Cost-Effectiveness of Primary Prevention Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillator Treatment: Data from a Large Clinical Registry

JOEP THIJSSEN, M.D.,* M. ELSKE VAN DEN AKKER VAN MARLE, PH.D.,†
C. JAN WILLEM BORLEFFS, M.D., PH.D.,* JOHANNES B. VAN REES, M.D.,* MIHÁLY K. DE BIE, M.D.,* ENNO T. VAN DER VELDE, PH.D.,* LIESELOT VAN ERVEN, M.D., PH.D.,*
and MARTIN J. SCHALIJ, M.D., PH.D.*

From the *Department of Cardiology; and †Department of Medical Decision Making, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, the Netherlands

Background: *Although randomized trials have shown the beneficial effect on survival of an implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) as primary prevention therapy in selected patients, data concerning the cost-effectiveness in routine clinical practice remain scarce. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to assess the cost-effectiveness of primary prevention ICD implantation in the real world.*

Methods: *Patients receiving primary prevention single-chamber or dual-chamber ICD implantation at the Leiden University Medical Center were included in the study. Using a Markov model, lifetime cost, life years (LYs), and gained quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) were estimated for device recipients and control patients. Data on mortality, complication rates, and device longevity were retrieved from our center and entered into the Markov model. To account for model assumptions, one-way deterministic and probabilistic sensitivity analyses were performed. Importantly, calculations for the estimated incremental cost-effectiveness rate (ICER) per QALY gained are based on several numbers of assumptions, and accordingly findings may have over- or underestimated the cost-effectiveness of ICD therapy.*

Results: *Primary prevention ICD implantation adds an estimated mean of 2.07 LYs and 1.73 QALYs. Increased lifetime cost for single-chamber and dual-chamber ICD recipients were estimated at €60,788 and €64,216, respectively. This resulted for single-chamber ICD recipients, in an estimated ICER of €35,154 per QALY gained. In dual-chamber ICD recipients, an estimated ICER of €37,111 per QALY gained was calculated. According to the probabilistic sensitivity analysis, estimated cost per QALY gained are €35,837 (95% confidence interval [CI]: €28,368–€44,460) for single-chamber and €37,756 (95% CI: €29,055–€46,050) for dual-chamber ICDs.*

Conclusions: *On the basis of data and detailed costs, derived from routine clinical practice, ICD therapy in selected patients with a reduced left ventricular ejection fraction appears to be cost-effective. (PACE 2014; 37:25–34)*

cost-benefit analysis, implantable cardioverter defibrillator, left ventricular ejection fraction, primary prevention

Introduction

Multiple randomized studies have demonstrated a survival benefit in selected groups of patients with ischemic and nonischemic heart disease following implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) implantation.[1–7]

With the recommendation of ICD therapy as prophylaxis for sudden cardiac death (SCD) in patients with a depressed left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), worldwide implantation rates have increased significantly.[8,9] Concomitantly, the costs associated with ICD treatment increased as well, putting a heavy cost burden on healthcare systems, making it essential to assess the cost-effectiveness of ICDs.[10,11] Previously, several studies have assessed the cost-effectiveness of the primary prevention use of ICDs and demonstrated that ICDs may be cost-effective if current guidelines are followed.[12–18] However, it is difficult

Funding sources: Department of Cardiology, Leiden University Medical Center, the Netherlands, receives unrestricted research grants from Biotronik, Medtronic, and Boston Scientific not related to the current analysis.

Address for reprints: Martin J. Schalij, M.D., PH.D., Department of Cardiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA Leiden, the Netherlands, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC Leiden, the Netherlands. Fax: 31 71 526 6809; e-mail: m.j.schalij@lumc.nl

Received January 17, 2013; revised May 26, 2013; accepted June 3, 2013.

doi: 10.1111/pace.12238

to extrapolate these results to routine clinical practice since these studies mainly used experts' opinions for complication rates, device longevity, and costs.

Since 1996, all patients receiving an ICD at the Leiden University Medical Center have been assessed and followed-up. This thoroughly screened cohort provided a unique opportunity to assess cost-effectiveness of primary prevention ICD implantation based on clinical data and detailed costs derived from routine clinical practice.

Methods

Design of the Study

The estimated lifetime cost and effects of primary prevention ICD implantation were compared with conventional pharmacological therapy in patients with a reduced LVEF using a Markov model. For the current analysis, a model initially developed by Sanders et al. and thereafter further adapted by Cowie et al. was used.[13,15] In this model, a hypothetical cohort of patients receiving ICD therapy and/or conventional pharmacological therapy were tracked using a 1-month cycle length. In each model cycle, patients from both cohorts were at risk for SCD, heart failure death (HFD), other cardiac death (OCD), and noncardiac death (NCD). Also, patients receiving ICD therapy were at risk for ICD treatment-related complications such as operative death, implant-associated complications, device-associated complications, and discontinuation of ICD therapy. Furthermore, associated medical costs were included in the model and therewith provide the opportunity to estimate the lifetime costs and effects of patients receiving ICD therapy or conventional pharmacological therapy.

