WEBVTT

- 1.00:00:02.430 --> 00:00:06.210 < v -> Prior to joining the faculty at YSPH, <math></v>
- $2\ 00:00:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.650$ Dr. Cameron was a member
- 3 00:00:07.650 --> 00:00:10.080 of the Global Health Cost Consortium,
- $4~00:00:10.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.190$ an initiative funded
- $5~00:00:11.190 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.620$ by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- 6~00:00:13.620 --> 00:00:15.780 to provide decision makers
- $7\ 00:00:15.780 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.370$ with improved resources
- $8\ 00:00:17.370 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.960$ to estimate the cost
- 9 00:00:18.960 \rightarrow 00:00:21.450 of HIV and tuberculosis programs,
- 10 00:00:21.450 --> 00:00:26.450 and to improve the availability, quality, timing,
- $11\ 00:00:26.550 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.150$ and policy relevance of cost information.
- $12\ 00:00:30.150 \longrightarrow 00:00:32.760$ He holds an MA in international development
- $13\ 00:00:32.760 --> 00:00:37.020$ from American University and a PhD in health policy
- 14 00:00:37.020 --> 00:00:38.850 from the University of California Berkeley
- $15\ 00:00:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.620$ School of Public Health.
- $16\ 00:00:40.620 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.157$ The title of his talk is
- 17 00:00:42.157 --> 00:00:44.510 "Costing and Economic Evaluations
- 18 00:00:44.510 --> 00:00:46.410 in Implementation Science."
- $19\ 00:00:46.410 --> 00:00:48.300$ He'll speak for about 45 minutes,
- $20\ 00:00:48.300 --> 00:00:52.050$ and then we'll open the floor for questions and discussion.
- $21\ 00:00:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.193$ There you go, drew.
- 22 00:00:54.120 --> 00:00:56.220 <v -> Thanks very much for that introduction, Debbie,</v>
- 23 00:00:56.220 --> 00:00:59.340 and thank you to those who were kind enough
- $24\ 00:00:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.573$ to join the call today.
- 25 00:01:01.590 --> 00:01:03.930 I won't introduce myself any further
- $26\ 00:01:03.930 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.820$ than to say as a member
- $27\ 00:01:05.820 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.680$ of the Center for Methods
- 28 00:01:07.680 --> 00:01:09.600 and Implementation and Prevention Science,

- 29 00:01:09.600 --> 00:01:12.600 this is a pretty sort of exciting opportunity
- $30\ 00:01:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.280$ to share some of the work
- $31\ 00:01:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.440$ that I've been involved with in the past.
- $32\ 00:01:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:01:20.760$ This talk though, I'm gonna focus largely on, you know,
- $33\ 00{:}01{:}20.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.780$ what might be for many of you a review of topics
- $34\ 00:01:24.780 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.110$ as they relate to economic evaluations and costing.
- $35\ 00:01:28.110 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.870$ So please do bear with me on that front.
- 36 00:01:30.870 --> 00:01:33.660 I'll try to get to some novel research findings
- $37\ 00:01:33.660 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.640$ towards the end of the talk,
- $38\ 00{:}01{:}35.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.900$ but this is sort of designed as a, anyone can participate.
- 39 00:01:39.900 --> 00:01:41.970 You don't have to have much of any background
- 40 00:01:41.970 --> 00:01:43.590 in economic evaluation or costing.
- 41 00:01:43.590 --> 00:01:46.770 So without much more,
- $42\ 00:01:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.790$ let me get into the topics here.
- 43 00:01:50.790 --> 00:01:52.740 Okay, so this talk is divided
- $44\ 00:01:52.740 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.060$ into three main sections.
- $45~00{:}01{:}54.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}56.700$ First, I'm gonna discuss some key economics concepts
- $46\ 00:01:56.700 --> 00:01:59.490$ that kind of lay the groundwork for the rest of the talk.
- 47 00:01:59.490 --> 00:02:01.290 I'll briefly cover some different types
- $48~00:02:01.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.650$ of economic evaluation and decision analyses
- $49\ 00:02:04.650 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.840$ and how costing
- $50\ 00:02:06.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.400$ in particular is an important
- $51\ 00:02:08.400 --> 00:02:12.150$ and often overlooked component of implementation science.
- 52 00:02:12.150 --> 00:02:13.740 Second, we'll get into the nitty gritty
- $53\ 00:02:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.090$ of costs and costing.
- 54 00:02:15.090 --> 00:02:17.340 So what are they, who uses them?

- 55 00:02:17.340 --> 00:02:18.510 How do you do it?
- $56\ 00:02:18.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.370$ And what are some of the key considerations
- 57 00:02:20.370 --> 00:02:22.230 that you have to make along the way
- $58\ 00:02:22.230 --> 00:02:25.953$ when you are conducting a costing study?
- $59\ 00:02:26.790 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.100$ If you have a great deal of experience with costing already,
- $60\ 00:02:29.100 --> 00:02:31.050$ some of you may find some of this to be familiar,
- 61 00:02:31.050 --> 00:02:32.760 so I'll apologize in advance,
- $62\ 00:02:32.760 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.460$ but I'm still eager for your feedback.
- 63 00:02:35.460 --> 00:02:36.293 And then finally,
- $64\ 00:02:36.293 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.736$ I'm gonna briefly discuss the efforts
- 65 00:02:38.736 --> 00:02:39.600 of the Global Health Cost Consortium,
- $66\ 00:02:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.190$ which includes a website
- $67\ 00:02:41.190 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.440$ with a ton of great costing resources.
- 68 00:02:43.440 --> 00:02:44.400 So if you're more interested
- 69 00:02:44.400 --> 00:02:46.530 in costing and economic evaluation,
- $70~00:02:46.530 \dashrightarrow 00:02:49.620$ I can direct you towards those at the end of the talk.
- 71 $00:02:49.620 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.940$ And as part of that effort,
- $72\ 00:02:50.940 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.140$ I'll share some of the results
- $73\ 00:02:52.140 --> 00:02:53.670$ of a somewhat recent publication,
- 74 00:02:53.670 --> 00:02:56.610 a systematic review of costing literature on HIV
- 75 00:02:56.610 --> 00:02:58.230 in Sub-Saharan Africa,
- $76\ 00:02:58.230 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.500$ and another study that's in progress.
- 77 00:03:01.500 --> 00:03:04.560 So let me move ahead here.
- $78~00{:}03{:}04.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}06.030$ So there are four main takeaways.
- $79\ 00:03:06.030 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.510$ You know, if you take nothing else from this talk,
- 80 00:03:09.510 --> 00:03:11.523 and I wouldn't blame you if you didn't.
- 81~00:03:13.350 --> 00:03:17.070 Four things that I'd like you to walk away from this talk.

- 82 00:03:17.070 --> 00:03:20.460 considering like number one is perspective.
- $83\ 00:03:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.940$ I'll get into what perspective is, and timeframe.
- $84\ 00:03:23.940 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.130$ These are two concepts that matter,
- $85~00{:}03{:}26.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.360$ I think the absolute most in terms of economic evaluations
- $86\ 00:03:30.360 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.359$ and costing and how they're conducted and the findings,
- 87 00:03:33.359 --> 00:03:34.740 you know, that you were able to generalize
- $88\ 00:03:34.740 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.513$ from these studies.
- $89~00:03:37.440 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.780$ I wanna also leave you with the impression
- 90 00:03:39.780 --> 00:03:42.270 that although expenditures are real,
- 91 $00:03:42.270 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.380$ they're real things,
- 92 00:03:43.380 --> 00:03:44.790 things you can quantify,
- 93 00:03:44.790 --> 00:03:46.830 costs really aren't.
- 94 00:03:46.830 --> 00:03:48.840 They're conceptual in nature,
- $95~00{:}03{:}48.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51.810$ and they depend on a lot of different assumptions.
- 96~00:03:51.810 --> 00:03:55.110 So, you know, we'll get into the nitty gritty of that.
- $97\ 00:03:55.110 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.150$ I'd also like to leave you with the idea
- 98 00:03:57.150 \rightarrow 00:03:59.520 that perfect is often the enemy of the good.
- $99\ 00:03:59.520 --> 00:04:01.260\ I$ think that's a concept that's very familiar
- $100\ 00{:}04{:}01.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04.470$ to any body who's ever published a paper, for example.
- 101 00:04:04.470 --> 00:04:06.150 But on the flip side,
- $102~00{:}04{:}06.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}09.537$ little details in your decision making and costing
- $103\ 00:04:09.537 --> 00:04:12.510$ and data collection can matter a lot.
- $104\ 00:04:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.540$ So there's a balance that we try to strike
- $105\ 00:04:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.610$ when we do these types of studies.
- 106 00:04:17.610 --> 00:04:18.600 And then finally,
- 107 00:04:18.600 --> 00:04:21.660 reporting standards and quality are two areas

- $108\ 00:04:21.660 --> 00:04:23.940$ that have a lot of room to improve in this field.
- 109 00:04:23.940 --> 00:04:26.193 And I'll show you some examples of why.
- $110\ 00:04:27.300 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.310$ So what is economic evaluation?
- 111 00:04:29.310 --> 00:04:32.820 Economic evaluation is an often sort of misunderstood term.
- $112\ 00:04:32.820 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.740$ You've probably heard of monitoring and evaluation,
- $113\ 00:04:34.740 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.180$ which typically refers to monitoring processes
- $114\ 00{:}04{:}37.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}40.830$ for a program's implementation and ongoing operation.
- 115 00:04:40.830 --> 00:04:42.330 If you work in the social sciences,
- $116\ 00:04:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.160$ you've probably heard of impact evaluation,
- $117\ 00:04:44.160 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.790$ which typically refers to evaluating, say, health, social,
- $118\ 00:04:47.790 --> 00:04:50.370$ or economic impacts of the program.
- $119\ 00{:}04{:}50.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54.390$ These are all separate but related fields and methods.
- $120\ 00{:}04{:}54.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57.750$ Economic evaluation is sort of an umbrella term.
- 121 00:04:57.750 --> 00:05:00.300 This includes a broad range of comparative methods
- 122 00:05:00.300 --> 00:05:01.260 to help to evaluate
- $123\ 00{:}05{:}01.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}04.650$ choices or trade-offs between costs and benefits.
- $124\ 00:05:04.650 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.013$ Another familiar term might be decision analysis.
- $125\ 00:05:08.013 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.208$ At the heart though of economic evaluation
- $126\ 00:05:10.208$ --> 00:05:12.930 and decision analysis is a concept that, you know,
- $127\ 00:05:12.930 \dashrightarrow 00:05:17.580$ we spoke about or that I'll speak about a little further
- $128\ 00:05:17.580 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.450$ into the talk.
- $129\ 00:05:18.450 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.370$ And that is opportunity costs.
- $130\ 00:05:20.370 \dashrightarrow 00:05:22.620$ So when we talk about economic evaluation,

- $131\ 00:05:22.620 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.120$ what we typically wanna understand
- $132\ 00:05:24.120 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.310$ is what's the best value for money?
- $133\ 00:05:26.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.920$ And in the most basic sense,
- $134\ 00:05:27.920$ --> 00:05:31.140 cost is what you pay and value is what you get.
- $135\ 00:05:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.990$ It's the benefit.
- 136 00:05:32.850 --> 00:05:35.880 So it won't always indicate a clear choice,
- $137\ 00:05:35.880 \longrightarrow 00:05:39.630$ but it will help to evaluate options quantitatively
- $138\ 00:05:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.093$ based on a defined set of decisions.
- $139\ 00{:}05{:}43.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}46.590$ These processes, they aim to capture opportunity costs
- $140\ 00:05:46.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.300$ of doing one thing over another.
- 141 00:05:48.300 --> 00:05:49.200 So for example,
- 142 00:05:49.200 --> 00:05:51.750 do we invest in home visits
- $143\ 00:05:51.750 --> 00:05:54.750$ or do we make mass media platforms
- $144\ 00{:}05{:}54.750 {\: -->\:} 00{:}05{:}56.940$ to disseminate behavior change communication
- $145\ 00:05:56.940 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.650$ for improved, say infant and young child feeding practices,
- $146\ 00:06:01.650 \dashrightarrow 00:06:04.980$ or do we promote home gardens or vitamin A capsule
- $147\ 00{:}06{:}04.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}09.783$ supplementations to address micronutrient deficiencies?
- 148 00:06:10.620 --> 00:06:12.000 So lastly, I'll leave you
- $149\ 00:06:12.000 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.650$ with the thought that economic evaluations
- $150\ 00:06:13.650 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.270$ are comparative by nature.
- $151\ 00:06:15.270 \dashrightarrow 00:06:18.420$ So not only do they compare costs and benefits,
- 152 00:06:18.420 --> 00:06:19.980 but a comprehensive evaluation
- $153\ 00:06:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.830$ will compare two or more different options.
- $154\ 00:06:22.830 --> 00:06:24.690$ So let's look at a couple of different types
- $155\ 00:06:24.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.280$ of economic evaluations.

