Supplementary Information – Online Resource 14

Evaluating cost-utility of continuous glucose monitoring in individuals with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review of methods and quality of studies using decision models and/or empirical data.

de Jong LA[1]* (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8814-0670), Li X[2] (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0225-6937), Emamipour S[3], van der Werf S[4] (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5856-7657), Postma MJ[1,5], van Dijk PR[6] (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9702-6551), Feenstra TL[2] (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5788-0454)

[1] Department of Health Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

[2] Unit of PharmacoTherapy, -Epidemiology & -Economics, University of Groningen, Groningen Research Institute of Pharmacy (GRIP), Groningen, the Netherlands

[3] Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

[4] Central Medical Library, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

[5] Department of Economics, Econometrics and Finance, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

[6] Department of Endocrinology. University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

*Corresponding author: t.l.feenstra@rug.nl

Table 1. Quality assessment of empirical-data-based studies using the CHEC-checklist

	Emamipour 2022, The Netherlands [1]	Ly 2014, Australia [2]
1. Is the study population clearly described?	YES	YES
2. Are competing alternatives clearly described?	NO	NO
3. Is a well-defined research question posed in answerable form?	YES	YES
4. Is the economic study design appropriate to the stated objective?	YES	YES
5. Is the chosen time horizon appropriate in order to include relevant costs and consequences?	NO	NO
6. Is the actual perspective chosen appropriate?	YES	YES
7. Are all important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?	YES	YES
8. Are all costs measured appropriately in physical units?	YES	YES
9. Are costs valued appropriately?	YES	YES
10. Are all important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?	YES	YES
11. Are all outcomes measured appropriately?	YES	YES
12. Are outcomes valued appropriately?	YES	YES
13. Is an incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?	NO	YES
14. Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	NA	NA
15. Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?	YES	NO
16. Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?	YES	YES
17. Does the study discuss the generalizability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups?	YES	YES
18. Does the article indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?	YES	YES
19. Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?	YES	NO

Abbreviation: NA, not applicable.

References

1. Emamipour S, van Dijk PR, Bilo HJG, Edens MA, van der Galiën O, Postma MJ, et al. Personalizing the Use of a Intermittently Scanned Continuous Glucose Monitoring (isCGM) Device in Individuals With Type 1 Diabetes: A Cost-Effectiveness Perspective in the Netherlands (FLARE-NL 9). J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2022.
2. Ly TT, Brnabic AJM, Eggleston A, Kolivos A, McBride ME, Schrover R, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy and automated insulin suspension versus standard pump therapy for hypoglycemic unaware patients with type 1 diabetes. Value Health. 2014;17:561–9.