

Supplementary Materials for

Costs and effectiveness of influenza vaccination: a systematic review

Lucia Sara D'Angiolella, Alessandra Lafranconi, Paolo Angelo Cortesi, Silvia Rota, Giancarlo Cesana and Lorenzo Giovanni Mantovani

Corresponding author:

Lucia Sara D'Angiolella, Centro di Studio e Ricerca sulla Sanità Pubblica (CESP), Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca, Via G. Pergolesi 33, 20900 Monza, Italy. E- mail: l.dangiolella@campus.unimib.it.

Published on

Ann Ist Super Sanità 2018 Vol. 54, No. 1: 49-57

DOI: 10.4415/ANN_18_01_10

This PDF file includes:

Tables 1-3

Table 1
Characteristics of included studies

Reference	Study design	Country	Population	Vaccination strategy	Analysis	Perspective	Costs	Incremental cost	Incremental outcome	ICER
Blommaert et al. 2014	Static model	Belgium	Pregnant women (2 nd or 3 rd trimester)	Increasing TIV vaccine uptake (0%-50%)	CEA	Health care payer	Direct	€ 383,962	59.00 QALYs	6,763
			Health care workers	Increasing TIV vaccine uptake (35%-50%)				€ 709,133	30.00 QALYs	24,595
			0-14 y	Increasing TIV vaccine uptake (20%-40%)				€ 689,189	33.00 QALYs	22,596
			15-49 y	Increasing TIV vaccine uptake (20%-40%)				€ 2,473,748	101.00 QALYs	25,278
			50-64 y	Increasing TIV vaccine uptake (20%-40%)				€ 1,901,101	133.00 QALYs	14,610
Bellinghen et al. 2014	Markov model	UK	Pt at risk and elderly (65+)	TIV vs QIV	CEA	NHS	Direct	190,778,818 GBP	36,002 QALY 37,085 LY	5,299 5,144
Baguelin et al. 2015	Markov model	England and Wales	> 2 y	Extending vaccination (2-4 y)	CEA	HS and Personal Social Services	Direct	10,473,000 GBP	4,009 QALYs	2,613
				Extending vaccination (50-64y)				48,813,000 GBP	6,642 QALYs	7,350
				Extending vaccination (5-16y)				41,527,000 GBP	23,801 QALYs	1,745
				Extending vaccination (2-4 and 50-64 y)				59,438,000 GBP	10,545 QALYs	5,637
				Extending vaccination (2-16 y)				52,840,000 GBP	27,115 QALYs	1,949
				Extending vaccination (2-16 and 50-64 y)				101,976,000 GBP	33,186 QALYs	3,073
				Extending vaccination (2-64 y)				253,941,000 GBP	50,323 QALYs	5,046
Garcia et al. 2016	Markov model	Spain	Risk and elderly (65+)	TIV vs QIV	CEA	NHS Societal	Direct	€ 447,554,791	40,005 QALYs:	11,188
							Direct + Indirect	€ 349,974,624		8,749
Damm et al. 2014	Age structured dynamic model	Germany	2-17 y	TIV vs TIV + LAIV	CEA	Narrow third payer Broad third payer Societal	Direct	€ 398,615,966.62	175,960 QALYs	2,265
							Direct	€ 216,122,046.12		1,228
							Direct + indirect	€ 3,403,599,345.84		TIV + LAIV dominates
Clements et al. 2014	Decision tree	USA	All population	TIV vs QIV	CEA	Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ 121,912,743	3,596 QALYs	90,301
Joyce You et al. 2015	Decision tree	Hong Kong	All population	TIV vs QIV	CEA	HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 38,877 \$ 21,600	1.72 QALYs	22,603 12,558
			0.5-4 y			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 37,471 \$ 194,403		20.39 QALYs
			5-9 y			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 23,194 \$ 24,445	3.95 QALYs	5,872 QIV dominates
			10-14 y			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 30,925 \$ 20,845	0.79 QALYs	39,146 26,386
			15-64 y			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 30,243 \$ 27,128	0.29 QALYs	104,283 93,545
			65-79 y			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 103,172 \$ 86,416	2.81 QALYs	36,716 30,753
			80+			HS Societal	Direct Direct + Indirect	\$ 60,328 \$ 7,248	7.48 QALYs	8,065 QIV dominates

