameter assumptions did not impact on the model's conclusion.

Conclusion

A personalised medicine strategy using anti-TNF therapy at diagnosis in Crohn's disease to patients at high risk of subsequent relapse is highly likely to be a cost-effective use of resources in the UK National Health Service.

Keywords: Prognostic test, Biomarker, Personalised medicine, Cost-effectiveness, Crohn's disease

INTRODUCTION

Clinical outcomes in inflammatory disease such as Crohn's Disease (CD) are heterogeneous, creating uncertainty in treatment decisions as two patients with similar clinical presentations may each experience very different disease courses. Without being able to predict clinical outcome, a personalised medicine strategy – in which treatment is matched to patients destined for an aggressive disease course – is not possible. Such clinical biomarkers have recently become available, but in order to achieve widespread acceptance it must be demonstrated that they can not only reliably predict disease course¹ but also that

the information provided can improve both efficacy² and efficiency of treatment regimens. The latter requires modelling their impact on the cost-effectiveness of current therapy guidelines.

National and International guidelines, including from the European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation (ECCO) and the British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG), recommend a treatment strategy for CD that is reactive, with stepwise escalations in therapy being used in response to recurrent flares or persistently active disease². The UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines state that patients with CD should initially be treated with corticosteroids to induce remission, and that if the symptoms worsen or the disease is resistant to corticosteroids then therapy should be incrementally escalated, with the addition of immunosuppressive medications and biologic therapy ('step-up' therapy). Biologic therapy, including anti-TNF α , is only recommended for people with severe active disease which has not responded to conventional therapy, or where conventional therapy is not tolerated for maintaining remission³.

However, early use of anti-TNF therapy as part of a 'top-down' treatment strategy has been repeatedly shown to improve clinical outcomes in CD compared to standard therapy⁴⁻⁷. This approach also maximises the potential to achieve disease remission since delayed introduction of anti-TNF has been consistently shown to reduce response rates. Early biologic therapy can also deliver savings from reduced disease-related adverse events such as hospitalisation, flares and surgery^{8,9}. However, increasing early use of more potent biologic treatments inevitably impacts on the cost-effectiveness of any treatment: it must be effective enough to outweigh any associated risks and costs, in order to have a net improvement on the treatment strategy. Untargeted use of top-down treatment strategies have not gained widespread adoption, due to the inevitable exposure of low-risk patients to the toxicity of avoidable immunosuppression and the increased healthcare costs associated¹⁰. The ability to reliably predict an individual's clinical outcome at the point of diagnosis^{1,10} provides the maximum "window of opportunity" to harness the benefit of topdown therapy while minimising the associated risk and costs. In effect, personalising therapy can improve cost-effectiveness of therapy by only exposing patients who stand to gain most from them.

3

Reduction in healthcare associated costs is a major factor in the adoption of new healthcare technology and consequently in the translation of personalised medicine from the bench to the bedside in Crohn's disease: it is not enough for new treatments to demonstrate efficacy as, for adoption into clinical use, impact on cost-effectiveness is also required^{11,12}. Here, we formally test the cost-effectiveness of a personalised medicine strategy in Crohn's disease in which use of top-down treatment (comprising combination or monotherapy with anti-TNF therapy) at diagnosis is guided by a prognostic marker. We compare healthcare costs (from drugs, hospitalisations and complications) with benefits (incremental QALYs) resulting from both the personalised strategy and the current standard of care (as per UK NICE guidelines). We go further to investigate the impact of key modelling parameters on the cost-effectiveness of a personalised approach, testing the sensitivity of our conclusions to assumptions of treatment efficacy, biomarker performance, drug costs and model time horizon.

MATERIALS & METHODS

A decision tree leading into a Markov state transition model was designed to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of biomarker-guided top-down therapy compared with standard of care (SoC) step-up therapy in newly diagnosed CD patients. The model captured the frequency of flares (defined as episodes of active CD requiring escalated immunomodulator therapy), hospitalisations and surgery and calculated both the costs and QALYs associated with the two treatment approaches in a hypothetical cohort of newly diagnosed CD patients. Model assumptions, patient characteristics and biomarker performance were informed by prior evidence as cited and guided by independent expert review.

Population, Interventions and Comparators

The model population was treatment-naïve patients with newly diagnosed CD. Patients eligible for immediate top-down therapy (complex perianal disease, significant fistulising disease or multiple risk factors) were excluded from the personalised strategy as there is a clear indication for early biologic treatment. The NICE technology appraisal (TA) of ustekinumab for the treatment of CD¹³ was used to generate representative baseline patient characteristics¹⁴ as presented in Table 1.

Patients were allocated to one of two treatment approaches (Figure 1):

Personalised therapy

The intervention in the personalised therapy group was targeted anti-TNF therapy guided by biomarker assay results¹, whereby patients identified as high risk receive anti-TNF α therapy combined with an immunomodulator, followed by other biologic classes upon relapse ('top-down' treatment, TD):

- Induction with anti-TNF therapy (allocated to patients as 80% adalimumab, 20% infliximab) and immunomodulator (allocated to patients as 80% azathioprine, 10% 6mercaptopurine and 10% methotrexate). Proportions of treatments were informed by clinical opinion.
- 2) Second line biologic, allocated as 50% vedolizumab and 50% ustekinumab
- 3) Third line biologic, allocated as 50% vedolizumab and 50% ustekinumab (converse of selection used in step 2)
- 4) Immunomodulator alone (allocated as per step 1)

Time to event data for the personalised therapy subgroups (high and low risk) was based on the validation study of the PredictSure-IBD prognostic assay¹ as indicated in Figure 2A.

Standard care

The standard care group received treatment following established UK clinical guidelines¹⁵, consisting of sequences of immunomodulator followed by biologic upon relapse ('step-up' treatment, SU):

- 1) Treatment with corticosteroid (prednisolone), followed by observation until relapse
- 2) Immunomodulator (as per TD)
- 3) anti-TNF therapy and immunomodulator (as per TD)
- 4) A second-line biologic allocated as 50% vedolizumab and 50% ustekinumab
- 5) A third-line biologic allocated as 50% vedolizumab and 50% ustekinumab (converse of selection used in step 4)

The biomarker assay used was modelled on the performance of PredictSure-IBD with assay performance evaluated in an independent cohort as described¹. The PredictSure-IBD assay was used as an exemplar for the impact of personalised medicine, although broader relevance to other putative predictive models was facilitated through sensitivity modelling of the model's result to key performance characteristics including treatment effect size on subgroups identified.

Model structure

A decision tree leading into a Markov state-transition model was constructed in Microsoft Excel to compare personalised and standard therapy approaches. The decision tree component allocates patients to a clinical prognostic group (high or low risk) and to a treatment strategy (personalised or standard therapy). Patients in both the personalised and standard treatment groups were similarly allocated a prognostic group, the only difference being that this information is 'known' in advance in the personalised therapy group with treatment assigned accordingly with high risk individuals receiving top-down therapy and low-risk individuals receiving standard therapy. The 'standard' group comprises identical % of individuals with high and low risk outcomes to the personalised group, the only difference being that both groups receive the same initial therapy (following current guidelines) as the outcome is not known in advance (Figure 1A).

Patients in each prognostic group and treatment strategy then enter the Markov phase of the model. A Markov model is comprised of a set of mutually exclusive and exhaustive health states that represent disease progression, in this case CD severity score as measured on the CD activity index (CDAI). Health states were defined as Remission (CDAI≤150), Partial response/mild disease (CDAI 150-220), Non-response/moderate-severe disease (CDAI 220-600), Surgery or Death. The health states capture the costs and health-related QoL (utility) scores associated with each level of severity and any adverse events that occur as a result of either the disease or therapy¹⁶. A Markov-based analysis was selected as this model structure is most suited for chronic diseases such as CD, with features such as the ability to incorporate temporal detail such as recurrent events¹⁷ which other model structures do not allow for.

As step-up and top-down therapy both comprise a series of discrete treatments, the Markov component of the model was constructed to model treatment sequences, with each treatment divided into induction and maintenance phases. While on treatment, in order to reflect the relapsing-remitting nature of CD, patients can cycle through the three CDAI health states, can have a disease flare and can undergo surgery. The Markov cycle length was 14 days with a time horizon of 20 years. Parameters were chosen to reflect both the relapsing-remitting and chronic nature of CD balanced against inherent uncertainty of extrapolating evidence-based assumptions across increasing time horizons and are in line with previous cost-effectiveness models in chronic relapsing disease^{3,13,18,19}. Additional sensitivity modelling was undertaken to test their impact on model outcome as detailed below.

Patients escalate from one treatment to the next through the defined schedule (personalised or standard therapy) when they experience a disease flare requiring treatment escalation. Patients on TD have a reduced risk of experiencing adverse events, including surgeries and hospitalisations, compared to SU with an effect size estimated from prior studies and with sensitivity modelling as outlined below. Once treated, patients can experience mucosal healing (absence of ulcers) after which the probability of achieving clinical remission (CDAI<150) on treatment is increased. More patients in the model are assumed to achieve mucosal healing and hence remission on TD than on SU^{8,20}.

Once patients fail the last treatment in the sequence, they are allocated equally to the moderate and severe health states. Although in practice treatment-refractory patients may receive further investigational medicines, this was not explicitly modelled as clinical practice varies widely for such refractory cases. The model also incorporates an age-related decline in utility²¹.

Assumptions

The key assumptions underlying the model are provided in table 2. Model assumptions were validated against key prior studies as cited and validated by independent, expert review.

Model parameters

Clinical

The proportion of patients allocated to high/low risk subgroups and their respective clinical outcomes were obtained from pooled individual patient data from a prospective cohort of patients with active IBD, tested prior to initiation of therapy^{1,10,22}.

The probabilities of treatment escalation, disease flare and surgery for each group were estimated by fitting parametric survival curves to the Kaplan-Meier time to event data of the cohort using STATA 14 (StataCorp) and extracting time-dependent transition probabilities. Choice of parametric function was determined by goodness of fit statistics and visual fit. The treatment effect (hazard ratio) of TD on time to treatment escalation and flares was based on median values reported in the "Step-Up Top-Down" trial⁶ with sensitivity modelling as described below. Note that treatment effect size is a hazard ratio of disease flare in the high-risk group with/without early anti-TNF therapy and consequently a smaller value reflects a larger treatment effect. The treatment effect of TD on surgery was calculated from the number of surgeries reported in the extended follow-up of the "Step-Up Top-Down" study²³. The treatment effect of TD vs. SU on treatment escalation was assumed to wane over time until no treatment effect remained by 10 years (the duration of follow-up in the study on which the assumption is founded²³). CDAI scores to inform allocation to disease severity health state were derived from prior studies and independent expert review^{13,19}.

Mean values for all clinical input parameters are provided in supplementary table S1, along with their respective distributions and sources.