- $156\ 00:06:26.280 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.520$ So you may have come across these in the past.
- 157 00:06:29.520 --> 00:06:30.930 There's really a large family
- $158\ 00:06:30.930 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.180$ of economic evaluation methods,
- $159\ 00{:}06{:}33.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35.580$ but it's important to note that all of these different types
- $160\ 00:06:35.580 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.730$ of analyses and tools at their core
- $161\ 00:06:38.730 \longrightarrow 00:06:40.410$ are measuring costs in dollars.
- $162\ 00:06:40.410 --> 00:06:42.870$ So that that column down the middle.
- $163\ 00:06:42.870 --> 00:06:46.110$ And that's the main focus of the rest of this talk.
- $164~00{:}06{:}46.110 --> 00{:}06{:}49.920$ But a key difference across these different types
- $165\ 00:06:49.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.850$ of evaluations is gonna be whose costs it is
- $166\ 00:06:53.850 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.230$ that we're taking into account
- $167\ 00:06:55.230 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.600$ as well as how we're measuring benefits.
- 168 00:06:57.600 --> 00:07:00.120 So all decision analyses are comparative,
- $169\ 00:07:00.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.260$ as I mentioned,
- $170\ 00:07:01.260 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.060$ we're gonna compare one or more options
- $171\ 00:07:03.060 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.200$ in relation to another.
- $172\ 00:07:04.200 --> 00:07:05.940$ So that other option could just be
- $173\ 00:07:05.940 --> 00:07:06.900$ what the current standard
- $174\ 00{:}07{:}06.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}09.000$ of care is or the status quo.
- 175 00:07:09.000 --> 00:07:10.800 It could be doing nothing
- $176\ 00:07:10.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.020$ or it could be another active intervention.
- $177\ 00:07:13.020 --> 00:07:14.850$ So one of the first things that we need to do
- $178\ 00:07:14.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.960$ in any such analysis
- $179\ 00{:}07{:}15.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.496$ is to understand where a comparator is
- $180\ 00:07:18.496 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.188$ and the most basic type of economic evaluation
- $181\ 00:07:21.188 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.830$ is the one on the top there.
- $182\ 00:07:22.830 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.140$ We'll start with cost efficiency analysis,

- $183\ 00:07:25.140 --> 00:07:27.690$ which is sort of a partial form of economic appraisal
- $184\ 00:07:27.690 --> 00:07:29.030$ 'cause it looks only at the costs
- $185\ 00:07:29.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.660$ of the program and it doesn't
- $186\ 00:07:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.900$ really provide any information on let's say agriculture,
- $187\ 00:07:33.900 --> 00:07:36.570$ nutrition, or health outcome of interest.
- $188\ 00{:}07{:}36.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39.600$ This typically reports out on the cost per output achieved.
- 189 00:07:39.600 --> 00:07:41.130 So another example of this might be
- $190\ 00{:}07{:}41.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}43.650$ like a budget impact analysis where you're looking
- 191 00:07:43.650 --> 00:07:46.860 at the cost per output, per patient served,
- $192\ 00:07:46.860 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.923$ or per vaccine administered.
- $193~00{:}07{:}50.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}53.880$ Now the more common type of economic evaluation
- $194\ 00:07:53.880 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.920$ for evaluating health interventions
- $195\ 00:07:55.920 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.170$ is cost effectiveness analysis.
- $196\ 00:07:58.170$ --> 00:08:02.250 And CEAs, they compare the cost and outcomes of two or more
- $197\ 00:08:02.250 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.610$ alternatives or compare a new intervention
- $198\ 00:08:05.610 \longrightarrow 00:08:07.410$ or treatment with the status quo.
- 199 00:08:07.410 --> 00:08:09.900 CEAs relate the cost associated
- $200\ 00:08:09.900 \dashrightarrow 00:08:13.920$ with the health outcome such as cost per disease avoided,
- $201\ 00:08:13.920 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.180$ cost per death avoided
- $202\ 00:08:15.180 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.020$ or additional expected life year for example.
- $203\ 00:08:19.020 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.030$ And then there's some other types of analysis
- $204\ 00:08:21.030 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.710$ that we won't get into too much.
- 205 00:08:22.710 --> 00:08:24.870 Cost utility analysis,
- 206 00:08:24.870 --> 00:08:28.650 you know, includes analyses with say disability
- $207\ 00:08:28.650 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.550$ or quality adjusted life years
- $208\ 00:08:31.950 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.950$ or other standardized measures of preference.

- 209 00:08:37.230 --> 00:08:38.970 And then there's cost benefit analysis,
- $210\ 00:08:38.970 --> 00:08:42.210$ which is a method in which both the costs and the benefits
- $211\ 00{:}08{:}42.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}45.209$ of the intervention are expressed in monetary terms.
- 212 00:08:45.209 --> 00:08:47.490 So in agriculture for example,
- $213\ 00:08:47.490 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.700$ this might be the value of increased crop production.
- $214\ 00{:}08{:}50.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}54.180$ While in health it would be the dollar value associated
- 215 00:08:54.180 --> 00:08:55.770 with the life years that were gained
- $216\ 00:08:55.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.120$ because of an intervention.
- $217\ 00:08:57.960 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.900$ There's several other types of decision analysis
- $218\ 00:09:00.900 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.180$ that I haven't included in this table
- $219\ 00:09:03.180 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.880$ and they exist, so sorry.
- 220 00:09:05.880 --> 00:09:09.630 So those include return on investment analysis,
- $221\ 00:09:09.630 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.063$ cost of illness analysis and others.
- 222 00:09:13.140 --> 00:09:14.220 So as I've suggested,
- $223\ 00:09:14.220 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.180$ different sectors kind of use different of these approaches.
- 224 00:09:18.180 --> 00:09:19.013 So for example,
- $225\ 00:09:19.013 --> 00:09:21.090$ global health and education disciplines
- $226\ 00{:}09{:}21.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}24.540$ have promoted the use of cost effectiveness analysis.
- $227\ 00{:}09{:}24.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}27.690$ Implementation science probably naturally falls
- 228 00:09:27.690 --> 00:09:29.820 under this category
- 229 00:09:29.820 --> 00:09:32.580 or in the cost efficiency analysis category
- $230\ 00:09:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.101$ with a little bit more emphasis
- 231 00:09:34.101 --> 00:09:36.210 on perhaps cost efficiency
- $232\ 00:09:36.210$ --> 00:09:39.420 depending on the scope of the evaluation taking place.
- 233 00:09:39.420 --> 00:09:41.820 And I'll get into that in a moment.

- $234\ 00:09:41.820 --> 00:09:44.640$ Meanwhile, you might see agriculture
- $235\ 00:09:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.380$ or large scale investment
- 236 00:09:46.380 --> 00:09:48.780 in infrastructure being evaluated using
- $237\ 00:09:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.433$ say a cost benefit analysis.
- $238\ 00{:}09{:}52.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}57.810$ So zooming out to sort of the level that we often interact
- $239\ 00:09:59.878 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.130$ with these types of evaluations,
- 240 00:10:02.130 --> 00:10:05.370 say an aim three of your NIH proposal,
- $241\ 00:10:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.390$ depending of course on your desired evaluation type,
- $242\ 00:10:09.390 --> 00:10:10.710$ you'll often wanna arrive
- $243\ 00:10:10.710 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.720$ at really a simple division problem.
- $244\ 00:10:12.720 --> 00:10:15.900$ The cost of a program or policy or intervention
- $245\ 00:10:15.900 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.450$ divided by the outcome in question.
- $246\ 00:10:18.450 --> 00:10:20.100$ For cost effectiveness analysis,
- 247 00:10:20.100 --> 00:10:22.830 the outcome is some measure of effectiveness,
- $248\ 00:10:22.830 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.820$ particularly a health outcome.
- 249 00:10:26.820 --> 00:10:29.460 For budget impact analysis and cost efficiency.
- $250\ 00:10:29.460 --> 00:10:31.530$ This might be an intermediate outcome
- $251\ 00:10:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.670$ per person vaccinated or per patients served.
- 252 00:10:35.670 --> 00:10:36.660 But at its core,
- $253\ 00:10:36.660 --> 00:10:38.543$ all the economic evaluations boil down
- 254 00:10:38.543 --> 00:10:40.920 to this simple division problem.
- 255 00:10:40.920 --> 00:10:43.350 And I wanna mention one more
- $256\ 00:10:43.350 --> 00:10:44.640$ slightly more complicated
- $257\ 00:10:44.640 --> 00:10:46.560$ but still simple division problem
- $258\ 00:10:46.560 --> 00:10:50.508$ that you may have come across at some point, you know,
- $259\ 00{:}10{:}50.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}54.330$ in the process of of putting together a proposal.
- $260\ 00:10:54.330 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.230$ And that is one that builds very simply on the previous,

- $261\ 00:10:58.230 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.750$ and that's for cost effectiveness analysis
- $262\ 00:11:00.750 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.760$ that compares the cost effectiveness
- $263\ 00:11:02.760 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.620$ of the intervention and question
- $264\ 00:11:04.620 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.030$ to some particular alternative.
- 265 00:11:06.030 --> 00:11:08.190 So that's, that's the ICER.
- $266\ 00:11:08.190 --> 00:11:11.253$ And this stands for incremental cost effectiveness ratio.
- 267 00:11:12.480 --> 00:11:14.910 So usually the comparator here is a status quo
- 268 00:11:14.910 --> 00:11:16.143 or a standard of care,
- $269\ 00:11:17.040 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.683$ but it might be some new alternative you're considering too.
- 270 00:11:20.683 --> 00:11:23.863 <-v Person>That is very useful for developers.
</v>
- 271 00:11:23.863 --> 00:11:26.520 <v ->I dunno if I'm getting a question here or not,</v>
- $272\ 00:11:26.520 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.923$ but I'll just continue about that.
- $273\ 00:11:30.360 --> 00:11:31.920$ You can also use ICERs to compare
- 274 00:11:31.920 --> 00:11:33.060 between multiple different
- $275\ 00:11:33.060 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.580$ alternative interventions or configurations.
- $276\ 00{:}11{:}35.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38.430$ You might end up with like a list of different interventions
- $277\ 00:11:38.430 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.380$ that you want to choose between
- 278 00:11:40.380 --> 00:11:44.580 using a process like a shopping spree scenario.
- 279 00:11:44.580 --> 00:11:45.930 I won't get into the details of that,
- $280\ 00:11:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.010$ but there's lots of different ways
- $281\ 00:11:47.010 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.360$ that you can use this tool.
- $282\ 00:11:51.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.800$ Lemme move on.
- 283 00:11:52.800 --> 00:11:53.850 In this talk though,
- $284~00{:}11{:}53.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}55.650$ I'm mostly concerned with the numerator.
- $285~00:11:55.650 \dashrightarrow 00:11:58.650$ So how do we choose what counts and what doesn't count?
- $286\ 00:11:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.630$ What goes into the process of collecting data

- $287\ 00:12:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.790$ to inform these numbers
- $288\ 00:12:02.790 --> 00:12:04.530$ and how might we begin to distinguish
- $289\ 00:12:04.530 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.500$ between studies that do that well or do that poorly?
- $290~00{:}12{:}07.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}10.230~\mathrm{So~I}$ wanna get through a couple of key concepts here
- $291\ 00:12:10.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.150$ before we get started.
- 292 00:12:12.150 --> 00:12:15.090 And those are scarcity, opportunity costs,
- 293 00:12:15.090 --> 00:12:17.700 types of efficiency and perspective.
- 294 00:12:17.700 --> 00:12:20.460 And I'll linger on perspective a bit longer
- $295\ 00:12:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.480$ than the others.
- $296\ 00:12:21.480 --> 00:12:24.450$ Scarcity is one of the most important concepts in economics
- $297\ 00:12:24.450 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.480$ and that's simply stated, resources are limited.
- 298 00:12:27.480 --> 00:12:29.940 So whether we have relatively more resources
- 299 00:12:29.940 --> 00:12:33.390 as within the US or say other OECD countries,
- $300\ 00:12:33.390 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.040$ or relatively fewer resources
- $301\ 00:12:35.040$ --> 00:12:39.000 as many low and middle income countries find,
- $302\ 00{:}12{:}39.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41.970$ there's always trade offs to be made in terms of investments
- $303~00:12:41.970 \dashrightarrow 00:12:44.040$ and competing programs and activities.
- $304\ 00:12:44.040 --> 00:12:45.993$ So it's a major consideration.
- $305\ 00:12:46.980 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.650$ The most powerful implication of the concept of scarcity
- $306\ 00:12:49.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.630$ is of course opportunity costs.
- $307~00{:}12{:}51.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}55.050$ So this refers to the simple truth that the use of resources
- $308\ 00:12:55.050$ --> 00:12:58.410 for any one purpose precludes their use for another.
- $309~00{:}12{:}58.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01.440$ And I have to say that opportunity cost is is a really great
- $310\ 00:13:01.440 --> 00:13:05.100$ concept for focusing the mind by counteracting
- $311\ 00:13:05.100 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.590$ our own personal tendencies towards inertia,

- $312\ 00{:}13{:}07.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}11.580$ which is to say the tendency to say unthinkingly continue
- $313\ 00{:}13{:}11.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}15.360$ this year, what worked or what we did last year,
- 314 00:13:15.360 --> 00:13:16.193 or for that matter,
- $315~00:13:16.193 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.960$ what didn't work particularly well last year.
- 316 00:13:18.960 --> 00:13:21.810 So thinking about opportunity costs stimulates
- $317\ 00:13:21.810 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.630$ some creativity about the best use of resources
- $318\ 00:13:24.630 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.590$ given the needs and alternatives that exist.
- $319\ 00:13:28.590 --> 00:13:30.330$ And the problem of resource allocation
- $320\ 00:13:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.520$ then becomes where can we get
- $321\ 00:13:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.000$ the greatest benefit for a given expenditure.
- $322\ 00:13:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.400$ And cost effectiveness analysis provides
- $323\ 00:13:38.400 \longrightarrow 00:13:40.560$ the sort of conceptual framework and methods
- $324\ 00:13:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.902$ to help make that determination.
- 325 00:13:42.902 --> 00:13:44.070 Efficiency.
- 326 00:13:44.070 --> 00:13:46.050 I'll just touch on briefly,
- $327\ 00:13:46.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.250$ there's two major types.
- 328 00:13:47.250 --> 00:13:48.270 Allocative efficiency,
- $329\ 00:13:48.270 --> 00:13:50.850$ which con concerns the division of funds
- $330\ 00:13:50.850 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.160$ among different interventions.
- 331 00:13:53.160 --> 00:13:56.310 So HIV prevention versus treatment.
- $332\ 00:13:56.310 --> 00:13:59.010$ This often involves complex choices,
- $333\ 00{:}13{:}59.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}02.040$ even if the health gains achievable in one area are greater
- $334\ 00:14:02.040 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.950$ than in another because costs also differ.
- 335 00:14:04.950 --> 00:14:06.510 And then there's technical efficiency,
- $336\ 00{:}14{:}06.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.490$ which is about how we implement an intervention
- $337\ 00:14:08.490 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.290$ that we've decided upon.
- 338 00:14:10.290 --> 00:14:11.280 So for example,

