

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE 33

Health Economic Evaluation Considerations

Version:	4.0
Approval Date:	08/07/2026
Effective Date:	22/07/2026
Review Date:	21/07/2028
Review Lead:	Jo Grumett, QA Manager, WCTU
WCTU Reviewers:	Jason Madan, Director, Centre for Health Economics at Warwick, WCTU Lazaros Andronis, Professor of Health Economics, WCTU Mandana Zanganeh, Assistant Professor, WCTU
Sponsor Reviewers:	Mathew Gane, Research Governance & QA Manager, R&IS
WCTU approval:	Natalie Strickland, Head of Operations, WCTU
Sponsor approval:	Carole Harris, Associate Director Research Culture, Governance and Compliance, R&IS

Revision Chronology:	Effective date:	Reason for change:
Version 4.0	22 July 2026	Biennial review. Updates to resource utilisation measurements. Addition of references to AI. Update to new template and review of text for readability.
Version 3.0	16 July 2024	Biennial review. Addition of some definitions. Added to the responsibilities of the junior health economist (4.1). Expanded the economic database section (4.3.2.2). Expanded the monitoring of health economics data section (4.3.2.3). Added to the list of terms and updated some references.
Version 2.0	8 April 2022	Biennial review. Change to new format.
Version 1.2	30 January 2020	Biennial review. Change to new format.
Version 1.1	3 November 2017	Change to new format. Addition of use of eQMS (Q-Pulse) to approve Economic Evaluation Analysis Plans.
Version 1.0	23 February 2015	

CONTENTS

1	PURPOSE AND SCOPE	3
2	ACRONYMS.....	3
3	DEFINITIONS	3
4	BACKGROUND.....	4
5	RESPONSIBILITIES	5
6	WHEN	5
7	HOW.....	5
7.1	PLANNING AND PREPARATION OF A CLINICAL STUDY.....	5
7.2	DURING THE DATA COLLECTION PERIOD	6
7.2.1	HEALTH ECONOMIC ANALYSIS PLAN	6
7.2.2	ECONOMIC DATABASE.....	7
7.2.3	MONITOR COLLECTION OF HEALTH ECONOMICS DATA	7
7.2.4	PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS	7
7.3	AFTER THE DATA COLLECTION PERIOD	8
7.3.1	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF DATA	8
7.4	REPORT AND PUBLISH	8

1 Purpose and Scope

To outline the requirements for an economic evaluation conducted alongside a clinical study. This SOP is applicable to all research staff who work on studies which include a health economic evaluation and for the Health Economists who work on University of Warwick sponsored research studies. Where elements of the SOP are not appropriate for a study, justification must be given and documented.

2 Acronyms

CBA	Cost-benefit analysis
CCA	Cost-consequences analysis
CEA	Cost-effectiveness analysis
CEAC	Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve
CMA	Cost-minimisation analysis
CRF	Case Report Form
CSRI	Client Service Receipt Inventory
CUA	Cost-utility analysis
EVPI	Expected value of perfect information
FRS	Functional requirement specification
HEAP	Health Economics Analysis Plan
HES	Hospital Episode Statistics
ICER	Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
MODRUM	Modular Resource-Use Measure
NHS	National Health Service
NICE	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
NMB	Net monetary benefit
PSS	Personal and Social Services
QALY	Quality-Adjusted Life-Year
RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
R&IS	Research & Impact Services
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TSC	Trial Steering Committee
WCTU	Warwick Clinical Trials Unit
WTP	Willingness-to-Pay

3 Definitions

Health economic evaluation	Health economics is a branch of economics concerned with issues related to efficiency, effectiveness, value and behaviour in the production of health and consumption of healthcare. A health economic evaluation compares the costs and outcomes of a healthcare intervention against a suitable comparator to assist decision makers in maximising benefits from limited healthcare resources.
Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)	An economic evaluation that expresses all gains and losses in common units (usually money), allowing a judgement to be made of whether, or to what extent, an intervention should be pursued.