Quality-adjusted life years

The economic evaluation took the form of a cost-utility analysis with outcomes measured in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs). QALYs corresponding to the health states and decrements in QALYs for adverse events were extracted from multiple published studies, as detailed in Table S1. Outcomes were discounted at an annual rate of 3.5% after the first year²⁴.

Costs

The economic evaluation was conducted from the UK National Health Service (NHS) perspective, thus only direct costs incurred by the NHS were accounted for. The reference year for costs was 2019. Costs were discounted at 3.5%. Drug costs were sourced from

published unit costs such as the British National Formulary (BNF) and the NHS drug tariff and calculated based on posology in the BNF. Biosimilar costs were used where these treatments were available on the NHS. Reasonable assumptions were made regarding confidential discounts, ranging from 25% for innovator biologics to 74% for biosimilars. Costs of biologics were tapered according to NICE guidelines, which recommend withdrawal of biologic after one year of treatment, subject to clinical assessment^{13,18,19}. Health state costs and costs of flare and surgery were sourced from NICE Health Technology Assessments. Mean values for all cost inputs are provided in Table S1.

Cost-effectiveness analysis

The outcomes of interest for cost-utility analysis were the differences in outcomes (QALYs) and costs between the two treatment strategies, personalised and standard therapy. This information was combined to derive an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). The estimated ICER was compared against the NICE cost-effectiveness threshold of £20,000 to £30,000 per QALY.

Sensitivity analyses

One-way sensitivity analysis

A base-case analysis was undertaken, using a model incorporating the most likely hyperparameters as informed by prior published evidence and independent expert review. Uncertainty in the model results was examined using a one-way sensitive analysis (OWSA) varying key input parameters (Table S2) within their specified range (upper and lower limits). The ICER was recalculated whilst varying one specific parameter and holding all other parameters constant. Results were plotted in the form of a tornado graph, illustrating parameters to which the ICER is most sensitive, quantified as changes in net monetary benefit¹ (NMB) at the median NICE cost-effectiveness threshold of £25,000 per QALY.

¹ calculated as incremental QALYs * willingness to pay threshold – incremental costs

Longer bars indicate the most important parameters, giving the diagram its "tornado" appearance²⁵.

Scenario analysis

Scenario analyses were conducted to explore the sensitivity of the results to changes in key assumptions underpinning the base-case analysis. The scenarios that were explored were reducing the time horizon, reducing the duration of the treatment effect and reducing the magnitude of treatment effect on clinical outcome (treatment escalations)⁶. A further scenario directly comparing the cost-effectiveness of early top-down versus step-up treatment in the absence of a personalised medicine approach (i.e. without guidance from a prognostic biomarker) was also explored.

Probabilistic sensitivity analysis

In addition to OWSA, parameter uncertainty was further explored through probabilistic sensitivity analysis (PSA). PSA involves assigning a distribution to all input parameters, from which samples are repeatedly drawn (5000 iterations in this analysis) and used as model inputs²⁶. The purpose of conducting a PSA is to estimate the uncertainty around the ICER value, such that the robustness of the cost-effectiveness estimate can be explored. Output from the PSA is presented in the form of a scatterplot described as the "cost-effectiveness plane". Depending on the distribution of scatter points within the quadrant(s) of the plane, one can identify the likelihood of the intervention being cost-effective. Points towards the North quadrants indicate greater cost, whereas points towards the East indicate greater likelihood that the intervention is effective²⁷. The PSA output was also presented in the form of a cost-effectiveness acceptability curve (CEAC). The CEAC was used to explore the probability of biomarker-guided personalised therapy being cost-effective at a range of ICER thresholds.

Patient and public involvement

Patient consultation was undertaken during model development through discussion with Crohn's and Colitis UK.

RESULTS

Base-case analysis

A personalised treatment strategy resulted in an ICER of £2,176 per quality-adjusted life year (QALY), with £717 incremental costs and 0.330 incremental QALYs vs. standard of care. The disaggregated costs and outcomes are presented in Table 3. As expected, the costs of induction and maintenance treatment were substantially higher in the personalised therapy group compared to standard care (incremental costs of £9,029 and £112 respectively) but were offset by higher frequency (and therefore costs) of adverse events in the standard care group with respective incremental savings of £1,100 (disease flares), £1,761 (surgery) and £6,812 (hospitalisation costs). Total QALYs were also higher in the personalised therapy group (10.650 vs 10.320), underpinned by higher proportions of patients in better CDAI health states and a reduction in flares and surgery. The results of the fitted survival curves determining the time to switch to the next treatment in the sequence by arm and risk group are depicted in Figures 2A and B. As patients predicted to be 'low-risk' in the personalised medicine group receive standard care, they have identical outcomes to patients with a low risk trajectory in the standard care group (orange lines, Figure 2A, B). The key difference in the outcome groups is the lower event rate experienced in high-risk individuals, who receive early aggressive therapy in the personalised group but less effective step-up therapy in the standard care group (orange lines, Figures 2A, B). Assumptions for time to event and the magnitude of benefit brought about by early anti-TNF therapy are based on prior studies as outlined in Table S2 with additional sensitivity modelling as below.

Sensitivity analysis

One-way sensitivity analysis (OWSA)

OWSA was undertaken to determine the impact of independently varying key model assumptions (Figure 3). The model result is illustrated as net monetary benefit (NMB), a summary statistic reflecting the monetary value of an intervention when a willingness to pay threshold (such as QALYs) is known. A positive NMB indicates that an intervention is cost-effective and a value of zero indicating the threshold at which the intervention ceases to be cost-effective for a given QALY threshold²⁸. None of the OWSA undertaken reduced

the NMB value below, or near to, the cost-effectiveness threshold of £25,000/QALY (NMB £0). The model was most sensitive to the rate of mucosal healing in the TD arm, hospitalisation costs and the odds ratio of steroid-free remission with mucosal healing after 2 years and least sensitive to the observed cost of flares, the proportion of patients receiving treatment for adverse events and the proportion of patients receiving anti-TNF and Immunomodulator treatment due to AEs.

Scenario analysis

Reducing the time horizon from 20 years to 15, 10 or 5 years increased the ICER to £7,179, £26,895 and £99,716 per QALY respectively (Table 4, Figure 5), consistent with increased early costs driven by early adoption of more expensive therapy in the personalised medicine group. There is inevitable uncertainty in estimating the treatment effect size in a personalised medicine strategy: different treatments may be more or less effective when targeted using different prognostic biomarkers. Consequently, we chose to model a wide range of treatment effect size estimates (from 0.3 to 1), ranging from more effective than what has been observed in prior clinical studies of untargeted top down therapy (0.4⁶) to equal effectiveness (Hazard ratio of 1). The cost-effectiveness threshold (NMB £0) was not reached until the effect size was approximately half what has been observed in prior studies (Hazard ratio ~0.7, Table 5 and Figure 6). A reduction in treatment effect duration from 10 years to 5, 3 or 2 years resulted in an increased ICER of £12,212, £32,625 and £88,307 per QALY respectively (Table 4).

A direct comparison of unselected top-down anti-TNF use indicated an ICER of £66,347, with total costs of £74,680 in the 'all top-down' arm compared to £93,249 in the standard therapy group (Table 6).

Probabilistic sensitivity analysis

A probabilistic sensitivity analysis (PSA) was undertaken to explore the probability of personalised therapy being cost-effective at a range of ICER thresholds. For this approach, across multiple simulations of the input data, an estimate of incremental cost is compared to that of incremental QALYs, allowing an estimate of the probability that an intervention is deemed cost-effective (by falling below a threshold of cost-per-QALY, such as that established by NICE in the UK). This demonstrated that, at the current UK NICE costeffectiveness threshold of £20-30,000 per incremental QALY, personalised therapy in Crohn's disease has a ≥95% probability of being cost-effective (cost-effectiveness acceptability curve, Figure 4A). The multiple iterated simulations can be visualised on a costeffectiveness plane (Figure 4B) which demonstrates that the majority of estimates falling in the upper right (or 'North East') quadrant, indicating increased effectiveness with increased costs by adopting a personalised therapy approach (Figure 4B).

DISCUSSION

The model-based economic evaluation presented here clearly demonstrates that personalised medicine is a cost-effective strategy for CD. The ICER value of £2,176 per QALY is well below the current NICE cost-effectiveness threshold of £20,000 - £30,000 per QALY. As with any model, estimates of likely parameters have been made, using previous highquality evidence to inform the most likely base-case scenario. A series of on-way sensitivity analyses incorporating broad ranges of all major parameters indicates that the base-case result is unlikely to be altered with modified assumptions.

The incremental QALY gain for the test group was driven by increased time spent in remission and improved QoL as a result of lower rates of flares and subsequent hospitalisations and surgery. A personalised medicine strategy aims to bring more expensive, more aggressive therapy earlier in the treatment paradigm for patients who stand to benefit most from that cost. This inevitably increases early costs compared to a standard step-up regimen. However, the additional costs relating to earlier biologic use in high-risk patients were significantly offset by reductions in the cost of adverse events in these patients. This result is in line with previous economic models although total costs per patient were higher in the present study⁸, driven by increased use of biologic treatments as maintenance (as opposed to purely induction) therapy, consistent with evolving real-world practice. The incremental QALY gain associated with top-down therapy was slightly lower in this study (0.056) compared to that in Marchetti *et al* (2011)⁸ (0.14) as only patients who tested high-risk (41%) received it. While reducing drug costs – due for example to the emergence of biosimilar anti-TNF - could attenuate the increased early expense of a personalised approach, there are inevitably new (and typically comparatively expensive) treatment options that emerge. Consequently, it is unlikely that the model result provided here will substantially change in the near future: reducing drug costs with generic availability are likely to lower the cost of bringing targeted aggressive therapy earlier in the treatment schedule.

Sensitivity analyses undertaken here also indicate the relative importance of key parameter assumptions in determining the cost-effectiveness of a personalised medicine strategy. The

15

ICER was found to reduce significantly with increasing time horizon. Selection of an appropriate time horizon (20 years in the base-case presented here) represents a balance between appropriately capturing the chronic burden of lifelong disease and increasing uncertainty around the persistence of treatment effects (which are typically based on trial evidence with shorter follow up). It is clear from the extended time horizon modelling presented here (Figure 5) that use of very short (5y or less) horizons will inevitably fail to capture later benefit of early, expensive therapy and should be interpreted with caution. As can be expected, use of frontline biologic is more expensive, resulting in higher ICERs when implementing a shorter-term time horizon. When the time horizon is extended, the longer-term benefits of upfront biologic treatment are accrued, resulting in a lower ICER. Notably, NICE prefers the use of longer-term time horizons in chronic diseases, despite the presence of long-term uncertainty from extrapolated outcomes¹¹.

