

The Economics of Vaccines: Ensuring Value amidst Resource Constraints

Kenneth KC Lee
Professor of Pharmacy
School of Pharmacy
Monash University Malaysia







Content of Presentation

- Overview of health economic evaluation of vaccines
- Traditional approach its shortcomings
- Recent approach the improvements
- Summary of messages







"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"

Benjamin Franklin





Overview of health economic evaluation of vaccines

- Vaccination has been recognized as one of the most successful health interventions (WHO 2021)
- Vaccination not only affects morbidity and mortality of a target disease but also the complications, long-term sequelae and the related effects on quality of life (QoL) of the vaccinated individuals and the wider population
- Value of vaccines can be assessed in many ways: including prevention, impact on public health (esp long-term), various positive externalities e.g. herd immunity, and internalities e.g. QoL
- In view of the nature of vaccine, its value is traditionally assessed only through direct cost savings, productivity loss of those affected due to absenteeism and adverse effects on QoL







a 10 year person, assung so a resource or resource remove reconstruction in denset medical come. Additional cost surings from the reduced

promon of 919 add cases of IPO during the time proved also constru!

Oreal, "ACV reconsion as resimul to have an extractal one per

Ourse, NVV secondon was nomina to not an occument one po-life-year gained at HESSO,456 (ESSO40) from a paper perspective course for accessing the second of the second of

supper games or reasonable statement from a paper prosperance or HESSE, SIG (ESSES) when book direct and indirect costs were

Login

ABSTRACTONLY / VOLUME 17 ISSUE 3, PAZZ3, MAY 01, 2014

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Of Joint Vaccination With 13-Valent Pheumococcal Conjugate Vaccine (Pcv13) And Influenza Vaccine In Taiwan During Seasonal Influenza Wu D.B.C. *Chong HY *Lee K.K.C

Volume 27, Issue 52, 9 December 2009, Pages 7282-7291 Overview of the disease burden of invasive pneumococcal disease in Asia ≯ L.C. Bravo & the members of the Asian Strategic Alliance for Pneumococcal Disease Prevention (ASAP)

Open Archive * DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2014.03.1592



Traditional approach of evaluation and its shortcomings

- Narrow perspective: usually from payer's perspective, hence
 NOT capturing the value/benefits on the wider society such as:
 - non health-related costs e.g. transport, communication, energy, human capitol, peace of mind (Bloom et al 2018)
- Short time horizon for assessment, not able to capture benefits at older age from avoiding childhood diseases, so whether there is indeed cost savings/avoidance is unclear (Annemans et al 2021)
- Same discounting rate across (Christensen et al 2020) e.g.
 Covid-19 vaccines vs Pneumococcal vaccines



Traditional approach of evaluation and its shortcomings

- Distribution of costs and outcomes/effects only on affected parties, but unequal distribution among different populations in reality e.g. age, socioeconomic, ethnicity, leading to an equity issue (EUnetHTA.HTA Core Model 2020, Standaert et al 2020)
- Quality-adjusted life years (QALY) assumed to be equivalent among all populations leading to uncertainty on true value of vaccines
- Over reliance of decision making on incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) and cost-effectiveness threshold



Evaluation approach adopted by different jurisdictions

All countries

Clinical outcomes
Cost-effectiveness (but often informally)

Most countries

Disease burden
National health system priorities

Some countries

Equity Budget impact

Few/none

Peace-of-mind benefits
Public/societal preferences

Source: Christensen et al (2020)



- 1. Value of avoiding complications should be included (Annemans et al 2021)
 - complications can lead to extended hospitalizations
 - health gains for caregivers and caregivers' family
 - ↑QoL
- 2. Herd immunity due to vaccination can be significant
 - indirect effect found in unvaccinated individuals



- 3. Effects at the community level need to be considered
 - serotype redistribution (Shiri et al 2019) due to appearance of serotypes not covered by a specific vaccine
 - ↓ infections → ↓ use of antibiotic → ↓ speed of antibiotic resistance (Esposito 2018)
- 4. **Improved productivity** of populations (Verlinden 2018) is important from a societal perspective
 - - ↓ absenteeism and effect of peace-of-mind at work → positive effect on national GDP
 - improvement in human capital



- 5. The issue of **EQUITY** should be included
 - by developing adjusting factors (using tools like discrete choice experiments) to adjust perceived value of outcomes depending on populations e.g. age, socioeconomic status, whose value may not necessarily be the same (Phelps et al 2018)
 - a distributional cost-effectiveness analysis may be a more reliable tool (Dawkins et al 2018)



- 6. **Differential discounting rate** for vaccines (Christensen et al 2020)
- 7. Flexibility of cost-effectiveness threshold for vaccines instead of using a national threshold across the board
- 8. Improved consistency and **transparency** in developing economic evaluation models (Walker 2010)



Principles of equity in vaccine application

| | Table 2. Equity principles and their application to vaccines. | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| | Equity principle | Explanation of principle | Translation to vaccines | Value |
| Protecting | Principles related to the healthcare recipient Tackling social determinants of health | More effort should be made to create health in socially disadvantaged groups. | Large vaccination programs are tools to reduce burden of disease in deprived social groups, directly through providing vaccines or indirectly through herd immunity. | Positive |
| the most | Protecting the most vulnerable | It is ethically imperative to protect those who are vulnerable and cannot protect themselves. | Vaccines can protect the most vulnerable groups that cannot become vaccinated (eg, immunocompromised individuals, the very young or old) via herd immunity. | Positive |
| vulnerable | Fair innings | Although controversial, there is a body of research that indicates that people prefer health benefits for younger vs older people. | Vaccines typically target children. | Positive |
| | Professional deontology | For some professions, there is an additional ethical imperative to avoid falling sick to avoid spreading infections (eg, healthcare workers), or to protect the country (eg, the military). | Healthcare workers, police, and the military are target groups for vaccination. | Positive |
| Social inclusion of | Social inclusion of minorities | Effort should be made to integrate ethnic minorities into society. | Outbreaks can be stigmatizing. Vaccines targeted at ethnic groups at risk of infectious diseases help prevent disease transmission among those groups. | Positive |
| minorities | Principles related to the health benefit | | | |
| minorities | The aggregation problem | Size matters: many small health gains do not add up to a few big ones. | Some vaccines typically protect against very serious but rare outcomes (eg, meningitis) and deserve a higher valuation. Other vaccines protect against common but mild outcomes and deserve lower priority. | Mixed |
| Equity | Luck egalitarianism | There are ethical reasons to distinguish between option luck and brute luck and to prioritize health problems that were self-inflicted over those that were unavoidable. | Vaccines are preventive and are examples of responsible health behavior. | Positive |
| beyond health | Equity beyond health | Are the ignored broader consequences disproportionally affecting sensitive ethnic groups? | Comorbidities occur more often in disadvantaged groups, and health- and career-related productivity losses are worse among these groups. | Positive |
| ilealtii | Principles related to the intervention | | | |
| | Man-made vs natural effects | Individuals respond differently to side effects than to natural infections. | Vaccines occasionally cause side effects, negatively affecting public trust. | Negative |
| | Respect for individual autonomy | Though not considered in economic evaluations, there is a cost to individual autonomy when people are forced to use healthcare. | Vaccines are often embedded in programs that stimulate uptake (from soft nudges to stronger legal compulsion). | Negative |





Summary of take home messages

- Traditional evaluation framework is grossly insufficient in identifying the true value of vaccine across the entire population
- New approach should encompass a societal perspective instead of limiting to the payer's perspective
- New outcomes should extend beyond just cost and benefit to include equity of the population





THANK YOU



