A health technology assessment of the 2-nrti backbones available in Italy

Elisabetta Garaglio 1, Emmanuela Foglia 1, Lucazio Ferrario 2, Giovanni Cenderello 3, Antonio Di Biagio 4, Barbara Menzaghi 3, Giuliano Rizzardi 3 and Davide Croci 4.

1 Centre for Research on Health Economics, Social and Health Care Management, LIUC-Universita Cattaneo, Castellanza, Italy.
2 Galleria Hospital, Department of Infectious Diseases, Genova, Italy.
3 IRCCS San Martino IST Hospital, Unit of Infectious Diseases, Genova, Italy.
4 Valle Okona Hospital, Department of Infectious Diseases, Busto Arsizio, Italy.
5 Fattorinafalletti Sacco Hospital, Department of Infectious Diseases, Milan, Italy.
6 School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Introduction and Aim of the Study

- Recently, therapeutic strategies for HIV have had significant success in improving patients’ quality of life. In particular, triple therapy with a 2-NRTI backbone, that is now considered the standard of care approach for HIV treatment.
- The introduction of emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (FTC/TAF) and the shift to tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (FTC/TDF) as an off-patent drug, is predicted to alter the HIV drugs market in Italy.
- As a consequence, this would have an impact on policy-making processes, disinvestment strategies, and re-allocation of economic resources.
- The aim of the study was to assess the effects of FTC/TAF introduction and emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (FTC/TDF) disinvestment, using a multi-dimensional framework, similar to that proposed by EUnetHTA Core Model (EUnetHTA, 2016).

Methods

- In 2018, a Health Technology Assessment (HTA) was conducted, involving 18 Infectious Disease Departments across Italy.
- The assessment compared the 2-NRTI backbones available in Italy emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (FTC/TAF), tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (FTC/TDF), and abacavir/lamivudine (ABC/3TC).
- The HTA considered the 9 dimensions resulting from the European Network for Health Technology Assessment Core Model (EUnetHTA, 2016) and used an MCDA approach (Thokala et al., 2016).
- Systematic literature research was conducted to complete safety and efficacy dimensions. The validation of the evidence retrieved was carried out by 5 experts using the CASP Qualitative Checklist.
- Qualitative and quantitative data were collected, in particular, clinicians perceptions, in terms of efficacy, safety, social aspects, equity, legal and organizational impacts were retrieved using validated questionnaires (with a Likert scale from 1 to 5).
- A Budget Impact Analysis was performed: cost data inputs were derived from a process mapping analysis; considering the drug cost, the cost of pathway and the cost of adverse events. Information was evaluated in accordance with the Lombardy Region’s inpatients and hospital admissions Reimbursement Tariffs and the NHS official drugs price list. The economic differences among the groups were studied using the ANOVA test.

Assessment of the Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Prioritization</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Prioritization</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Prioritization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Prioritization of the HTA Core Model Dimensions

1°: Efficacy

Literature evidence showed that FTC/TAF ensures a higher percentage of virological and immunological control compared with FTC/TDF and ABC/3TC. The perception of the clinicians confirmed (FTC/TAF: 1.86 vs FTC/TDF: 0.89 and ABC/3TC: 0.68, p-value: 0.023).

2°: Efficacy

FTC/TAF also presents a better safety profile, in particular regarding renal impairment and bone density, compared with both FTC/TDF and ABC/3TC (0.93 vs 0.99 and 0.14 respectively; p-value: 0.04); the clinicians perceptions confirmed the safety evidence actually presented in literature.

3°: Social aspects

From a social perspective, FTC/TDF has a negative impact on social costs and patients’ quality of life (FTC/TDF: 0.96 vs FTC/TAF: 0.87 vs ABC/3TC: 0.25, p-value: 0.001), by sensitivity, and the worst overall impact of therapy on patient’s satisfaction.

4°: Economic Dimension and 5° General Relevance

The total cost of HIV+ patients, assuming the 2-NRTI backbones, was evaluated.
- The Budget Impact analysis considered the Italian NHS perspective with 86,044 HIV+ patients assuming the backbones.
- Three scenarios were performed: i) basal, ii) the introduction of FTC/TAF, and iii) the introduction of FTC/TDF and FTC/TAF as an off patent drug.
- The results revealed a 9% cost saving for the Italian NHS with FTC/TAF introduction and FTC/TDF as an off patent drug.

6°: Equity Impact

Collected data showed that FTC/TAF decreases the burden of adverse events management, thus increasing the accessibility of patients to healthcare providers (FTC/TAF: 0.85 vs FTC/TDF: 0.10 and ABC/3TC: 0.26, p-value: 0.016).

7°: Legal Impact

FTC/TAF was considered a valuable therapeutic approach also in terms of legal impact (FTC/TAF: 1.13 vs FTC/TDF: 0.65 and ABC/3TC: 0.73, p-value: 0.096) due to medicolegal issues in the prescription phase. It is important to note that all the 2-NRTI backbones in the study are mentioned in the Italian HIV National guidelines.

8°: Organisational Impact

From an organisational perspective FTC/TAF could simplify the overall management of drug complications for hospitals, both in the short term (0.60 vs 0.13 FTC/TDF and 0.01 ABC/3TC, p-value: 0.001) and in the long term (0.65 vs 0.18 FTC/TDF and 0.03 ABC/3TC, p-value:0.001).
- However, the introduction of FTC/TAF would require a little additional investment in training courses (5 days, on average, equal to 3,300 and meetings (3.5 hours, on average).

Conclusion

After completing the steps of prioritisation and assessment of the dimensions, the final appraisal of technologies was conducted in order to give a unique and synthetic value that allows comparison between 2-NRTI backbones.

The introduction of FTC/TAF was found to deliver improvements in efficacy, with a greater chance of virological control and safety compared with the older 2-NRTI backbones, FTC/TDF and ABC/3TC. Thus, a FTC/TDF disinvestment strategy would be cost saving for the Italian NHS.
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