The structure of the model applied here is clinically appropriate with the use of treatment sequencing to account for the relapsing-remitting nature of CD. Assumptions were validated with clinician input and key parameters were derived from high quality published evidence with sensitivity analysis to ensure confidence in the model output (Table S2-S4). However, the analysis has some limitations. The cost-effectiveness analysis presented is based on findings from a Markov model. Although demonstrably useful tools in modelling interventions targeted at chronic disease, Markovian models lack 'memory' of prior health states and are thus inherently limited for modelling treatment sequencing. We addressed this issue in the present study by assuming constant probabilities for risk of later events and by applying adjustment factors where necessary. QoL outcomes (QALYs) for each health state were also based on published literature and prior NICE technology appraisals^{13,15,18,19}. While the model result is sensitive to these QoL inputs (Figure 3) we estimated this uncertainty by varying QoL scores for different health states as part of the OWSA (Figure 3), finding that the overall result remained unchanged.

The current economic evaluation assumes that the prognostic information is available from the point of diagnosis, to guide early 'top-down' therapy for patients predicted to follow an aggressive, relapsing disease course. It should be noted that applying a predictive model at later stages of disease, for example by including patients who have already failed on several rounds of 'step-up' therapy, is likely to result in smaller treatment effect sizes and less

16

impact on cost-effectiveness. In essence, the later targeted therapy is employed the more the personalised medicine approach resembles a conventional 'step-up' regimen.

The extent to which clinical outcomes will be improved by giving targeted anti-TNF therapy to high risk patients at diagnosis remains unknown, although it is being directly tested by the ongoing PROFILE clinical trial². For the current study, assumptions of treatment effect size were informed by the results of the Top-down Step-Up study^{6,23} and its long-term follow-up extension phase. This study does not directly reflect current clinical approaches to early anti-TNF therapy which have adopted maintenance TNF α inhibition for 1 year in addition to the induction therapy initially trialled. Furthermore, a more extensive range of follow-on biologic therapy options are now available in the case of anti-TNF failure. For this reason we chose to include a marginally higher treatment effect size in our base case compared to that seen in the Top-down Step-Up trial (HR 0.4 vs 0.53), which used infliximab for induction but not maintenance of remission, although it was notable in the sensitivity analysis that a personalised strategy remained cost effective (NMB>£0) until an effect size of almost half the founding estimate was reached (HR 0.7, Figure 6).

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of a personalised medicine strategy for the treatment of newly diagnosed patients with CD, comparing 'top-down' use of early anti-TNF therapy with step-up therapy recommended by current NICE guidelines. Our findings suggest that personalised therapy for CD patients is a highly cost-effective strategy with significant implications for the management of CD in the UK.

Author Contributions

James C Lee, Paul A Lyons, Kenneth GC Smith, Miles Parkes and Eoin F McKinney: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Methodology

Vanessa Buchannan, Warda Tahir and Susan Griffin; Conceptualization, Data Curation, Methodology, Formal analysis Vanessa Buchannan, Warda Tahir, Susan Griffin, Karen Hills & Eoin F McKinney; Writing – original draft and review & editing

James C Lee, Paul A Lyons, Kenneth GC Smith, Miles Parkes; Writing - review & editing

Data Availability

The data underlying this article are available in this article and the Health Economic model will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

References

- 1. Biasci D, Lee JC, Noor MN et al. A blood-based prognostic biomarker in IBD. Gut 2019; 68:386-1395.
- 2. Parkes M, Noor NM, Dowling F, et al. PRedicting Outcomes For Crohn's dlsease using a moLecular biomarkEr (PROFILE): protocol for a multicentre, randomised, biomarker-stratified trial. BMJ Open 2018; 8, e026767.
- 3. NICE 2019 Crohn's Disease. <u>https://cks.nice.org.uk/crohns-disease#!topicSummary</u>.
- 4. Tsui JJ & Huynh HQ. Is top-down therapy a more effective alternative to conventional stepup therapy for Crohn's disease? Ann Gastroenterol 2018; 31:413-424.
- 5. Colombel JF, Reinisch W, Mantzaris GJ, et al. Randomised clinical trial: deep remission in biologic and immunomodulator naive patients with Crohn's disease a SONIC post hoc analysis. Aliment Pharmacol Ther2015; 41:734-746.
- 6. D'Haens G, Baert F, van Assche G, et al. Early combined immunosuppression or conventional management in patients with newly diagnosed Crohn's disease: an open randomised trial. Lancet 2008; 371:660-667.
- Ungaro RC, Aggarwal S, Topaloglu O, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis: efficacy and safety of early biologic treatment in adult and paediatric patients with Crohn's disease. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2020; 51:831-842.
- Marchetti M, Liberato NL, Di Sabatino A & Corazza GR. Cost-effectiveness analysis of topdown versus step-up strategies in patients with newly diagnosed active luminal Crohn's disease. Eur J Health Econ 2013; 14:853-861.
- 9. Ghosh N & Premchand P. A UK cost of care model for inflammatory bowel disease. Frontline Gastroenterol 2015; 6:169-174.
- 10. Lee JC, Lyons PA, McKinney EF, et al. Gene expression profiling of CD8+ T cells predicts prognosis in patients with Crohn disease and ulcerative colitis. J Clin Invest 2011;121:4170-4179.

- 11. NICE technology appraisal guidance. NICE 2020 <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/About/What-we-do/Our-Programmes/NICE-guidance/NICE-technology-appraisal-guidance</u>. Accessed Month N, 20NN
- 12. NICE Diagnostics Assessment Programme programme manual. NICE 2020. <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/About/What-we-do/Our-Programmes/NICE-guidance/NICE-diagnostics-guidance</u>. Accessed Month N, 20NN
- 13. NICE Single Technology Appraisal. Ustekinumab for treating moderately to severely active Crohn's disease after prior therapy [ID843]. Committee papers. NICE 2017.
- 14. Feagan BG, Sandborn WJ, Gasink C, et al. Ustekinumab as Induction and Maintenance Therapy for Crohn's Disease. N Engl J Med 2016; 375:1946-1960.
- 15. NICE. Crohn's disease: management. NICE 2019 <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng129/chapter/Recommendations</u>. Accessed Month N, 20NN.
- 16. Salgado CM, Azevedo C, Proenca H & Vieira SM. Secondary Analysis of Electronic Health Records. Springer 2016:163-183
- 17. Heeg BMS. Developing health economic models of chronic diseases for reimbursement purposes. University of Groningen, Thesis 2015.
- NICE. Multiple Technology Appraisal: Infliximab and adalimumab for the treatment of Crohn's disease. NICE 2018. <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta187/chapter/1-Guidance</u>. Accessed Month N, 20NN
- 19. NICE. Single Technology Appraisal: Vedolizumab for treating moderately to severely active Crohn's disease after prior therapy. NICE 2015.
- 20. Baert F, Moortgat L, van Assche G, et al. Mucosal healing predicts sustained clinical remission in patients with early-stage Crohn's disease. Gastroenterology 2010; 138:463-468; quiz e410-461.
- 21. Ara, R & Brazier JE. Populating an economic model with health state utility values: moving toward better practice. Value Health 13. 2010:509-518.
- 22. McKinney EF, Lee JC, Jayne DRW et al. T-cell exhaustion, co-stimulation and clinical outcome in autoimmunity and infection. Nature 2015;523:612-616.
- 23. Hoekman DR, Stibbe JA, Baert FJ, et al. Long-term Outcome of Early Combined Immunosuppression Versus Conventional Management in Newly Diagnosed Crohn's Disease. J Crohns Colitis. 2018;12:517-524.
- 24. Claxton K, Paulden M, Gravelle H, et al. Discounting and decision making in the economic evaluation of health-care technologies. Health Econ. 2011;20:2-15.
- 25. Michaud TL, Abraham J, Jalal H et al. Cost-Effectiveness of a Statewide Campaign to Promote Aspirin Use for Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease. J Am Heart Assoc 2015; 4.
- 26. Hatswell AJ, Bullement A, Briggs A, et al. Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis in Cost-Effectiveness Models: Determining Model Convergence in Cohort Models. Pharmacoeconomics 2018;36:1421-1426.
- 27. Fenwick E, Marshall DA, Levy AR & Nichol G. Using and interpreting cost-effectiveness acceptability curves: an example using data from a trial of management strategies for atrial fibrillation. BMC Health Serv Res. 2006;6:52.
- 28. Drummond MF, Claxton K, Stoddard GL, & Torrance GW. Methods for the Economic evaluation of Health Care Programmes. Oxford University Press 4th edition 2015.
- 29. Colombel JF, Sandborn WJ, Reinisch W, et al. Infliximab, azathioprine, or combination therapy for Crohn's disease. N Engl J Med. 2010;362:1383-1395.
- 30. Archer R, Tappenden P, Ren S, et al. Infliximab, adalimumab and golimumab for treating moderately to severely active ulcerative colitis after the failure of conventional therapy (including a review of TA140 and TA262): clinical effectiveness systematic review and economic model. Health Technol Assess 2016;20:1-326.

- 31. Greenberg D, Schwartz D, Vardiet H, al. Health-Related Utility Weights in a Cohort of Real-World Crohn's Disease Patients. J Crohns Colitis 2015; 9:1138-1145.
- 32. Authority, NBS. NHS Electronic Drug Tariff, 2019. <u>https://www.nhsbsa.nhs.uk/pharmacies-gp-practices-and-appliance-contractors/drug-tariff</u>. Accessed Month N, 20NN
- 33. Committee, J.F. British National Formulary 2019. <u>https://bnf.nice.org.uk/about/frequently-asked-questions-for-the-bnf-and-bnf-for-children-bnfcgeneral.html</u> Accessed Month N, 20NN.
- 34. Woehl A, Morgan CC, Punekar Y et al. The epidemiology and health care resource use in patients with Crohn's disease: A population based UK study. Value Health 2001;10:A355.
- 35. Dretzke J, Edlin R, Round J,et al. A systematic review and economic evaluation of the use of tumour necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-alpha) inhibitors, adalimumab and infliximab, for Crohn's disease. Health Technol Assess 2011;15:1-244.

Figure 1.



Figure 1. Model structure.

A, Model structure diagram demonstrating the decision tree and Markov components; No patients were assumed to have a CDAI score greater than 450 (very severe disease) until the end of sequence, whereupon 50% of patients were assumed to have very severe disease **B**, Step-up and Top-down treatment sequences CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; IM, immunomodulator; CS, corticosteroid

Figure 2.

A: Standard of care arm



B: Personalised therapy



Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier survival curves showing time to first treatment escalation for each model arm

A, Comparison of the lognormal parametric survival curves (solid lines) fitted to the Kaplan-Meier time to escalation patient data (dotted lines), stratified by risk group. **B**, Treatment effect of using a TD therapy approach on high-risk patients, modelled by applying a hazard-ratio of 0.53 to the high-risk fitted time to escalation curve. KM, Kaplan-Meier survivor function.

Figure 3.



Figure 3: Tornado diagram showing results of varying parameters as part of the one-way sensitivity analysis

TD, top-down; SU, step-up; QoL, quality of life; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; RR, relative risk; OR, odds ratio; Trt, treatment. The central line of the tornado indicates the base case NMB of £7,523.