In the previous model, however, trial data were based on expert opinion and manufacturer data, whereas in this study these inputs (i.e., complication rates, device longevity, and costs) were based upon actual data of routine clinical practice at the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), the Netherlands.

Cost-effectiveness was calculated for both single-chamber and dual-chamber ICD devices. Data entered in the model were derived from 483 consecutive patients with a reduced LVEF (≤35%) who received a primary prevention single-chamber (n = 45, 9%) or dual-chamber (n = 438, 91%) ICD in the LUMC between January 1996 and September 2009. Eligibility for ICD implantation was based on international guidelines for primary prevention.[8,9] Baseline characteristics for the complete group are summarized in Table I. During a mean follow-up of 31.7 ± 26.9 months, 22 single-chamber and 86 dual-chamber replacement devices were implanted. Eleven (2%) patients without data for the most recent 6 months prior to the end of the study were considered lost to follow-up; however, they were included in the analysis as far as data were acquired.

Table I.

Baseline Patient Characteristics

	Total (n = 483)
Clinical characteristics	
Age (years)	61 ± 11
Male (%)	409 (85)
Left ventricular ejection fraction (%)	27 ± 7
QRS, mean (SD), ms	111 ± 26
Renal clearance, mean (SD), mL/min	85 ± 35
Ischemic heart disease (%)	399 (83)
History of atrial fibrillation/flutter (%)	96 (20)
Medication	
ACE inhibitors/AT II antagonist (%)	423 (88)
Aspirin (%)	239 (49)
β-blocker (%)	331 (69)
Diuretics (%)	328 (68)
Statins (%)	359 (74)
Antiarrhythmic medication†	
Amiodarone (%)	45 (9)
Sotalol (%)	57 (12)

†Patients could be treated with >1 antiarrhythmic drug.
ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; AT = angiotensin; SD = standard deviation.

Life years (LYs) and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained were discounted at 1.5% per annum, and costs were discounted at 4% per annum.[19–21]

Death Probabilities

The overall mortality rate in patients with reduced LVEF who received primary prevention ICD implantation was founded on data from routine clinical practice. Since specific causes of death were unavailable in our center, modeling into different categories of death was predicated upon the meta-analysis of mortality rates from six primary prevention trials conducted by Cowie et al.[13] The overall mortality rate in ICD recipients from routine clinical practice was distributed over four different categories of death (SCD, HFD, OCD, and NCD) in the same proportion as found in the pooled estimate derived from the meta-analysis. Noncardiac mortality was adjusted to age by incorporating the Dutch lifetable (statline.cbs.nl).

The efficacy of ICD therapy was defined as the relative risk of death for each type of mortality

Table II.

Estimated Mortality Rates for Different Categories of Death Based on Data from a Meta-Analysis of Six Primary Prevention Trials and the All-Cause Mortality Rate of the Leiden ICD Population

	Meta-Analysis†		Current Study	
	ICD Therapy	Conventional Therapy	ICD Therapy	Conventional Therapy
One-month death probability				
Sudden cardiac death	0.0015	0.0042	0.0009*	0.0025*
Heart failure death	0.0029	0.0029	0.0017*	0.0018*
Other cardiac death	0.0004	0.0002	0.0002*	0.0001*
Noncardiac death	0.0024	0.0031	0.0014*	0.0019*
All-cause	0.0072	0.0105	0.0043	0.0063*

*Estimated values.
†Meta-analysis of mortality rates from the following primary prevention trials: AMIOVIRT, MADIT I, MADIT II, SCD-HeFT, CAT, and DEFINIT. ICD = implantable cardioverter defibrillator.

outcome in the ICD therapy group when compared with the control group. Given that mortality data of a reliable control group (i.e., without ICD therapy) from routine clinical practice were available, the mortality rates of the control group were assessed by using the mortality rates of the ICD therapy group and the relative risks provided by the meta-analysis of Cowie et al.[13]

In our cohort, 62 patients died during a mean follow-up of 31.7 months, resulting in a monthly death probability of 0.0043 for ICD patients in the current analysis. In the meta-analysis of Cowie et al., the monthly death probability for ICD patients was 0.0072 and for patients receiving conventional pharmacological therapy was 0.0105.[13] This resulted in an adjusted death probability for the hypothetical cohort of patients receiving conventional pharmacological therapy in the current analysis of 0.0063. According to the pooled estimate derived from the meta-analysis, these overall monthly death probabilities were then proportionally distributed over the four different categories of death (SCD, HFD, OCD, and NCD) (Table II). It was assumed that the benefit of ICD therapy was constant over time.