- $339\ 00:14:11.280 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.710$ what's the best program designed
- 340 00:14:13.710 --> 00:14:16.530 to deliver ARV therapy?
- 341 00:14:16.530 --> 00:14:19.530 Both kinds of efficiency require good cost data
- $342\ 00:14:19.530 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.600$ in order to properly assess them.
- $343\ 00:14:21.600 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.210$ However, technical efficiency is only about costs,
- 344 00:14:24.210 --> 00:14:25.530 whereas allocative efficiency
- $345\ 00:14:25.530 \longrightarrow 00:14:28.293$ concerns health impacts as well.
- 346 00:14:29.280 --> 00:14:30.357 And then finally, perspective,
- 347 00:14:30.357 --> 00:14:31.487 and I'll spend a little more time here
- 348 00:14:31.487 --> 00:14:33.900 'cause I think this is a really key thing
- $349\ 00:14:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.230$ that we all need to be on the same level with.
- $350\ 00:14:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.993$ This is perhaps the most important concept.
- $351\ 00:14:40.890 --> 00:14:42.180$ So different stakeholders
- $352\ 00:14:42.180 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.610$ have different experiences of cost.
- 353 00:14:44.610 --> 00:14:46.170 There's the societal perspective,
- 354 00:14:46.170 --> 00:14:48.960 which is what we consider the most inclusive
- $355\ 00{:}14{:}48.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}53.670$ and is often recommended for most policy analyses
- $356\ 00:14:53.670 --> 00:14:55.420$ in low and middle income countries.
- 357 00:14:56.610 --> 00:14:57.600 In this case,
- $358~00{:}14{:}57.600$ --> $00{:}15{:}00.550$ all costs are considered regardless of who incurs them
- $359\ 00:15:01.470 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.940$ within a society.
- 360 00:15:02.940 --> 00:15:05.790 However, considering the perspective
- $361\ 00:15:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.270$ of specific stakeholders is particularly useful
- $362\ 00{:}15{:}09.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}12.810$ in helping to address those stakeholder concerns.
- $363~00:15:12.810 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.710$ So will a payer or an insurance provider lose money
- 364 00:15:16.710 --> 00:15:19.980 even though a society gains in net savings?
- $365\ 00:15:19.980 --> 00:15:22.320$ Or should we align financial incentives

- 366 00:15:22.320 --> 00:15:24.963 and how do we go about accomplishing that?
- $367\ 00:15:26.490 --> 00:15:28.560$ So here's another sort of useful graphic
- $368\ 00:15:28.560 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.000$ for thinking about perspectives
- $369\ 00:15:30.000 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.060$ and in the context of a cost effectiveness analysis,
- $370\ 00{:}15{:}33.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}35.100$ these are the areas in which you might consider your choice
- 371 00:15:35.100 --> 00:15:36.870 of inputs for costs and benefits
- $372\ 00:15:36.870 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.370$ for a programmer intervention.
- $373\ 00:15:39.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.080$ So you'll see that in the rows of the table here.
- $374\ 00:15:43.080 --> 00:15:45.720$ So many decision analyses are gonna be taking a societal
- 375 00:15:45.720 --> 00:15:47.763 perspective to start,
- $376\ 00:15:48.840 --> 00:15:51.870$ but let's drill down a little bit more
- $377\ 00{:}15{:}51.870 --> 00{:}15{:}55.020$ where we're talking about the hospital perspective
- $378\ 00:15:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.700$ or a payer perspective.
- $379~00:15:56.700 \dashrightarrow 00:16:00.303$ So this is sort of the narrowest definition.
- $380\ 00:16:01.170 --> 00:16:03.480$ They'll have their own particular interests
- $381\ 00:16:03.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.520$ and we can also think about this being done
- $382\ 00:16:05.520 --> 00:16:07.323$ from the perspective of an employer,
- $383\ 00:16:08.340 --> 00:16:11.240$ how we might think about the healthcare system as a whole.
- $384\ 00:16:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.300$ The next level out would be the payer perspective,
- $385\ 00:16:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.140$ and that captures the insurer
- $386\ 00:16:22.140 --> 00:16:24.690$ and that that may be a government entity.
- 387 00:16:24.690 --> 00:16:26.373 So Medicare, Medicaid,
- $388\ 00:16:27.210 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.090$ and then zooming out even further
- $389\ 00:16:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.010$ the societal perspective.
- $390\ 00{:}16{:}32.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}36.270$ And that captures, you know, this broader range of costs.
- 391 00:16:36.270 --> 00:16:37.103 Okay?

- 392 00:16:40.140 --> 00:16:44.430 I wanna mention then the question arises,
- $393\ 00:16:44.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.310$ which of these perspectives should we choose?
- 394 00:16:47.310 --> 00:16:49.833 So in implementation science,
- $395\ 00:16:51.180 --> 00:16:56.180$ it often depends on the priorities
- $396\ 00:16:56.874 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.750$ of the those on the ground partners
- 397 00:17:00.750 --> 00:17:02.400 and the institutions that you're working with
- $398\ 00:17:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.220$ when you roll out one of these studies.
- 399 00:17:05.220 --> 00:17:07.920 So in low and middle income country settings,
- $400\ 00{:}17{:}07.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}12.660$ the guidance from traditional reference case examples,
- 401 00:17:12.660 --> 00:17:14.940 and I'll touch on those in a bit,
- 402 00:17:14.940 --> 00:17:16.920 tend to encourage including
- $403\ 00:17:16.920 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.590$ this broader set of perspectives.
- $404\ 00:17:19.590 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.730$ So the societal
- $405\ 00:17:20.730 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.380$ or the health system perspective.
- 406 00:17:23.550 --> 00:17:25.320 However, narrower perspectives
- $407\ 00{:}17{:}25.320 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}17{:}28.650$ are usually these are more directed at the interests
- $408\ 00:17:28.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:30.390$ of key stakeholders,
- $409\ 00:17:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.240$ and that may be the number one priority
- $410\ 00:17:33.240 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.350$ in any one of these examples.
- 411 00:17:37.350 --> 00:17:38.910 So it really, you know,
- $412\ 00:17:38.910 --> 00:17:41.370$ in short it really depends on the priorities
- $413\ 00:17:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.720$ of your partner agencies
- $414\ 00:17:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.710$ and those who are rolling out
- $415\ 00:17:46.710 --> 00:17:50.133$ whatever this intervention happens to be.
- 416 00:17:51.420 --> 00:17:53.040 You know, there's a really great quote
- $417\ 00:17:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.873$ from this paper
- $418\ 00:17:53.873 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.900$ by Eisman and colleagues
- $419\ 00:17:54.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.580$ that just came out last year,
- 420 00:17:56.580 --> 00:17:58.807 and really it's a pragmatic answer.

- $421\ 00{:}17{:}58.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}01.380$ "The perspective of the stakeholder and the decision makers
- 422 00:18:01.380 --> 00:18:03.570 who will be informed by the analysis
- 423 00:18:03.570 --> 00:18:05.880 should probably be prioritized."
- $424\ 00{:}18{:}05.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09.810$ But you can also conduct analysis at multiple levels,
- $425\ 00:18:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.950$ you know, as long as you're able
- $426\ 00:18:10.950 --> 00:18:13.200$ to distinguish between those different levels
- 427 00:18:14.220 --> 00:18:15.390 when you write things up.
- 428 00:18:15.390 --> 00:18:18.570 So just keep in mind in this process,
- $429\ 00:18:18.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.750$ the organizations that are adopting evidence-based policies,
- $430~00{:}18{:}21.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}23.850$ they really need to know what it's gonna cost them
- 431 00:18:23.850 --> 00:18:26.103 in their setting, given their resources.
- $432\ 00:18:28.080 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.310$ But then there's a trade off
- $433\ 00:18:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.740$ and that is whose reality counts
- 434 00:18:31.740 --> 00:18:33.030 and whose being missed
- $435\ 00:18:33.030 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.800$ by these types of analyses?
- $436~00:18:34.800 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.270~\mathrm{I}$ don't know if those on the call have ever read anything
- $437\ 00:18:39.270 --> 00:18:41.280$ by Robert Chambers, but you know,
- 438 00:18:41.280 --> 00:18:42.430 I think a lot about
- 439 00:18:44.250 --> 00:18:48.120 one of his early books, "Whose Reality Counts,"
- $440\ 00:18:48.120 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.470$ when it comes to development interventions
- $441\ 00:18:49.470 --> 00:18:52.743$ when I think about this idea of perspective.
- $442\ 00:18:55.050 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.600$ Another consideration that's closely related
- $443\ 00:18:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:19:00.150$ to perspective is timeframe.
- $444\ 00:19:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.550$ And so that is not just what costs and benefits
- 445 00:19:02.550 --> 00:19:05.160 should we collect, but like when and where
- 446 00:19:05.160 --> 00:19:07.290 in the project life cycle itself
- $447\ 00:19:07.290 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.480$ is it appropriate to collect 'em?

- 448 00:19:09.480 --> 00:19:11.520 So one option, you know, and we'll start
- $449\ 00:19:11.520 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.170$ with the first in that list there
- $450\ 00:19:13.170 --> 00:19:16.440$ is to focus solely on the short term health care costs,
- $451\ 00:19:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.750$ which could include the costs of the intervention,
- $452\ 00:19:18.750 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.110$ costs of downstream stream healthcare.
- 453 00:19:22.110 --> 00:19:23.910 This approach is consistent with,
- 454 00:19:23.910 --> 00:19:24.743 I think, you know,
- 455 00:19:24.743 --> 00:19:27.600 most budget impact analyses, frameworks,
- 456 00:19:27.600 --> 00:19:29.970 particularly those mentioned
- 457 00:19:29.970 --> 00:19:32.580 in the CHEERS guidelines,
- $458\ 00:19:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.610$ which I'll provide some resources for later.
- 459 00:19:35.610 --> 00:19:37.770 And in the context of costing,
- $460\ 00:19:37.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.770$ this is usually on the order of about six months
- 461 00:19:40.770 --> 00:19:42.660 after a program's been implemented.
- $462\ 00:19:42.660 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.990$ So it's once that program is reached maturity,
- $463\ 00:19:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.220$ you know, what does it cost to continue to implement?
- 464 00:19:50.220 --> 00:19:52.200 But that ignores another set of questions,
- 465 00:19:52.200 --> 00:19:54.540 which is, you know, number two here,
- $466\ 00:19:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.910$ the intervention startup.
- 467 00:19:56.910 --> 00:19:58.440 And it might be extremely valuable,
- $468\ 00:19:58.440 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.150$ the organizations and key stakeholders
- $469\ 00:20:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.080$ who are carrying out
- $470\ 00:20:01.080 --> 00:20:03.510$ that evidence-based program
- $471\ 00:20:03.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.830$ to include these costs
- $472\ 00:20:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.080$ in order to capture some sense
- $473\ 00:20:07.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.520$ of what it would take for a system
- 474 00:20:08.520 --> 00:20:10.200 to start to integrate new practices,
- $475\ 00:20:10.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.424$ how long it might take
- $476\ 00:20:11.424 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.223$ for those systems to reach maturity.

- 477 00:20:15.360 --> 00:20:16.193 Another option,
- $478\ 00:20:16.193 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.030$ the third in that list
- 479 00:20:18.030 --> 00:20:20.640 is to include additional research costs,
- $480\ 00{:}20{:}20.640 \to 00{:}20{:}23.752$ research costs included in the design and development
- $481\ 00{:}20{:}23.752 --> 00{:}20{:}28.380$ of implementing a new evidence-based practice.
- $482\ 00:20:28.380 \dashrightarrow 00:20:32.640$ So that might be adapting that evidence-based practice
- $483\ 00:20:32.640 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.800$ to a local setting or an intervention.
- $484\ 00:20:34.800 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.707$ And it could also include some of the costs of say,
- 485 00:20:40.800 --> 00:20:42.360 monitoring and getting feedback
- 486 00:20:42.360 --> 00:20:43.860 from participants in order
- 487 00:20:43.860 --> 00:20:48.780 to adapt and to improve,
- $488\ 00:20:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.810$ I guess the implementation of that process.
- 489 00:20:51.810 --> 00:20:52.643 And then finally,
- $490\ 00:20:52.643 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.476$ there's this question
- $491\ 00:20:53.476 -> 00:20:55.290$ of future downstream costs and benefits.
- $492\ 00:20:55.290 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.790$ And that's particularly to patients
- $493\ 00:20:56.790 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.170$ and to program beneficiaries.
- $494~00{:}20{:}58.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}01.050$ So that's number four in the image that you see.
- 495 00:21:01.050 --> 00:21:03.360 And this is often included, you know,
- 496 00:21:03.360 --> 00:21:04.193 as I mentioned before,
- $497\ 00:21:04.193 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.280$ in perspectives that are taken
- $498\ 00:21:05.280 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.513$ from the societal level,
- 499 00:21:07.530 --> 00:21:11.580 but all too often they fall outside
- $500\ 00:21:11.580 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.500$ of the scope of interest
- 501 00:21:13.500 --> 00:21:14.850 for implementing partners
- $502\ 00:21:14.850 --> 00:21:16.650$ and particularly for payers.
- 503 00:21:16.650 --> 00:21:17.520 You know, and I'll just mention

- $504\ 00:21:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.210$ that this is one of the main major downsides to many,
- 505 00:21:21.210 --> 00:21:23.700 if not most economic evaluations
- $506\ 00:21:23.700 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.380$ that are conducted domestically.
- 507 00:21:25.380 --> 00:21:26.370 So when it, you know,
- $508~00{:}21{:}26.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}27.750$ this is a setting where the payer
- $509~00{:}21{:}27.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30.780$ is often a private health insurer who has no monetary stake
- 510 00:21:30.780 --> 00:21:32.340 in the future health state
- $511\ 00:21:32.340 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.140$ of their clients because
- 512 00:21:34.140 --> 00:21:38.640 in most cases those customers might age out
- 513 00:21:38.640 --> 00:21:40.200 and move into a new health insurer,
- 514 00:21:40.200 --> 00:21:42.783 so Medicare, for example, when you turn 65.
- $515\ 00:21:43.920 --> 00:21:46.470$ So I'll just mention that an analyst may choose
- $516~00{:}21{:}46.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}48.600$ to include any number of these different components
- $517\ 00:21:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.700$ of an intervention or these different parts
- $518\ 00:21:50.700 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.900$ of the timeframe.
- 519 00:21:51.900 --> 00:21:52.733 But in any case,
- 520 00:21:52.733 --> 00:21:54.870 it's really essential to be able to distinguish
- $521~00{:}21{:}54.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}56.850$ between these different sets of costs and benefits
- 522 00:21:56.850 --> 00:21:59.610 and to be explicit about the scope,
- 523 00:21:59.610 --> 00:22:01.830 particularly for generalizability
- 524 00:22:01.830 --> 00:22:03.393 and understanding limitations.
- 525 00:22:05.130 --> 00:22:06.870 So lemme go into costs and costing,
- $526\ 00:22:06.870 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.660$ I've kinda droned on for a long time here,
- 527 00:22:09.660 --> 00:22:12.693 but let's talk about what costs are.
- 528 00:22:14.820 --> 00:22:15.930 So there's definitely,
- 529 00:22:15.930 --> 00:22:19.080 there's many different sources of costs
- 530 00:22:19.080 --> 00:22:21.390 from donors and government providers,
- 531 00:22:21.390 --> 00:22:23.070 international and local NGOs,