Figure 4: Results of probabilistic sensitivity analysis

A, Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve showing the probability of a precision medicine strategy being considered cost-effective at different monetary thresholds; NICE cost-effectiveness upper threshold indicated as green area (£20-30,000/QALY) **B**, Cost-effectiveness plane plotted with scatter points representing 5000 simulations from the probabilistic sensitivity analysis.

Figure 5: Impact of varying time horizon on cost-effectiveness



Figure 6: Impact of varying treatment effect size on net monetary benefit



Note: Net monetary benefit was calculated using a willingness to pay threshold of £25,000/QALY

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of patients entered in the model

Characteristic	Value
Starting age (years)	40
Proportion with high-risk CD	55%
Mean patient weight (kgs)	72
% patients <55kg	21%
% patients 55kg <x<85g< th=""><th>59%</th></x<85g<>	59%
% patients >85kg	20%

Table 2: Key assumptions of Markov model

Assumption	Explanation
Treatment effect on time to escalations/flares (relapse) is 0.4, greater than that reported in D'Haens et al [®] , which was 0.53	In the D'Haens trial, the median time to relapse was 174.5 vs 329 days for SU and TD respectively. Using these figures, we derived a hazard ratio on time to relapse of 0.53. However, it was assumed that this was an underestimate of the efficacy of top-down treatment as the top-down group received infliximab as induction treatment only, and patients received maintenance azathioprine rather than continuing TNF α inhibitor maintenance therapy as per current guidelines ²⁹ .
	Therefore, we adjusted the treatment effect on time to relapse to reflect the greater efficacy that is known to result from combined Infliximab and azathioprine treatment.
Treatment effect of top-down on risk of flares, treatment escalations and surgery assumed to last 10 years	Effects on key clinical outcomes were observed up to 10 years after randomisation to the top-down vs. step-up treatment arms in D'Haens trial ⁶ , as reported in Hoekman et al ²³
After 12 months of maintenance biologic, 85% of step-up patients remain on regular maintenance within that step.	While NICE recommends ongoing use of biologic after 12 months based on clinical need, only 15-20% of patients in clinical practice discontinue biologics after 12 months, hence we assumed that approximately 85% would remain on therapy.
After 12 months of maintenance biologic, 20% of top-down patients remain on regular maintenance within that step	There is a paucity of evidence to support what proportion of patients given top-down biologic is likely to require treatment after 12 months, but due to better response this is likely to be significantly lower than in immunomodulator-refractory disease. Based on clinical expert opinion, it was assumed that only 20% of patients were likely to require treatment after 12 months.
The effect of TD on mucosal healing is assumed to be sustained over all treatments in the sequence	76% and 40% of top-down vs. step-up patients respectively achieved mucosal healing after 6 months in the D'Haens trial ⁶ . The effect of mucosal healing on the proportion in remission (odds ratio of 4.3 ²⁰) was found to be sustained for up to 4 years. Although long-term remission was not observed in the long-term follow-up of the D'Haens study ²³ , this may reflect the use of biologic during induction only and lack of 2 nd and 3 nd line alternatives. The assumption was therefore made of longer-term impact on remission
The risk of flares not requiring treatment escalation was assumed to be constant over time	Due to small event rates, an exponential distribution was fitted to time to escalation-free flare, with the implication that the risk of flare is constant over the model lifetime
Risk of treatment escalation and/or surgery following the first event was assumed to be constant over time	Due to the Markovian memory limitation and diminishing patient numbers over the follow-up time, an exponential distribution was fitted to time to treatment escalation and time to surgery following the first event, with the implication that risk is constant over the remaining model lifetime
Distribution across CDAI health states conditional on treatment was assumed to remain constant over time	Due to the Markovian memory limitation, an exponential distribution had to be fitted to this parameter, with the implication that this parameter is constant over time

Table 3: Base-case scenario results

	PredictSURE IBD	No test	Increment
Discounted costs			
Induction	£4,132	£4,020	£112
Maintenance	£33,942	£24,914	£9,029
Non-hospitalisation costs	£27,631	£34,443	-£6,812
Flares	£1,414	£2,514	-£1,100
Surgery and complications	£6,311	£8,071	-£1,761
PredictImmune	£1,250	£0	£1,250
Total costs	£74,680	£73,963	£717
Clinical outcomes			
Number of surgeries per person	1.183	1.513	-0.330
Life years	19.554	19.549	0.005
Discounted QALYs			
QALYs lost to surgery	-0.003	-0.004	0.001
QALYs lost to flares	-0.006	-0.009	0.002
Health state QALYs	10.659	10.332	0.326
Total QALYs	10.650	10.320	0.330

Table 4: Scenario analysis results when varying time parameters

Parameter	Base case value	Value used in scenario analysis	ICER
Treatment effect on escalations	0.4	0.53	£9,307
Time horizon	20years	15 years	£7,179
		10 years	£26,895
		5 years	£99,716
Duration of treatment	ment 10 years	5 years	£12,212
effect	3 years	£32,625	
		2 years	£88,307

Table 5: Scenario analysis exploring impact on net monetary benefit when varying treatment effect on escalations

Parameter	Base case value	Value used in scenario analysis	Net monetary benefit
Treatment effect	0.4	0.3	£10,475
		0.4	£7,523
		0.5	£4,633
		0.6	£1,780
		0.7	-£1,028
		0.8	-£3,765
		0.9	-£6,399
		1	-£8,903

Table 6: Scenario analysis results for unselected 'all top down'TD vs standard care

	Top-down	Step-up	Increment
Total costs	£74,680	£93,249	-£18,568
Total QALYs	10.650	10.929	-0.280