Complications of ICD Therapy

Patients with reduced LVEF who received primary prevention ICD implantation were at risk for device-associated complications. The following complications were included in the model: operative death, device infection, lead dislodgement, inappropriate shocks, discontinuing ICD therapy following inappropriate shock, and lead failures requiring replacement. The probability of experiencing such complications was based on data from routine clinical practice in our center and is presented in Table III. Complication rates were calculated for the complete group of devices (i.e., all single-chamber and dual-chamber devices). The effect of different complication rates was tested in the sensitivity analysis. Mean device longevity was based on data from our center, and was 4.6 years in single-chamber and 4.7 years in dual-chamber ICD devices.

Quality-of-Life

On the basis of the Sudden Cardiac Death in Heart Failure Trial (SCD-HeFT), an utility score of 0.85 for both the ICD and the conventional therapy group was applied in the current model.[14] Furthermore, it was assumed that ICD implantation had no effect on the quality of life.[14,22] If patients were exposed to ICD-related complications (e.g., device infection, inappropriate shocks, and lead replacement) a utility score of 0.75 during a period of 1 month was assumed.[15]

Costs

Cost analyses were performed from the healthcare perspective. Costs of healthcare associated with inpatient and outpatient treatment were included. Device and lead costs were based on average contractual price agreements between the Dutch hospitals and manufacturers (expert's opinion). For all routine procedures and ICD treatment-related complications requiring hospital admission, the exact average duration of hospital stay, based on the clinical data available, was calculated and then multiplied with the standard cost per hospital day.[23] Procedural costs of device system implantation, device replacement, and lead replacement were derived in a microcost analysis including personnel costs, diagnostic test,

Table III.

Base Case Model Inputs

Model Inputs	ICD Therapy Single-Chamber	ICD Therapy Dual-Chamber	Conventional Therapy	Data Sources
One-month death probability single-chamber ICD cohort				
Sudden cardiac death	0.000916	0.000916	0.002538	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Heart failure death	0.001743	0.001743	0.001752	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Other cardiac death	0.000224	0.000224	0.000102	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Noncardiac death	0.001439	0.001439	0.001890	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
All-cause	0.004322	0.004322	0.006283	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Initial implant operative death probability	0.00207	0.00207	Not applicable	Clinical data
Mean follow-up (months)	31.7	31.7	28	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Mean age (years)	60.8	60.8	61.1	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
Gender (% male)	84.7	84.7	79.5	Clinical data/Cowie et al.[13]
One-month probability of inappropriate shocks	0.00538	0.00538	Not applicable	Clinical data
One-month probability of discontinuing ICD after inappropriate shocks	0.00000	0.00000	Not applicable	Clinical data
Monthly probability of a right atrial lead replacement due to failure following initial implant	Not applicable	0.00017	Not applicable	Clinical data
Monthly probability of a right ventricular lead replacement due to failure following initial implant	0.00127	0.00127	Not applicable	Clinical data
Monthly probability of a right atrial lead replacement due to failure following replacement implant	Not applicable	0.00083	Not applicable	Clinical data
Monthly probability of a right ventricular lead replacement due to failure following replacement implant	0.00234	0.00234	Not applicable	Clinical data
Probability of a lead infection at initial implant	0.02277	0.02277	Not applicable	Clinical data
Probability of a lead infection at replacement ICD implant	0.03704	0.03704	Not applicable	Clinical data
Probability of a lead dislodgement at initial implant	0.00828	0.00828	Not applicable	Clinical data
Probability of a lead dislodgement at replacement ICD implant	0.00000	0.00000	Not applicable	Clinical data
Initial device + leads cost (€) (2010)	19,600	22,150	Not applicable	Clinical data
Replacement device cost (€) (2010)	17,000	19,000	Not applicable	Clinical data
Atrial lead replacement cost per event (lead failure) (€) (2010)	Not applicable	2,845	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Right ventricular lead replacement cost per event (lead failure) (€) (2010)	4,895	4,895	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Lead infection cost (€) (2010)	29,561	32,111	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Lead dislodgement cost (€) (2010)	4,895	4,895	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Inappropriate shocks cost (€) (2010)	132	132	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Monthly long-term inpatient and outpatient cost (€) (2010)	197	197	197	RIVM 2008
ICD additional monthly follow-up cost (€) (2010)	43	43	Not applicable	Clinical data/Hakkaart et al.[23]
Mean device longevity (years)	4.6	4.7	Not applicable	Clinical data
Duration of ICD benefit	Lifetime	Lifetime	Not applicable	Assumption
Utility of heart failure patient annual	0.85	0.85	0.85	Mark et al.[14]
Utility of ICD complications state (annual)	0.75	0.75	Not applicable	Sanders et al.[15]
Discount rate outcomes (%)	1.5	1.5	1.5	CVZ 2006[19]
Discount rate costs (%)	4.0	4.0	4.0	CVZ 2006[19]

ICD = implantable cardioverter device.