Continues

Table 1
Continued

Reference	Study design	Country	Population	Vaccination strategy	Analysis	Perspective	Costs	Incremental cost	Incremental outcome	ICER
Akin et al. 2016	Decision analytic model	Turkey	Adults (18+) with DM 2	Increasing vaccination coverage from 9.1% to 20%	CEA	Societal	Direct + Indirect	174,597 TRY	2,743 QALYs	64
						Public payer perspective	Direct			1,158
				Societal	Direct + Indirect	334,778 TRY	5,258 QALYs	64		
Chit et al. 2014	Economic model	US	> 65 y	TIV high dose vs TIV standard dose	CEA	Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ 153,790,271	29,023 QALYs	5,299
						Thirty payer perspective	Direct	\$ 300,400,337		10,350
				TIV high dose vs QIV standard dose	Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ -16,509,606	27,718 QALYs	TIV dominates	
					Thirty payer perspective	Direct	\$ 122,090,183		4,365	
Chit et al. 2015 (A)	Static model	Ontario	All population (6m+)	QIV vs TIV	CEA	HS	Direct	7.2 million CAD	76 QALYs	94,248
						Societal	Direct + Indirect	4,784,112 CAD		63,773
			≤ 4y	HS	Direct	NA	2.36 QALYs	112,274		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect			112,017		
			5-19y	HS	Direct	NA	6.1 QALYs	174,525		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect			167,856		
			20-49y	HS	Direct	NA	7.0 QALYs	303,851		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect			76,351		
			50-64y	HS	Direct	NA	8.4 QALYs	217,878		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect			146,192		
			65+	HS	Direct	NA	52.1 QALYs	36,034		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect			32,864		
Chit et al. 2015 (B)	Economic model based on single clinical trial	US	65+	TIV high dose vs TIV standard dose	CEA	HS	Direct	\$ 116 (per participant)	-0.0003 QALYs	Dominated
						Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ 128		Dominated
			Adults with ≥ 1 comorbidity	HS	Direct	\$ 106	-0.0013 QALYs	Dominated		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ 119		Dominated		
			75+	HS	Direct	\$ 12	-0.0053 QALYs	Dominated		
				Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ 22		Dominated		
Shim et al. 2016	Age-structured model	US	2-8y	Mixed vaccination strategy: 33.3% LAIV and 66.7% IIV vs IIV alone	CEA	HS	Direct	664 million \$	NA	LAIV dominates
						Societal	Direct + Indirect	978 million \$		LAIV dominates
				Mixed vaccination strategy: 33.3% LAIV and 66.7% IIV vs LAIV alone	HS	Direct	664 million \$		LAIV was cost-effective 99% of the time	
Gregg et al. 2014	RCT	Canada	Children (36 m-15 y)	Vaccinated vs non vaccinated	CEA	Societal (school-work)	Direct	\$ 36.41	-0.23 influenza cases	164.12
Brydak et al. 2012	Decision-analytic model	Poland	65+	New situation (universal coverage) vs Current situation (out of pocket)	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	71.6 PLN million	2,744 QALYs	26,118

