Long-Term Cost-Effectiveness of Providing Full Coverage for Preventive Medications After Myocardial Infarction
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Background—Adherence to drugs that are prescribed after myocardial infarction remains suboptimal. Although eliminating patient cost sharing for secondary prevention increases adherence and reduces rates of major cardiovascular events, the long-term clinical and economic implications of this approach have not been adequately evaluated.

Methods and Results—We developed a Markov model simulating a hypothetical cohort of commercially insured patients who were discharged from the hospital after myocardial infarction. Patients received β-blockers, renin–angiotensin system antagonists, and statins without cost sharing (full coverage) or at the current level of insurance coverage (usual coverage). Model inputs were extracted from the Post myocardial Infarction Free Rx Event and Economic Evaluation trial and other published literature. The main outcome was an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio as measured by cost per quality-adjusted life year gained. Patients receiving usual coverage lived an average of 9.46 quality-adjusted life years after their event and incurred costs of $171,412. Patients receiving full coverage lived an average of 9.60 quality-adjusted life years and incurred costs of $167,401. Compared with usual coverage, full coverage would result in greater quality-adjusted survival (0.14 quality-adjusted life years) and less resource use ($4011) per patient. Our results were sensitive to alterations in the risk reduction for post-myocardial infarction events from full coverage.

Conclusions—Providing full prescription drug coverage for evidence-based pharmacotherapy to commercially insured post-myocardial infarction patients has the potential to improve health outcomes and save money from the societal perspective over the long-term.

Clinical Trial Registration Information—https://clinicaltrials.gov/ (NCT00566774) (Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2015;8:00-00. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.114.001330.)
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Clinical practice guidelines recommend that all post-MI patients receive treatment with β-blockers, renin–angiotensin system antagonists (angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors [ACEI] or angiotensin receptor blockers [ARB]), statins, and aspirin, unless a contraindication exists, for secondary prevention.1 Although the rates of prescribing secondary prevention drugs at hospital discharge after acute MI have improved substantially,2 long-term adherence to these drugs remains far from optimal.

Several interventions that could effectively improve adherence to chronic preventive medications have been identified and evaluated in clinical trials.3,5 Among these, removing financial barriers to medication filling by reducing patient out-of-pocket costs has attracted much attention,6–12 supported by the Post Myocardial Infarction Free Rx Event and Economic Evaluation (MI FREEE) trial.13 In this study, eliminating copayments for β-blockers, ACEIs, ARBs, and statins prescribed to post-MI patients not only improved adherence but also reduced rates of major vascular events (although not revascularization) without increasing overall health spending.

Because MI FREEE was of relatively short duration (ie, a median follow-up period of 394 days) and most secondary prevention drugs are intended for life-long use, the better understanding of long-term implications of this strategy is needed. Accordingly, we conducted a cost-effectiveness analysis to evaluate the health and economic effect of providing full prescription drug coverage for evidence-based pharmacotherapy to post-MI patients over their lifetimes.

Methods

Study Setting and Background

MI FREEE was a clustered-randomized policy trial that evaluated whether providing full prescription drug coverage for secondary prevention drugs prescribed to patients after acute MI improved adherence, clinical outcomes, and health spending compared with usual
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WHAT IS KNOWN

• Adherence to evidence-based pharmacotherapy after myocardial infarction (MI) remains suboptimal.

• The Post Myocardial Infarction Free Rx Event and Economic Evaluation (MI FREEE) trial demonstrated that eliminating patient medication copayments to post-MI patients not only improved adherence but also reduced rates of major vascular events (although not revascularization) without increasing overall health spending over a relatively short duration.

WHAT THE STUDY ADDS

• We developed a Markov model simulating a hypothetical cohort of commercially insured patients who were discharged from the hospital after MI.

• Using model inputs from the MI FREEE trial and other published literature, we concluded that the elimination of patient copayments for evidence-based pharmacotherapy after MI improves health outcomes and saves money from the societal perspective over a lifetime horizon.