Table IV.

Costs, Life Years, Quality-Adjusted Life Years, and Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratios for Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillator Compared with Control Therapy

	Cost (€)	LY	QALY	ICER (€/LY)	ICER (€/QALY)
Single-chamber					
Discounted					
ICD therapy	79,914	11.62	9.84	29,369	35,154
Control therapy	19,126	9.55	8.11		
Difference	60,788	2.07	1.73		
Undiscounted					
ICD therapy	104,428	13.24	11.21	31,282	37,641
Control therapy	25,299	10.70	9.09		
Difference	79,642	2.55	2.12		
Dual-chamber					
Discounted					
ICD therapy	83,342	11.62	9.84	31,025	37,111
Control therapy	19,126	9.55	8.11		
Difference	64,216	2.07	1.73		
Undiscounted					
ICD therapy	109,132	13.24	11.21	32,928	39,583
Control therapy	25,299	10.70	9.09		
Difference	83,833	2.55	2.12		

ICD = implantable cardioverter defibrillator; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; LY = life years; QALY = quality-adjusted life years.

costs of consumables used during the procedure, depreciation of the radiology equipment and catheterization laboratory, and overhead costs.[23] For routine ICD and unexpected ICD check-up (i.e., following an appropriate or inappropriate shock), cost of an outpatient visit was applied.[23] All prices were converted to the price level of 2011 according to the general Dutch consumer price index (statline.cbs.nl, accessed January 2011). Results of other studies, reported in U.S. dollars, were also converted to euros using the purchasing power parity index with a ratio of $1 = €0.8382 (stats.oecd.org, accessed December 2011).

In the current analysis, a cost-effectiveness ratio below €40,000 per gained QALY was assumed to be acceptable according to the current Dutch economic threshold.[24,25]

Sensitivity Analyses

To account for important model assumptions, one-way deterministic sensitivity analyses were performed. Ranges of the variables were established on current literature or on expert's opinion if literature was lacking.

Probabilistic sensitivity analysis (PSA) was performed to evaluate the combined uncertainty of individual input variables on the model's outcome of cost and effects. To achieve this, probability distributions for death and complication rates as well as the utilities scores associated with different states were defined and 10,000 simulations were undertaken.

Results

Base-Case Analysis

Following primary prevention ICD implantation, all-cause mortality decreased, resulting in an increased life expectancy of 2.07 years as compared with patients receiving conventional therapy. With an estimated utility score of 0.85 per LY saved and 0.75 if patients were exposed to ICD-related complications, incremental QALYs were 1.73 years for ICD recipients.

With respect to single-chamber ICDs, implantation is associated with an average additional lifetime cost of €60,788 per patient when compared with conventional therapy. Consequently, both the lifetime costs and the effectiveness (i.e., life expectancy) were higher in single-chamber ICD recipients as compared with patients receiving conventional therapy. Accordingly, this resulted in an estimated cost-effectiveness of €29,369 per LY gained and €35,154 per QALY gained for patients with a mean age of 61 years receiving single-chamber ICD therapy as compared with patients receiving conventional therapy (Table IV).



Figure 1. *Tornado diagram of the deterministic sensitivity analysis representing the five most sensitive factors with regard to the incremental cost per QALY of ICD therapy compared with conventional therapy. The estimated cost per QALY based on the base case analyses are demonstrated for both single-chamber (blue line) and dual-chamber (red line) ICDs. ICD = implantable cardioverter defibrillator; QALY = quality-adjusted life years.*

Regarding primary prevention dual-chamber ICD implantation, average additional lifetime cost of €64,216 per patient was calculated. With an increased life expectancy of 2.07 and an incremental QALY of 1.73, estimated cost-effectiveness of €31,025 per LY gained and €37,111 per QALY gained for patients with a mean age of 61 years receiving dual-chamber ICD therapy compared to patients receiving conventional therapy was assessed (Table IV).

Deterministic Sensitivity Analysis

With all model variables included in the sensitivity analysis, incremental cost-effectiveness of ICD therapy compared with conventional therapy demonstrated to be most sensitive to variation in the following five factors: device longevity, device and lead costs, quality of life, discount rates, and mortality rates (Fig. 1).

Device longevity in the current analyses (i.e., a mean of 4.6 years for single-chamber and 4.7 years for dual-chamber ICDs) was based on data from our own center. However, it is conceivable that device longevity varies according to the device settings and the generation of devices used per center. Accordingly, adaptation of the mean device longevity to 4 years resulted in an incremental cost-effectiveness of €38,123 and €40,746 per QALY for single-chamber and dual-chamber devices, respectively. When the mean device longevity was increased to 10 years, incremental cost-effectiveness improves to €23,744 and €25,273 per QALY for single-chamber and dual-chamber devices, respectively.