Cost-consequences analysis (CCA)	A form of economic evaluation where the whole array of outcomes is presented alongside the costs, without any attempt to aggregate these.
Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA)	An economic evaluation where costs are measured in monetary terms and outcomes are measured in units directly related to the intervention.
Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve (CEAC)	A graph summarising the impact of uncertainty on the result of an economic evaluation, expressed as the probability of cost-effectiveness at a range of threshold values of willingness to pay.
Cost-minimisation analysis (CMA)	An economic evaluation where the outcomes of competing healthcare interventions are equivalent, so comparison is made on the basis of resource costs alone. The aim is to determine the lowest-cost way of achieving the same outcome.
Case Report Form (CRF)	A printed or electronic document designed to record all protocol required information to record for each study participant.
Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY)	A measure of the state of health of a person or group in which the benefits, in terms of length of life, are adjusted to reflect the quality of life. One QALY is equal to 1 year of life in perfect health. QALYs are calculated by estimating the years of life remaining for a patient following an intervention and weighting each year with a quality-of-life score.
Cost-utility analysis (CUA)	A form of cost-effectiveness analysis where a health-preference measure is repeatedly recorded in patients over time, to calculate a QALY.
Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER)	Obtained by dividing the difference between the costs of the two interventions by the difference in the outcomes (i.e. the extra cost per extra unit of effect).
Willingness-to-Pay (WTP) threshold	The maximum amount that society is willing to pay for an additional QALY.
Net monetary benefit (NMB)	A way to express measured costs and QALYs as a single monetary value at a given willingness to pay threshold (where $NMB = QALY * WTP - Cost$)
Health Economics Analysis Plan (HEAP)	Prospectively agreed analysis plan describing the presentation of results, base case, and secondary analysis.
Within trial analysis	Analysis of the costs and effects of treatment alternatives limited to changes occurring within the duration of the follow-up of a trial.
Cost-effectiveness model	A mathematical extension of a within trial analysis to facilitate (variously) extrapolating beyond the trial follow-up, adjusting the study population, and facilitating further analyses.
Expected value of perfect information (EVPI)	The monetary value to a decision maker of eliminating all decision uncertainty

4 Background

Health economic evaluation has increasingly been used to inform the regulatory and reimbursement decisions of government agencies. A common vehicle for the conduct of economic evaluation is the RCT. A key goal of a trial-based economic evaluation is to estimate the additional cost of a new intervention compared to the existing alternative, and what additional health benefits it produces, and to

SOP: 33

Title: Health Economic Evaluation Considerations

Version: 4.0

Effective: 22/07/2026

combine this information within a cost-effectiveness ratio. In order to undertake a rigorous trial-based economic evaluation, access to health economics expertise is essential throughout the study. This includes input from health economists during the design, conduct, analysis and reporting of the study.

5 Responsibilities

Lead Health Economist	• Contribute to the design of the study • Supervise the junior health economist • Review the appropriateness of planned health economic analyses • Audit analysis coding • Review and contribute to reports of results and publications
Junior Health Economist	• Provide day-to-day input on health economics for the trial/study • Draft the HEAP (supervised by the lead health economist) • Access trial data to provide data completeness/quality updates to trial meetings, as required and as agreed with the trial team. • Conduct (under supervision) the health economic analysis for the trial. • Draft reports of results and publications

Since mentoring is a key part of career development, variations in the above roles are sometimes appropriate. For example, for both lead and junior roles, a trial may include a more experienced economist supporting a colleague-in-training.

6 When

Health economics input should be provided at each stage of the study, including during design, conduct, analysis, and reporting.

7 How

7.1 Planning and preparation of a clinical study

After agreement on the objectives and the economic question of interest in a study, the lead economist should identify a health economics researcher who will be responsible for the day-to-day running of the economic evaluation alongside the study.