Continues

Table 1
Continued

Reference	Study design	Country	Population	Vaccination strategy	Analysis	Perspective	Costs	Incremental cost	Incremental outcome	ICER		
Dolk et al. 2016	Dynamic transmission model	Germany	All population	QIV vs TIV	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	57.5 million €	3,975 QALYs	14,461		
						Societal	Direct + Indirect	-57.9 million €		QIV dominates		
Leung et al. 2016	Decision-analytic model	Hong Kong	65+	IM vaccine vs ID vaccine	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	\$ 5.23 (per person)	0.00336 QALYs	14,528		
Meeyai et al. 2015	Age-structured decision model	Thailand	Children (2-17 y)	TIV vs No vaccination	CEA	Societal	Direct + indirect	218 million \$	49,000 DALYs averted	4,445		
			Children (2-17 y)	LAIV vs No vaccination				91-372 million \$ (according to age sub-groups)	45,000-65,000 DALYs averted	1,841- 5,748 (according to age sub-groups)		
			Elderly (60+)	TIV vs No vaccination				65 million \$	23,000 DALYs averted	2,889		
Meier 2015	Markov model	UK	At risk adults and elderly (65+)	QIV vs TIV	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	755 million £	51,538 QALYs	14,645		
			Elderly (65+)	Societal		Direct + indirect	696 million £		13,497			
				Payer perspective		Direct	549 million £	45,753 QALYs	11,998			
Nagy et al. 2016	Transmission model	Finland	All population	TIV vs No vaccination	CEA	HS	Direct	350 million €	-47 QALYs	Dominated		
				QIV vs No vaccination				327 million €	62.4 QALYs	5,237		
				TIV/Q-LAIV vs No vaccination				398 million €	-65 QALYs	Dominated		
				QIV/Q-LAIV 50 % vs No vaccination				30 million €	5.5 QALYs	5,329		
				QIV/Q-LAIV 100 % vs No vaccination				30 million €	5.2 QALYs	5,734		
				TIV vs No vaccination				Societal	Direct + Indirect	238 million €	-47 QALYs	Dominated
				QIV vs No vaccination						33 million €	-62 QALYs	Dominated
				TIV/Q-LAIV vs No vaccination						-111 million €	-65 QALYs	Dominated
				QIV/Q-LAIV 50 % vs No vaccination				-136 million €	-68 QALYs	Dominated		
QIV/Q-LAIV 100 % vs No vaccination	-229 million €	73 QALYs	QIV/Q-LAIV dominates									
Newall et al. 2014	Single-year model	Australia	Elderly (65+)	Vaccination vs no vaccination	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	56 million \$	1.232 QALYs	45,400		
Patterson et al. 2012	Quasi-Markov simulation	US	50+	TIV to 65 vs No vaccination	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	\$ 17,375	1.3 Lives saved	13,084		
				TIV to 50 vs No vaccination (ED)				\$ 48,606	1.4 lives saved	34,610		
				TIV to 50 vs TIV to 65				\$ 31,231	0.08 lives saved	408,784		

Continues

Table 1
Continued

Reference	Study design	Country	Population	Vaccination strategy	Analysis	Perspective	Costs	Incremental cost	Incremental outcome	ICER
Pitman et al. 2013	Dynamic influenza transmission model	England and Wales	2-18 y	No Vaccination vs Current Policy	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	£9,164	-20 million QALY	Current Policy dominates
				Current policy + TIV (2-4 y) vs Current Policy				£ 192	-1.6 million QALY	Dominated
				Current policy + LAIV (2-4 y) vs Current Policy				£ -182	2.0 million QALYs	Current policy + LAIV dominates
				Current policy + TIV (2-10 y) vs Current Policy				£ 1,554	-1.8 million QALYs	Dominated
				Current policy + LAIV (2-10 y) vs Current Policy				£ 1,152	2.3 million QALYs	506
				Current policy + TIV (2-18 y) vs Current Policy				£ 1,218	-1.7 million QALYs	Dominated
				Current policy + LAIV (2-18 y) vs Current Policy				£ 699	2.3 million QALYs	298
Raviotta et al. 2016	Markov model	US	65+	No vaccination vs TIV	CEA	Societal	Direct+Indirect	US\$ -4.1	0.0011 QALYs	3,693
				No vaccination vs QIV				US\$ -2.0	0.0001 QALYs	20,939
				No vaccination vs High dose TIV				US\$ -6.5	0.0002 QALYs	31,214
Smith et al. 2016	Markov model	US	Children (2-8 y)	IIV vs LAIV	CEA	Societal	Direct +Indirect	US\$8.75	-0.00008 QALYs	Dominated
Thommes et al. 2015	Dynamic model	Canada	Whole population	QIV vs TIV	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	\$ 220,036,899	31,791QALYs 22,899 LYs	7,961 11,211
		UK	Whole population	TIV/LAIV vs QIV/QLAIV				£ 23,258,257	29,315 QALYs 20,966 LYs	7,234/ 10,364
Thorrington et al. 2015	Dynamic Model	England	2-16 y	No vaccination vs vaccination (primary school]	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	Minimum cost per vaccination per person: £ 9.13 (with 92% coverage]	Maximum QALYs gained 0.0093 (92% coverage]	3,117
				No vaccination versus vaccination (secondary school]				Minimum cost per vaccination per person: £ 11.26 (with 1% coverage]	Maximum QALYs gained as above 0.0063 (12% coverage]	4,280
				No vaccination versus vaccination (primary+secondary school]				Minimum cost per vaccination per person: £ 6.14 (with 44% coverage in primary and 29% in secondary schools]	Maximum QALYs gained as above 0.0128 (45% and 28%]	16,152
Xu et al. 2016	Decision-analytic model	US	Pregnant women	No vaccination vs vaccination (moderate intensity]	CEA	Societal	Direct + Indirect	\$ -43,040,676	305 QALYs	Vaccination dominates
				No vaccination vs vaccination (mild intensity]				\$ 30,873,253	123 QALYs	250,689
				No vaccination vs vaccination (moderately severe intensity]				\$ -89,810,994	610 QALYs	Vaccination dominates

