Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs): A Key Metric in Pharmacoeconomic Evaluation

Christian Thomas*

Department of Management, Evaluation and Health Policy, School of Public Health, University of Montreal, Montreal, QC, Canada

Introduction

Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) have emerged as a cornerstone metric in pharmacoeconomic evaluation, providing a comprehensive framework for assessing the impact of healthcare interventions on patient Health-Related Quality Of Life (HRQoL). Rooted in the principles of health economics and outcomes research, QALYs offer a standardized measure that integrates both quantity and quality of life into single metric, thereby facilitating comparative analyses of diverse healthcare interventions across different disease states and populations. This essay endeavours to explore the conceptual underpinnings of QALYs, elucidate their methodological underpinnings, examine their applications in pharmacoeconomic evaluation, and discuss their implications for healthcare decision-making. At its essence, the concept of QALYs embodies the notion that not all life years are of equal value, and health-related quality of life represents a crucial dimension in assessing the overall welfare gains attributable to healthcare interventions. Unlike conventional metrics such as life expectancy or survival rates, which focus solely on the duration of life, QALYs integrate measures of health status and HRQoL, thereby providing a more nuanced understanding of the health outcomes associated with different interventions. By weighting each period of life according to its quality, QALYs enable analysts to quantify the overall impact of healthcare interventions on patient well-being, accounting for both the quantity and quality of life gained or lost [1].

Description

The calculation of QALYs typically involves two key components: health state utilities and time. Health state utilities represent the subjective preferences or valuations that individuals assign to different health states, reflecting the perceived desirability or quality of life associated with each state. These utilities are typically measured on a scale ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 represents a state equivalent to death, and 1 denotes perfect health or full quality of life. Intermediate values between 0 and 1 capture varying degrees of impairment or disability, with lower values indicating poorer health status and diminished quality of life. To derive health state utilities, researchers often employ preference-based instruments such as the EuroQol five-dimensional questionnaire (EQ-5D) or the Health Utilities Index (HUI), which elicit individuals' preferences for different health states through direct valuation techniques or multi-attribute utility functions. These instruments allow respondents to evaluate their health status across multiple dimensions, such as mobility, self-care, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression, and cognition, thereby generating a composite index of health-related quality of life that can be used to assign utility scores to specific health states [2].

Once health state utilities are obtained, the next step involves estimating the duration or time spent in each health state, accounting for transitions between states over time. This temporal dimension is critical in calculating QALYs, as it captures both the length of time spent in different health states and the corresponding quality of life associated with each state. By multiplying the utility score for each health state by the time spent in that state, analysts can compute the QALYs accrued over a specified time horizon, thereby quantifying the overall impact of an intervention on patient well-being in terms of both quantity and quality of life. The application of QALYs in pharmacoeconomic evaluation encompasses a wide array of healthcare interventions, ranging from pharmaceutical therapies and medical devices to surgical procedures and public health interventions. Within the context of pharmaceuticals, QALYs serve as a pivotal metric for assessing the cost-effectiveness of different drugs, comparing their relative benefits in terms of improvements in HRQoL and life expectancy against their costs. By quantifying the incremental QALYs gained or lost relative to a comparator, such as standard of care or placebo, analysts can compute the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), which expresses the additional cost per QALY gained by the intervention [3].

The use of QALYs in pharmacoeconomic evaluation offers several advantages over traditional outcome measures, such as survival rates or disease-specific endpoints. Firstly, QALYs provide a comprehensive and standardized measure of health outcomes that can be applied across diverse disease states and patient populations, facilitating comparability and generalizability of study findings. Secondly, QALYs capture the multidimensional nature of health-related quality of life, encompassing physical, psychological, and social dimensions of well-being, thereby offering a more holistic assessment of patient outcomes. Furthermore, QALYs enable analysts to account for trade-offs between quantity and quality of life, thereby guiding resource allocation decisions based on the principle of maximizing health gains within resource constraints. By valuing health outcomes in terms of their impact on HRQoL, QALYs provide decision-makers with a common currency for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of competing healthcare interventions, irrespective of their therapeutic area or mode of action. This facilitates the rational allocation of healthcare resources, ensuring that resources are directed towards interventions that offer the greatest value for money in terms of improving patient well-being [4].

Despite its widespread adoption and utility, the use of QALYs in pharmacoeconomic evaluation is not without its challenges and controversies. One of the primary criticisms levelled against QALYs pertains to the measurement and valuation of health state utilities, which are inherently subjective and may vary across individuals, cultures, and contexts. Critics argue that the use of preference-based instruments to elicit utilities may not fully capture the complexity and diversity of patient preferences, leading to potential biases and inaccuracies in QALY estimates. Moreover, the application of QALYs raises ethical concerns regarding the valuation of health outcomes and the implications for healthcare resource allocation. Critics contend that QALYs may prioritize certain health conditions or patient populations over others, potentially exacerbating disparities in access to care and health outcomes. Additionally, the use of QALYs to inform reimbursement decisions or coverage policies has sparked debates regarding distributive justice, fairness, and the prioritization of health interventions based on their cost-effectiveness [5].

Conclusion

In conclusion, Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) represent a fundamental metric in pharmacoeconomic evaluation, providing a standardized measure of health outcomes that integrates both quantity and quality of life into a single metric. By quantifying the impact of healthcare interventions on patient well-being in terms of QALYs gained or lost, analysts can assess the cost-effectiveness of different interventions and inform resource allocation decisions within healthcare systems. Despite its methodological complexities and ethical considerations, QALYs remain indispensable in guiding healthcare policy, optimizing patient outcomes, and ensuring the efficient allocation of scarce resources in pursuit of improved population health and well-being.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Testa, Marcia A., and Donald C. Simonson. "Assessment of quality-of-life outcomes." *N Eng J Med* 334 (1996): 835-840.

2. Mavranezouli, Ifigeneia, John E. Brazier, Donna Rowen and Michael Barkham. "Estimating a preference-based index from the Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation–Outcome Measure (CORE-OM) valuation of CORE-6D." *Med Decis Mak* 33 (2013): 381-395.

3. Chen, Gang, and Julie Ratcliffe. "A review of the development and application of generic multi-attribute utility instruments for paediatric populations." *Pharmacoeconomics* 33 (2015): 1013-1028.

4. Duru Gérard, Jean Paul Auray, Ariel Béresniak and Michel Lamure, et al. "Limitations of the methods used for calculating quality-adjusted life-year values." *Pharmacoeconomics* 20 (2002): 463-473.

5. Young, Tracey, Yaling Yang, John E. Brazier and Aki Tsuchiya, et al. "The first stage of developing preference-based measures: Constructing a health-state classification using Rasch analysis." *Qual Life Res* 18 (2009): 253-265.