A number of important choices regarding the economic evaluation will have to be made by the lead economist (with input from the junior health economist, clinical expertise and wider TMG) and included in the protocol including:

- Form(s) of economic evaluation to be adopted: these include CUA, CEA, CCA, CMA, or CBA. This choice will be guided by the scope and perspective of the study, the requirements of the decision maker/funder and the type of costs and outcomes data which are collected. See the following references for more information: Drummond and McGuire, 2001; Donaldson *et al.*, 2002; Eggar *et al.*, 2003; Drummond *et al.*, 2015; Ramsey, *et al.*, 2005; Glick *et al.*, 2007; NICE, 2022.
- Measure of outcome (effect/consequence/utility). This decision will be made in consultation with colleagues in the wider study team. More information can be found in the following references for guidance: Drummond and McGuire, 2001; Donaldson *et al.*, 2002; Eggar *et al.*, 2003; Drummond *et al.*, 2015; Ramsey, *et al.*, 2005; Glick *et al.*, 2007; NICE, 2022.

SOP: 33

Title: Health Economic Evaluation Considerations

Version: 4.0

Effective: 22/07/2026

- iii. The perspective of analysis. The current preferred approach is to adopt an NHS/PSS perspective or multi agency public sector where possible. Where this is not relevant, an NHS or societal perspective should be adopted (NICE, 2022).
- iv. Type and range of resource use items to be measured. This choice will be informed by the perspective of the analysis and consultation with the wider study team. Further information can be found in the following references to help identify relevant resource and cost categories: Drummond and McGuire, 2001; Donaldson *et al.*, 2002; Eggar *et al.*, 2003; Drummond *et al.*, 2015; Ramsey, *et al.*, 2005; Glick *et al.*, 2007; NICE, 2022.
- v. Method of measurement of resource utilisation. This could be by extraction of data from patient records, by patient recall using an established resource use questionnaire (e.g. a version of the CSRI (Knapp *et al.*, 2006) or MODRUM (Garfield *et al.* 2023) for adults, with adaptations if necessary. Similarly, an appropriate resource use questionnaire should be used when the focus is on children and young people (e.g. CYP-TUQEE (Morgan *et al.*, 2026)) . Alternatively, relevant data can be obtained from a secondary data source, (e.g. HES records). This decision should be made in consultation with the wider study team.
- vi. Source of unit costs. Resource inputs should be valued (£ Sterling for the UK, for the most recent available financial year) using national tariffs where available or routine data sources if agreed by the study team. An early assessment should be made regarding how much primary research will be required for the estimation of unit costs. Where unit costs derive from different years these will be adjusted to a common base year using published health service reflators (Jones *et al.*, 2023).
- vii. Method of collecting data relating to prescribed medicines. Data may be collected directly (from hospital notes and/or primary care) or through patient recall using a variant of the CSRI (i.e. a type of CRF) that measures resource utilisation) or a similar approach. This decision will be made in consultation with the wider study team.

7.2 During the data collection period

7.2.1 Health Economic Analysis Plan

In developing a HEAP, health economists are advised to consult established methodological guidance that aims to ensure that produced HEAPS are appropriately comprehensive and informative. These include publications such as Thorn *et al.* (2021) which provide a consensus-based framework of essential HEAP content and Dakin *et al.* (2021) which includes a practical checklist and guidance for implementation.

This plan will be written and then, following consultation, approved by the Chief Investigator, at an early stage of the study (preferably before the end of recruitment, and certainly before data are shared with the HE team).

The HEAP would usually be expected to reflect the following general principles for economic analysis, When deviations are deemed necessary, these should be explained and justified.

- i. An intention to treat approach should be used for the base case analysis.
- ii. The study health economist(s) should consistently address missing or censored data by making use of relevant statistical techniques to handle missing or censored cost and health-related quality of life data (Glick *et al.* 2007).

SOP: 33

Title: Health Economic Evaluation Considerations

Version: 4.0

Effective: 22/07/2026

- iii. Uncertainty analysis should be conducted by applying the standard methods (e.g. bootstrapping for calculating CEACs and confidence intervals) (Glick *et al.* 2007; Groot Koerkamp *et al.*, 2007; NICE, 2022).