- $532\ 00:22:23.070$ --> 00:22:25.773 participant costs from households and individuals.
- $533\ 00:22:26.670 --> 00:22:28.710$ There's also many different ways to describe
- 534 00:22:28.710 --> 00:22:30.303 and categorize costs,
- $535\ 00:22:31.410 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.607$ say by the type of costs.
- $536~00{:}22{:}32.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.360$ Are they real world costs or are they costs
- 537 00:22:35.360 --> 00:22:37.440 of a randomized control trial?
- 538 00:22:37.440 --> 00:22:39.123 Are they full or incremental?
- 539 00:22:40.560 --> 00:22:42.930 Or by cost categories,
- 540 00:22:42.930 --> 00:22:44.970 so different types of inputs
- $541\ 00:22:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.443$ or organized by activities.
- $542\ 00:22:47.589 --> 00:22:50.243$ Or, you know, as I mentioned even by the timing of costs.
- 543 00:22:51.810 --> 00:22:53.490 If you remember my first major takeaway
- 544 00:22:53.490 --> 00:22:54.750 from the presentation,
- 545 00:22:54.750 --> 00:22:56.160 you should be starting to get an idea
- 546 00:22:56.160 --> 00:22:56.993 of why I say
- 547 00:22:56.993 --> 00:22:59.763 that there was my second takeaway, rather,
- $548\ 00:23:00.780 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.550$ you start to get an idea here
- 549 00:23:02.550 --> 00:23:05.850 of the notion that expenditures exist,
- $550\ 00:23:05.850 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.200$ but that costs,
- $551\ 00:23:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.760$ they're a little bit fuzzier.
- 552 00:23:08.760 --> 00:23:10.380 They're frequently abstract
- $553\ 00:23:10.380 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.680$ and they depend on a lot of different factors.
- $554\ 00:23:13.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.310$ So two different kinds of costs to be able
- $555\ 00{:}23{:}17.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.540$ to distinguish between are economic and financial costs.
- $556~00{:}23{:}21.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}25.230$ So financial costs are those appearing potentially
- $557\ 00:23:25.230 --> 00:23:29.610$ in the program expenditures documents.
- 558 00:23:29.610 --> 00:23:33.090 Meanwhile, economic costs are costs
- $559\ 00:23:33.090 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.980$ that are included or that include

- $560\ 00:23:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.900$ the value of all resources,
- 561 00:23:36.900 --> 00:23:38.160 regardless of who's paying.
- $562\ 00:23:38.160 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.090$ So the difference here is resources contributed
- $563\ 00:23:42.090 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.990$ by other entities.
- 564 00:23:42.990 --> 00:23:45.600 So for example, the local hospital,
- $565\ 00:23:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.430$ the clinical staff,
- 566 00:23:47.430 --> 00:23:50.610 volunteers or subsidized costs,
- $567\ 00:23:50.610 --> 00:23:55.233$ such as from an international agency paying for commodities.
- $568\ 00:23:56.400 \dashrightarrow > 00:24:01.200$ So note that when you see an economic costing exercise
- 569 00:24:01.200 --> 00:24:03.270 referred to in the literature,
- 570 00:24:03.270 --> 00:24:06.365 it typically subsumes financial costing
- $571~00{:}24{:}06.365 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}11.043$ when it's, you know, thought of in this Venn diagram.
- $572\ 00:24:13.260 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.720$ So we have a sense of what costs are
- 573 00:24:15.720 --> 00:24:16.740 and why they're important,
- $574\ 00:24:16.740 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.410$ but what exactly is costing.
- $575\ 00:24:19.410 --> 00:24:22.397$ So we use this term costing as a shorthand
- $576\ 00:24:22.397 --> 00:24:25.230$ to describe the estimation of the costs
- $577\ 00:24:25.230 --> 00:24:29.220$ of producing health services, for example.
- $578\ 00{:}24{:}29.220$ --> $00{:}24{:}32.400$ So costing places of value on the total resources used
- 579 00:24:32.400 --> 00:24:34.140 to produce a good or service.
- $580~00:24:34.140 --> 00:24:37.380~\mathrm{It}$ requires measurement of the amount of each resource
- 581 00:24:37.380 --> 00:24:39.480 as well as information about the price
- $582\ 00:24:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.640$ of each of those resources.
- $583\ 00:24:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.520$ So costs can vary by context.
- $584\ 00:24:44.520 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.670$ So when one is costing,
- $585~00{:}24{:}47.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}50.160$ it's important to gather information about location,

- $586~00{:}24{:}50.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53.823$ about time period, population, and a host of other factors.
- $587\ 00:24:54.990 --> 00:24:56.670$ Some of the different types of resources
- $588\ 00:24:56.670 --> 00:24:59.250$ that are used to produce health services
- 589 00:24:59.250 --> 00:25:02.640 might include human resources,
- 590 00:25:02.640 --> 00:25:04.470 drugs and supplies,
- $591\ 00:25:04.470 --> 00:25:07.710$ medical or other non-medical equipment
- $592\ 00:25:07.710 --> 00:25:09.213$ or even patient costs.
- 593 00:25:10.380 --> 00:25:12.393 So what exactly do we use costing for?
- 594 00:25:13.260 --> 00:25:14.220 Well, costing is used
- 595 00:25:14.220 --> 00:25:18.450 in a range of research evaluations, programs,
- 596 00:25:18.450 --> 00:25:19.950 and in planning,
- 597 00:25:19.950 --> 00:25:22.680 primarily it's in the areas of financial planning
- 598 00:25:22.680 --> 00:25:24.900 and budgeting and priority setting
- 599~00:25:24.900 --> 00:25:28.833 that cost data is the most sort of visible we'll say.
- $600\ 00:25:29.670 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.503$ So for example,
- $601\ 00:25:30.503 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.960$ cost data are used to evaluate the effectiveness
- $602\ 00:25:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.150$ of an intervention or to understand
- $603\ 00:25:36.150 \longrightarrow 00:25:38.550$ the efficiency of health delivery,
- $604\ 00:25:38.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:40.000$ but what are the cost drivers
- 605 00:25:40.890 --> 00:25:42.570 and how do these vary over time?
- $606\ 00:25:42.570 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.160$ So in in ART,
- $607\ 00:25:44.160 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.983$ which is the example in the slide here,
- $608\ 00:25:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.700$ this figure is from a systematic review
- $609\ 00:25:50.700 --> 00:25:52.163$ of the costing literature.
- $610\ 00:25:52.163 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.390$ This is one that I'll touch on later
- $611\ 00:25:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.920$ for antiretroviral treatment
- 612 00:25:55.920 --> 00:25:57.670 in low and middle income countries,
- 613 00:25:58.590 --> 00:26:00.750 it shows the different drivers
- $614\ 00{:}26{:}00.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}04.893$ of the average unit costs across five different settings.

- $615\ 00:26:05.910 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.470$ And this helps to show
- $616\ 00:26:07.470$ --> 00:26:11.940 which cost inputs contribute most to the overall unit cost.
- 617 00:26:11.940 --> 00:26:13.080 So this figure I think does
- $618\ 00{:}26{:}13.080 {\: -->\:} 00{:}26{:}16.260$ a really great job of showing the absolute difference
- $619\ 00:26:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.450$ in unit costs between settings.
- 620 00:26:18.450 --> 00:26:20.340 And in this case it's it's by country
- $621\ 00:26:20.340 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.140$ and it includes a lot of different settings
- $622\ 00:26:22.140 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.140$ within countries and doing so over time.
- $623\ 00:26:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.103$ Oops, excuse me.
- 624 00:26:33.690 --> 00:26:35.850 So cost data are also used, you know,
- $625\ 00:26:35.850 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.550$ as I mentioned in efficiency analyses.
- 626 00:26:38.550 --> 00:26:39.383 So for example,
- 627 00:26:39.383 --> 00:26:42.570 this might be to examine how costs vary
- 628 00:26:42.570 --> 00:26:45.120 with different levels of service delivery.
- $629~00{:}26{:}45.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}48.900$ So understanding unit costs at different coverage levels
- $630~00{:}26{:}48.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}51.960$ is really important to predicting costs as programs tend
- $631\ 00:26:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.580$ to scale up or to grow.
- $632~00:26:53.580 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.120$ So scale is a really important component here.
- $633\ 00:26:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.000$ Now these dynamics can be explored
- $634\ 00:27:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.830$ through the use of cost functions.
- $635\ 00:27:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.630$ So here the figure shows
- $636\ 00:27:03.630 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.180$ this sort of interesting dynamic relationship
- $637\ 00{:}27{:}06.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}10.230$ between scale and unit cost for antiretroviral treatments
- $638\ 00:27:10.230 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.670$ across a large number of sites
- 639 00:27:11.670 --> 00:27:13.950 in sub-Saharan African countries.
- 640~00:27:13.950 --> 00:27:17.910 So you'll note that the relationship here isn't linear.
- 641 00:27:17.910 --> 00:27:19.380 It's a little noisy,

- $642\ 00{:}27{:}19.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}21.990$ but that makes it important to estimate cost functions
- $643\ 00:27:21.990 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.120$ and then to utilize different costs
- $644\ 00:27:24.120 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.160$ for different levels of coverage.
- $645\ 00:27:26.160 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.350$ So in this case we can see
- $646\ 00:27:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.620$ some suggestive evidence of economies of scale,
- 647 00:27:31.620 --> 00:27:36.060 which is to say that per patient ART services
- $648\ 00:27:36.060 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.970$ within facilities with larger numbers
- 649 00:27:38.970 --> 00:27:40.170 of annual patients tend
- $650\ 00:27:40.170 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.450$ to be slightly cheaper than facilities
- $651\ 00:27:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:44.073$ with fewer annual patients.
- $652\ 00:27:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.210$ So one thing to remember here
- 653 00:27:48.210 --> 00:27:50.130 is that although there's a wide range
- $654\ 00:27:50.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.350$ of different analyses that need cost data,
- $655\ 00:27:52.350$ --> 00:27:57.350 they don't always use or need the same types of data.
- $656\ 00:27:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.370$ The purpose of the analysis
- $657\ 00:27:59.370 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.440$ in this case sort of dictates
- $658\ 00:28:01.440 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.300$ the type of cost that is required.
- 659 00:28:03.300 --> 00:28:04.780 And so it's really important
- $660\ 00:28:05.640 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.163$ that the purpose be identified at the outset.
- 661 00:28:09.510 --> 00:28:10.650 So, you know,
- 662 00:28:10.650 --> 00:28:13.950 we have to consider budgeting, forecasting,
- $663\ 00{:}28{:}13.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}18.060$ efficiency analysis, priority setting, among others.
- $664\ 00:28:20.641 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.200$ Move forward.
- 665 00:28:22.200 --> 00:28:24.630 So before we go into costs further,
- $666~00{:}28{:}24.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27.530$ I think it's also important to get some terminology right.
- 667 00:28:28.710 --> 00:28:31.710 In addition to the types of costs,
- $668\ 00:28:31.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.020$ there's also different measures of cost.
- 669 00:28:34.020 --> 00:28:36.633 So being clear about what each means, I think,

- 670 00:28:37.470 --> 00:28:40.710 is pretty central to understanding
- $671\ 00{:}28{:}40.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44.340$ and interpreting cost information better as a field.
- $672\ 00:28:44.340 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.140$ So here are four different types
- $673~00{:}28{:}46.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}49.170$ of costing terms that you're probably familiar with
- 674 00:28:49.170 --> 00:28:51.960 or, you know, you may have encountered some,
- $675\ 00:28:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.370$ but what do they mean?
- $676\ 00:28:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.470$ So the first is total cost,
- $677~00{:}28{:}55.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}57.900$ which is as you'd imagine the total cost
- $678\ 00:28:57.900 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.073$ of producing a service.
- $679\ 00:29:00.030 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.330$ And in healthcare this is often presented as an annual cost.
- $680~00{:}29{:}03.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}07.237$ For example, the total annual cost of VMMC services
- 681 00:29:07.237 --> 00:29:09.813 at a clinic in a particular setting.
- $682\ 00:29:11.040 --> 00:29:13.530$ The second term is average unit cost.
- $683\ 00:29:13.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.860$ And so this is the total cost per unit of output.
- 684 00:29:16.860 --> 00:29:18.840 And you'll notice that the units of output
- $685\ 00:29:18.840 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.540$ can be measured in different ways,
- $686\ 00:29:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.800$ even within the same service.
- $687\ 00:29:22.800 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.820$ So for example,
- $688\ 00:29:23.820 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.950$ there's a cost per person contacted
- $689\ 00:29:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.900$ or a cost per person treated.
- $690\ 00:29:27.900 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.540$ And I'll return to this a little later.
- $691\ 00:29:30.540 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.460$ The third term is marginal cost,
- $692\ 00{:}29{:}32.460 {\: -->\:} 00{:}29{:}35.490$ which is a concept that's frequently used in economics
- $693\ 00:29:35.490 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.246$ and it's really critical to efficiency analysis.
- 694 00:29:38.246 --> 00:29:40.020 And this is the additional cost of producing
- $695\ 00:29:40.020 --> 00:29:41.880$ just one more unit of output.
- 696 00:29:41.880 --> 00:29:43.557 So for example,

- $697\ 00:29:43.557 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.870$ the cost of testing one more person
- 698 00:29:45.870 --> 00:29:48.033 or vaccinating one additional patient.
- $699\ 00:29:49.140 --> 00:29:52.530$ And then the final term here is incremental cost,
- $700\ 00:29:52.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.840$ which also examines change.
- $701\ 00:29:54.840 --> 00:29:57.690$ In this case, however, the focus is on the cost
- $702\ 00:29:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.190$ of adding a completely new level
- $703\ 00:29:59.190 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.360$ or type of service rather
- 704 00:30:00.360 --> 00:30:02.820 than adding one more unit of output
- $705\ 00:30:02.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.320$ to an existing service.
- $706\ 00:30:04.320 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.190$ So for example,
- $707\ 00:30:05.190 --> 00:30:08.070$ the additional cost of adding counseling
- $708\ 00:30:08.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.210$ and linkage to care
- $709\ 00:30:09.210 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.653$ to current HIV testing.
- 710 00:30:12.180 --> 00:30:15.810 Most costing exercises though that you'll encounter tend to
- $711\ 00:30:15.810 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.423$ refer to either average or to unit costs.
- 712 00:30:21.009 --> 00:30:23.070 I wanna give you just a quick example here
- 713 00:30:23.070 --> 00:30:26.970 of what a program costing table might look like.
- 714 00:30:26.970 --> 00:30:30.960 So this slide comes from a presentation by Dr. Jim Kahn,
- $715\ 00:30:30.960 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.940$ who is a mentor of mine at Cal.
- $716\ 00:30:35.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.860$ The example here is a small rural HIV clinic
- 717 00:30:40.860 --> 00:30:45.860 that was set up by a colleague of Dr. Khan at UCSF,
- 718 00:30:45.990 --> 00:30:46.920 which I'll have to say
- $719\ 00:30:46.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.030$ is where he spent most of his career.
- $720\ 00:30:51.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.720$ And the two in this case conducted
- 721 00:30:54.720 --> 00:30:57.600 a costing analysis of this facility.
- $722\ 00:30:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.433$ So as you can see,
- 723 00:30:58.433 --> 00:31:00.000 the summary divides costs

```
724\ 00:31:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:31:02.160 into four different categories.
```

725 00:31:02.160 --> 00:31:03.723 There's personnel at the top,

 $726\ 00:31:04.620 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.210$ antiretroviral medications.

