Systematic Review of Utility Values Used in the Pharmacoeconomic Evaluations for Schizophrenia: Implications on Cost-effectiveness Results

Elena Debreu*

Department of Clinical Correlates, London South Bank University, Borough Rd, UK

Introduction

The use of utility values in pharmacoeconomic evaluations plays a crucial role in determining the cost-effectiveness of treatments, particularly in chronic and debilitating conditions like schizophrenia. Utility values represent the preferences for different health states, often quantified on a scale where 0 represents death and 1 represents perfect health. These values are essential in calculating quality-adjusted life years, a key measure used in cost-utility analyses to assess the value of medical interventions. In the context of schizophrenia, a condition characterized by profound impacts on mental health, functioning, and quality of life, utility values are central to understanding the trade-offs between treatment costs and patient outcomes [1]. This systematic review examines the utility values used in pharmacoeconomic evaluations for schizophrenia, highlighting their implications on cost-effectiveness results. Schizophrenia is a severe mental disorder that affects millions of individuals worldwide, imposing significant personal, societal, and economic burdens. Treatments for schizophrenia include antipsychotic medications, psychosocial interventions, and support services, all of which aim to alleviate symptoms, improve functioning, and enhance quality of life. Pharmacoeconomic evaluations provide a framework for comparing these treatments by integrating clinical effectiveness with costs, helping policymakers allocate healthcare resources efficiently. Utility values are an integral part of these evaluations, as they allow the measurement of health benefits in terms of QALYs. However, the accuracy and consistency of these values can greatly influence the conclusions of cost-effectiveness analyses, making it essential to systematically review their use in schizophrenia research [2].

Description

A key finding of this review is the variability in utility values reported across studies. Differences in methodologies, populations, and health state descriptions contribute to this variability, complicating comparisons between pharmacoeconomic evaluations. For example, some studies derive utility values from generic preference-based measures like the EQ-5D, while others use condition-specific instruments or expert opinions. These differences in measurement tools can lead to discrepancies in utility values, reflecting not only the heterogeneity of the disease but also methodological inconsistencies. The use of generic instruments may fail to capture the unique aspects of schizophrenia, such as cognitive impairments and social withdrawal, leading to potential underestimation of the true impact of the disease on quality of life.

The population characteristics in utility value studies also play a significant role in the observed variability. Factors such as age, disease severity, and treatment status can influence the reported utility values, as these characteristics affect patients' health states and their perceived quality of life. For instance, utility values may be lower in patients experiencing acute psychotic episodes compared to those in remission or stable phases of the disease. Similarly, differences in cultural contexts and healthcare systems may lead to variations in how patients and caregivers value health states, further contributing to the observed inconsistencies. These population-specific factors highlight the importance of carefully considering the representativeness of utility values used in pharmacoeconomic evaluations for schizophrenia [3].

Another critical issue identified in this review is the impact of utility value selection on cost-effectiveness results. The choice of utility values can significantly alter the estimated QALYs gained from an intervention, thereby influencing the cost-effectiveness ratio and, ultimately, the conclusions of the analysis. For example, using higher utility values for baseline health states may result in smaller incremental QALY gains, potentially making treatments appear less cost-effective. Conversely, lower baseline utility values may exaggerate the benefits of an intervention, skewing the results in favor of certain treatments. These effects underscore the need for transparency and justification in selecting utility values, as well as sensitivity analyses to explore the robustness of cost-effectiveness results to variations in these inputs [4].

The implications of utility value variability extend beyond individual pharmacoeconomic evaluations. Policymakers and healthcare decision-makers rely on these analyses to allocate resources and prioritize interventions, making it crucial to ensure that utility values accurately reflect the true burden of schizophrenia and the benefits of treatments. Inconsistent or poorly chosen utility values may lead to suboptimal decisions, such as underfunding effective interventions or allocating resources to less impactful treatments. This highlights the importance of standardizing the measurement and reporting of utility values in schizophrenia research, as well as developing guidelines for their use in pharmacoeconomic evaluations. Despite the challenges associated with utility values, this review also highlights opportunities for improving their use in pharmacoeconomic evaluations for schizophrenia. Advances in measurement techniques, such as the development of condition-specific preference-based instruments, offer the potential to capture the unique aspects of schizophrenia more accurately. Incorporating patient and caregiver perspectives in utility value estimation can also enhance the validity of these measures, as they provide firsthand insights into the lived experience of the disease. Furthermore, international collaborations and data-sharing initiatives can help harmonize utility value data, facilitating more consistent and comparable pharmacoeconomic evaluations across settings [5].

Conclusion

In conclusion, utility values are a cornerstone of pharmacoeconomic evaluations for schizophrenia, providing a means to quantify the health benefits of interventions in terms of QALYs. However, this systematic review reveals significant variability in the utility values used in these analyses, driven by differences in measurement methodologies, population characteristics, and health state descriptions. This variability has important implications for cost-effectiveness results, influencing treatment recommendations and resource allocation decisions. To address these challenges, efforts should focus on standardizing the measurement and reporting of utility values, developing condition-specific instruments, and incorporating diverse perspectives in utility value estimation. By improving the accuracy and consistency of utility values, pharmacoeconomic evaluations can better inform decision-making and contribute to the efficient allocation of resources in schizophrenia care.

***Address for Correspondence**: Elena Debreu, Department of Clinical Correlates, London South Bank University, Borough Rd, UK; E-mail: elenaebreu@gmail.com*

Acknowledgement

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Zhou, Junwen, Aurélie Millier and Mondher Toumi. "Systematic review of pharmacoeconomic models for schizophrenia." *JMAHP* 6 (2018): 1508272.

2. Revicki, Dennis A. "Methods of pharmacoeconomic evaluation of psychopharmacologic therapies for patients with schizophrenia." *JPN* 22 (1997): 256.

3. Zito, Julie Magno. "Pharmacoeconomics of the new antipsychotics for the treatment of schizophrenia." *Psychiatry Clin* 21 (1998): 181-202.

4. Einarson, Thomas R., Maria Geitona, Alexandros Chaidemenos and Vasiliki Karpouza, et al. "Pharmacoeconomic analysis of paliperidone palmitate for treating schizophrenia in Greece." *Ann Gen Psychiatry* 11 (2012): 1-8.

5. Einarson, Thomas R., Colin Vicente, Roman Zilbershtein and Michiel EH Hemels. "Pharmacoeconomics of depot antipsychotics for treating chronic schizophrenia in Sweden." *Nord J Psychiatry* 68 (2014): 416-427.