As a result, the factor device longevity demonstrated to have the largest effect on the total costs and cost-effectiveness of all factors in the deterministic model.

With respect to device and lead costs, a 25% lowering in prices would affect incremental cost-effectiveness by 19%. Outcomes ranged from €26,392 to €38,817 per QALY for single-chamber devices and from €28,638 to €42,487 per QALY for dual-chamber devices.

Variation in the patients' quality of life to 0.75 in both therapy groups (i.e., ICD and conventional therapy) resulted in an incremental cost-effectiveness of €36,376 per QALY for single-chamber and of €39,675 per QALY for dual-chamber ICD therapy. Consequently, if it was assumed that the patients' quality of life was 0.75 in the conventional therapy group and 0.80 in the ICD therapy group, incremental cost-effectiveness improved to €26,644 per QALY and €29,060 per QALY for single and dual-chamber ICDs, respectively.

A less favorable incremental cost-effectiveness ratio will result if discount rates for both outcomes and cost are assumed to be equal. The effect of the variation of discount rates between 0% (i.e., undiscounted) and the more internationally accepted 3% for both outcomes and costs on the incremental cost-effectiveness of primary prevention ICD therapy is illustrated in Figure 1.

Another important factor determining the incremental cost-effectiveness of ICD therapy is the mortality rate of patients applicable for primary prevention ICD implantation. On the basis of the outcomes of the deterministic sensitivity analysis, the incremental cost-effectiveness tended to be more favorable in patients with an increased annual mortality. This outcome could be explained by the fact that in the current model a higher mortality is associated with an increased number of SCDs and therewith an improved beneficial effect of ICD therapy. This results in a higher number of incremental LYs added for the ICD cohort as compared with the conventional pharmacological therapy cohort.

PSA

On the basis of the PSA, the incremental cost-effectiveness of single-chamber ICDs compared with conventional therapy resulted in a mean estimate of €35,837 per QALY (95% confidence interval [CI]: €28,368–€44,460 per QALY). For dual-chamber ICDs, the PSA resulted in a mean estimate of the incremental cost-effectiveness of €37,756 per QALY (95% CI: €29,055–€46,050 per QALY) when compared with conventional therapy. The cost-effectiveness acceptability curve in Figure 2 shows the probability that single-chamber and dual-chamber ICDs are cost-effective compared with conventional therapy for different



Figure 2. *Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve for single-chamber (blue line) and dual-chamber (red line) ICD therapy compared to conventional therapy.*

values of the willingness to pay. According to the Dutch threshold of €40,000 per QALY, the probability that ICD therapy is cost-effective was estimated at respectively 81% for single-chamber ICDs and 67% for dual-chamber ICDs.

Discussion

In the current analysis, primary prevention ICD implantation in addition to optimal pharmacologic therapy (i.e., conventional therapy) in patients with an increased risk for SCD as a result of a reduced LVEF was assessed with the use of a Markov model. On the basis of the deterministic analysis, both single-chamber and dual-chamber ICD implantation had an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio below the accepted threshold of €40,000 per QALY gained.[24,25] The probabilistic sensitivity analyses confirm these results, as both single-chamber and dual-chamber ICD therapy have a high probability of being cost-effective.

However, variation in specific model factors was demonstrated to have major impact on the cost-effectiveness of ICD therapy. For example, an increased device longevity due to improved device batteries would have a considerable beneficial effect on the cost-effectiveness and should therefore be one of the main incentives of device manufacturers in the development of new generation ICDs. Furthermore, significant higher prices for ICD and leads, with respect to base-case prices currently used, could easily result in less favorable or even unfavorable cost-effectiveness. Another important model factor with major impact on the cost-effectiveness is the quality of life. In this study, the quality of life is based on data derived from the SCD-HeFT trial in which all patients received devices unable to deliver antitachycardia pacing (ATP).[14] However, now a days almost all patients receive ICDs capable of ATP and as demonstrated by the PainFREE trial may experience a higher quality of life then reported in the SCD-HeFT trial.[26] Although exact data remain unclear, the deterministic sensitivity analysis demonstrated that an improved quality of life in ICD recipients could have a large, namely beneficial, impact on the actual cost-effectiveness reported in this study. Other factors with noteworthy effects on the cost-effectiveness were discount rates, mortality rates, and ICD efficacy.

Furthermore, worth mentioning is the relatively minor effect that most device-related complications had on the cost-effectiveness. Although complications such as lead infections requiring complete replacement of the device and leads are associated with extremely high costs, the relatively low incidence significantly reduces the effect on total cost-effectiveness.