• The model-estimated average cost reduction of $4011 per patient in this study suggests that societal over a lifetime horizon.

levels of insurance coverage. The trial included a total of 8855 individuals who received health and pharmacy benefits from Aetna, a large health insurer in the United States. Patients randomized to receive full prescription drug coverage had no cost sharing (ie, copayments, coinsurance, and deductibles) for any brand-name or generic statins, β-blockers, and ACEI or ARB for every prescription after randomization until the end of the trial. Patients randomized to usual prescription drug coverage. At the decision node, patients were assigned to usual or full coverage. Patients entered the model in the post-myocardial infarction (MI) health state. In each cycle, patients had a chance of having reinfarction, having stroke, being hospitalized for congestive heart failure (CHF), with the potential of dying from any of these conditions, or undergoing revascularization. Throughout the patients’ lifetimes, they were also at risk for dying of other causes. Our model did not consider potential adverse drug effects as a result of improved adherence. Based on guidelines from the Panel on Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine of the US Public Health Service, we assumed a societal perspective, lifetime horizon, and a discount rate of 3% per year for both health benefits and costs. The analysis was performed using TreeAge Pro Suite 2013 software (TreeAge Software, Williamstown, MA). The analysis was exempt from approval by an institutional review board.

Model Inputs

The model parameters are summarized in Table 1 and are described in greater detail below.

Figure 1. Cost-effectiveness model structure comparing full and usual prescription drug coverage. At the decision node, patients were assigned to usual or full coverage. Patients entered the model in the post-myocardial infarction (MI) health state. In each cycle, patients had a chance of having reinfarction, having stroke, being hospitalized for congestive heart failure (CHF), with the potential of dying of these conditions, or undergoing repeat revascularization. Repeat revascularization was modeled as a transient health state. All patients had a chance of dying of other causes from any Markov health state at any time throughout the patients’ lifetime. The dead state was modeled as a terminal (ie, absorbing) health state.
We obtained rates of post-MI events (ie, reinfarction, stroke, hospitalization for CHF, and repeat revascularization) under usual coverage from MI FREEE,13 pooled data from the Framingham Heart Study, Atherosclerosis Risk in Community study, and Cardiovascular Heart Study of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute,17 and the Arterial Revascularization Therapies Study.18 We obtained the risk reduction for post-MI events from full coverage from MI FREEE.13 Consistent with other cost-effectiveness analyses of the long-term effect of health interventions,28 we made a conservative assumption that the benefit of full coverage was constant for 5 years after the start of this enhanced coverage and then decreased in a linear fashion over the next 5 years to null. We chose a 5-year cutpoint somewhat arbitrarily based on the fact that the longest follow-up in MI FREEE was just over 4 years. Because the long-term effect of full coverage has yet to be determined, we varied this assumption widely in our sensitivity analyses.

### Mortality
We obtained case fatality rates related to post-MI events from population-based cohort studies of patients who were hospitalized for MI, stroke, and CHF. We obtained total mortality rates from the 2006
United States Life Table. We modeled the long-term excess mortality after MI using pooled data from the Framingham Heart Study, Atherosclerosis Risk in Community study, and Cardiovascular Heart Study of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute.

Quality of Life
We assigned a utility weight to each health state that reflected the preference for, or desirability of, that health state. All utility values were taken from studies that used standardized methods (ie, the time-tradeoff or standard gamble technique). Specifically, we used EQ-5D scores collected from coronary heart disease patients in the Alberta Provincial Project for Outcome Assessment in Coronary Heart Disease database to define the utilities for MI. We used a time trade-off score collected from stroke patients in the quality-of-life substudy of Global Use of Strategies to Open Occluded Coronary Arteries trial and an EQ-5D score collected from stroke patients in the Medicare Expenditure Panel Survey to define the utilities for stroke. We used standard gamble scores directly elicited from the general public to define the utilities for CHF. We used a pooled EQ-5D score taken from the percutaneous coronary intervention arms of the Arterial Revascularization Therapies Study and the Stent or Surgery trial to define the utility for repeat revascularization. For patients with multiple conditions, the utilities for the associated conditions were multiplied together. We assumed that a stroke, for example, reduced a patient’s quality of life by the same percentage, regardless of whether CHF also is present.