Table S1: Model input parameters

OTHOR INFOR			
Kiki (D	40000	Lawrence of	Basclar of (2000)
Rick of surgery, low-rick	60033	Exponential	Mancliet al (2008)*
Nisk of flare, high-sisk	60032	Exponential	Randiet al (2009)
Not of faces from the	4000	Concentral I	Burd and CARY
		apprenta.	Ration a (200)
% of flaws hospitalised Siz	0.30	into .	Haekman et al (2018)"
% of fans hopitalised TD	0.254	iko.	Haekman et al (2018)"
instability of new sension constitutions	0.00	in .	Terrender et el (VII-)"
Probability of death during surgery	6.002	ieta	Marzhetti et al (2013)*
Mucrosi healing			
Probability of mucoual healing SJ	42%	ieta	Marzheti et al (2018) ⁴
Probability of nucceol heating 10	7KSN	ieto.	Marchetti et al (2013)*
	470		have and OAD [®]
and a second		uguna	Martin R. a (Acad
Time to mucool healing (year)	2	Faed	Abert et al (2010)"
h we we have to have a			
Durinian Bologe CD			
	094	in .	(inician minim
Proportion on biologic therapy after 12m5U			
Proportion on biologic therapy after 24m5U	CORE	ieto.	Cinician opinion
	Cali	ieta	Cinician opinion
Proportion on biologic therapy after alimitiu	02	ing.	Cinician opinion
Proportion on therapy after 12m TD			
Proportion on therapy after 24m TD	62	ieta.	Oinician apinian
	62	ing.	Cinician opinion
Proportion with escalated dose			
N with exclused biologic does high-risk	016	Separential	Calculation based on comparison of survival models from IPO
h with relatived biologic downlow risk	011	Esponential	carculation/tased or comparison of survival models/from PO
Relative risks CD	09	Langrad	Heimontal (2008"
Surgery step up us top down			
	0.40	Lagnarmal	D'Heens et al (2008)"
90.5y2 Square	CHD	Lagnarmal	Asungtion
ilized	DAD.	Lagnannal	Asungtion
18tzapa	0.40	Lagnormal Lagnormal	Asungton Asungton
Mittaya Mittaya	20	Faed	Hoekman et al (2028)"
Suration tradement effect (years)			
ex invus			
Con-100	6.60	ito.	NCI appraisal"
CDH 260233	0.700	into .	NCC appraisal [®]
CDAV 200-650	650	ieta	NCS appraisal**
	0.493	ieta	szeecbieg et al (2019)"
Treat ment-related (p.k. decoversents (multiplient)			
Chanation	10000	âro.	Assumption
tubel numb	59952 59962	ing ing	NG appaids
recitante	0.9908	ins	NCS appraisal"
Addmunab	69962	âro.	NCE appraisa"
Austriaprine	0.99922	ing.	NCS appraisal**
6-mercant source	69932	ino ino	NCS appraisal
Mercowasi	6.9932	ieta	Asunption - as per conventional therapy
Produktione			
Immunomodulator	6.99922	inta	NCS appraisal**
anti INF	6992	ieto.	NCC appraisal
anti-the + M	C 9886	into into	NG appraisa" NG appraisa"
enterlanente + M	69941	ing .	NCS appraisal
	0.9925	ins.	NCE appraisal**
inconservation and a decrements			
	0.109	into .	Marchetti et al (2000)
Ofurfall survey constitutions	600	im.	Marchetti et al (2028)*
		-	
Offici f tail ions of response (applied to those that switch treatment)			
Oper tail loss of response (applied to those that sails)s tradement. Oper tail augury	640	into .	Marcheni et al (2012)*
decitati kos di regone logilaj to toar har akto teameri Gestal kogey decital koder desse eccedator joekshile e occisionj	680	ins ins	Marzhetti et al (2003) Marzhetti et al (2003), Greenberg et al (2005)''
Onr fuil line of reasons logisly is those that which tradeword One rule angery One rule logist division should be the excluding	600 600	ing ing	Marchenti et al (2000)" Marchenti et al (2000)", Greenberg et al (2000)"
Okraal land magnes (apdiel is then thet white tradeword Okraal mages Qartail naze dassee maantalike (antit it her matatice)	600 600 606	ing ing ing	Marchenti et al (2000)" Marchenti et al (2000)", Gravesbarg et al (2000)" Gravesbarg et al (2000)"
(2014) is drogoni jugali is han thi and trainweil (2014) ange (2014) ange ange (2014) ange ange ange ange ange ange ange ange	600 600 606	80 80 80	Marbeet et al (2007) Marbeet et al (2007, Greenberg et al (2007) Greenberg et al (2007)
cartañ las d'assectavidad as than that which taxicons Cartañ Lager Cartañ Lager Cartañ Lager Cartañ Chaptalad Agenat Chaptalad	600 608 606	ko ko ko	No Desi et al 2007 Mar Desi et al 2007, fonesterg et al 2009 ¹⁴ Geneterg et al 2009 ¹⁴ An et al 2009 ¹⁴
Childhead Agener Sedicit then the back hot well general agen (yen of a con deve want date) justs he want date) (yen of a con deve want date) (yen of a fauged well (yen of a fauged well)	600 606 6000 6000	ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino	Narten e a (2021) Narten e a (2022), Genetary e a (2023) Genetary e a (2023) No e a (2023) No e a (2023)
Schulze (appen gale) is har to add hower. Schul appen Schul appen Schul hardwer Schul hardwe	636 636 636 636	inn inn inn inn inn	Narodi e a (200)" Narodi e a (200)" Genetary eta (201)" An eta (200)" An eta (200)"
Scholar Agen gels hav for web next here of on the age generation of the scholar scholar generation of the scholar scholar generation of the scholar generation of the scholar of scholar	630 630 636 6300 6300 63000	ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino	Narben e a (200) Marben e a (200) Davelleg e a (200) An et al (200) An et al (200)
Schulze / species updie 1 has for bank haused (2) of a constant of bank has and may (2) of a constant of bank has and may (2) of a forget of the section of (2) of a forget of the section of (2) of a forget of the section of (2) of the section of the section of (2) of the section of the section of the section of (2) of the section of the section of the section of (2) of the section of the section of the section of the section of (2) of the section of the sec	600 600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000	ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino	Nardwell et al (2009) Marguet et al (2003), Gowellung et al (2003) Gowellung et al (2003) An et al (2003) ¹¹
Schulze Agenerative Star for web heads have and charter age gans at lange searching in the schulzer gans at lange schulzer gan	000 600 600 600 6000 6000	ins	Nacional e 2007 Nacional e 2007 Onestry e 2007 Nacional 2007 Nacional 2007
Schulze / speed spield is that the additionant is Schulze / Schulzer / Schul	640 640 640 640 6400 6400 6400	in in iteration in the second	No bolin a g (Dal) Marene a s (Dal) ⁴ Gonday a a (Dal) ⁴ An et a (Dal) ⁴ An et a (Dal) ⁴
Scholar Fager gela to be for activities of Control of a second s	600 600 600 6000 6000 6000 600		Mohan a giott Mohan a diott, Gwining a diott Gwining an giott Na an giott Na an giott Guinnchurok Saguth
An Indus Angen guide the for additionant	640 640 640 640 6400 6400 6400 6400 640	La construction of the second	Nachan a giorg Nachan a giorg Sanday a giorg Anan giorg Anan giorg Calandhan Wel Agund ^a
an halfen fregen gefat her for uch heren i Schlefter fregen. Schlefter fregen. Schle	600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000 60	La	Nachara y Staff Machara y Staff Daviery et Staff Rank of Staff Couldentras Vel August ⁴
An of the Angen split is the for add is based. Series angen Series and the angeneric address and the angeneric Series and the angeneric address and the angeneric Series and the angeneric address and the angeneric address Neuros address angeneric address angeneric address angeneric address angeneric address angeneric address angeneric address and the	640 640 640 6400 6400 6400 640	La Carta Car	Northern and 2000 Northern and 2000 ¹⁴ Annual 2000 ¹⁴ Annual 2000 ¹⁴ Columentation with an gener ¹⁴
Shindaa rayaa yada sharka waxaa waxaa Shindaa rayaa waxaa sharka baa ka waxaa Shindaa ya xaa waxaa sharka baa ka waxaa Shindaa ya xaa waxaa sharka waxaa Maraa ya xaa ya xaa xaa xaa xaa xaa xaa xaa ya xaa y	600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000 600	La	Nacasana y Salay Manana y Salay Davatary at Salay Manana y Salay Manana y Salay Galanashan Nel Angune [®]
An Indus Agen geta to bar to each search An Indus Agent gan at house an each search on a dense gan at house and at a search on a dense at a search on a dense at a search on a dense at a search on a dense bar a sea	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60		Norman et jäller Manner et jäller Norma jäller Norma jäller Norma jäller Ocumentum tekk ag und ^{ar}
In halfs i regen geta her for uch hereit on hill op . In half an interesting lack hereiter of the set of the setting of the	600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000 6000 6000		Norman e plant Manama e plant Sources e e a class An ele a class An ele a class Columbum tel e grant Columbum tel e grant Columbum tel e grant Columbum tel e grant
An Indus Agen gets her for each near of each	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60		Normen et jäller Normen et jäller Normen jäller Normen jäller Normen jäller Constantinum het dag varf Constantinum het dag varf Constantinum het dag varf Constantinum het dag varf
An India Angen agina har ka an	600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000 6000 6000		Norman e plane Marcine e plane Sector e plane Marcine e plane Marcine e plane Marcine e plane Sector e plane Sector e plane Marcine e plane Ma
An India Angen gala har for act han set Ser far age age at a far age and a set of the model general trapped at age at a trapped at the ansatz Ser Ser Ser Ser Ser Ser Ser Ser	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Koomer a (1007 Koomer
An Index Angen materia has for each means and hange	600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 6		Nachara (1907) Machara (1907) Daving ar (1907) Machard (1907) Machard (190
An India Angeon guide to bar for each toward Contral op Contral op Spin al Angeonalistic lock for an oblig Spin al Angeonalistic Spin al Angeonalistic Spin and Spin Spin and Spin Spin Spin and Spin Spin Spin and Spin	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Koomen at julier"
An Index A search that for each search of a search of	640 640 640 6400 6400 6400 640 640 640 6		Nachel e (1907) Machel e (1907) Bankey er (1907) Markey er (1907) Markey er (1907) Cashelmanne for a grant Cashelmanne for a grant Cashelmanne for a grant Cashelmanne for a grant Markey Markey Cashelmanne for a grant Markey Cashelmanne for a grant Markey M
An India Angeon agains than for west treated the India of Angeon against the for west treated against Angeonalise the India of Angeonalise against Angeonalise against Angeonalise against Angeonalise the A	600 600 6000 6000 6000 600 60 60 60 60 6		Kooner a tiof Kooner a tiof Ko
An officie of ageneration to the treat of a sector of	640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640		Nones a pint of control a spart " Annes a pint of control a spart " Annes a pint of control a spart " Annes a control " Annes a control" Annes a control " A
	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		
Andra Agen yets her for advised Andra Agen yets her for advised yet of an assessible behave and advised agent for advised advised behaves advised behaves	640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640 640		
An indust rangem spires has for and showed in the spire of the showed in the showed in the showed is both the showed is in the showed is b	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Alexan e plot (denter a e plat " meter a plot (denter a e plat " meter a e plot " meter a e plot " Alexandra blag out" and "
An India Angen gala ha fa ha fa sa hina an An India Angen gala ha fa ha malani ga ha Angen gala ha fa ha malani ga ha Angen gala ha fa ha malani ga ha fa ha manana fa ha ha ha ha malani ga ha ha ha ha ha ha ha malani ga ha	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Koomen a jüür Annea a jüür Annaa a jüür Anna
An indust regen regists the for existences Defining			Norman a pilot Manama a pilot Source a pilot Source and Source And a Dist Columbra to La guart Columbra to La guar
An indust angen spirst har for such transmit Ser in age. Ser in age.	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60		
Shale rays after the to estimate Shale rays after the to estimate Shale rays after the same after the same			
An indust angues spires has to each search of a second			Kooner at 1007 Kooner at 1007 Kords at 1007 Kords at 1007 Kords at 1007 Columnities of agent? Columnities of
Shinks rayse raise has be delivered. Shinks rayse raise has be to extended and rayse and the sector of the sector and rayse has been and the sector of the sector and the sector of the sector of the sector of the sector and the sector of the sector o			Norman a pilot (Soundar a pil
Anishin rayam ngina han ku			Norma a pilot (Sounda
Andra rays art bar to a transmission and rays art bar to a status art of an assessmith back to a status art of a data art of a			
Andria rayan yara ha ku ku ku ku ku ya			Automa a (DDF) Automa a (DDF)
	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Koons a too" Koons a too" Ko
Andria rayse spire her best externed and rayse and rayses and r			
Andra rays arts har to a transmission of the procession of the adding arts of a procession of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts of the adding arts arts of the adding ar			Ausens a too" Ausens a too ausens
Anishi rigam qata ha ka ka shanga anishi qa ba ka sa sang anishi qa ba ka sa sa anishi qa ba ka sa			
Shinks range rates have a values Shinks range			
Anishi Agam agin ha ha na ha an ang agin ha ha na ang agin ha			Looks a (D) Autor a (D) Control (C) Autor (C) Control
Shinking ngan ngan ha ku su hu nu su			Subset of SUDY Subset of Subset of SUDY Subset of Subset o
Shinking nging high has be able of a sing of a si			
			Subset of SUP Subset of Sup Sup Subset of Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup
Shifts fragen spirs has to activate set Shifts fragen spirs has to activate			
Selection of a set of			Subset of SUP Subset of Sup Sup Subset of Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup Sup
Shinking nging high has has a sing and an analysis has a sing and an analysis has a sing and an analysis has a sing and an			
Shinking ngan ngan han ku shinking ngan ngan han ku shinking ngan han ku shi			
Shinking nging high has house housed Shinking has house h			
Selection of a set of			
Anishing again back back back back back back back back			
Shinkin Jakan			
Anishi a dana maka ha ha ha a dang aya dang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang			
Subject of a part o			School of School
Anisis resum suis has has a suis suis has a suis suis has has has a suis suis has has has has has has has has has ha			
Subject of a growth of a field of a growth			
Aniski share nakis has has a stars Shife share marked has has a stars Share marked has a stars			
			Standard (Standard
Anisis a sea se			

Key: CD, Crohn's Disease; TD, top-down; RR, relative risk; QoL, quality of life; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; Vedo, vedolizumab; Uste, ustekinumab; IM, immunomodulator

Table S2: Parameters varied in one-way sensitivity analysis

Parameter	Range	Source
Mucosal healing		
Step-up	0.07 to 0.592	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸
Top-down	0.55 to 0.923	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸
Hospitalisation costs	0.64 to 9505	Woehl et al. (2007) ³⁴
Surgery costs	4511 to 9128	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Cost of treating flare	0.1639 to 289	Dretzke et al (2011) ³⁵
OR steroid-free remission year 2+ with mucosal healing	1.1 to 17.2	Baert et al (2010) ²⁰
Relative risk of surgery step-up vs top-down	0.41 to 0.65	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³
Relative risk of treatment switch (step-up vs top-down) from induction to maintenance treatment	0.37 to 0.43	D'Haens et al (2008) ⁶
Hospitalised for Flare StepUp	0.24 to 0.47	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³
Hospitalised for Flare Top-Down	0.15 to 0.37	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³
Cost of CDAI <150	13 to 28	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Cost of CDAI 150-220	22 to 48	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Cost of CDAI 220-450	197 to 434	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Cost of CDAI >450	197 to 434	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Utility of CDAI <150	0.71 to 0.91	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Utility of CDAI 150-220	0.66 to 0.74	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Utility of CDAI 220-450	0.40 to 0.68	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Utility of CDAI >450	0.30 to 0.57	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸
Utility multiplier due to Adverse E	vent:	
Biologic (Vedolizumab/Ustekinumab)	0.98 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
anti-TNF + IM	0.96 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹
Immunomodulator	0.97 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹

