# Appendix

## Appendix A: Parameters used in model

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Category** | **Description** | **References** |
| **Risks/Probabilities** | Death from other causes | Nonparametric | UK Lifetables. [1] |
| Sensitivity and Specificity of TTE in detecting ABN | Jointly estimated from Dirichlet distribution  (FN, TP, TN, FP) =  (5, 87, 83, 159) | Table 2 of Providencia et al 2012 [2] |
| Proportion of patients with ABN | Beta(2.5, 22.5) for CHADS2  Beta(0.5, 11.5) for CHA2DS2-VASc  (Both with prior of 0.5 added to both cell counts.) | Table 2 of Providencia et al 2012 [2] |
| Annual stroke risk by CHADS2 score | Annual risks (95% Credible intervals) by CHADS2 were reported as follows:  0.6% (0.5% to 0.7%) for CHADS2=0  3.0% (2.9% to 3.2%) for CHADS2=1  4.2% (4.0% to 4.4%) for CHADS2=2  7.1% (6.7% to 7.5%) for CHADS2=3  11.1% (10.4% to 11.8%) for CHADS2=4 | Friberg 2012[3] |
| Annual stroke risk in those with ABN | In the initial study four out of 50 patients with identified ABN had a stroke. This was used to produce a mean stroke rate of 8.0% and bootstrapped 95% CrIs of 7.2% to 8.2% | Stroke Prevention 1988 [4] |
| Relative risk (RR) of stroke in patients receiving dabigatran. | Indirect comparison simulation approach. One thousand simulated values from a lognormal distribution representing the RR of warfarin compared with placebo were multiplied by 1000 simulated values from a lognormal distribution comparing dabigatran with warfarin, to produce 1000 estimates of the RR of dabigatran compared with placebo. Mean RRs and 95% CIs/CrIs are shown below:  Reported RR warfarin vs. placebo: 0.33 (0.24 to 0.45)  Reported RR dabigatran vs. warfarin: 0.66 (0.53 to 0.82)  Derived RR dabigatran vs. placebo: 0.22 (0.15 to 0.32) | Lip et al 2006 for RR of warfarin compared with placebo [5]  Eikelboom et al 2011 for RR of dabigatran compared with warfarin[6] |
| Annual major bleeding risk for patients receiving dabigatran | Stratified by age. Credible interval calculated using simulation approach. Annual risk reported separately for people under 75 years, and people aged 75 years or older. Credible intervals were calculated by assuming sample sizes of 3618 for people aged under 75 years and 2419 for people aged 75 years or older, then sampling repeatedly and taking the values 2.5% and 97.5% of the way along the distributions. The central estimates (95% CrIs) are as follows:  Under 75: 2.1% (1.7 to 2.6%)  75 and older: 5.1% (4.2% to 6.0%) | Eikelboom et al 2011 [6] |
| Relative risk (RR) of stroke in patients receiving warfarin | Reported RR warfarin vs. placebo: 0.33 (0.24 to 0.45) | Lip et al 2006 [5] |
| Annual major bleeding risk for patients receiving warfarin | Stratified by age. Credible interval calculated using simulation approach. Annual risk reported separately for people under 75 years, and people aged 75 years or older. Credible intervals were calculated by assuming sample sizes of 3618 for people aged under 75 years and 2419 for people aged 75 years or older, then sampling repeatedly and taking the values 2.5% and 97.5% of the way along the distributions. The central estimates (95% CrIs) are as follows:  Under 75: 3.4% (2.5 to 3.6%)  75 and older: 4.4% (3.6% to 5.2%) | Eikelboom et al 2011 [6] |
| Relative risk (RR) of stroke in patients receiving rivaroxaban | Indirect comparison simulation approach. One thousand simulated values from a lognormal distribution representing the RR of warfarin compared with placebo were multiplied by 1000 simulated values from a lognormal distribution comparing dabigatran with warfarin, to produce 1000 estimates of the RR of dabigatran compared with placebo. Mean RRs and 95% CIs/CrIs are shown below:  Reported RR warfarin vs. placebo: 0.33 (0.24 to 0.45)  Reported RR Rivaroxaban vs. warfarin: 0.88 (0.74 to 1.03)  Derived RR Rivaroxaban vs. placebo: 0.30 (0.20 to 0.41) | Lip et al 2006 for RR of warfarin compared with placebo [5]  Patel et al 2011 for RR of rivaroxaban compared with warfarin [7] |