Costs
MI FREEE collected healthcare spending (ie, prescription drugs and nondrug medical services, such as physician visits, emergency room admissions, hospitalizations, and outpatient procedures) from the insurer’s claims data. MI FREEE, full coverage increased cardiovascular drug spending from $162.40 to $1455 per month (ie, relative spending 1.08; 95% CI 1.01–1.15; P < 0.02). We used these data to estimate that full coverage increased cardiovascular drug spending across the 3 drug classes (statins, β-blockers, and ACEI or ARB). We obtained direct and indirect healthcare costs of ongoing care after post-MI events from a previous cost-effectiveness analysis of strategies to improve adherence to post-MI medications. All costs were presented in 2012 US dollars and were inflated using the medical care component of the US Consumer Price Index.

Outcomes
We calculated the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of full coverage as the additional cost from this strategy compared with usual coverage divided by its additional health benefit. Health benefits were measured in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios were calculated at multiple time horizons to provide a trajectory of summary measures over time. To assess the robustness of our findings, we performed extensive deterministic sensitivity analyses. We obtained ranges tested from 95% CI when available; otherwise, we used from 50% to 200% of the base-case estimates. Two-way sensitivity analyses were performed by simultaneously altering relative drug spending and the risk reduction for post-MI events from full coverage. We also conducted a probabilistic sensitivity analysis, in which the model was run using a value of each parameter drawn randomly from the distribution assigned to that parameter. We used beta distributions for probabilities; log-normal distributions for relative risks; and gamma distributions for costs and utility decrements. We ran 10,000 iterations to generate a cost-effectiveness acceptability curve showing the probability that full prescription drug coverage is cost-effective at varying willingness-to-pay thresholds, compared with usual prescription drug coverage.

Model Validation
The estimated proportions of patients who had reinfarction, stroke, and hospitalization for CHF within 5 years after first MI were 19%, 5%, and 13%, respectively. The estimated median survival after MI was 20 years. All of these estimates correlated well with available observational data.

Results
Base-Case Analysis
For patients receiving usual coverage, average quality-adjusted survival was 9.46 QALYs, and lifetime costs were $171,412 (Table 2). For patients receiving full coverage, average quality-adjusted survival was 9.60 QALYs, and lifetime costs were $167,401. Compared with usual coverage, full coverage improved quality-adjusted survival by 0.14 QALYs per patient and reduces costs by $≈$4011 per patient. Because it yielded greater health benefits at a lower cost, full prescription drug coverage dominated the strategy of usual prescription drug coverage. Both cumulative cost savings and QALY gained from full coverage were greater than the time with usual initial MI but began to plateau 10 years after initial hospital discharge, when the model had assumed that the effect of full coverage had fully dissipated (Table 3).

Sensitivity Analyses
Full coverage would remain dominant with a wide range of plausible estimates of model parameters, including age of the cohort, rates, mortality utilities, and costs of post-MI events, and discount rate. Assuming the shortest duration of the health benefit from full coverage (ie, 1 year, which was shorter than the average duration of MI FREEE), full coverage had an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of $15021 per QALY gained. Table 4 summarizes 2-way sensitivity analyses of relative drug spending and the risk reduction of post-MI events from full coverage. Even under assumptions using the highest bound of 95% CI of relative drug spending and the lowest bound of 95% CI of the risk reduction of post-MI events from full coverage (Table 1), full coverage would be preferred at a conventional willingness-to-pay threshold of $100,000 per QALY gained.