The following are also appropriate to include:

- iv. A time horizon that is appropriate to the analysis should be adopted (NICE, 2022).
- v. Recommended discount rates for long-term costs and benefits should be applied (NICE, 2022).
- vi. An appropriate cost-effectiveness threshold should be adopted according to established guidelines (NICE, 2022).

7.2.2 Economic database

The study health economist(s) will manage the economic data in an appropriate software package in accordance with University SOPs and in compliance with the UK GDPR. For WCTU studies, the study health economist(s) will work in collaboration with WCTU's programming team to manage the data as specified above and resolve any coding issues or devise appropriate changes in response to issues arising early in each trial. The study economist should request access to the database via the trial manager and obtain the project's FRS from the programming team. For WCTU studies, storage should be within a pre-agreed and secure Health Economics location (e.g. M:Drive or other location within the TMF), accessible only to the study economist and an appointed colleague that can access files if the study economist is unavailable.

7.2.3 Monitor collection of health economics data

The study health economist(s) will work closely with the study team throughout the data collection period to ensure suitable data are collected and provide updates on data completeness for trial meetings as and when agreed with the Chief Investigator and statistician. Data collection forms (e.g. CRFs) will be assessed throughout the study period to monitor the quality of data and amend any forms or procedures if necessary.

The health economist(s) should carry out validation checks on the data quality and integrity (e.g. range checks, outliers, missing observations), recording checks performed within analysis records. These checks should begin early in the life of a trial, after an agreed initial recruitment, to identify and resolve coding/programming problems. The study economist(s) should refer any data queries arising during the analysis to the Trial Manager for investigation or resolution.

7.2.4 Preparation for analysis

Where possible, the health economics team will access trial data set as part of monitoring process. This permits checks for completeness, missingness, and detailed quality checks, which may help identify data issues and allows analysis code to be developed that can be used for the final analysis. The adequacy of within trial analysis (or the need for further modelling) should be explored. Once developed, the analysis code and output should be audited by the lead health economist or other experienced colleagues. The lead health economist is responsible for ensuring the veracity of the analysis aspects (e.g. coding).

7.3 After the data collection period

7.3.1 Economic analysis of data

- i. Final validation checks should be completed, with any data queries referred to the Study Manager for investigation or resolution.
- ii. Costs and outcomes for each study participant will be calculated. Costs and utilities should (normally) be analysed using well-established approaches (e.g. net monetary benefit framework) (at a patient or group level) to produce ICERs, cost-effectiveness planes and CEAC and EVPI.
- iii. The base case (prospectively planned primary analysis) should be reported.
- iv. The handling of any missing data within clinical studies is an important consideration, as failure to identify properly the influences of the missing data may cause bias and reduce the validity of findings.
- v. Supportive sensitivity analyses should be carried out to assess the impact of parameter, methodological and structural uncertainties on the base case findings (e.g. relevant sub-groups, regression model specification, observed vs. imputed data). Prospectively planned and post hoc analysis should be clearly delineated and justified.
- vi. Decision-analytic modelling should be considered where within trial analysis may be inadequate. Reasons modelling may not be required include convergence of treatment group costs or utilities during the within trial follow-up; clear dominance of one of the treatments; or uninformative (poor quality) trial data.
- vii. After completion of the trial, the key economic analysis documents (e.g. HEAP, analysis programs/scripts and final analysis report) should be added to the Trial/Study Master File (T/SMF) for archiving.
- viii. Any use of Artificial Intelligence (e.g. to develop or adapt code for analysis of study data) should be in line with university and funder requirements and best practice. It should be discussed with the TSC prior to use and declared transparently.

7.4 Report and publish

The results will be published in accordance with standard guidelines (e.g. Drummond, 1996; Ramsey *et al.*, 2005; NICE, 2022; Husereau *et al.*, 2022). In general:

- i. The results of the analyses will be presented in a format that is appropriate for the stakeholders and incorporated into the final study report.
- ii. Wherever possible, the economic evaluation results will be published alongside clinical results.
- iii. Efforts will also be made to publish secondary analyses, particularly of a methodological nature, based on economic data collected as part of the study.