 $727\ 00:31:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:07.800$ which are the dominant supply

 $728\ 00:31:07.800 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.300$ that were used by the program,

729 00:31:10.260 --> 00:31:14.040 lab tests, which is the main service that was provided

 $730\ 00:31:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.300$ by the program,

 $731\ 00:31:15.300 \longrightarrow 00:31:18.420$ and then there's this fourth sort of residual category

 $732\ 00:31:18.420 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.190$ of less expensive items.

733 00:31:20.190 --> 00:31:23.340 So administration, general supplies,

 $734\ 00:31:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.890$ vehicles, storage, utilities.

 $735\ 00:31:25.890 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.440$ You might find pencils in here.

 $736\ 00:31:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.320$ So the standard input categories here

 $737\ 00:31:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.490$ were adapted to conform

738 00:31:32.490 --> 00:31:35.460 to how clinicians think about major components

 $739\ 00:31:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.963$ of antiretroviral treatment.

 $740\ 00:31:37.800 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.630$ In this case, the columns show the units

 $741\ 00:31:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.250$ that were tested,

 $742\ 00:31:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.040$ the costs per unit,

743 00:31:44.040 --> 00:31:47.460 the resulting monthly cost for the entire activity

744 00:31:47.460 --> 00:31:50.340 and the entire costs per patient

745 00:31:50.340 --> 00:31:51.333 for each line item.

 $746\ 00:31:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.700$ So in this case, for example,

 $747\ 00:31:53.700 --> 00:31:58.290$ the full-time doctor costs \$1083 per month

 $748\ 00:31:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.453$ and \$52 per patient year.

 $749\ 00:32:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.110$ So one interesting takeaway here

 $750\ 00:32:04.110 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.030$ is that the authors found

- $751\ 00:32:06.030$ --> 00:32:09.660 that once the clinic had reached fully operational capacity,
- 752 00:32:09.660 --> 00:32:11.580 it was able to deliver an ART
- 753 00:32:11.580 --> 00:32:16.110 at it looks like about \$550 per patient per year.
- 754 00:32:16.110 --> 00:32:18.330 And they also found, which isn't shown here,
- $755\ 00:32:18.330 \longrightarrow 00:32:21.180$ that the cost could drop by about a third
- $756\ 00:32:21.180 --> 00:32:23.580$ with less expensive medications
- 757 00:32:23.580 --> 00:32:25.320 as well as lower wage scales
- 758 00:32:25.320 \rightarrow 00:32:27.990 and modest increases in patient load.
- $759\ 00:32:27.990 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.490$ So just an interesting example
- $760\ 00:32:30.750 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.853$ to kind of put some of this into context.
- 761 00:32:34.290 --> 00:32:36.810 A couple of key costing principles here.
- $762\ 00:32:36.810 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.220$ And these are major takeaways
- $763\ 00:32:38.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.980$ I think from Jim as well.
- $764~00{:}32{:}40.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.610$ But in theory you can do some really solid costing work
- $765~00{:}32{:}44.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}48.420$ if you adhere to really these three main principles.
- $766\ 00:32:48.420 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.100$ So the most important is that your goal
- $767\ 00:32:50.100 --> 00:32:52.440$ is to quantify the resources required
- $768\ 00:32:52.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.530$ for program operation and the associated cost,
- 769 00:32:55.530 --> 00:32:59.880 and that means developing an inventory of resources
- $770\ 00:32:59.880 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.590$ and assigning appropriate costs.
- 771 00:33:01.590 --> 00:33:05.040 So this task is quite different
- $772\ 00:33:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.080$ than simply accepting a program's budget
- $773\ 00:33:07.080 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.970$ or their expenditure report
- $774\ 00:33:08.970 \longrightarrow 00:33:10.650$ because that report might include costs
- $775\ 00{:}33{:}10.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}13.350$ that aren't required for routine program operations,
- $776\ 00:33:13.350 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.483$ like special evaluation needs of a funder.
- 777 00:33:17.400 --> 00:33:19.980 Also, even if the costs are accurate,

778 00:33:19.980 --> 00:33:21.330 you've likely learned nothing

779 00:33:21.330 --> 00:33:23.160 about how the program operates.

 $780\ 00:33:23.160 --> 00:33:26.010$ So specifically, what types of inputs might be available?

781 00:33:27.450 --> 00:33:29.220 The number two point, you know,

 $782\ 00{:}33{:}29.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}33.390$ that Jim makes often is that you should be systematic

783 00:33:33.390 --> 00:33:35.130 and thoughtfully thorough.

 $784\ 00:33:35.130 --> 00:33:37.950$ And by systematic, you know, we mean

 $785\ 00:33:37.950 --> 00:33:39.630$ that the search for resources

 $786\ 00:33:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.240$ should include all of the usual input categories

787 00:33:42.240 --> 00:33:43.803 like personnel and equipment,

 $788\ 00:33:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.740$ the range of activities, such as marketing

 $789\ 00:33:46.740 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.793$ and service delivery.

790 00:33:48.840 --> 00:33:52.620 But, by being thoughtfully thorough, you know,

791 00:33:52.620 --> 00:33:56.580 what Jim refers to is that all of the significant resources

 $792\ 00:33:56.580 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.150$ should be included, quantified and costed.

793 00:34:00.150 --> 00:34:01.800 But minor costs,

 $794~00{:}34{:}01.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05.220$ truly minor things like routine stationary supplies

795 00:34:05.220 --> 00:34:09.570 or routine services, pencils and erasers,

 $796\ 00:34:09.570 \dashrightarrow 00:34:13.170$ they can often be safely ignored if the data collection

 $797\ 00:34:13.170 --> 00:34:16.200$ in order to obtain those is too onerous.

 $798\ 00:34:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.780$ So of course that's like a judgment call.

799 00:34:18.780 --> 00:34:21.120 And one suggestion, you know,

 $800\ 00:34:21.120 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.240$ that Jim makes is to use a table

801 00:34:24.240 --> 00:34:25.860 and kind of order resources

 $802\ 00:34:25.860 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.510$ from the most to the least expensive

 $803\ 00:34:27.510 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.850$ so that you can empirically identify,

 $804~00{:}34{:}29.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}32.610$ say a cutoff for each of the resources

- $805\ 00:34:32.610 --> 00:34:34.770$ that are considered maybe too minor
- $806\ 00:34:34.770 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.850$ or that may not play into the overall costs
- $807\ 00:34:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.620$ as much as you might be concerned about.
- $808\ 00:34:40.620$ --> 00:34:44.070 So, you know, this is really getting into fine, fine detail.
- 809 00:34:44.070 --> 00:34:46.270 Do you really need to cost that last pencil?
- $810\ 00:34:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:34:50.700$ And then finally, you know, as we mentioned before,
- 811 00:34:50.700 --> 00:34:52.740 adopt the appropriate perspective.
- $812\ 00:34:52.740 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.103$ So I've talked about, you know, this at some length,
- 813 00:34:58.320 --> 00:34:59.670 but it's worth reiterating.
- 814 00:35:03.750 --> 00:35:06.480 I'll go over, I think I might skip past some
- $815~00{:}35{:}06.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}10.380$ of the typical cost and categories except to say, you know,
- $816\ 00:35:10.380 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.620$ these are some examples they may often
- $817\ 00:35:13.620 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.023$ go as far as to include patient costs.
- $818\ 00:35:18.030$ --> 00:35:23.030 They may also vary by program and over time.
- $819\ 00:35:26.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.340$ The timeframe, you know, which I mentioned earlier,
- $820\ 00{:}35{:}29.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}32.220$ typically when we think about a costing exercise,
- 821 00:35:32.220 --> 00:35:35.670 it's about 12 months or it's multiples thereof.
- $822\ 00:35:35.670 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.170$ And you know, the reason for this
- $823\ 00:35:37.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.400$ for annual costing
- 824 00:35:38.400 --> 00:35:41.940 is that it has the hallmark of, you know,
- $825\ 00:35:41.940 --> 00:35:45.000$ conforming to our pervasive and programmatic record keeping,
- 826 00:35:45.000 --> 00:35:46.470 which is really nice,
- 827 00:35:46.470 --> 00:35:49.500 but it can also help to deal with distortions,
- 828 00:35:49.500 --> 00:35:51.420 seasonal effects and shocks.
- $829\ 00:35:51.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.180$ It's smooths as a lot of random variation.

- 830 00:35:54.180 --> 00:35:56.010 So that can be for like the calendar year
- 831 $00:35:56.010 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.510$ or the fiscal year, typically.
- 832 00:35:58.620 --> 00:36:00.510 Portraying costs by month,
- $833\ 00:36:00.510 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.343$ if it's easier,
- $834\ 00:36:01.343 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.050$ might indicate how costs vary over the course of a year.
- 835 $00:36:04.050 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.650$ So that's another consideration.
- 836 00:36:07.470 --> 00:36:08.730 And you know, again,
- $837\ 00:36:08.730 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.000$ if we're talking about fully operational programs,
- $838\ 00:36:12.000 --> 00:36:15.780$ we wanna make sure that the program is actually matured,
- 839 00:36:15.780 --> 00:36:18.910 but again, that might ignore some of the startup costs
- $840\ 00:36:20.210 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.353$ or other costs that I discussed earlier.
- 841 00:36:23.340 \rightarrow 00:36:26.640 One other little piece of terminology that I want to cover
- $842\ 00{:}36{:}26.640 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}36{:}29.640$ is gross versus macro, and top down versus bottom up.
- $843\ 00:36:29.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.010$ So you might have come across this a number of times,
- 844 00:36:32.010 --> 00:36:33.990 you know, in proposals or mentioned
- 845 00:36:33.990 --> 00:36:35.740 sort of casually in the literature,
- $846\ 00{:}36{:}36{:}6600 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{00:}}}36{:}39{:}840$ micro-costing focuses on really granular accounting
- 847 00:36:39.840 --> 00:36:44.840 of inputs as opposed to to macro-costing,
- 848 00:36:45.420 --> 00:36:50.420 which is, or sorry, gross costing.
- $849\ 00:36:50.430 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.780$ I always get them confused.
- $850\ 00{:}36{:}52.852 --> 00{:}36{:}54.930$ A gross costing approach that might simply estimate
- $851\ 00:36:54.930 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.790$ all of the relevant costs,
- 852 00:36:56.790 --> 00:36:59.250 typically from program expenditure data,
- $853\ 00:36:59.250 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.070$ and then dividing the associated outputs.
- $854\ 00:37:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.083$ So like patient episodes.

 $855\ 00:37:05.280 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.250$ In contrast, we've got the bottom up or top down,

 $856\ 00:37:08.250 --> 00:37:12.390$ which refers to the way in which each resource is allocated

 $857\ 00:37:12.390 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.280$ to the total unit cost being estimated.

 $858\ 00:37:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.370$ So top down costing divides

859 00:37:17.370 --> 00:37:19.680 overall program costs or expenditures,

860 00:37:19.680 --> 00:37:21.780 often including those,

 $861\ 00:37:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.780$ which are above the service delivery level

 $862\ 00:37:26.820 \longrightarrow 00:37:28.290$ by the number of outputs in order

 $863\ 00:37:28.290 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.943$ to calculate the unit cost,

 $864\ 00:37:30.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.180$ whereas bottom up costing

 $865\ 00:37:33.180 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.500$ measures input quantities at the client or activity level.

866 00:37:37.500 --> 00:37:39.390 So gross costing, for example,

867 00:37:39.390 --> 00:37:42.183 is commonly done top down, for example.

 $868~00{:}37{:}44.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}46.990$ And then micro-costing kind of has a bottom up.

869 00:37:49.590 --> 00:37:50.760 I'll skip over.

870 00:37:50.760 --> 00:37:55.323 Well, let's see, Debbie, we're at 43 after.

871 00:37:57.300 --> 00:38:00.750 I wanna mention pricing and valuation very briefly

872 00:38:00.750 --> 00:38:04.830 before moving into some of our other findings

 $873\ 00:38:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.300$ simply because I think there's one example

 $874\ 00:38:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.640$ in the popular press right now

875 00:38:11.640 --> 00:38:13.170 that's really worth consideration,

 $876\ 00:38:13.170 --> 00:38:14.610$ particularly if you're operating

877 00:38:14.610 --> 00:38:15.840 in low and middle income countries.

 $878\ 00:38:15.840 \dashrightarrow 00:38:20.840$ And I'll just point to the fourth bullet here, inflation.