| Annual major bleeding risk for patients receiving rivaroxaban | The annual risk of bleeding given rivaroxaban was estimated indirectly by combining estimates of the risk of bleed given warfarin compared with placebo with estimates of the risk of bleed given rivaroxiban compared with warfarin. The central estimates (95% CrIs) were estimated to be as follows:  Under 75: 3.2% (2.5% to 4.0%)  75 or older: 4.6% (3.6% to 5.7%) | Eikelboom et al 2011 [6]  Patel et al 2011 [7] |
| Outcome following stroke | Simulation & mapping based approach described in an upcoming report.  The proportion dying of a stroke (95% CrI) was estimated to be 0.25 (0.23 to 0.27); the proportion in an independent state was estimated to be 0.56 (0.52 to 0.59); and the proportion in an dependent state following a stroke was estimated to be 0.19 (0.16 to 0.23). | Method described in report using results published in Rivero-Arias et al 2010 [8] |
| Outcome following a major bleeding event | Previous estimates | Simpson et al 2010 [9] |
| **Utilities** | Baseline utilities by age and gender | Regression based approach, described in full in the reference. HRQoL is estimated as a function of age and gender, using the equation for the general population. | Ara et al 2010 [10] |
| Utility multiplier following stroke, utility multiplier following major non-fatal intracranial bleed | Simulation & mapping based approach described in an upcoming report.  Utility multipliers (95% CrIs) were estimated to be 0.822 (0.819 to 0.824) for an independent state following a stroke, and 0.482 (0.477 to 0.487) for a dependent state following a stroke. | Method described in report results published in  Rivero-Arias et al 2010 [8] |
| **Costs** | Annual cost of dabigatran | £920. A fixed cost was assumed. | NICE FAD, 2011 [11] |
| Annual cost of rivaroxaban | £767. A fixed cost was assumed. | London New Drugs Group [12] |
| Annual cost of warfarin | £252 to £259 including monitoring costs. A uniform distribution was assumed. | BNF [13] |
| Cost of TTE | £66 | NHS Reference Costs [14] |
| Cost of death due to stroke | £7,019 (95% CrI £6,975 to £7,064) | Sandercock et al 2002 [15] |
| Costs in stroke survivors | Various. Differing according to dependent and independent states. Subdivided into one-off and continuing costs. Estimates (95% CrIs) are as follows:  Dependent stroke, one-off costs: £2830 (£2708 to £2952)  Dependent stroke, continuing annual cost: £6386 (£5749 to £7023)  Independent stroke, one-off costs: £542 (£513 to £571)  Independent stroke, continuing annual cost: £3195 (£2871 to £3518) | NHS Reference Costs [14]  NHS Stroke Strategy Impact Assessment [16]  Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2010 [17] |
| Costs of fatal bleed | Assumed identical to costs of death due to stroke | |
| Costs of nonfatal bleed | Major bleeds subdivided into gastrointestinal (GI) and intracranial (IC). GI bleeds were assumed to incur a one-off cost but no continuing costs. The one-off cost (95% CrI) was £1261 (£1212 to £1310).  For IC bleeds, the costs depended on the Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS) level of disability that they cause, from GOS 2 (most severe) to GOS 5 (least severe).  The one-off costs (95% CrIs) used were as follows:  GOS 2: £46785 (£40895 to £53250)  GOS 3: £10096 (£8849 to £11363)  GOS 4: £27419 (£22582 to £32964)  GOS 5: £1261 (£1211 to £1309)  GOS 4 and GOS 5 states were assumed not to have ongoing costs. The ongoing annual costs (95% CrIs) of the other states were as follows:  GOS 2: £50047 (£49645 to £50343)  GOS 3: £33949 (£33843 to £33969) | NHS Reference Costs [14] |