Continues

Table 1
Continued

Reference	Study design	Country	Population	Vaccination strategy	Analysis	Perspective	Costs	Incremental cost	Incremental outcome	ICER
Yamin et al. 2014	Retrospective cohort data analysis	Israel	Patients with previous pneumonia, all ages	No vaccination vs vaccination (hosp)	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	\$ 656,760	-203.1 QALYs	Vaccination dominates
				No vaccination vs vaccination (non-hosp)				\$ 680,439	-237.31 QALYs	Vaccination dominates in elderly patients and it is cost-effective (ICER 40.123) in patients with 4-24 years
			65+	No vaccination vs vaccination (non hosp)				\$ 281,022	-136.04 QALYs	Vaccination dominates
Yao et al. 2012	Decision analysis model	US	Post-partum women	No vaccination vs vaccination	CBA	Payer perspective	Direct	US \$-13.7		-13.7 US \$
								Societal	Direct + indirect	US \$ 12.57
You et al. 2015	Decision tree	Hong Kong	All population	QIV vs TIV	CEA	Payer perspective	Direct	\$ 38,877	1.72	22,603
								Societal	Direct + indirect	\$ 21,600
You et al. 2014	Epidemiology model	Hong Kong	Elderly (65-79 y] (Year 2007)	QIV vs TIV	CEA	Societal	Direct + indirect	\$ -266,473	22.826 QALYs	QIV dominates
								\$ 25,803	2.210 QALYs	103,072
			\$ -483,461					27.335 QALYs	QIV dominates	
			\$ 14,657					0.829 QALYs	78,633	
			\$ 266,473					22.826 QALYs	100,164	
			\$ 25,803					2.21 QALYs	1,135,786	
			\$ 483,461					27.335 QALYs	13,440	
\$ 14,657	0.829 QALYs	945,509								

Table 2
Range of costs reported in the selected studies by Region and patients' group