 $879\ 00:38:20.970 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.780$ So inflation comes up a lot

 $880\ 00:38:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.650$ in the popular press

881 $00:38:25.650 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.750$ because we're experiencing rapid inflation

- 882 00:38:27.750 --> 00:38:28.983 in the US right now,
- 883 00:38:29.850 \rightarrow 00:38:33.960 but I wanna linger on it for a second, simply to say,
- $884\ 00:38:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.960$ so the operation that you use
- $885\ 00:38:40.020 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.020$ in order to account for inflation
- $886\ 00:38:43.020 --> 00:38:46.620$ in different country settings matters a great deal.
- $887\ 00:38:46.620 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.270$ So the example here is,
- 888 00:38:48.270 --> 00:38:49.820 let's say that you've collected
- 889 00:38:50.915 --> 00:38:51.748 a piece of critical cost data
- 890 00:38:51.748 --> 00:38:53.610 from a program in Tanzania,
- $891\ 00:38:53.610 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.433$ the unit cost of a service
- $892\ 00:38:55.433 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.353$ in the year 2000 to say a \$100.
- 893 00:38:59.400 --> 00:39:02.040 So, you know, the typical strategy
- 894 00:39:02.040 --> 00:39:07.040 is to use a US price inflation tool,
- $895\ 00:39:08.220 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.720$ so typically the GDP price deflator
- $896\ 00:39:11.700 --> 00:39:15.300$ and convert that into US dollars
- $897\ 00:39:15.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.820$ in order to inflate over time.
- 898 00:39:17.820 --> 00:39:21.390 There's some recommendations in the literature
- $899\ 00:39:21.390 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.223$ that this should be done
- 900 00:39:22.223 --> 00:39:24.150 in a different order of operations,
- $901\ 00:39:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.420$ and that would be to actually inflate
- $902\ 00{:}39{:}26.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}30.720$ in local inflation before converting into US dollars.
- 903 00:39:30.720 --> 00:39:32.010 And the implications for that.
- $904\ 00:39:32.010 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.700$ So in the next slide here are pretty substantial.
- $905\ 00{:}39{:}35.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}38.850$ So, you know, in Tanzania over that same period,
- 906 00:39:38.850 --> 00:39:42.630 inflation was quite rampant and so it it really changes
- $907\ 00:39:42.630 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.900$ the overall dollar amount
- 908 00:39:45.900 --> 00:39:46.860 that you're looking at

- $909\ 00:39:46.860 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.770$ in the last period of the cycle there.
- 910 00:39:49.770 --> 00:39:51.720 And it's even more volatile
- 911 00:39:51.720 --> 00:39:53.550 when you include other countries
- 912 00:39:53.550 --> 00:39:55.653 in sub-Saharan Africa, period.
- 913 00:39:57.180 --> 00:40:02.180 So, your choice of inflating first before exchanging
- 914 00:40:02.340 --> 00:40:04.830 into US dollars or exchanging into US dollars
- 915 00:40:04.830 --> 00:40:07.800 and then using a US inflation process
- $916\ 00:40:07.800 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.100$ can have some really substantial implications.
- 917 00:40:11.970 --> 00:40:13.350 I just wanted to highlight that.
- 918 00:40:13.350 --> 00:40:18.350 I'm gonna push through some of these final notes here
- 919 00:40:18.780 --> 00:40:23.010 because I'd like to get to some of our findings.
- 920~00:40:23.010 --> $00:40:26.040~\mathrm{I}$ do wanna leave you with three key resources at the end,
- 921 00:40:26.040 --> 00:40:28.950 and those are the consolidated health economics
- $922\ 00:40:28.950 --> 00:40:30.450$ evaluation reporting standards,
- 923 00:40:30.450 --> 00:40:31.320 or CHEERS standards.
- $924\ 00:40:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.180$ There's a new update to those standards
- $925\ 00:40:33.180 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.370$ that was published in 2022.
- $926\ 00:40:35.370 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.570$ And then for those working
- 927 00:40:36.570 --> 00:40:39.060 in low and middle income country settings,
- 928 00:40:39.060 --> 00:40:42.090 Vasal and colleagues reference case
- $929\ 00:40:42.090 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.064$ for estimating the cost
- $930\ 00:40:44.064 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.630$ of global health services and interventions
- 931 00:40:45.630 --> 00:40:49.110 and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation 2014 guidelines
- 932 00:40:49.110 --> 00:40:51.570 that come through their reference case.
- 933 00:40:51.570 --> 00:40:54.900 And I'm happy to share those resources after the talk,
- 934 00:40:54.900 --> 00:40:56.610 but let me get into costing and practice here
- 935 00:40:56.610 --> 00:40:59.250 because I am running quite low on time.

- 936 00:40:59.250 --> 00:41:01.860 So the Global Health Cost Consortium,
- 937 00:41:01.860 \rightarrow 00:41:03.230 as Debbie mentioned at the top
- $938\ 00:41:03.230 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.920$ of the hour was funded
- 939 00:41:04.920 --> 00:41:06.970 by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.
- 940 00:41:08.550 --> 00:41:11.670 I was involved with this project for about four years,
- 941 00:41:11.670 --> 00:41:15.600 and two of the outputs from the project
- 942 00:41:15.600 --> 00:41:18.450 were our unit cost study repository,
- 943 00:41:18.450 --> 00:41:21.060 which I'd invite you to visit.
- 944 00:41:21.060 --> 00:41:24.360 And that's really a one-stop shop for all
- $945\ 00:41:24.360 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.770$ of the published cost data
- 946 00:41:25.770 --> 00:41:27.690 from HIV and TB interventions
- 947 00:41:27.690 --> 00:41:28.523 that were conducted
- 948 00:41:28.523 --> 00:41:30.390 in low and middle income countries settings,
- $949\ 00:41:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.223$ really over the last 20 years or so.
- $950~00{:}41{:}33.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}36.450$ So we went through a pretty long pains taking process
- 951 00:41:36.450 --> 00:41:39.033 of extracting primary cost data,
- 952 00:41:39.033 --> 00:41:41.710 that is costs that were not modeled
- $953\ 00:41:42.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.700$ from the published literature,
- 954 00:41:44.700 --> 00:41:47.670 standardizing them across
- 955 00:41:47.670 --> 00:41:51.150 several hundred different variables,
- $956~00{:}41{:}51.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}55.560$ and then making them sort of available to the public
- 957 00:41:55.560 --> 00:41:57.630 at large in a pretty easy
- $958\ 00:41:57.630 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.050$ to use dropdown type of database.
- 959 00:42:01.050 \rightarrow 00:42:04.650 So if you're ever doing any program planning
- 960 00:42:04.650 --> 00:42:06.570 for HIV or TB interventions,
- 961 00:42:06.570 --> 00:42:09.630 I'd invite you to visit that site
- 962 00:42:09.630 --> 00:42:11.400 and see if you can get any utility
- $963\ 00:42:11.400 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.740$ from some of the efforts that we put forward.
- $964\ 00:42:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.840$ Another big output was the reference case

- 965 00:42:15.840 --> 00:42:17.700 that I mentioned before,
- 966 00:42:17.700 --> 00:42:19.439 guidelines for estimating costs
- 967 00:42:19.439 --> 00:42:21.333 for Global Health Interventions.
- 968 00:42:22.170 --> 00:42:24.520 And again, happy to share those after the talk.
- 969 00:42:26.100 --> 00:42:28.740 Another major output here was we were able
- $970\ 00:42:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:42:33.120$ to produce several different publications.
- 971 00:42:33.120 --> 00:42:36.330 So I'll present a little bit of the findings from that.
- 972 00:42:36.330 --> 00:42:38.129 So over several years, our team
- 973 00:42:38.129 --> 00:42:39.900 conducted the systematic search
- $974\ 00{:}42{:}39.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}43.200$ and screening of peer reviewed and grey literature.
- $975\ 00:42:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.660$ We had a few different goals here.
- $976\ 00:42:45.660$ --> 00:42:48.390 We wanted to describe the quantity and characteristics
- 977 00:42:48.390 --> 00:42:50.820 of public published costing data
- 978 00:42:50.820 --> 00:42:54.270 to identify production patterns over time,
- 979 00:42:54.270 --> 00:42:55.770 so geographic location,
- 980 00:42:55.770 --> 00:42:58.260 publication venues like journals
- 981 00:42:58.260 --> 00:43:01.830 and authorship and to look into key methods
- 982 00:43:01.830 --> 00:43:04.560 and reporting standards to try to identify gaps
- $983\ 00:43:04.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.540$ in the costing literature.
- 984 00:43:06.540 --> 00:43:09.150 So I'll go over some of those findings.
- 985 00:43:09.150 --> 00:43:12.210 So figure one here shows the results
- 986 00:43:12.210 --> 00:43:15.180 of that search and screening process.
- $987\ 00{:}43{:}15.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}17.700$ So we covered articles that were published starting
- 988 00:43:17.700 --> 00:43:22.700 in January, 2006 through October, 2017.
- 989 $00:43:22.710 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.273$ So it's a couple years old now.
- 990 $00:43:25.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.270$ We use six databases,
- 991 00:43:27.270 --> 00:43:30.243 so PubMed, M Base, Web Science, Cochrane,

- 992 $00:43:32.454 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.350$ and a number of others.
- 993 00:43:34.350 --> 00:43:36.930 I'm gonna give you high level content here.
- 994 00:43:36.930 --> 00:43:39.600 So searching also included grey literature,
- $995\ 00:43:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.700$ which you see on the right hand side.
- 996 00:43:41.700 --> 00:43:45.540 And we identified over 23,000 possible titles,
- 997 00:43:45.540 --> 00:43:48.360 including nearly 500 known costing studies
- $998\ 00:43:48.360 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.770$ that we had started with.
- 999 00:43:49.770 --> 00:43:51.600 So from these we were able to screen down
- $1000\ 00:43:51.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.824$ to 217 relevant titles
- $1001\ 00:43:53.824 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.140$ that got included in that unit cost study repository,
- $1002\ 00:43:58.140 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.810$ that database that I mentioned before.
- $1003\ 00{:}44{:}00.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05.673$ And of those we published one study among 159
- 1004 00:44:10.560 --> 00:44:12.060 published studies that had taken place
- $1005\ 00:44:12.060 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.203$ in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- $1006~00{:}44{:}14.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}17.610$ So I'm gonna discuss really briefly two different studies
- $1007\ 00:44:17.610 \longrightarrow 00:44:18.660$ that came out of the effort.
- $1008~00{:}44{:}18.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}22.230$ And the first was that 2019 study that I just described.
- 1009 00:44:22.230 --> 00:44:24.060 And the second is a study that's in progress
- 1010 00:44:24.060 --> 00:44:26.340 where we're reviewing findings
- $1011\ 00:44:26.340 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.020$ from the detailed extraction
- $1012\ 00:44:28.020 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.000$ of the 243 studies that we started with
- $1013\ 00:44:32.010 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.750$ in the lines above.
- $1014\ 00:44:33.750 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.820$ So I might jump a little bit between findings
- 1015 00:44:35.820 --> 00:44:37.020 in these two different venues.
- 1016 00:44:37.020 --> 00:44:40.920 So the first study focused on that evidence
- $1017\ 00:44:40.920 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.450$ from Sub-Saharan Africa.
- $1018\ 00:44:42.450 --> 00:44:43.830$ This gave us a really nice picture
- 1019 00:44:43.830 --> 00:44:46.830 of where costing data is and isn't collected

- $1020\ 00:44:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.213$ on the continent.
- $1021\ 00{:}44{:}49.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}51.840$ The studies we identified took place in 25 countries.
- 1022 00:44:51.840 --> 00:44:55.170 so mostly East Africa and Southern Africa.
- $1023\ 00{:}44{:}55.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57.870$ And although this sort of geographic variation
- 1024 00:44:57.870 --> 00:44:59.400 is broad, you know,
- $1025\ 00:44:59.400 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.990$ we found that the quality of evidence
- $1026\ 00:45:00.990 --> 00:45:03.357$ within many of these countries is,
- $1027\ 00{:}45{:}03.357 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}05.160$ or the quantity rather of evidence within these countries
- $1028\ 00:45:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.690$ is quite sparse.
- 1029 00:45:06.690 --> 00:45:10.200 So west Africa doesn't have
- $1030\ 00:45:10.200 --> 00:45:12.535$ a great deal of primary cost data
- $1031\ 00:45:12.535 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.190$ in the published literature.
- 1032 00:45:14.190 --> 00:45:16.503 A lot of it, you know, is often modeled.
- $1033\ 00:45:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.970$ In terms of who is publishing studies
- $1034\ 00:45:20.970 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.970$ that report on HIV intervention costs.
- $1035\ 00:45:23.970 --> 00:45:25.890$ There's a few notable peer-reviewed journals.
- $1036~00{:}45{:}25.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}30.843$ So PLoS One, J AIDS and AIDS are kind of our leaders.
- $1037\ 00:45:33.360 --> 00:45:34.710$ But I think the big takeaway here
- $1038\ 00:45:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.000$ is that there's an awful lot
- $1039\ 00:45:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.010$ of potential destinations
- $1040\ 00:45:38.010 --> 00:45:41.050$ for published primary cost data
- $1041\ 00:45:42.000 --> 00:45:45.000$ and more so than I think we realized
- 1042 00:45:45.000 --> 00:45:47.760 when we set out in this exercise.
- $1043\ 00:45:47.760 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.430$ So you can see the large list
- $1044\ 00:45:50.430 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.010$ of different published studies on the left
- $1045\ 00:45:53.010 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.440$ or sorry journal destinations
- 1046 00:45:55.440 --> 00:45:57.090 for published studies on the left
- $1047\ 00:45:57.930 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.280$ and the table in the right.

- $1048\ 00:46:00.210 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.820$ These are grey literature resources.
- $1049\ 00:46:01.820 \longrightarrow 00:46:05.340$ So these are the sources of grey lit,
- 1050 00:46:05.340 --> 00:46:08.880 a few key players here, USAID, PEPFAR,
- 1051 00:46:08.880 --> 00:46:11.970 the Futures Group, Health Policy Project
- $1052\ 00:46:11.970 --> 00:46:15.240$ and PANGEA and Bill and Melinda Gates
- 1053 00:46:15.240 --> 00:46:16.410 had their fingers
- $1054\ 00:46:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.080$ in a lot of these different published studies.
- $1055\ 00:46:19.080 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.123$ But these are the destinations.
- $1056\ 00:46:22.710 --> 00:46:24.570$ One thing that I do wanna mention here
- 1057 00:46:24.570 --> 00:46:26.220 is that although we're examining
- $1058\ 00{:}46{:}26.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}29.340$ this subset of primary cost data that was collected
- 1059 00:46:29.340 --> 00:46:31.860 from studies in Sub-Saharan Africa,
- $1060\ 00:46:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.270$ there's a little bit of a disconnect here
- $1061\ 00:46:33.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.050$ in terms of where we find that primary cost evidence
- $1062\ 00{:}46{:}37.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}39.690$ is being published and where leaders in the field,
- 1063 00:46:39.690 --> 00:46:41.954 at least nine years ago
- $1064\ 00:46:41.954 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.003$ when the first CHEERS guidelines paper was published,
- $1065\ 00:46:46.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.760$ that there's, you know,
- $1066\ 00:46:47.760 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.760$ in that paper there was an explicit effort
- $1067\ 00:46:52.920 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.820$ to identify leading journals as landing places
- $1068\ 00:46:56.820 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.190$ for health economic evaluations.
- $1069\ 00{:}46{:}59.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02.520$ But what we find is that of the 10 that they identified
- 1070 00:47:02.520 --> 00:47:04.830 in that CHEERS statement paper,
- $1071\ 00:47:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.680$ only three were we able to find
- $1072\ 00{:}47{:}07.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10.893$ in our larger systematic search of the HIV literature.
- $1073\ 00{:}47{:}11.760 --> 00{:}47{:}14.220$ And this is, you know, beyond Sub-Saharan Africa.