Table 1 Parameters used in model
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## Appendix B: Sensitivity and Specificity tables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***W\_50*** | | *Specificity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_M*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Sensitivity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 8.4 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 5.7 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 70.7 | 4.9 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 26.2 | 4.4 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 17.1 | 4.2 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 65.6 | 13.1 | 4.0 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 35.0 | 10.9 | 3.8 | | **0.8** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 24.5 | 9.5 | 3.8 | | **0.9** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 63.9 | 19.2 | 8.5 | 3.7 | | **1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 40.2 | 16.0 | 7.8 | 3.6 | |
| 1. W\_50\_0\_M |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***W\_65*** | | *Specificity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_M*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Sensitivity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 8.9 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 29.8 | 4.9 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 62.8 | 13.9 | 3.6 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 25.0 | 9.3 | 2.9 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 38.8 | 15.9 | 7.1 | 2.5 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 56.6 | 23.4 | 11.8 | 5.8 | 2.3 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | D | D | 80.4 | 32.1 | 16.9 | 9.4 | 5.0 | 2.1 | | **0.8** | D | D | D | D | >99 | 42.3 | 22.6 | 13.3 | 7.9 | 4.4 | 1.9 | | **0.9** | D | D | D | >99 | 54.5 | 28.9 | 17.5 | 11.0 | 6.9 | 4.0 | 1.8 | | **1** | D | D | >99 | 69.3 | 36.1 | 22.1 | 14.4 | 9.5 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 |  1. W\_65\_0\_M |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***W\_65*** | | Specificity | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_F*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Sensitivity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 8.1 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 24.4 | 4.6 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 39.8 | 12.9 | 3.4 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 54.5 | 21.0 | 9.0 | 2.8 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 68.6 | 28.8 | 14.4 | 7.0 | 2.5 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | >99 | 82.0 | 36.5 | 19.8 | 11.1 | 5.8 | 2.3 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | >99 | 94.7 | 44.1 | 25.1 | 15.2 | 9.1 | 5.0 | 2.1 | | **0.8** | D | D | >99 | >99 | 51.4 | 30.3 | 19.2 | 12.4 | 7.8 | 4.5 | 2.0 | | **0.9** | D | >99 | >99 | 58.4 | 35.4 | 23.2 | 15.7 | 10.6 | 6.9 | 4.1 | 1.9 | | **1** | >99 | >99 | 65.4 | 40.4 | 27.1 | 18.9 | 13.3 | 9.2 | 6.1 | 3.7 | 1.8 | | |
| 1. W\_65\_0\_F | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***R\_50*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_M*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 7.5 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 5.1 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 38.2 | 4.3 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 19.0 | 3.9 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 82.0 | 13.3 | 3.6 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 35.4 | 10.5 | 3.5 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 23.2 | 8.9 | 3.3 | | **0.8** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 54.8 | 17.7 | 7.8 | 3.2 | | **0.9** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 34.4 | 14.5 | 7.1 | 3.2 | | **1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | 78.5 | 25.5 | 12.4 | 6.5 | 3.1 | | |
| 1. R\_50\_0\_M | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***R\_50*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_F*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 7.5 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 5.2 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 35.2 | 4.4 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 19.1 | 4.0 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 63.0 | 13.7 | 3.8 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 32.9 | 11.0 | 3.7 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 90.7 | 22.9 | 9.4 | 3.6 | | **0.8** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 46.8 | 17.9 | 8.3 | 3.5 | | **0.9** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 32.2 | 14.9 | 7.5 | 3.4 | | **1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | 60.7 | 24.8 | 12.9 | 6.9 | 3.4 | | | |