The result of the probability sensitivity analysis is displayed in the cost-effectiveness acceptability curve (Figure 2). The curve indicates that full coverage was cost-saving compared with usual coverage in 56% of simulations and was cost-effective at a conventional willingness-to-pay threshold of $100,000 per QALY gained in 86% of simulations.

<p>| Table 2. Base-Case Analysis Results |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Cost, $</th>
<th>Total, $</th>
<th>QALYs</th>
<th>ΔCost, $</th>
<th>ΔQALYs</th>
<th>ICER, $ per QALY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usual coverage</td>
<td>Drug 23371</td>
<td>Non-drug 148041</td>
<td>Total 171412</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full coverage</td>
<td>Drug 25413</td>
<td>Non-drug 141988</td>
<td>Total 167401</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>−4011</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICER indicates incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; and QALY, quality-adjusted life year.
Nonadherence to preventive therapies prescribed after MI has well-documented clinical and economic consequences. Efforts to improve adherence by selectively reducing patient copayments have demonstrated short-term benefits for improving health outcomes in a cost-effective manner.6–11 Using data from MI FREEE,13 we evaluated the long-term benefits of this strategy and found that, compared with the usual pharmacy benefits, the elimination of patient copayments for evidence-based pharmacotherapy after MI improves health outcomes and saves money from the societal perspective. These savings resulted from the acute and ongoing costs of care for major vascular events (ie, reinfarction, stroke, and hospitalization for CHF) avoided and more than offset the additional prescription drug costs resulting from improved adherence. Cost savings and gains in quality-adjusted survival appeared within the first year of initial MI and continued to increase over patients’ lifetimes. The average cost reduction of $4011 per patient would save society almost $2 billion over the patient’s lifetime for the 525,000 Americans who will experience their first MI every year.17

Copayments are widely used to contain health spending in the US healthcare system. However, as the burden of cost sharing continues to grow, patients may increasingly avoid essential medical interventions.6–8 Underuse of effective drugs is a major contribution to suboptimal disease control and poor outcomes. For example, studies of patients with a variety of chronic health conditions have indicated that a 10% increase in patient cost sharing is associated with a reduction of 2% to 6% in spending on prescription drugs and an increase in the use of other resources, such as emergency departments and inpatient services.7 One logical response to these observations is to selectively eliminate cost-related barriers for evidence-based drugs. In this strategy, widely known as value-based insurance design (VBID) or evidence-based plan design, copayments, coinsurance, and deductibles are reduced or eliminated for drugs that are potentially life-saving and of high value (ie, providing important health benefits relative to costs).6–11 VBID has implemented increasingly in the management of chronic health conditions, such as cardiovascular diseases, diabetes mellitus, and asthma.12 The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 included a provision that “the Secretary may develop guidelines to permit a group health plan and a health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage to utilize” VBID.13

A review of observational studies suggests that VBID is consistently associated with short-term improvements in adherence (average change of 3% over 1 year) that are cost-neutral for payers.14 The hope that these changes in adherence should be translated into meaningful improvements in health and reduction in overall healthcare spending in the long-term, thus far, has been largely based on data from model-based economic evaluations.22,34–36 For example, a previous cost-effectiveness analysis based on Medicare data showed that the elimination of patient cost sharing for secondary prevention drugs would save both lives (0.35 QALYs) and money ($2500) per post-MI Medicare beneficiary.23 However, the critical limitation of these analyses is their reliance on data generated from policies that increased cost sharing for evidence-based drugs to estimate what would be expected to happen if copayments were reduced instead. MI FREEE filled this knowledge gap by demonstrating the ability of VBID not only to improve adherence but also to reduce actual rates of major vascular events (although not revascularization) without increasing overall healthcare spending, but was of relatively short duration.13 Given that most secondary prevention drugs are intended for life-long use, the findings from our analysis are likely to be more representative of the real-world effect of VBID. In the current policy climate where efforts to improve healthcare quality must be coupled with efforts to contain costs, our analysis extended the growing evidence that VBID is a promising approach that could be easily scaled to large populations to improve the quality of care for post-MI patients.