Comparison with Different ICD Cost-Effectiveness Analyses

Currently, cost-effectiveness analyses of primary prevention ICD therapy in patients with a reduced LVEF using data from real clinical

Table V.

Results of Increased Costs, Increased Life Years, Increased Quality-Adjusted Life Years, and Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratios for Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators Compared with Control Therapy in Different Primary Prevention ICD Trials and the Current Analysis for Both Single-Chamber and Dual-Chamber Devices

Trial	Increase in Cost (€)	Increase in LY	Increase in QALY	ICER (€/LY)	ICER (€/QALY)
MADIT I[6,15]	77,200	3.64	2.64	21,207	29,254
MUSTT[3,15]	85,080	4.14	2.99	20,536	28,500
MADIT II[7,15,18]†	66,555	2.03	1.47	32,690	45,348
DEFINITE[15,27]	84,241	2.73	1.96	30,847	43,001
COMPANION[15,28]	57,251	1.87	1.36	30,595	42,163
SCD-HeFT[2,15]	59,514	1.40	1.01	42,498	58,842
Study single-chamber‡	60,788	2.07	1.73	29,369	35,154
Study dual-chamber‡	64,216	2.07	1.73	31,025	37,111

†The ICER in the MADIT II during a 12-year time horizon was $91,300/LY (65,238 €/LY) and assumed that the hazard ratio remained similar and constant as compared with the 3.5-year duration of the trial. A decrease in this hazard ratio would result in a less favorable ICER during this time interval. ‡Converted to euros using the purchasing power parity index with a ratio of $1 = €0.8382 (stats.oecd.org, accessed December 2011).
ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; LY = life years; QALY = quality-adjusted life years.

practice are scarce. However, based on analysis and meta-analysis of the major primary prevention trials of ICD therapy, several cost-effectiveness analyses have been published. Results from the SCD-HeFT trial demonstrated a comparable cost-utility ratio (discounted at 3%) of $41,530 (€34,810) per QALY for single-chamber ICDs as compared with medical therapy alone.[14] Of note is that, likewise the current analysis, Mark et al. assumed that the benefits of ICD therapy were constant over time and outcomes became economically attractive if benefits persist for at least 8 years, which was beyond the empirical 5-year trial data of the SCD-HeFT. Sanders et al. projected the cost-effectiveness of eight randomized trials in which primary prevention ICD implantation among patients who are at risk for SCD due to a reduced LVEF was evaluated.[15] In two of those trials, primary prevention ICD implantation did not reduce the risk of death, and thus was both more expensive and less effective than control therapy. Since in these two trials primary prevention ICD implantation occurred in selected patients who are not included in the current analysis, comparison with these outcomes is less appropriate. Regarding the six other trials included by Sanders et al., primary prevention single-chamber ICD implantation was projected to add between 1.01 and 2.99 QALYs and the incremental cost-effectiveness (discounted at 3%) ranged from $34,000 (€28,500) to $70,200 (€58,842) per QALY gained. Results of this study regarding the added LYs and incremental costs per QALY are for both single-chamber and dual-chamber ICDs amid these outcomes of Sanders et al. (Table V).

In the meta-analysis by Cowie et al., consisting of six primary prevention trials with inclusion criteria matching ACC/AHA/ESC Class I or IIa recommendations, direct medical costs were estimated using Belgian national references and complication rates were based on experts opinion.[13] In this analysis, primary prevention single-chamber ICD implantation was projected to add 1.88 LY, and the estimated mean lifetime costs per QALY gained were €29,530 and €31,717 according to the deterministic and PSA, respectively. These outcomes are comparable with outcomes of the current analyses, indicating that single-chamber and dual-chamber ICDs are, based on clinical data and detailed costs derived from routine clinical practice, cost-effective as primary prevention therapy in patients with a reduced LVEF ($\leq$35%).

Van Brabandt et al. criticized the fact that Cowie et al. based their results on a meta-analysis of six primary prevention trials rather than using data from the SCD-HeFT alone.[27] Hence, in the deterministic sensitivity analyses of the current study, ICD effectiveness was based on results from the SCD-HeFT alone and resulted in an incremental cost-effectiveness per QALY of €41,837 for single-chamber devices and of €44,182 for dual-chamber devices. Consequently, it can be concluded that ICDs would be approximately borderline cost-effective if effectiveness is based on results from the SCD-HeFT trial alone.