Key: OR, odds ratio; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; IM, immunomodulator; Costs are given in £s sterling

Table S3: Clinical cohort characteristics by risk subgroup (after Biasci et al, Gut 2019)				
	high risk	low risk	P value	
Age (years)	30.3 (25.3-36.1)	30.3 (23.2-38.7)	0.98	
Sex (% male)	42.4	39.4	1	
smoking (% yes)	28.6	33.3	0.79	
newly diagnosed (% yes)	81.8	72.7	0.56	
disease duration (years)	0	0	0.78	
Haemoglobgin (g/L)	12.5 (11.7-13.3)	13.1 (11.8-13.6)	0.63	
CRP (mg/L)	26 (16-39)	25 (10-59)	0.6	
Albumin (g/L)	35 (32-37)	37 (34-39)	0.14	
Diseae distribution:				
ileal	27.3	39.4	0.43	
ileocolonic	33.3	27.3	0.79	
colonic	39.4	33.3	0.8	
upper Gl	6.1	9.1	1	
perianal	6	3	0.48	
prospective follow-up, years	4.9 (3.6-7.4)	5.3 (4.3-8.3)	0.24	

Table S3: Clinical cohort characteristics by risk subgroup (after Biasci et al, Gut 2019)

Table S4: Model validity evaluation criteriaFollowing ISPOR recommendations as per Principles of Good Practice for Decision AnalyticModeling in Health, Value Health. 2003;6(1):9-17. doi:10.1046/j.1524-4733.2003.00234

	Crite	rion
Model Criterion	me	t?
	Yes	No
A. Model structure		
inputs/outputs relevant to decision-making perspective	х	
evidence supporting causal linkages between variables	х	
limitations accepted (sensitivity analyses performed)	х	
Health states defined to correspond to disease process	х	
State transition probabilities depend on prior states	х	
States not excluded due to lack of data	х	
Consideration given to health state subdivision	х	
appropriately short cycle length	х	
model structure simplicity	х	
model options not constrained by availability of evidence	х	
data availability may affect model choices	х	
disaggregation of founding population	N/A	
time horizon long enough to reflect long term consequences	х	
B. Data input		
i. Data identification		
literature reviews conuducted on key inputs	х	
ranges for parameters used in sensitivity anaylsis	х	
formal probabilistic sensitivity analysis	х	
justification of any excluded data sources	N/A	
uncertainty around estimates disclosed	х	
sensitivity analysis for expert opinion input	х	
reasonable opportunities to include new data included	х	
ii. Data modeling		
assumptions disclosed and supported by evidence	х	
sensitiviity analyses with alternative modeling if appropriate	N/A	
modeling following accepted principles	х	
iii. Data incorporation		
measurement units, time intervals and populations consistent	х	
probabilistic or deterministic simulation	х	
probabilistic or deterministic sensitivity analyses for key parameters	х	
half-cycle correction used where appropriate		
	N1/A	
	N/A	
C. Model Validation		
I. Internal validation		
model debugging e.g. using extreme values and sense checking	х	
model calibration against external data	х	
availability of model on reasonable request	х	
II. Between model validation		
model developed independently	х	
discrepancies with published models explained	х	
cooperation with other modelers for comparision/explanation where appropriate	х	
iii. External and predictive validation		
results reported as conditional on the input assumptions	x	
consideration given to obtaining additional prospective data for validation	х	
models open to update or replacement when new data becomes available	X	

Figure 1.



Figure 1. Model structure.

A, Model structure diagram demonstrating the decision tree and Markov components; No patients were assumed to have a CDAI score greater than 450 (very severe disease) until the end of sequence, whereupon 50% of patients were assumed to have very severe disease **B**, Step-up and Top-down treatment sequences CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; IM, immunomodulator; CS, corticosteroid

Figure 2.

A: Standard of care arm



B: Personalised therapy



Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier survival curves showing time to first treatment escalation for each model arm

A, Comparison of the lognormal parametric survival curves (solid lines) fitted to the Kaplan-Meier time to escalation patient data (dotted lines), stratified by risk group. **B**, Treatment effect of using a TD therapy approach on high-risk patients, modelled by applying a hazard-ratio of 0.53 to the high-risk fitted time to escalation curve. KM, Kaplan-Meier survivor function.

Figure 3.



Figure 3: Tornado diagram showing results of varying parameters as part of the one-way sensitivity analysis

TD, top-down; SU, step-up; QoL, quality of life; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; RR, relative risk; OR, odds ratio; Trt, treatment. The central line of the tornado indicates the base case NMB of £7,523.







Figure 4: Results of probabilistic sensitivity analysis

A, Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve showing the probability of a precision medicine strategy being considered cost-effective at different monetary thresholds; NICE cost-effectiveness upper threshold indicated as green area (£20-30,000/QALY) **B**, Cost-effectiveness plane plotted with scatter points representing 5000 simulations from the probabilistic sensitivity analysis.

Figure 5: Impact of varying time horizon on cost-effectiveness



Figure 6: Impact of varying treatment effect size on net monetary benefit



Note: Net monetary benefit was calculated using a willingness to pay threshold of £25,000/QALY

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of patients entered in the model

Characteristic	Value
Starting age (years)	40
Proportion with high-risk CD	55%
Mean patient weight (kgs)	72
% patients <55kg	21%
% patients 55kg <x<85g< th=""><th>59%</th></x<85g<>	59%
% patients >85kg	20%

Table 2: Key assumptions of Markov model

Assumption	Explanation
Treatment effect on time to escalations/flares (relapse) is 0.4, greater than that reported in D'Haens et al [®] , which was 0.53	In the D'Haens trial, the median time to relapse was 174.5 vs 329 days for SU and TD respectively. Using these figures, we derived a hazard ratio on time to relapse of 0.53. However, it was assumed that this was an underestimate of the efficacy of top-down treatment as the top-down group received infliximab as induction treatment only, and patients received maintenance azathioprine rather than continuing TNF α inhibitor maintenance therapy as per current guidelines ²⁹ .
	Therefore, we adjusted the treatment effect on time to relapse to reflect the greater efficacy that is known to result from combined Infliximab and azathioprine treatment.
Treatment effect of top-down on risk of flares, treatment escalations and surgery assumed to last 10 years	Effects on key clinical outcomes were observed up to 10 years after randomisation to the top-down vs. step-up treatment arms in D'Haens trial ⁶ , as reported in Hoekman et al ²³
After 12 months of maintenance biologic, 85% of step-up patients remain on regular maintenance within that step.	While NICE recommends ongoing use of biologic after 12 months based on clinical need, only 15-20% of patients in clinical practice discontinue biologics after 12 months, hence we assumed that approximately 85% would remain on therapy.
After 12 months of maintenance biologic, 20% of top-down patients remain on regular maintenance within that step	There is a paucity of evidence to support what proportion of patients given top-down biologic is likely to require treatment after 12 months, but due to better response this is likely to be significantly lower than in immunomodulator-refractory disease. Based on clinical expert opinion, it was assumed that only 20% of patients were likely to require treatment after 12 months.
The effect of TD on mucosal healing is assumed to be sustained over all treatments in the sequence	76% and 40% of top-down vs. step-up patients respectively achieved mucosal healing after 6 months in the D'Haens trial ⁶ . The effect of mucosal healing on the proportion in remission (odds ratio of 4.3 ²⁰) was found to be sustained for up to 4 years. Although long-term remission was not observed in the long-term follow-up of the D'Haens study ²³ , this may reflect the use of biologic during induction only and lack of 2 nd and 3 nd line alternatives. The assumption was therefore made of longer-term impact on remission
The risk of flares not requiring treatment escalation was assumed to be constant over time	Due to small event rates, an exponential distribution was fitted to time to escalation-free flare, with the implication that the risk of flare is constant over the model lifetime
Risk of treatment escalation and/or surgery following the first event was assumed to be constant over time	Due to the Markovian memory limitation and diminishing patient numbers over the follow-up time, an exponential distribution was fitted to time to treatment escalation and time to surgery following the first event, with the implication that risk is constant over the remaining model lifetime
Distribution across CDAI health states conditional on treatment was assumed to remain constant over time	Due to the Markovian memory limitation, an exponential distribution had to be fitted to this parameter, with the implication that this parameter is constant over time

Table 3: Base-case scenario results

	PredictSURE IBD	No test	Increment	
Discounted costs				
Induction	£4,132	£4,020	£112	
Maintenance	£33,942	£24,914	£9,029	
Non-hospitalisation costs	£27,631	£34,443	-£6,812	
Flares	£1,414	£2,514	-£1,100	
Surgery and complications	£6,311	£8,071	-£1,761	
PredictImmune	£1,250	£0	£1,250	
Total costs	£74,680	£73,963	£717	
Clinical outcomes				
Number of surgeries per person	1.183	1.513	-0.330	
Life years	19.554	19.549	0.005	
Discounted QALYs				
QALYs lost to surgery	-0.003	-0.004	0.001	
QALYs lost to flares	-0.006	-0.009	0.002	
Health state QALYs	10.659	10.332	0.326	
Total QALYs	10.650	10.320	0.330	

Table 4: Scenario analysis results when varying time parameters

Parameter	Base case value	Value used in scenario analysis	ICER
Treatment effect on escalations	0.4	0.53	£9,307
Time horizon	20years	15 years	£7,179
		10 years	£26,895
		5 years	£99,716
Duration of treatment effect	10 years	5 years	£12,212
		3 years	£32,625
		2 years	£88,307

Table 5: Scenario analysis exploring impact on net monetary benefit when varying treatment effect on escalations

Parameter	Base case value	Value used in scenario analysis	Net monetary benefit
Treatment effect 0.4	0.4	0.3	£10,475
		0.4	£7,523
		0.5	£4,633
		0.6	£1,780
		0.7	-£1,028
		0.8	-£3,765
		0.9	-£6,399
		1	-£8,903

Table 6: Scenario analysis results for unselected 'all top down'TD vs standard care

	Top-down	Step-up	Increment
Total costs	£74,680	£93,249	-£18,568
Total QALYs	10.650	10.929	-0.280