	All population	Children	Adult	Elderly	Pregnant	High-Risk	
Europe (12)	<p>IC with Increasing TIV uptake vs No vac.: € 689,687 - € 1,902,263 [8]</p> <p>TIV: €4,114,006,943 QIV: €4,304,813,247 [18]</p> <p>TIV: €798,118,103 -4,066,097,342 QIV: €855,597,200-4,008,204,019 [14]</p> <p>No Vac.: 230-2,828 mln € TIV: 580-3,066 mln € QIV: 556-2,795 mln € [16]</p>	<p>No Vac.: 27,468 mln £ Current policy: 18,304 mln £ Increasing LAIV: 18,122-19,973 mln £ Increasing TIV: 18,496-20,493 mln £ [17]</p> <p>No Vac.: 188.0 mln £ Vac.: 210.7-226.1 mln £ [19]</p> <p>TIV: €4,089,995,812-15,042,784,059 TIV + LAIV: €4,488,611,779-11,639,184,713 [12]</p>	<p>IC with Increasing TIV: 709,703 mln € [8]</p>	<p>TIV € 7,578,672,042 QIV € 7,769,450,859 [9]</p> <p>No vac.: K€40,664 alternative influenza vac. policies: K€167,425 [10]</p> <p>TIV: €34,462,064,137-46,363,458,774 QIV: €34,364,483,970-46,713,433,398 [11]</p> <p>Current situation: 45.6 mln PLN New Policy: 41.6 mln PLN [13]</p>	<p>IC with Increasing TIV: 385,978 mln € [8]</p>	<p>IC with Increasing TIV: 385,978 mln € [8]</p>	<p>TIV €7,578,672,042 QIV €7,769,450,859 [9]</p> <p>No Vac.: £ k 40,664 Alternative influenza Vac. policies: k £167,425 [10]</p> <p>TIV: £27,861,559,964 QIV: £28,557,157,397 [15]</p>
USA (8)	<p>TIV: \$25,769,664,907 QIV: \$25,891,577,650 [22]</p>	<p>LAIV: \$165.25 IIV: \$174.00 (per patient) [26]</p> <p>LAIV was more costly than IIV [25]</p>		<p>No Vac.: \$70.52 TIV: \$81.73 QIV: \$85.83 HD \$85.43 (per person) [21]</p> <p>TIV HD 1,377-2,007 US\$ SD: 1,493-2,029 US\$ (per participant) [23]</p> <p>No vac.: 96.49 \$ TIV: 100.62 \$ QIV: 102.64 \$ TIV HD: 109.10 \$ (per person) [5]</p> <p>No vac.: \$8,409,289 Vac.: \$8,426,664-8,457,895 (per 100,000 persons) [24]</p>	<p>Vac. was less costly than No vac. [20]</p> <p>Vac.: \$197.6-328.5 No vac.: \$ 183.9-341.02 (per mother) [7]</p>		
Canada (3)	<p>TIV: \$2,232,166,489 QIV: \$2,452,203,389 [18]</p> <p>QIV was more costly than TIV [27]</p>	<p>Vac.: \$69.07 No vac.: \$32.66 (per patient) [28]</p>					
China (3)	<p>TIV: \$44,071-183,235 QIV: \$82,948-204,835 (per 100,000) [30]</p>			<p>IM vac.: \$47.59 ID vac.: \$52.82 (per person) [31]</p> <p>QIV was less costly than TIV [29]</p>			
Turkey (1)						<p>Current situation: 140,517,766 TRY projected situation: 174,597-1,055,590 TRY [32]</p>	
Israel (1)						<p>No vac. \$ 3,563,543-5,825,904 Vac.: \$ 2,906,783-6,506,343 [35]</p>	
Thailand (1)		<p>No vac.: 20 mln \$ TIV: 237mln \$ LAIV: 111-392 mln \$ [33]</p>					
Australia (1)				<p>IC of Vac. vs No vac.: 12-64 mln A\$ [34]</p>			

IC: Incremental Costs, No vac.: No vaccination, mln: Million, Vac.: Vaccination, k: Thousand, TIV: Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine, QIV: Quadrivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine, LAIV: live Live Attenuated Influenza Vaccine, IIV: Inactivated Vaccine, HD: High-dose, SD: Standard-dose, IM: Intra-Muscular, ID: Intra-Dermal.