Limitations

In this study, mortality rates of the control group were assessed by using mortality rates of the ICD therapy group and the relative risks provided by the meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials by Cowie et al.[13] This was based on the assumption that the efficacy of ICD therapy in clinical practice is similar to the efficacy of ICD therapy demonstrated in the randomized clinical trials. In addition, the overall mortality rate of the ICD group and control group over the four different categories of death were distributed in a similar proportion as the pooled estimate derived from the meta-analysis. Furthermore, although clinical follow-up data were limited to a mean of 31.7 months, cost and benefits were projected to a lifetime horizon. Also, the current analysis was performed in a relatively small cohort of 483 patients with a low proportion of single-chamber ICDs. Finally, the long enrollment time may have resulted in heterogeneity regarding clinical management and device technology within the study cohort. Importantly, all the above study limitations could have resulted in an over- or underestimation of the beneficial effects of ICD therapy, consequently over- or underrating the cost-effectiveness of ICD therapy in clinical practice.

Implications for Society

In the current analyses, primary prevention ICD implantation has demonstrated to have a favorable effectiveness versus acceptable costs in patients with a reduced LVEF in the long term. However, despite existing guidelines supporting primary prevention implantation of ICDs in these patients, implementation hereof is currently far from complete as is demonstrated with the widely varying implantation rates across Europe.[9,30] This might be the result of the high upfront cost of ICD therapy following implantation and the large patient population in which it may be applied.[11] Consequently, wide penetration of ICD therapy in selected patients forms an absolute challenge to health policymakers, since healthcare expenditure for ICDs in Europe could easily exceed several billion euros per year. On the other hand, a saving effect might be expected due to an increased addition (i.e., work, consumption) to the general economy.

Furthermore it is worth mentioning that the current analysis reflected only the cost-effectiveness of primary prevention ICD therapy without resynchronization therapy in heart failure patients. Since patients, eligible for combined defibrillator and resynchronization therapy, are characterized by a more deteriorated form of heart failure, results of the current analysis do not apply for these patients.

Conclusion

On the basis of data from routine clinical practice, primary prevention single-chamber and dual-chamber ICD therapy in selected patients with a reduced LVEF appears to be cost-effective.

References

1. The Antiarrhythmics versus Implantable Defibrillators (AVID) Investigators. A comparison of antiarrhythmic-drug therapy with implantable defibrillators in patients resuscitated from near-fatal ventricular arrhythmias. N Engl J Med 1997; 337:1576–1583.
2. Bardy GH, Lee KL, Mark DB, Poole JE, Packer DL, Boineau R, Domanski M, et al. Amiodarone or an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator for congestive heart failure. N Engl J Med 2005; 352:225–237.
3. Buxton AE, Lee KL, Fisher JD, Josephson ME, Prystowsky EN, Hafley G. A randomized study of the prevention of sudden death in patients with coronary artery disease. Multicenter Unsustained Tachycardia Trial Investigators. N Engl J Med 1999; 341:1882–1890.
4. Connolly SJ, Gent M, Roberts RS, Dorian P, Roy D, Sheldon RS, Mitchell LB, et al. Canadian implantable defibrillator study (CIDS): A randomized trial of the implantable cardioverter defibrillator against amiodarone. Circulation 2000; 101:1297–1302.
5. Kuck KH, Cappato R, Siebels J, Ruppel R. Randomized comparison of antiarrhythmic drug therapy with implantable defibrillators in patients resuscitated from cardiac arrest: The Cardiac Arrest Study Hamburg (CASH). Circulation 2000; 102:748–754.
6. Moss AJ, Hall WJ, Cannom DS, Daubert JP, Higgins SL, Klein H, Levine JH, et al. Improved survival with an implanted defibrillator in patients with coronary disease at high risk for ventricular arrhythmia. Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial Investigators. N Engl J Med 1996; 335:1933–1940.
7. Moss AJ, Zareba W, Hall WJ, Klein H, Wilber DJ, Cannom DS, Daubert JP, et al. Prophylactic implantation of a defibrillator in patients with myocardial infarction and reduced ejection fraction. N Engl J Med 2002; 346:877–883.
8. Epstein AE, DiMarco JP, Ellenbogen KA, Estes NA III, Freedman RA, Gettes LS, Gillinov AM, et al. ACC/AHA/HRS 2008 Guidelines for Device-Based Therapy of Cardiac Rhythm Abnormalities: A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 Guideline Update for Implantation of Cardiac Pacemakers and Antiarrhythmia Devices): Developed in collaboration with the American Association for Thoracic Surgery and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. Circulation 2008; 117:e350–e408.
9. Zipes DP, Camm AJ, Borggrefe M, Buxton AE, Chaitman B, Fromer M, Gregoratos G, et al. ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 Guidelines for Management of Patients with Ventricular Arrhythmias and the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death: A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Develop Guidelines for Management of Patients With Ventricular Arrhythmias and the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death): Developed in collaboration with the European Heart Rhythm Association and the Heart Rhythm Society. Circulation 2006; 114:e385–e484.
10. Heidenreich PA, Trogdon JG, Khavjou OA, Butler J, Dracup K, Ezekowitz MD, Finkelstein EA, et al. Forecasting the future of cardiovascular disease in the United States: A policy statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2011; 123:933–944.
11. Hlatky MA, Sanders GD, Owens DK. Evidence-based medicine and policy: The case of the implantable cardioverter defibrillator. Health Aff (Millwood) 2005; 24:42–51.
12. Caro JJ, Ward A, Deniz HB, O'Brien JA, Ehreth JL. Cost-benefit analysis of preventing sudden cardiac deaths with an implantable