- $1074\ 00:47:14.220 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.620$ This is that paper too that I mentioned.
- $1075~00{:}47{:}16.620 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>} 00{:}47{:}19.740$ So this isn't necessarily an indictment of the list
- $1076\ 00:47:19.740 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.160$ that was generated by the CHEERS authors,
- 1077 00:47:23.160 --> 00:47:24.240 but it does highlight,
- $1078~00{:}47{:}24.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}27.270$ I think a large and varied number of journal sources
- $1079\ 00:47:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.950$ where these data are published.
- $1080\ 00:47:28.950 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.480$ And it emphasizes the need to be sure
- $1081\ 00:47:30.480 --> 00:47:32.040$ that these standards, you know,
- $1082\ 00:47:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:47:35.113$ like the ones laid out by the CHEERS document are being
- $1083\ 00:47:35.113 --> 00:47:38.373$ upheld across different publications.
- $1084\ 00:47:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.680$ So, you know, a large growth in publications over time,
- $1085\ 00:47:43.680 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.170$ a difference in the time to publication.
- $1086~00{:}47{:}46.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}51.150$ So peer reviewed studies tended to take 2.8 years on average
- 1087 00:47:51.150 --> 00:47:52.590 to get published,
- $1088\ 00:47:52.590 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.980$ whereas those in the grey literature 1.4 years.
- 1089 00:47:55.980 --> 00:47:59.710 So this is much more quickly disseminated
- 1090 00:48:00.900 --> 00:48:03.540 into the zeitgeist, you know,
- $1091\ 00:48:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.150$ the ability for folks to actually start
- $1092\ 00:48:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:48:07.410$ to use these data
- $1093\ 00:48:07.410 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.013$ for their own program planning purposes.
- $1094\ 00:48:12.900 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.250$ Scale, I'll mention.
- 1095 00:48:14.250 --> 00:48:16.680 This is probably our most substantial finding
- $1096\ 00:48:16.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.580$ and you don't need to spend
- 1097 00:48:17.580 --> 00:48:19.230 a lot of time pouring over this table,
- 1098 00:48:19.230 --> 00:48:21.030 but this was actually quite damning.
- $1099\ 00:48:22.440 --> 00:48:23.970$ If you don't take anything else away
- 1100 00:48:23.970 --> 00:48:24.990 from this presentation,

- 1101 00:48:24.990 --> 00:48:28.323 I think, I hope that that this resonates,
- $1102\ 00:48:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.840$ that reporting of scale
- $1103\ 00{:}48{:}30.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34.080$ is, you know, it's a really critical, important component
- $1104\ 00:48:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.180$ of any costing exercise.
- 1105 00:48:36.180 --> 00:48:40.020 But what we found is that in, you know,
- $1106\ 00{:}48{:}40{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}43{.}620$ the six of the intervention types of all the studies
- 1107 00:48:43.620 --> 00:48:46.440 through which we were able to collect data,
- $1108\ 00:48:46.440 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.610$ the average number of unit costs
- 1109 00:48:50.190 --> 00:48:52.623 in those published studies,
- $1110\ 00:48:54.060 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.243$ scale was reported below 50% of the time.
- 1111 00:48:58.230 --> 00:49:03.230 And in some areas as low as 35 or 26% of the time.
- 1112 00:49:04.320 --> 00:49:06.303 So in total, I think the average, you know,
- $1113\ 00:49:06.303 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.530$ that we found was something
- $1114\ 00:49:07.530 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.800$ like 44% of unit costs have
- $1115\ 00{:}49{:}10.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}13.865$ explicit measurement of scale associated
- $1116\ 00:49:13.865 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.020$ with those reports.
- 1117 00:49:16.020 --> 00:49:18.540 So that's a problem,
- $1118\ 00{:}49{:}18.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}20.723$ that's something that needs to improve in the field.
- 1119 00:49:21.780 --> 00:49:24.090 And then I'll also mention perspectives.
- $1120\ 00{:}49{:}24.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}28.987$ So despite I think recommendations and urging from say,
- 1121 00:49:30.000 --> 00:49:31.890 the Gates Foundation's reference case,
- 1122 00:49:31.890 --> 00:49:33.453 which I cited earlier,
- 1123 00:49:34.290 --> 00:49:36.150 which emphasizes that authors should focus
- 1124 00:49:36.150 --> 00:49:38.850 on societal perspectives as much as possible,
- $1125\ 00:49:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.710$ we actually find here in terms
- $1126\ 00:49:40.710 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.710$ of what folks in these articles report
- $1127\ 00:49:45.750 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.790$ as their given perspective

- $1128\ 00:49:47.790 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.210$ and when we clean it up and we, you know,
- $1129\ 00{:}49{:}51.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}53.280$ we figure out among those who didn't report
- $1130\ 00:49:53.280 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.630$ what their perspective was, by the way,
- $1131\ 00:49:54.630 \longrightarrow 00:49:57.840\ 15.6\%$ of of studies
- 1132 00:49:57.840 --> 00:50:00.180 that we uncover don't report a perspective,
- $1133\ 00:50:00.180 \dashrightarrow 00:50:03.003$ which is again, a problem for reporting standards,
- $1134\ 00:50:04.680 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.190$ only seven or about 2.9% of the studies
- $1135\ 00:50:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.610$ that we identified take a societal perspective.
- 1136 00:50:11.610 --> 00:50:13.320 So, you know, most of this is done
- $1137\ 00:50:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.360$ at the level of the provider.
- $1138\ 00{:}50{:}15.360 {\: \hbox{--}}{\:\raisebox{3pt}{$>$}}\ 00{:}50{:}17.310$ So, you know, it gives you a little bit of context,
- $1139\ 00:50:17.310 --> 00:50:19.983$ I think for where there's room for growth.
- $1140\ 00:50:21.420 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.090$ So in conclusion, on these points, you know,
- 1141 00:50:24.090 --> 00:50:27.330 there's, I wanna say that there's, you know,
- $1142\ 00:50:27.330 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.833$ a few final recommendations.
- $1143\ 00:50:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.280$ We recommend that that future costing
- 1144 00:50:32.280 --> 00:50:35.430 and cost effectiveness studies closely follow
- $1145\ 00:50:35.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:38.133$ the Gates and the GHCC reference case.
- $1146\ 00:50:40.186 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.090$ And you know,
- $1147\ 00:50:42.090 \dashrightarrow 00:50:44.850$ that there needs to be more detailed reporting
- $1148\ 00:50:44.850 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.490$ on a number of different items
- $1149\ 00:50:47.490 --> 00:50:49.680$ that I wasn't able to touch on in this talk.
- 1150 00:50:49.680 --> 00:50:51.120 But, you know, most of all,
- $1151\ 00:50:51.120 \dashrightarrow 00:50:53.580$ I think scale is something that's really missing
- $1152\ 00:50:53.580 \longrightarrow 00:50:54.480$ in the literature.
- 1153 00:50:55.650 --> 00:50:59.790 So I won't touch on this too much
- $1154\ 00:50:59.790 --> 00:51:01.440$ other than to say there's some future research
- $1155\ 00:51:01.440 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.580$ that we're working on

 $1156\ 00{:}51{:}02.580 {\: -->\:} 00{:}51{:}05.250$ to determine the quality of some of these cost data.

 $1157\ 00{:}51{:}05.250 --> 00{:}51{:}09.660$ So be on the look out for publication on that in the future.

 $1158\ 00:51:09.660 \longrightarrow 00:51:13.337$ And now that I've ran through all of our Q and A time,

1159 00:51:13.337 --> 00:51:14.790 I do wanna thank you for attending

1160 00:51:14.790 --> 00:51:16.590 and I'm happy to take any questions.

 $1161\ 00:51:20.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.323 < v \longrightarrow Yeah. < /v >$

 $1162\ 00:51:22.530 --> 00:51:24.210$ Thank you for the great talk.

 $1163\ 00:51:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.290$ So I had a question,

 $1164\ 00:51:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.170$ comment about, you know, the societal perspective.

1165 00:51:28.170 --> 00:51:31.380 I think in certain scenarios or situation,

 $1166\ 00:51:31.380 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.850$ this could be a little bit tricky.

1167 00:51:32.850 --> 00:51:34.860 For example, if you take vaccine

 $1168\ 00{:}51{:}34.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}38.133$ for some infectious disease in low income countries,

1169 00:51:39.030 --> 00:51:41.670 usually the price is heavily negotiated

 $1170\ 00:51:41.670 --> 00:51:46.527$ between the pharmaceutical companies and donors and NGOs.

1171 00:51:46.527 --> 00:51:49.170 And if you take the societal perspective,

 $1172\ 00:51:49.170 --> 00:51:52.050$ when you are doing the cost effectiveness analysis,

1173 00:51:52.050 --> 00:51:55.050 including, you know, the productivity loss,

 $1174\ 00:51:55.050 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.820$ the income loss, the vaccine becomes extremely,

1175 00:51:59.820 --> 00:52:02.610 you know, cost effective or even cost saving.

1176 00:52:02.610 --> 00:52:04.710 So even if they price the vaccine

1177 00:52:04.710 --> 00:52:06.960 to \$50, \$100,

 $1178\ 00:52:06.960 --> 00:52:10.080$ still it becomes cost saving, which is, you know,

1179 00:52:10.080 --> 00:52:12.720 it becomes an excuse in hands of, you know,

- $1180\ 00:52:13.710 --> 00:52:16.680$ the pharmaceutical companies to jump up the price of vaccine
- 1181 00:52:16.680 --> 00:52:19.140 because such a cost effective strategy.
- 1182 00:52:19.140 --> 00:52:20.910 So I dunno if you have thought about that.
- 1183 00:52:20.910 --> 00:52:23.700 I usually, I have purposefully avoided
- $1184\ 00:52:23.700 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.270$ taking societal perspective in those contexts
- $1185~00:52:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.820$ because I just don't want to put these numbers out,
- $1186\ 00{:}52{:}29.820$ --> $00{:}52{:}34.050$ but I don't know if you have comments, thoughts.
- 1187 00:52:34.050 --> 00:52:36.540 <
v ->Yeah, no, I mean that's a great point.</br/>/v>
- $1188\ 00:52:36.540$ --> 00:52:39.720 I often don't think far enough along the causal chain
- $1189\ 00:52:39.720$ --> 00:52:43.470 to consider sort of the potential negative externalities
- $1190\ 00:52:43.470 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.470$ of price gouging, you know, in those contexts.
- 1191 00:52:49.020 --> 00:52:51.960 I guess I'll say, you know,
- $1192\ 00:52:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.930$ at least in the context of what we found, you know,
- $1193\ 00:52:54.930 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.150$ in our search of the literature and you know,
- $1194\ 00:52:57.150 \dashrightarrow 00:52:59.190$ there were a few of those different intervention types
- 1195 00:52:59.190 --> 00:53:01.650 that dealt with pharmaceuticals,
- $1196\ 00:53:01.650 --> 00:53:03.900$ you know, and the costs of those being, you know,
- 1197 00:53:03.900 --> 00:53:07.740 not insignificant drivers of overall program
- 1198 00:53:07.740 --> 00:53:10.600 and unit costs, you know, for HIV care
- 1199 00:53:11.940 --> 00:53:15.853 that most of the studies that we identified,
- 1200 00:53:20.100 --> 00:53:22.140 you know, really do focus in, you know,
- $1201\ 00:53:22.140 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.660$ don't tend to focus in on the societal level.
- 1202 00:53:24.660 --> 00:53:26.670 So it's not, you know,
- $1203\ 00:53:26.670 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.580$ perhaps that that type of crisis
- $1204\ 00:53:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.380$ hasn't borne out necessarily

- $1205\ 00:53:31.380 \longrightarrow 00:53:33.510$ as a result of some of this in the literature,
- $1206\ 00{:}53{:}33.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35.708$ but it's definitely not something that's discussed
- $1207\ 00:53:35.708 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.290$ as often as I think it should be.
- $1208\ 00:53:37.290 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.027$ So you raise an excellent point and, you know,
- $1209\ 00:53:39.027 \longrightarrow 00:53:40.770$ and one that I hope, you know,
- $1210\ 00:53:40.770 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.167$ gets added to further discussions
- $1211\ 00:53:43.167 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.833$ in published literature and forums like this.
- 1212 00:53:48.629 --> 00:53:49.462 So I don't have a good, you know,
- $1213\ 00:53:49.462 --> 00:53:54.270\ I$ don't have a good anecdotal example to share,
- 1214 00:53:54.270 --> 00:53:56.370 but I really, yeah, I like the point.
- 1215 00:53:56.370 --> 00:53:58.020 Yeah. Jeremy.
- $1216\ 00:53:58.020 --> 00:53:59.100 < v -> Yeah, Drew, thanks so much. < / v >$
- $1217\ 00:53:59.100 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.053$ This was really informative.
- $1218\ 00:54:01.950 --> 00:54:03.390$ I actually wonder maybe building
- $1219\ 00:54:03.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.040$ on the previous question,
- $1220\ 00:54:05.040 --> 00:54:08.430$ if you could go back to the slide with the table
- 1221 00:54:08.430 --> 00:54:10.170 from that rural Uganda study,
- $1222\ 00{:}54{:}10.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}14.790$ because my question was about sort of was this a financial
- $1223\ 00:54:14.790 --> 00:54:17.730$ or economic perspective that was being presented
- $1224\ 00:54:17.730 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.070$ and I was honing in on the ART
- 1225 00:54:20.070 --> 00:54:21.660 because presumably, you know,
- $1226\ 00{:}54{:}21.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}25.290$ through PEPFAR from the programs perspective,
- 1227 00:54:25.290 --> 00:54:28.516 ART should have been without cost
- $1228\ 00:54:28.516 \longrightarrow 00:54:31.230$ and also without cost to the patient.
- 1229 00:54:31.230 --> 00:54:32.700 So then, so which made me think,
- 1230 00:54:32.700 --> 00:54:35.790 well maybe this is an economic perspective,