Table 3
Range of outcome reported in the selected studies by Region and patients' group

	All population	Children	Adult	Elderly	Pregnant	High-Risk
Europe (12)	Incr. QALYs with Increasing TIV vs No Vac.: 31-132 [8]	No Vac.: 27.7 mln QALYs lost Current policy: 7.7 QALYs lost Current policy + LAIV: 1.1 – 5.7 mln QALYs lost Current policy + TIV: 1.7 – 6.2 mln QALYs lost [17]	Incr. QALYs with Increasing TIV uptake vs No Vac.: 29 [8]	TIV 1,190,979,257 QALYs /1,375,979,430 LYs QIV 1,191,015,259,2 QALYs /1,376,016,515 LYs [9] No Vac.: 71,025 QALYs lost Alternative influenza Vac. policies: 54,068 QALYs lost [10]	Incremental QALYs with Increasing TIV vs No Vac.: 58 [8]	TIV 1,190,979,257 QALYs /1,375,979,430 LYs QIV 1,191,015,259 QALYs /1,376,016,515 LYs [9]
	TIV: 998,215 QALYs/496,291 LYs lost QIV:968,900 QALYs/475,295 LYs lost [18]	No Vac.: 38,600 QALYs lost Vac. saves: 38,496 - 37,244 QALYs [19]		TIV: 1,038,585,055 QALYs /1,143,182,206 LYs QIV: 1,038,625,059 QALYs /1,143,233,538 LYs [11]		No Vac.: 71,025 QALYs lost Alternative influenza Vac. policies: 54,068 QALYs lost [10]
	TIV: 78,740 QIV: 74,765 QALYs lost [14]	TIV:449,443 TIV + LAIV: 273,483 QALYs lost [12]		Current situation: 44,143,029 LYs lost/24,490,083 QALYs lost New situation: 44,147,726 LYs/24,492,828 QALYs lost [13]		TIV: 956,326,785 QALYs/1,051,806,914 LYs QIV: 956,378,323 QALYs/1,051,860,14 LYs [15]
	No Vac.: 159 k QALYs lost TIV: 94-112 k QALYs lost QIV: 86-97 k QALYs lost [16]					
USA (8)	TIV: 225,372 LYs/171,428 QALYs lost QIV: 220,560 LYs/167,832 QALYs lost [22]	LAIV: -8.4 E-04 IIV: -9.2 E-04 QALYs [26] LAIV was more efficacious than IIV [25]		No Vac.: 4.96 QALYs TIV: 4.96 QIV: 4.96 QALYs HD: 4.96 QALY (per person) [21] TIV HD 8.1187-8.1502 QALYs TIV SD: 8.1134-8.1499 QALYs (per participant) [23] No Vac.: 0.00652 QALYs lost TIV: 0.0054 QALYs lost QIV: 0.0053 QALYs lost HD TIV: 0.0051 QALYs lost (per person) [5] No Vac.: 39.9 deaths Va.: 38.5-38.6 deaths (per 100.000 persons) [24]	Vac. was more efficacious than no vac.[20]	
					Net social benefit value of Vac.: \$12.57 (per mother) [7]	
Canada (3)	TIV: 522,596 QALYs/344,912 LYs lost QIV: 490,805 QALYs/322,013 LYs lost [18] QIV: 76 QALY/49 LYs [27]	Vac.: 0.04 No Vac.: 0.27 (influenza cases) [28]				
China (3)	TIV: 13.34 QALYs lost QIV: 11.62 QALYs lost (per 100,000) [30]			IM vac.: 0.00372 QALYs lost ID vac.: 0.00336 QALYs lost (per person) [31] QIV was more efficacious than TIV [29]		
Turkey (1)						Current situation: 91,562,582 QALYs/117,155,365 LYs gained Projected situation: Incr. QALYs 2,743-16,580 /Incr. LYs 3,342-20,208 [32]
Israel (1)						QALYs saved with Vac.: 203.71-237.31 [35]
Thailand (1)		No Vac.: 0 DALYs averted TIV: 49 DALYs averted LAIV: 45-65 DALYs averted [33]				
Australia (1)				Incr. QALYs of Vac. vs No Vac.: 344-6,324 [34]		

Incr: Incremental, No Vac.: No Vaccination, mln: million, Vac.: Vaccination, k: thousand, TIV: Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine, QIV: Quadrivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine, LAIV: Live Attenuated Influenza Vaccine, IIV: Inactivated Vaccine, HD: High-dose, SD: Standard-dose, IM: Intra-Muscular, ID: Intra-Dermal, LYs: Life Years, QALYs: Quality Adjusted Life Years, DALYs: Disability Adjusted Life Years.