Reporting checklist for economic evaluation of health interventions.

Based on the CHEERS guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the CHEERS reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, Carswell C, Moher D, Greenberg D, Augustovski F, Briggs AH, Mauskopf J, Loder E. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
	<u>#1</u>	Identify the study as an economic evaluation or use more specific terms such as "cost-effectiveness analysis", and describe the interventions compared.	Title (p.1)
Abstract			
	<u>#2</u>	Provide a structured summary of objectives, perspective, setting, methods (including study design and inputs), results (including base case and uncertainty analyses), and conclusions	Abstract (p. 2)
Introduction			
Background and objectives	<u>#3</u>	Provide an explicit statement of the broader context for the study. Present the study question and its relevance for health policy or practice decisions	Para. 1-3 (pp. 3-4)

Methods

Target population and subgroups	<u>#4</u>	Describe characteristics of the base case population and subgroups analysed, including why they were chosen.	Para. 1-2 (pp. 4-5)
Setting and location	<u>#5</u>	State relevant aspects of the system(s) in which the decision(s) need(s) to be made.	Para. 1 (pp. 4-5)
Study perspective	<u>#6</u>	Describe the perspective of the study and relate this to the costs being evaluated.	Para. 3 (pp. 5-6)
Comparators	<u>#7</u>	Describe the interventions or strategies being compared and state why they were chosen.	Para. 3 (pp. 5-6)
Time horizon	<u>#8</u>	State the time horizon(s) over which costs and consequences are being evaluated and say why appropriate.	Para. 4 (p. 6)
Discount rate	<u>#9</u>	Report the choice of discount rate(s) used for costs and outcomes and say why appropriate	Para. 4 (p. 6)
Choice of health outcomes	<u>#10</u>	Describe what outcomes were used as the measure(s) of benefit in the evaluation and their relevance for the type of analysis performed	Para. 3 (pp. 5-6)
Meaurement of effectiveness	<u>#11a</u>	Single study-based estimates: Describe fully the design features of the single effectiveness study and why the single study was a sufficient source of clinical effectiveness data	NA
Measurement of effectiveness	<u>#11b</u>	Synthesis-based estimates: Describe fully the methods used for identification of included studies and synthesis of clinical effectiveness data	Para. 3 (pp. 5-6)
Measurement and valuation of preference based outcomes	<u>#12</u>	If applicable, describe the population and methods used to elicit preferences for outcomes.	NA
**Estimating resources			
and costs **			

	<u>,, 104</u>	approaches used to estimate resource use associated with the alternative interventions. Describe primary or secondary research methods for valuing each resource item in terms of its unit cost. Describe any adjustments made to approximate to opportunity costs	
Methods			
Estimating resources and costs	#13b	Model-based economic evaluation: Describe approaches and data sources used to estimate resource use associated with model health states. Describe primary or secondary research methods for valuing each resource item in terms of its unit cost. Describe any adjustments made to approximate to opportunity costs.	Para. 3-9 (pp. 5-9), Table 2 (pp. 11-12)
Currency, price date, and conversion	<u>#14</u>	Report the dates of the estimated resource quantities and unit costs. Describe methods for adjusting estimated unit costs to the year of reported costs if necessary. Describe methods for converting costs into a common currency base and the exchange rate.	Para. 7 (p. 7)
Choice of model	<u>#15</u>	Describe and give reasons for the specific type of decision analytical model used. Providing a figure to show model structure is strongly recommended.	Para. 3-8 (pp. 5-8), Figure 2
Assumptions	<u>#16</u>	Describe all structural or other assumptions underpinning the decision-analytical model.	Para. 9 (pp. 7-8)
Analytical methods	<u>#17</u>	Describe all analytical methods supporting the evaluation. This could include methods for dealing with skewed, missing, or censored data; extrapolation methods; methods for pooling data; approaches to validate or make adjustments (such as half cycle corrections) to a model; and methods for handling population heterogeneity and uncertainty.	Para. 3-9 (pp. 5-9)

#13a Single study-based economic evaluation: Describe

NA

Results

Study parameters	<u>#18</u>	Report the values, ranges, references, and, if used, probability distributions for all parameters. Report reasons or sources for distributions used to represent uncertainty where appropriate. Providing a table to show the input values is strongly recommended.	Table 2 (pp. 11-12)
Incremental costs and outcomes	<u>#19</u>	For each intervention, report mean values for the main categories of estimated costs and outcomes of interest, as well as mean differences between the comparator groups. If applicable, report incremental cost-effectiveness ratios.	Para. 1-4 (pp. 12-13), Supporting Information 3
Characterising uncertainty	#20a	Single study-based economic evaluation: Describe the effects of sampling uncertainty for the estimated incremental cost and incremental effectiveness parameters, together with the impact of methodological assumptions (such as discount rate, study perspective).	NA
Characterising uncertainty	#20b	Model-based economic evaluation: Describe the effects on the results of uncertainty for all input parameters, and uncertainty related to the structure of the model and assumptions.	Para. 4 (p. 13), Supporting Information 3
Characterising heterogeneity	<u>#21</u>	If applicable, report differences in costs, outcomes, or cost effectiveness that can be explained by variations between subgroups of patients with different baseline characteristics or other observed variability in effects that are not reducible by more information.	Para. 2-4 (pp. 12-13), Supporting Information 3
Discussion			
Study findings, limitations, generalisability, and current knowledge	<u>#22</u>	Summarise key study findings and describe how they support the conclusions reached. Discuss limitations and the generalisability of the findings and how the findings fit with current knowledge.	Para. 1-6 (pp. 15-18)

Other

Source of funding	<u>#23</u>	Describe how the study was funded and the role of the funder in the identification, design, conduct, and reporting of the analysis. Describe other non- monetary sources of support	Funding statement (pp. 19-20)
Conflict of interest	<u>#24</u>	Describe any potential for conflict of interest of study contributors in accordance with journal policy. In the absence of a journal policy, we recommend authors comply with International Committee of Medical Journal Editors recommendations	Declaration of interests statement (p. 19)

Note: The CHEERS checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY-NC. This checklist can be completed online using https://www.goodreports.org/, a tool made by the EQUATOR Network in collaboration with Penelope.ai