- $1231\ 00:54:35.790 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.750$ but then there are other,
- $1232\ 00:54:36.750 --> 00:54:39.300$ all those other pieces of deliver of getting the medicine
- $1233\ 00:54:39.300 \longrightarrow 00:54:40.133$ to the patient,
- $1234\ 00:54:40.133 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.790$ the whole supply chain and whatnot.
- $1235\ 00:54:41.790 \longrightarrow 00:54:44.490$ And so I was just wondering if you have a sense of like,
- 1236 00:54:44.490 --> 00:54:47.350 was this trying to describe programmatic
- $1237\ 00:54:49.398 --> 00:54:51.461$ or economic perspectives
- 1238 00:54:51.461 --> 00:54:53.940 and, you know, when, if this is economic,
- $1239\ 00:54:53.940 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.360$ should we truly be thinking about like that whole process?
- $1240\ 00{:}54{:}57.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}01.260$ Like where in the supply chain do you start counting?
- 1241 00:55:01.260 --> 00:55:03.660 <
v->Yeah, you know, I wasn't involved
 $<\!/$ v>
- $1242\ 00:55:03.660 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.710$ in this particular study
- $1243~00{:}55{:}04.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}07.470$ and so I'm happy to field that question to Jim
- $1244\ 00:55:07.470 \longrightarrow 00:55:09.860$ 'cause he uses this example in his talks.
- $1245\ 00:55:09.860 \dashrightarrow 00:55:13.350$ My sense is that this is programmatic, you know.
- $1246\ 00:55:13.350 --> 00:55:15.720$ It does seem fairly narrow in scope,
- 1247 00:55:15.720 --> 00:55:17.190 but you do, you raise a really good point
- 1248 00:55:17.190 --> 00:55:19.440 I think, you know, that Reza raised as well,
- 1249 00:55:19.440 --> 00:55:21.210 which is, you know,
- 1250 00:55:21.210 --> 00:55:23.670 it depends on who's providing that,
- $1251\ 00:55:23.670 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.520$ where the supply chain is coming from
- 1252 00:55:26.634 --> 00:55:27.720 and you know, and that obviously
- $1253\ 00:55:27.720 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.070$ has downstream implications
- $1254\ 00:55:29.070 --> 00:55:34.070$ for, you know, how you deal with the costing procedures
- $1255\ 00:55:34.860 --> 00:55:37.593$ in, you know, these different income country settings,

- 1256 00:55:39.120 --> 00:55:42.330 how you'd inflate and how you'd adjust.
- $1257\ 00{:}55{:}42.330$ --> $00{:}55{:}46.620$ And so supply chains don't often make it into the discussion
- 1258 00:55:46.620 --> 00:55:49.170 in these write-ups, but they need to, right?
- $1259\ 00:55:49.170 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.320$ Because that's a really critical component.
- $1260\ 00:55:52.920 --> 00:55:55.530$ I don't know if that answers your underlying question.
- $1261\ 00:55:55.530 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.830 < v \longrightarrow Yeah$, I think it gets to it for sure. </v>
- 1262 00:55:58.830 --> 00:55:59.663 <v ->Okay.</v>
- $1263\ 00:55:59.663 --> 00:56:00.496$ Yeah.
- 1264 00:56:00.496 --> 00:56:01.329 And you know, like I said,
- 1265 00:56:01.329 --> 00:56:02.580 I'm happy to reach out and find out
- 1266 00:56:02.580 --> 00:56:05.040 a little this particular example,
- $1267\ 00:56:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.270$ but it's question.
- $1268\ 00:56:06.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.103 < v \longrightarrow Great, thanks. < / v >$
- $1269\ 00:56:08.124 --> 00:56:09.360 < v -> Yeah. < /v>$
- $1270\ 00:56:09.360 \longrightarrow 00:56:11.100\ I$ do realize we're at the top of the hour.
- 1271 00:56:11.100 --> 00:56:14.520 I'm not able to see the chat very well.
- $1272\ 00:56:14.520 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.460$ So if there's anyone that would like to raise anything
- 1273 00:56:17.460 --> 00:56:18.870 from there that I'm missing,
- 1274 00:56:18.870 --> 00:56:21.000 I'm happy to field those.
- $1275\ 00:56:21.000 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.106 < v \longrightarrow Drew. < /v >$
- $1276\ 00:56:22.106 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.860\ I$ would just say that before David Palteo ran away,
- 1277 00:56:25.860 --> 00:56:28.590 he said that for what it's worth,
- 1278 00:56:28.590 --> 00:56:32.040 his concern is the mirror opposite of Reza's.
- 1279 00:56:32.040 --> 00:56:34.740 When we abandon the societal perspective,
- 1280 00:56:34.740 --> 00:56:37.800 interventions that have broad public benefit
- $1281\ 00:56:37.800 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.570$ can be greatly undervalued
- $1282\ 00:56:39.570 --> 00:56:41.490$ because they're not germane to the narrow

- 1283 00:56:41.490 --> 00:56:45.330 decision maker and real economic resource use
- 1284 00:56:45.330 --> 00:56:46.920 such as volunteer time and effort
- $1285\ 00:56:46.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.350$ can be ignored because it looks free
- $1286\ 00:56:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.060$ to the narrow stakeholder.
- 1287 00:56:51.060 --> 00:56:53.940 So he's, and I would also say
- $1288\ 00:56:53.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.077$ that my question,
- 1289 00:56:55.077 --> 00:56:57.780 and this is one not as an economist
- $1290\ 00:56:57.780 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.160$ that I've wondered about
- 1291 00:56:59.160 --> 00:57:00.780 for a couple of years,
- 1292 00:57:00.780 --> 00:57:03.510 is that from an equity perspective,
- 1293 00:57:03.510 --> 00:57:07.440 I actually wonder about the household level perspective
- $1294\ 00:57:07.440 \longrightarrow 00:57:10.623$ as opposed to the individual level perspective.
- 1295 00:57:12.690 --> 00:57:14.880 I've never seen one of these presentations
- $1296\ 00:57:14.880 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.970$ that looks at the household level
- 1297 00:57:17.970 --> 00:57:20.130 and yet it's at the household level
- 1298 00:57:20.130 --> 00:57:22.770 that cushioning of resources
- 1299 00:57:22.770 --> 00:57:26.100 and equity balances often happen
- $1300\ 00:57:26.100 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.987$ not at the individual level.
- 1301 00:57:27.987 --> 00:57:31.440 And so I'm just curious from your experience,
- $1302\ 00:57:31.440 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.440$ have you ever seen work done at the household cost level?
- 1303 00:57:36.720 --> 00:57:37.740 And what do you think
- $1304\ 00:57:37.740 \longrightarrow 00:57:41.250$ about those as an equity perspective?
- $1305\ 00:57:41.250 --> 00:57:42.510 < v -> Yeah, I mean I think there's, </v>$
- $1306~00{:}57{:}42.510 --> 00{:}57{:}44.790$ I think there's some downstream costs there that, you know,
- 1307 00:57:44.790 --> 00:57:45.900 in theory would get
- $1308\ 00:57:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:57:50.040$ some subsumed into a societal perspective.
- 1309 00:57:50.040 --> 00:57:53.070 But I struggle to think of specific examples
- $1310\ 00:57:53.070 --> 00:57:56.010$ that kind of cast the umbrella wide enough

- $1311\ 00:57:56.010 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.150$ or cast a net wide enough
- $1312\ 00:57:57.150 --> 00:58:00.750$ to include other individuals within the household.
- $1313\ 00:58:00.750 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.210$ So I think that's a really,
- $1314\ 00:58:03.210 \longrightarrow 00:58:04.890$ that's a really great point.
- $1315\ 00:58:04.890 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.723$ You know, and it speaks
- $1316\ 00:58:05.723 \longrightarrow 00:58:10.670$ to the demand side part of this question
- 1317 00:58:12.480 --> 00:58:13.770 in a way that's really, you know,
- $1318\ 00:58:13.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.363$ potentially quite meaningful.
- $1319~00:58:16.410 \dashrightarrow 00:58:21.410$ And I would tend to think that as you suspect, you know,
- $1320\ 00:58:23.220 --> 00:58:27.750$ we'd be moving towards even greater downstream benefits
- $1321\ 00:58:27.750 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.680$ at the household level.
- 1322 00:58:28.680 --> 00:58:30.600 So I am working on one study right now
- $1323\ 00:58:30.600 \longrightarrow 00:58:31.980$ in Uganda actually
- $1324~00{:}58{:}31.980 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}~00{:}58{:}35.359$ with Jeremy who I think might have jumped off
- $1325\ 00:58:35.359 --> 00:58:40.200$ where we are investigating patient costs
- $1326\ 00:58:40.200 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.960$ as a component of that intervention
- $1327\ 00:58:42.960 --> 00:58:46.170$ and we do tend to ask in the scope
- $1328\ 00:58:46.170 \dashrightarrow 00:58:51.170$ of collecting patient costs data about opportunity costs
- $1329\ 00:58:51.540 --> 00:58:53.370$ that are germane to the rest of the household.
- $1330\ 00:58:53.370 --> 00:58:57.550$ So we'll often ask questions about household expenditures
- $1331\ 00:58:58.770 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.660$ and household income generating activities
- $1332\ 00:59:03.180 \dashrightarrow 00:59:07.260$ as well as durable assets of the household
- $1333\ 00:59:07.260 \dashrightarrow 00:59:09.480$ and ways that households can sort of deal
- $1334\ 00:59:09.480 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.640$ with shocks over time.
- $1335\ 00:59:11.640 \dashrightarrow 00:59:13.350$ 'Cause those are all really important questions
- 1336 00:59:13.350 --> 00:59:16.110 I think that play into, you know,

- 1337 00:59:16.110 --> 00:59:17.910 what the experience of a patient is like,
- $1338\ 00:59:17.910 --> 00:59:20.370$ particularly in a lower middle income country setting
- $1339\ 00:59:20.370 \longrightarrow 00:59:21.420$ where one of these interventions
- $1340\ 00{:}59{:}21.420 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}59{:}24.270$ might have a really meaningful downstream impact
- 1341 00:59:24.270 --> 00:59:26.700 on, you know, on the rest of the household.
- $1342\ 00{:}59{:}26.700 --> 00{:}59{:}29.370$ So it's something that I spend a lot of time thinking about
- $1343\ 00:59:29.370 \dashrightarrow 00:59:31.290$ 'cause I kind of started in that world I think
- $1344\ 00:59:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:59:34.260$ before coming into the economic evaluation world.
- $1345~00{:}59{:}34.260 --> 00{:}59{:}37.350$ And it's one that I think doesn't currently receive
- 1346 00:59:37.350 --> 00:59:39.930 a great deal of attention, but ought to.
- 1347 00:59:39.930 --> 00:59:41.910 But again, to, you know, to Reza's warning,
- $1348\ 00:59:41.910 --> 00:59:45.240\ I$ think you have to be careful about, you know,
- 1349 00:59:45.240 --> 00:59:47.523 how much generalizability you pull,
- $1350\ 00:59{:}49.020$ --> $00{:}59{:}51.480$ and try to tout from different studies like this
- $1351\ 00:59:51.480 \dashrightarrow 00:59:55.140$ because, right, they have different implications
- 1352 00:59:55.140 --> 00:59:56.280 for different parties
- 1353 00:59:56.280 --> 00:59:57.117 And so, you know,
- $1354\ 00:59:57.117 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.550$ I'd like to see a standard,
- $1355\ 00:59:59.550 \longrightarrow 01:00:01.440$ not where one perspective is chosen
- $1356\ 01:00:01.440 \longrightarrow 01:00:03.840$ over another ad nauseum,
- 1357 01:00:03.840 --> 01:00:05.490 but where they're both incorporated
- $1358\ 01:00:05.490 \longrightarrow 01:00:07.410$ and where there's a societal
- $1359\ 01:00:07.410 \dashrightarrow 01:00:11.160$ and a financial or a programmatic perspective presented
- 1360 01:00:11.160 --> 01:00:14.070 within the same paper, you know.
- 1361 01:00:14.070 --> 01:00:17.490 And readers of those pieces of evidence

- $1362\ 01:00:17.490 \longrightarrow 01:00:18.870$ can then decide for themselves,
- $1363\ 01:00:18.870 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.070$ like which is the perspective
- $1364\ 01:00:20.070 \longrightarrow 01:00:21.390$ that's the most meaningful?
- $1365\ 01:00:21.390 --> 01:00:24.300$ What are the trade-offs, you know, along the way?
- $1366\ 01:00:24.300 \longrightarrow 01:00:27.930$ 'Cause it, you know, the value add of that is substantial,
- 1367 01:00:27.930 --> 01:00:30.240 to add in a societal perspective piece
- $1368\ 01:00:30.240 --> 01:00:33.060$ to a publish economic evaluation.
- $1369\ 01:00:33.060 --> 01:00:35.490 < v -> So I think we do need to wrap up. </v>$
- $1370\ 01:00:35.490 \longrightarrow 01:00:36.870$ But thank you Drew.
- $1371\ 01:00:36.870 \longrightarrow 01:00:38.910\ I$ think that's very helpful
- $1372\ 01:00:38.910 \longrightarrow 01:00:42.993$ and we will have the video available for people.
- $1373\ 01:00:44.970 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.550$ And really appreciate your time
- 1374 01:00:47.550 --> 01:00:50.490 in preparing all of this material
- $1375\ 01:00:50.490 \longrightarrow 01:00:53.283$ and sharing it with all of us.
- $1376\ 01:00:54.420 \longrightarrow 01:00:55.500 < v \longrightarrow Appreciate the invitation < / v >$
- $1377\ 01:00:55.500 \longrightarrow 01:00:58.260$ and thanks to those attended today.
- $1378\ 01:00:58.260 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.660$ It's nice to see some faces.
- $1379\ 01:01:01.260 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.093 < v \longrightarrow Okay. < /v >$