Despite this, there are numerous barriers to the more widespread implementation of this adherence enhancing strategy.
For example, although all VBID plans lower copayments for high-value medications, these insurance designs can be designed in numerous different ways based on the way in which the benefit design is structured and the programs that are concurrently offered with it. And, the optimal design has yet to be conclusively established. Recent evidence from a large-scale observational study suggests that VBID plans that are more generous, target high-risk patients, offer wellness programs, do not offer disease management programs, and make the benefit available only for medication ordered by mail have a significantly greater effect on adherence than plans without these features.37 Interestingly, maintaining copayment tiers to create incentives for the preferential use of therapeutically equivalent generic medications does not seem to influence the ability of VBID plans to increase adherence, although the effect of this strategy on health spending remains unknown.

Further, payers have the greatest incentive to adopt plans using VBID when they have a reasonable change of benefiting from the reductions in spending on medical care that are averted by better medication adherence. The likelihood of this happening is threatened by the fragmented nature of the US healthcare system, whereby certain types of benefits like prescription drugs are carved out and where patients and employers frequently change who provides them with benefits (a process known as churn). As a result, with the exception of integrated systems and for high-risk conditions like post-MI care where improved quality maybe achieved quickly, payers face the possibility that they will bear the cost of therapy whereas other payers reap the savings from averted clinical events. These issues will need to be addressed before VBID becomes more widely adopted.38

It is important to note that our model was built using the clinical trial of relatively young individuals who had been discharged from the hospital after MI and who were covered by a large commercial insurer.13 Therefore, our results may not be fully generalizable to patients with other conditions or to those who receive health insurance through other means, such as Medicare. That said, it is reassuring that our results are robust to wide variations in model inputs, including patient characteristics and event costs that may differ based on the type of insurance that patients may have or that may change as patients transition from commercial to public insurance. It is similarly reassuring that even under those scenarios that providing full coverage had only a small effect on post-MI event rates (or in other words assuming that the results of MI FREEE were a significant overestimate of the true effect), the strategy still appeared cost-effective at a standard willingness to pay threshold of $100,000 per QALY.

Our results should be interpreted in light of several other limitations. First, there is currently a paucity of data as regards to how long the health benefit by full prescription drug coverage lasts beyond the time horizon of MI FREEE. To address this limitation, we extensively varied our assumption and confirmed the robustness of our results. Second, greater adherence to post-MI secondary prevention has the potential to increase the risk of adverse events (eg, renal failure associated with ACEI or ARB use), which we did not incorporate into our model. Although these outcomes are relatively rare, including them would likely have reduced the cost-saving from full coverage that we observed. Third, our analysis did not consider the effect of providing full coverage for clopidogrel, and thus our results are not necessarily generalizable to this drug. MI FREEE and the current analysis both sought to evaluate the effect of copayment elimination independent of other co-interventions. Because the appropriate length of treatment with antiplatelet agents other than aspirin remains controversial, for the insurance coverage being evaluated to have been truly evidence-based, we would have to have provided full coverage for clopidogrel for only 1 year only and then have returned coverage to usual levels. Doing so would have influenced clinical decision-making and would have confounded our assessment of the relationship between selective copayment reduction and improvements in medication adherence. As a consequence, we limited our attention to those agents intended for lifelong use. Consistent with this, there are numerous adherence interventions that could be possibly effective but were not incorporated in our analysis.13-5 Although our analysis focused on a policy-oriented intervention, it could be potentially attractive to combine it with other patient- or provider-oriented interventions aiming at improving adherence.

In conclusion, our analysis suggests that providing full prescription drug coverage for evidence-based pharmacotherapy to commercially insured post-MI patients could simultaneously save lives and money from the societal perspective and that the magnitude of such savings could be substantial. Future research should assess the long-term, real-world effectiveness of this strategy.
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