cardioverter defibrillator versus amiodarone. Value Health 2007; 10:13–22.
13. Cowie MR, Marshall D, Drummond M, Ferko N, Maschio M, Ekman M, de RL, et al. Lifetime cost-effectiveness of prophylactic implantation of a cardioverter defibrillator in patients with reduced left ventricular systolic function: Results of Markov modelling in a European population. Europace 2009; 11:716–726.
14. Mark DB, Nelson CL, Anstrom KJ, Al-Khatib SM, Tsiatis AA, Cowper PA, Clapp-Channing NE, et al. Cost-effectiveness of defibrillator therapy or amiodarone in chronic stable heart failure: Results from the Sudden Cardiac Death in Heart Failure Trial (SCD-HeFT). Circulation 2006; 114:135–142.
15. Sanders GD, Hlatky MA, Owens DK. Cost-effectiveness of implantable cardioverter-defibrillators. N Engl J Med 2005; 353:1471–1480.
16. Sanders GD, Kong MH, Al-Khatib SM, Peterson ED. Cost-effectiveness of implantable cardioverter defibrillators in patients > or = 65 years of age. Am Heart J 2010; 160:122–131.
17. Smith T, Jordaens L, Theuns DA, van Dessel PF, Wilde AA, Hunink MG. The cost-effectiveness of primary prophylactic implantable defibrillator therapy in patients with ischaemic or non-ischaemic heart disease: An European analysis. Eur Heart J 2013; 34:211–219.
18. Zwanziger J, Hall WJ, Dick AW, Zhao H, Mushlin AI, Hahn RM, Wang H, et al. The cost effectiveness of implantable cardioverter-defibrillators: Results from the Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial (MADIT)-II. J Am Coll Cardiol 2006; 47:2310–2318.
19. Dutch Guidelines for Pharmacoeconomic Research, updated version. Diemen, Health Care Insurance Board, 2006.
20. Gravelle H, Smith D. Discounting for health effects in cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis. Health Econ 2001; 10:587–599.
21. Klok RM, Brouwer WBF, Annemans LA, Bos JM, Postma MJ. Towards a healthier discount procedure. Exp Rev Pharmacoecon Outcome Res 2005; 5:59–63.
22. Noyes K, Corona E, Zwanziger J, Hall WJ, Zhao H, Wang H, Moss AJ, et al. Health-related quality of life consequences of implantable cardioverter defibrillators: Results from MADIT II. Med Care 2007; 45:377–385.
23. Hakkaart- van Roijen L, Tan SS, Bouwmans CAM. Manual for Costing: Methods and Standard Costs for Economic Evaluations in Health Care. [In Dutch]. Amstelveen, Dutch Health Insurance Executive Board, 2010.
24. Council for Public Health and Health Care (RVZ) [In Dutch]. Sensible and Sustainable Care, 2006.
25. Smulders YM, Thijs A. [The cost per year of life gained: Trends and internal contradictions]. Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd 2006; 150:2467–2470.
26. Wathen MS, DeGroot PJ, Sweeney MO, Stark AJ, Otterness MF, Adkisson WO, Canby RC, et al. Prospective randomized multicenter trial of empirical antitachycardia pacing versus shocks for spontaneous rapid ventricular tachycardia in patients with implantable cardioverter-defibrillators: Pacing Fast Ventricular Tachycardia Reduces Shock Therapies (PainFREE Rx II) trial results. Circulation 2004; 110:2591–2596.
27. van Brabandt H, Neyt M. Pitfalls in health-economic evaluations: The case of cost-effectiveness of prophylactic implantable cardioverter-defibrillator therapy in Belgium. Europace 2009; 11:1571–1573.
28. Ector H, Vardas P. Current use of pacemakers, implantable cardioverter defibrillators, and resynchronization devices: Data from the registry of the European Heart Rhythm Association. Eur Heart J Suppl 2007; 9:144–149.
29. Kadish A, Dyer A, Daubert JP, Quigg R, Estes NA, Anderson KP, Calkins H, et al. Prophylactic defibrillator implantation in patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy. N Engl J Med 2004; 350:2151–2158.
30. Bristow MR, Saxon LA, Boehmer J, Krueger S, Kass DA, De MT, Carson P, et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy with or without an implantable defibrillator in advanced chronic heart failure. N Engl J Med 2004; 350:2140–2150.