Table S1: Model input parameters

and NUS			
Kisk CD Kisk of aurany, historisk	4000	Lannastini	Basciet al (2009)
Kick of surgery, low-risk	0.0002	Exponential	Randi et al (2009)
Rick of flare, high-rick	6.0032	Esponential	illanci et al (2019)'
Kisk of flans, low-risk	6.0023	Esponential	Rauci et al (2019)
Al ad Bases benefatibed (fit)	6.Y5	her.	Inclusion of all Photon
	0.40		remains a poor
% of flams hospitalized 10	0.254	aro.	Hoekman et al (2018) [®]
Probability of post-surgical complications	0.43	inta	Tappenden et al (2014)"
Probability of death during surgery	6.002	ies.	Marchetti et al (2058)*
Probability of muccoal healing SU	42%	ito.	Marchetti et al (2013)
Probability of muccoal healing 10	Xss	ieta	Marchetti et al (2012)*
Odduratio for steroid-free remission year 2+ with muccoal healing	4.30	Lagnarmai	ilaert et al (2000)"
For the second burdles haven	,	ford.	from and 1040°
Time to incode hearing (year)	1	kaed	aser et a (Atal)
Duration biologic CD			
Proportion on biologic therapy after tilmfild	0.84	ieta	Clinician opinion
	0.84	into .	Clinician opinion
	Calif	ieto.	Clinician opinion
Proportion on biologic therapy alter birnsid	02	in .	(laitas ataim
Proportion on therapy after 12m TD			
Proportion on therapy after 24m TD	02	into .	Clinician opinion
	02	into .	Cinician opinion
Proportion of therapy after den 10 Proportion with excluted dose			
N with exclused biologic does high-risk	016	Separential	Calculation based on companison of survival models from IPO
N ulith ann denad blakester Anna San - Ad	Aug.	formality and	Calculation Joseph Concerning of the
n anne anna anna anna	011	upowital	unusuandared on companion of sarvival models from PO
Matalwa risks CD			
	059	Lagnarmal	Haskman et al (2018)"
Surgery step up ut top down	0.6	Lanenal	D'Hernunt al (2008)
	0.00	Lapona	
Separation Sectore Sec	0.0	Lagnarmal	Asurpton
Legalet .	0.40	Lagnormal	Asungtion
Bitaya Bitaya	0.40	Lagnamal	Asurption
Ducation transment effect loward	20	Reed	Haskman et al (2018)"
Health state Opt. (at little)			
(00-30)	0.00	into .	NG appraice [®]
CDN 200-60	6.60	ing ing	NG appraisal*
	0.63	ins	Greenberg et al (2019)"
vela Trast ment-misted Cot, decommunication Advisori			
Obernation	1000	ieta	Asunption
Uthinumb	69962	êro.	NG appraisal"
Vedditameb	0.902	into into	NG appalat"
bilisinab Addan grah	69962	ing line	NG appada
Austronia	0.9992	ins	NCE appraisal**
6 minutes and a second s	6.9932	âro.	NG appoint
Methormate	0.9932	âro.	NG appoint"
	0.9932	ikta	Asunption – as per conventional therapy
No.			
	69937	in .	N/C www.int
timunomodulator	69953	ing .	NG appala
anti-Thef + M	0.0006	into .	NCE appraixal [®]
Littelinerezh + M	0.9894	ieta	NG appraisal*
miniarak + M	0.9941	ino ino	NCE appealed
Vidolizuneb/udekinuneb			
Disease-related Opt decrements		he .	terrent a classif
detit tal array consistions	620	into .	Marzheti et al (2003)"
	6060		Marchetti et al (2012)*
		NG	
		80	
Offic field ions of response (applied to those that switch treatment)	6.00	ano ko	Marzheti et al (2007)
éger tal los el regione (appliet to thoir that which treatment) éger tal august regional avan discus avandantica lacitada en avatatival	600	80	Naroberli et al (2007) Naroberli et al (2007)
Chist Tail loss of regiones (applied to those that which treatment) Chist Tail anguy Chist Tail angue decrea encontration (which the enclation)	6.60 6.60	aro Aro	Marchesi et al (2020)" Marchesi et al (2020)", Generateg et al (2020)"
gertral loss of response legical to those that websh tradment) gertral argent gertral ander dense essanthation junch the exclusion)	630	86 86 80	Marbest et al (2009) Marbest et al (2009) Generating et al (2009)
Qu'trà les d'apprové gapital à traves de la solate est Qu'trà la supp Qu'trà auto d'asses escandation junchi her esclataria Qu'trà auto d'asses escandation junchi her	630 630 636	ans ins ins ins	Marbert et al (200)? Marbert et al (200), Greekerg et al (200)" Geenberg et al (201)?
Schulter of regenerated in the for which heaterst Schulter Angery Certral work search and a schulter in which it is a schuld Schulter of Francesson Schulter of Francesson	600 600 606	60 60 60	Nardent et al (200)" Mardent et al (200)", Geneterg et al (200)" Geneterg et al (200)
Skrift har if mener lands is bits for and it notices? Skrift soger Skrift and some samhenin jusk her melation Skrift fragsband sprender til gestammel	630 638 636	ins ins ins ins	Marchell et a (2007) Marchell et a (2007), Growthey et a (2007) Growthey et a (2007) An et al. (2007)
Schulzer fregen gelat i ber for soch neutrin Grund soger Grund soger Spänd soger Anders for dennen Grund Stageland An den Spänder An	800 888 636 636 6300 6300	ko ko ko ko ko	Norbell et 2009 Norbell et 2009 Gundary et 2007 No et 2007 No et 2007
Antol fau f average sealer's has for weld havened contributer (c) of d un taxes meaning lands the material data of taxes meaning lands the material data of taxes meaning of material (c) average and and are meaning lands to take the material data of the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to take the material lands to take the data of take the material lands to t	636 635 635 6383 6383	ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino ino	Macheni es (2001) Macheni es (2002) ⁴ Geneting es (2002) ⁴ Ros esta (2002) ⁴ An esta (2002) ⁴
Developed and a fragmentation in the first addressment and relianges of the second sec	630 635 635 635 635 635 635 635 635 635 635	ins ins ins ins ins ins ins ins ins ins	Norbert e a (2001) ⁴ Norbert e 3 (2001) ⁴ Geneting e a (2001) ⁴ Geneting e 4 (2001) ⁴ No et a (2001) ⁴
Antoha fragma paint has the set set of sources graft and graft graft and set see an exercise paint he analogy graft and set see an exercise paint he analogy graft and the second set of set of set of set graft fragments the fragments the	630 630 635 635 635 6350 6350 6350	an An An An And And	λωτοστι κα (200)" Ματοστι κα (200)" Οιοισίας κα (200)" Αντικά (200)" Αντικά (200)"
Dan falle of region lands in the file and handline of the second	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600	55 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 5	Ner new as (2002) Construct as (2002) Construct as (2002) An east (2002) Construct as
Scholar of regen particle that the delt hashest spin in age : general and second for second s	600 600 600 600 600 600 600		Nome a goog Anne a goog Anne ga goog Anne goog Anne goog Anne goog
Dan fall of Angene safet is the file and have and have set and set ange. The first set and set and set and set and set ange. Set and fall and set angel. Set and the file and set and fall and set and set and fall and set an	600 600 600 600 600 600 60	55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	Namine e politi Norme e politi Sondarge e politi ⁴⁴ An et a politi ⁴⁴ An et a polit ⁴⁴
Control of regions useful in the file data hashess data in ages and an ages and a file data washess and and a second and and and and and and a second and and and and a second and and a se	600 600 600 6000 6000 600	and and and and and and and and and and	Nones a pixe" Nones pixe" Source pixes" Nones pixes" Nones pixes" Counters that the pixes"
Antalia fayan anife' ha fa kela takan an fa fay i an fa fa fa an anife an anifer an fa fa fa anifer an anifer anifer and takan anifer anifer and takan anifer anif	600 600 600 6000 6000 600 600 60	65 66 66 66 66 66 66	Name at (DB) Manter at (DB) ² Anna (DB) ² Anna (DB) ² Anna (DB) ² Counterbanks at (DB) ²
Developed reading and in the first decisionment and stages and stages and the sta	600 600 600 600 600 600 60	ins ins ins ins ins ins ins ins ins	Name a port Sector of Data" Sector of Data" Sector Data" Calculation (Sector Of Sector
Andra frager, andré har fra de harden andré gen fal gen gen af de skales en entré part har en etter gen af harde frage entré part de la entré part andré par entré part andré par entré part andré part de la entré part andré part andré part de la entré part andré part	600 600 600 6000 6000 600 600 60 60 60 6		Nacional de (Della) Nacional de La Calificación Nacional de (Della) Nacional de Calificación Distantificación de Calificación Distantificación de Querto
Developed register in the first addressment and of agest and of agest and a developed and address and address and address and address addre	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 60 6		Names as (2007) Names as (2007) Sensory as (2007) ¹¹ Sensory (2007) ¹² Sectored (2007)
Andra frager selfs har for del hadre del selfer gen far de se dese mention parts har de se del gen andra frage dese mentions del de la dese dese mentions del de la dese de la del de la del del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de la del de de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de del de la del de la del de de la del del de la del de de la del de la del de de la del de la del de de la del del de de la del de la del de de la del de del de la del de de la del de del de la del de de la del del de de la del de del de la del de del de la del de de la del de del de de la del de de de la del de de de de de de de de de de de de de d	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60		Name a (100) Anato a (100) Anato (100) Ana
Danie dragen selfer her for acht self hannet An rich age Verd fast here menten in beiter en stelling Verd fast here self fast der stelling der stelling verden an en versionelen versionelen versionelen	600 600 6000 6000 6000 6000 600 600 60 6		Maneta e politi Maneta e politi Senarga e politi" Senarga e politi" Salamino vale a politi" Salamino vale a politi" Salamino vale a politi" Senarga e politika politi"
Cardia of agene suifer that the data taskes Sprind age 2 agene agene suifer a base of a suifer agene agene suifer a base of a suifer agene agene suifer agene agene suifer suifer agene agene suifer agene s	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Names a (1907) Names as (1907) Names as (1907) Names as (1907) Contained on the Angelow Contained on the Angelow Contained on the Angelow Contained on the Angelow Contained on the Angelow Market An
Danish of ageneration is the field addresses i and stage	605 606 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 6		Alasense se politi Mansten se politif Alasense se politif Mansten se politif Disabatelen se kal ag var " Galasenten se kal ag var " Galasenten se kal ag var "
Developed and any specific that the developments of the developments of the development o	605 605 605 606 606 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 6		Name a goof Anne a goof anne a goof anne a goof anne ag an Gooff Anne a gooff Anne Anne a gooff
Daniela dragostadia i har Madahament Anini agu Daniela dragostadia Variera dragostadia Variera dragostadia Variera dragostadia Selationa Selationa Variera dragostadia Variera dragostadia	600 600 6000 6000 600 600 60 60 60 60 60		Alashi a yang Manta a yang Alashi a yang Manta a yang Mantahan Malagar di Galashi an Malagar di Galashi an Malagar di Galashi an Malagar di Galashi an Malagar di Ma
Developed and a frequent subtrie to the first developments and starges in the subtrie making in the subtrie to the subtrie to the subtrie to the subtrie subtries are to the subtries in the subtries in the subtries in the subtries in the su	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Name or polity" Name or polity" overlap of (021" sourceg or 6 (001" An or g (001" Contact have being or 9" Contact have being or 90"
Danie drage selet i her for ach i energi an integritte en an integritte und an integritte und an integritte und an integritte and an integritte and an integritte und an integritte an i	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60		Alashi e yang Manta e yang Alashi ya yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta Manta a yang Manta yang Manta a yang Manta a yang Manta yang Manta a yang Manta ya yang Manta yang Manta ya yang Manta ya yang Manta ya yang M
Dan basi a daga saki a ba ba da basinani An da ga basi a ba ba ba ba basinani Yang daga basi a baba ba adag Yang da basi ang daga basi a basi a basi a Yang daga basi ang daga basi a basi a basi a basi a Yang daga basi a basi a basi a basi a basi a basi a basi a Yang daga basi a basi basi a basi	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		
Danial of upper latifies that the action states of upper latifies	600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 6		Alaber of platf Annue of platf, annue of older " Annue of platf, annue of older " Annue of platf, annue of older " Annue of platf, annue of older o
Danis of agen safe's the for de bit meets and agent of the fact agent meets in both the metage of the fact agent meets in both the metage of the fact agent meets agent	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Names a (2007) Names a (2007) Samesy ar (2007)
Danie of agen takin the for advanced and along	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Alashin e (1967) Alashin e (1967) Alashin e (1967) Alashin e (1967) Alashin e (1968) Alashin e (1968) Alashi
Danie of agen selfs in the for de bit senses Self of agent agent of agent agent of agent agent Self Se	600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 6		
Sanda daga saki sha ka aka saki saki Sanda ga Sanda daga saki saki saki saki saki Sanda daga saki saki saki Sanda daga saki saki saki saki saki saki Sanda daga saki saki saki saki saki saki saki sak	600 600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 6		Name a good Sector a good (sector
Danish of your sole's that for advisatored Seried age: Seried age:			
Danial of anyon suffici hay the delationers and anyon of the sufficience and anyon of the sufficience anyon of the suff	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Name a sport Name a sport Sense sport Sen
Randa daga saki ha pi ka da ha ana an Randa ga ang ha ga			
Shinka fayaa aafa'i har fa dahaanaa Shinka fayaa <			Names a poly Names a poly na
Danie of agen selfs in the for de shareers in a share of agent agent is the for de shareers in a share of agent ag			
Danie a fager seif a har for de blaneer and a fage (and a fage seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a and a fage a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a seif a a seif a seif a a seif a seif			kunet a (ptf) kunet a (ptf) soning a (ptf)
Shale a fages and is the plat a defaused Shale a fages and is the plat a defaused Shale a fages and is the plat a defaused Shale a fages and is the plat a defaused Shale a fages and is the plat a defaused Shale a defause a defause a defaused Shale a defause a defause a defaused Shale a defause a defause a defause a defaused Shale a defause a defause a defause a defaused Shale a defause a d			
Sector of a forget subir to the the deletationed Sector of a forget subir to the the deletationed Sector of a forget subir to the the deletationed Sector of a forget subir to the the deletationed Sector of a forget subir to the deletation	600 600 600 600 600 60 60 60 60 60 60 60		Autor a splif Survey ar splif, develop a split, " Survey ar split," Survey ar split," Survey ar split," Survey ar split, " Survey ar split,
Shale a fage safe is the for a statument Shale a fage safe is the for a statument Shale a fage safe is the for a statument Shale a fage safe is the formation of			
Standardsenset Standa			kunet a (1967) Survey ar 2007 (" and units of 2027" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007" Survey ar 2007 Survey ar 2007 Su
Bandad Agen Leff in the for delationed Bandad Agen Leff in the for delationed Bandad Agen Leff in the for delationed Standad Standards in the for delationed Yang Yang Yang Yang Yang Yang Yang Yang			
Shinka a' angan sala'u han fu da bitament Shinka a' angan sala'u han fu da bitament <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>			
Subject of a part and if it has the defendent of a subject of a su			
Banda dagan ada'a han fa da hananan Banda dagan ada'a hananan Banananananan Banda dagan ada'a			
Banda daga saki ha ya ka ka ka watat Banda daga Banda daga Banda daga Saki haga Varia ka watat Banda daga Saki haga Banda daga Saki haga			kunser sejter Menter sejter Anster
Shale a fages addit shark a data seemed Shale a fages addit seemed <			
Shale a fages which has he advanced Shale a fages which has he advanced Shale a fages Shale a fag			kunser septis Menter septis Anter septis
Subject of a property of a			
Shale a fage lafe is the for a de la materi Shale a fage lafe is the for a de la materi Shale a fage lafe is the for a de la materi Shale a materia de la materia Shale a materia			 Austan a (2007) Austan a (20
Banda daga adal hand adal adams Banda daga adal hand adal hand adal adams Banda daga adal hand adal han			
Balaka / agas laki / ba da bala met Balaka / agas laki / ba da balamet Balaka / agas laki / ba da balamet Balaka / agas laki / ba da balamet Salaka / ba da balamet <			
Rest of a start is best of a delationed Rest of a start is best of a delationed Rest of a start is best of a delationed Rest of a start is best of a delationed Rest of a start is best of a delationed Rest of a delationed <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
Banda daga baki han ka dahamati Shi daga			Ausen a part (annue of a part
Banda daga saki han ka ka ka ana ana Banda daga saki han ka ka ka ana Banda daga saki han ka ka ana Saki han ka			
Anita daga bait han ta dahamati Anita daga Anita daga <			
Rest of a segment of the set of a set of			
Balan dagan kaki han ka ka han manu Balan dagan kaki han ka han manu			
Banda daga bala hang bala han			
Restant and a formation of the sector of			
Balaka Agam Jaki hang da balawani Balawani da balawan			Ause of part of the second of
Restore a de la de			
Balaka / agas ada's hay fa da balawates Balaka / agas ada's hay fa da balawates Balaka / agas ada's hay fa da balawates Salaka / agas ada's hay fa da balawates <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Notice a (100°) Notice a (100°) Notic</td></t<>			Notice a (100°) Notic