| 1. R\_50\_0\_F | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***R\_65*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_M*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 8.0 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 20.4 | 4.4 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 31.5 | 10.8 | 3.1 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 41.5 | 16.9 | 7.5 | 2.5 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 50.7 | 22.7 | 11.7 | 5.8 | 2.2 | | **0.6** | D | D | D | D | >99 | 59.1 | 28.2 | 15.7 | 9.0 | 4.8 | 1.9 | | **0.7** | D | D | D | >99 | 66.7 | 33.4 | 19.6 | 12.1 | 7.4 | 4.1 | 1.7 | | **0.8** | D | D | >99 | 73.8 | 38.4 | 23.4 | 15.2 | 9.9 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 1.6 | | **0.9** | D | >99 | 80.3 | 43.2 | 27.1 | 18.1 | 12.4 | 8.4 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 1.5 | | **1** | >99 | 86.3 | 47.7 | 30.6 | 21.0 | 14.8 | 10.5 | 7.3 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 1.4 | | | |
| 1. R\_65\_0\_M | | |
|  | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***R\_65*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_F*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 77.0 | 7.3 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 65.3 | 17.4 | 4.1 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 61.4 | 23.9 | 10.1 | 3.0 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 59.5 | 28.4 | 14.8 | 7.3 | 2.4 | | **0.5** | D | D | D | D | >99 | 58.3 | 31.7 | 18.6 | 10.9 | 5.8 | 2.1 | | **0.6** | D | D | >99 | >99 | 57.5 | 34.2 | 21.8 | 14.0 | 8.7 | 4.8 | 1.9 | | **0.7** | D | >99 | >99 | 57.0 | 36.3 | 24.4 | 16.7 | 11.3 | 7.3 | 4.2 | 1.7 | | **0.8** | >99 | 93.2 | 56.6 | 37.9 | 26.6 | 19.0 | 13.6 | 9.5 | 6.3 | 3.7 | 1.6 | | **0.9** | 87.0 | 56.2 | 39.3 | 28.5 | 21.1 | 15.6 | 11.5 | 8.2 | 5.6 | 3.4 | 1.5 | | **1** | 56.0 | 40.4 | 30.1 | 22.9 | 17.5 | 13.3 | 10.0 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 1.5 | | | |
| 1. R\_65\_0\_F | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***D\_65*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_M*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | 44.1 | 6.8 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 36.0 | 12.8 | 3.6 | | **0.3** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 84.7 | 33.4 | 16.2 | 7.6 | 2.5 | | **0.4** | D | D | D | D | >99 | 62.0 | 32.0 | 18.3 | 10.5 | 5.5 | 1.9 | | **0.5** | D | D | >99 | >99 | 52.3 | 31.2 | 19.8 | 12.7 | 7.9 | 4.3 | 1.6 | | **0.6** | >99 | >99 | 79.3 | 46.9 | 30.7 | 20.9 | 14.4 | 9.8 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 1.4 | | **0.7** | >99 | 66.5 | 43.5 | 30.3 | 21.8 | 15.8 | 11.4 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 1.2 | | **0.8** | 58.8 | 41.1 | 30.0 | 22.4 | 16.9 | 12.7 | 9.4 | 6.7 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 1.1 | | **0.9** | 39.3 | 29.8 | 22.9 | 17.8 | 13.8 | 10.6 | 8.0 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | | **1** | 29.6 | 23.4 | 18.6 | 14.8 | 11.7 | 9.2 | 7.0 | 5.2 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 1.0 | | | |
| 1. D\_65\_0\_M | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***D\_65*** | | *Sensitivity* | | | | | | | | | | | | ***0\_F*** | | **0** | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** | | *Specificity* | **0** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | ∞ | | **0.1** | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | 28.3 | 6.2 | | **0.2** | D | D | D | D | D | >99 | >99 | 46.8 | 23.8 | 11.2 | 3.3 | | **0.3** | D | D | >99 | >99 | 99.6 | 57.0 | 35.4 | 22.2 | 13.4 | 7.1 | 2.4 | | **0.4** | >99 | >99 | 97.7 | 63.5 | 43.6 | 30.6 | 21.5 | 14.7 | 9.5 | 5.3 | 1.9 | | **0.5** | 96.6 | 67.9 | 49.8 | 37.2 | 28.0 | 21.0 | 15.5 | 11.0 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 1.6 | | **0.6** | 54.5 | 42.5 | 33.5 | 26.4 | 20.7 | 16.1 | 12.2 | 8.9 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 1.4 | | **0.7** | 38.1 | 31.0 | 25.3 | 20.5 | 16.5 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 7.5 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 1.3 | | **0.8** | 29.3 | 24.5 | 20.4 | 16.8 | 13.7 | 11.0 | 8.6 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 1.2 | | **0.9** | 23.9 | 20.2 | 17.1 | 14.3 | 11.8 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 1.1 | | **1** | 20.1 | 17.3 | 14.7 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 1.1 | | | |
| 1. D\_65\_0\_F | | |

Table 2 Effect of assumed sensitivity and specificity of device on estimated cost effectiveness. D: dabigatran; W: Warfarin; R: rivaroxaban; M: Male; F: Female; 65: 65 years old; 50: 50 years old

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | ***Cause of Death (%)*** | | | ***Average Number of Events*** | | | |
| ***OAC*** | ***Patient population[[1]](#footnote-1)*** | ***Strategy*** | **Life Years** | **Stroke** | **Bleed** | **Other** | **Dependent Strokes** | **Independent Strokes** | **ICH** | **NICH** |
| **Warfarin** | **Male, 50 years old** | **Without TTE** | 28.840 | 11.7 | 1.3 | 87.1 | 0.120 | 0.242 | 0.010 | 0.075 |
| **With TTE** | 28.928 | 10.8 | 1.8 | 87.4 | 0.111 | 0.223 | 0.014 | 0.112 |
| **Female, 50 years old** | **Without TTE** | 31.633 | 13.5 | 1.6 | 84.9 | 0.139 | 0.278 | 0.012 | 0.091 |
| **With TTE** | 31.734 | 12.6 | 2.1 | 85.2 | 0.130 | 0.259 | 0.017 | 0.130 |
| **Male, 65 years old** | **Without TTE** | 17.131 | 9.0 | 0.9 | 90.2 | 0.087 | 0.192 | 0.007 | 0.052 |
| **With TTE** | 17.204 | 8.0 | 1.3 | 90.7 | 0.078 | 0.172 | 0.010 | 0.079 |
| **Female, 65 years old** | **Without TTE** | 19.447 | 10.6 | 1.1 | 88.3 | 0.105 | 0.225 | 0.009 | 0.065 |
| **With TTE** | 19.531 | 9.6 | 1.6 | 88.8 | 0.096 | 0.205 | 0.012 | 0.095 |
| **Rivaroxaban** | **Male, 50 years old** | **Without TTE** | 28.861 | 11.5 | 1.3 | 87.2 | 0.117 | 0.239 | 0.010 | 0.075 |
| **With TTE** | 28.963 | 10.5 | 1.8 | 87.6 | 0.108 | 0.219 | 0.014 | 0.113 |
| **Female, 50 years old** | **Without TTE** | 31.657 | 13.3 | 1.6 | 85.1 | 0.136 | 0.275 | 0.012 | 0.091 |
| **With TTE** | 31.772 | 12.4 | 2.1 | 85.5 | 0.127 | 0.255 | 0.017 | 0.130 |
| **Male, 65 years old** | **Without TTE** | 17.141 | 8.8 | 0.9 | 90.3 | 0.085 | 0.190 | 0.007 | 0.052 |
| **With TTE** | 17.221 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 90.9 | 0.076 | 0.169 | 0.010 | 0.080 |
| **Female, 65 years old** | **Without TTE** | 19.460 | 10.5 | 1.1 | 88.4 | 0.103 | 0.223 | 0.009 | 0.066 |
| **With TTE** | 19.554 | 9.4 | 1.6 | 89.0 | 0.093 | 0.201 | 0.012 | 0.096 |
| **Dabigatran** | **Male, 65 years old** | **Without TTE** | 17.158 | 8.6 | 0.9 | 90.5 | 0.081 | 0.188 | 0.007 | 0.053 |
| **Female, 65 years old** | **With TTE** | 17.251 | 7.5 | 1.3 | 91.2 | 0.072 | 0.163 | 0.010 | 0.081 |