Key: CD, Crohn's Disease; TD, top-down; RR, relative risk; QoL, quality of life; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; Vedo, vedolizumab; Uste, ustekinumab; IM, immunomodulator

Table S2: Parameters varied in one-way sensitivity analysis

Parameter	Range	Source	
Mucosal healing			
Step-up	0.07 to 0.592	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸	
Top-down	0.55 to 0.923	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸	
Hospitalisation costs	0.64 to 9505	Woehl et al. (2007) ³⁴	
Surgery costs	4511 to 9128	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Cost of treating flare	0.1639 to 289	Dretzke et al (2011) ³⁵	
OR steroid-free remission year 2+ with mucosal healing	1.1 to 17.2	Baert et al (2010) ²⁰	
Relative risk of surgery step-up vs top-down	0.41 to 0.65	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³	
Relative risk of treatment switch (step-up vs top-down) from induction to maintenance treatment	0.37 to 0.43	D'Haens et al (2008) ⁶	
Hospitalised for Flare StepUp	0.24 to 0.47	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³	
Hospitalised for Flare Top-Down	0.15 to 0.37	Hoekman et al (2018) ²³	
Cost of CDAI <150	13 to 28	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Cost of CDAI 150-220	22 to 48	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Cost of CDAI 220-450	197 to 434	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Cost of CDAI >450	197 to 434	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Utility of CDAI <150	0.71 to 0.91	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Utility of CDAI 150-220	0.66 to 0.74	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Utility of CDAI 220-450	0.40 to 0.68	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Utility of CDAI >450	0.30 to 0.57	Marchetti et al (2013) ⁸	
Utility multiplier due to Adverse Event:			
Biologic (Vedolizumab/Ustekinumab)	0.98 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
anti-TNF + IM	0.96 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	
Immunomodulator	0.97 to 1	NICE technology appraisal TA352 ¹⁹	

Key: OR, odds ratio; CDAI, Crohn's disease activity index; IM, immunomodulator; Costs are given in £s sterling

Table S3: Clinical cohort characteristics by risk subgroup (after Biasci et al, Gut 2019)				
	high risk	low risk	P value	
Age (years)	30.3 (25.3-36.1)	30.3 (23.2-38.7)	0.98	
Sex (% male)	42.4	39.4	1	
smoking (% yes)	28.6	33.3	0.79	
newly diagnosed (% yes)	81.8	72.7	0.56	
disease duration (years)	0	0	0.78	
Haemoglobgin (g/L)	12.5 (11.7-13.3)	13.1 (11.8-13.6)	0.63	
CRP (mg/L)	26 (16-39)	25 (10-59)	0.6	
Albumin (g/L)	35 (32-37)	37 (34-39)	0.14	
Diseae distribution:				
ileal	27.3	39.4	0.43	
ileocolonic	33.3	27.3	0.79	
colonic	39.4	33.3	0.8	
upper Gl	6.1	9.1	1	
perianal	6	3	0.48	
prospective follow-up, years	4.9 (3.6-7.4)	5.3 (4.3-8.3)	0.24	

Table S3: Clinical cohort characteristics by risk subgroup (after Biasci et al, Gut 2019)

Table S4: Model validity evaluation criteriaFollowing ISPOR recommendations as per Principles of Good Practice for Decision AnalyticModeling in Health, Value Health. 2003;6(1):9-17. doi:10.1046/j.1524-4733.2003.00234

		Criterion	
Model Criterion		t?	
	Yes	No	
A. Model structure			
inputs/outputs relevant to decision-making perspective	х		
evidence supporting causal linkages between variables	х		
limitations accepted (sensitivity analyses performed)	х		
Health states defined to correspond to disease process	х		
State transition probabilities depend on prior states	х		
States not excluded due to lack of data	х		
Consideration given to health state subdivision	х		
appropriately short cycle length	х		
model structure simplicity	х		
model options not constrained by availability of evidence	х		
data availability may affect model choices	х		
disaggregation of founding population	N/A		
time horizon long enough to reflect long term consequences	х		
B. Data input			
i. Data identification			
literature reviews conuducted on key inputs	х		
ranges for parameters used in sensitivity anaylsis	х		
formal probabilistic sensitivity analysis	х		
justification of any excluded data sources	N/A		
uncertainty around estimates disclosed	х		
sensitivity analysis for expert opinion input	х		
reasonable opportunities to include new data included	х		
ii. Data modeling			
assumptions disclosed and supported by evidence	х		
sensitiviity analyses with alternative modeling if appropriate	N/A		
modeling following accepted principles	х		
iii. Data incorporation			
measurement units, time intervals and populations consistent	х		
probabilistic or deterministic simulation	х		
probabilistic or deterministic sensitivity analyses for key parameters	х		
half-cycle correction used where appropriate			
	N/A		
C. Model Validation			
I. Internal validation			
model debugging e.g. using extreme values and sense checking	Х		
model calibration against external data	Х		
availability of model on reasonable request	х		
II. Between model validation			
model developed independently	х		
discrepancies with published models explained	х		
cooperation with other modelers for comparision/explanation where appropriate	х		
iii. External and predictive validation			
results reported as conditional on the input assumptions	х		
consideration given to obtaining additional prospective data for validation	х		
models open to update or replacement when new data becomes available	х		