## Appendix C: Simulated clinical outcomes

## Appendix D: Scatterplots of estimated difference in costs and health outcomes from probabilistic sensitivity analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| X:\BMJ Echo AF Manuscript\S8\scatter_W_50_M.jpeg | X:\BMJ Echo AF Manuscript\S8\scatter_W_50_F.jpeg |
| a ) Warfarin, 50 years old, males | b) Warfarin, 50 years old, females |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| X:\BMJ Echo AF Manuscript\S8\scatter_W_65_M.jpeg | X:\BMJ Echo AF Manuscript\S8\scatter_W_65_F.jpeg |
| c ) Warfarin, 65 years old, males | d) Warfarin, 65 years old, females |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\R_50_0_M__PSA.jpeg | X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\R_50_0_F__PSA.jpeg |
| e ) Rivaroxaban, 50 years old, males | f) Rivaroxaban, 50 years old, females |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\R_65_0_M__PSA.jpeg | X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\R_65_0_F__PSA.jpeg |
| g ) Rivaroxaban, 65 years old, males | h) Rivaroxaban, 65 years old, females |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\D_65_0_M__PSA.jpeg | X:\EchoAF\R\Figures\D_65_0_F__PSA.jpeg |
| i ) Dabigatran 65 years old, males | j) Dabigatran, 65 years old, females |

Table 3 Scatterplots of estimated differences in health outcomes (in QALYs) and cost between the TTE and no TTE strategy for the ten populations simulated. QALY: Quality-adjusted life years. TTE: transthoracic echocardiography

## Appendix E: Summary of cost-effectiveness results of TTE compared with no TTE strategies for the 10 patient populations under consideration

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OAC | Patient Population | Strategy | Mean Cost (£) | Mean QALY | ICER (95% CrI), £/QALY | TTE dominated? |
| Warfarin | Male, Aged 50 | No TTE | 2459 | 13.60 | -26 489  (-26 552 to -26 408) | Yes |
| TTE | 4712 | 13.51 |
| Female, Aged 50 | No TTE | 2815 | 14.27 | -34 078  (-34 175 to -33 952) | Yes |
| TTE | 5405 | 14.19 |
| Male, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1527 | 9.12 | 66 793  (66 217 to 67 599) | No |
| TTE | 2467 | 9.13 |
| Female, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1974 | 9.94 | 39 485  (39 291 to 39 754) | No |
| TTE | 3106 | 9.97 |
| Rivaroxaban | Male, Aged 50 | No TTE | 2449 | 13.61 | -34 060  (-34 170 to -33 910) | Yes |
| TTE | 4614 | 13.54 |
| Female, Aged 50 | No TTE | 2779 | 14.27 | -47 535  (-47 773 to -47 271) | Yes |
| TTE | 5315 | 14.22 |
| Male, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1510 | 9.12 | 30 310  (30 179 to 30 487) | No |
| TTE | 2393 | 9.15 |
| Female, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1955 | 9.95 | 22 751  (22 681 to 22 844) | No |
| TTE | 3039 | 9.99 |
| Dabigatran | Male, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1487 | 9.13 | 14 728  (14 693 to 14 782) | No |
| TTE | 2321 | 9.18 |
| Female, Aged 65 | No TTE | 1942 | 9.95 | 12 314  (12 290 to 12 348) | No |
| TTE | 2946 | 10.01 |

Table 4 Summary of cost effectivness results. ICER: Incremental cost effectivness ratio. TTE: transthoracic echocardiography; QALY: Quality-adjusted life year. Dominated: the strategy is both more expensive and less effective than the strategy to which it is compared

1. All populations had initial CHADS2 scores of 0 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)