

checklist and its instructions is therefore required before commencing appraisal. Some criteria are difficult to score owing to study reporting limitations. Quality assessment can be challenging when multiple types of studies are included; however, currently there is no single universally validated tool available for diverse study designs. There are frequent demands for a cut-off point in order to separate high- from low-quality studies. However, no scale or numeric scoring was developed for the checklist, due to the well-recognized risks associated with such a scoring system.

CONCLUSIONS:

The increased use of the checklist and general positive feedback indicates the need for such a tool. User feedback helped improve our understanding of the checklist's applicability with various topics, as well as the potential refinements needed to increase its utility and robustness.

REFERENCES:

1. Moga C, Guo B, Schopflocher D, Harstall C. *Development of a quality appraisal tool for case series studies using a modified Delphi technique*. Edmonton (AB): Institute of Health Economics; 2012. Available from: <http://www.ihe.ca/advanced-search/development-of-a-quality-appraisal-tool-for-case-series-studies-using-a-modified-delphi-technique>.
2. Guo B, Moga C, Harstall C, Schopflocher D. A principal component analysis is conducted for a case series quality appraisal checklist. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;69:199-207.

PP050 Analysis Of Pharmacoeconomic Studies Published In The Scientific Electronic Library "eLIBRARY.RU" (RSCI)

AUTHORS:

Roza Yagudina (yagudina@inbox.ru), Andrey Kulikov, Pavel Zubarev, Marina Protsenko, Dzhumber Ugrekhelidze

INTRODUCTION:

During the information search revealed that there is no published analysis reflecting the actual status of pharmacoeconomic and clinical-economic research, but there are databases that allow you to do so. The platform for searching research data was scientific electronic library "eLIBRARY.RU". This portal is Russia's largest internet library of scientific publications, with rich search capabilities and the timely receipt of necessary information.

METHODS:

A search was carried out during the period from 2005 to 2015 of research papers on Russian and foreign pharmacoeconomic and clinical-economic research was carried out as at 1 September 2016 on the words "pharmacoeconomic*", "clinical and econom*" with the appropriate endings. The criteria for inclusion in this analysis were general accessibility and availability of full text scientific material on the portal.

RESULTS:

Over the last ten years the number of publications increased by 4 times. The leading destinations included cardiovascular, pulmonary, oncological and endocrinological diseases. According to published reports pharmacoeconomic and clinical-economic studies carried out in fifty-two subjects of the Russian Federation on the basis of sixty-three Universities. In addition to researchers from the Russian Federation, has placed the representatives from eleven countries. Only one third of the published studies are generally cited.

Among the methods of pharmacoeconomic analysis of the most popular in published studies is the analysis of “cost–effectiveness”, which is used in about 45 percent of the available studies.

CONCLUSIONS:

As a result, 1,425 articles were identified and analyzed. With the aim of providing concrete data that clearly illustrate the situation with the Russian scientific, pharmacoeconomic and clinical-economic writings to date all studies were classified according to the following parameters: geographical, temporary, local and nosological. In the framework of the analysis highlighted the authors whose works are most RISC (Russian Science Citation Index) with leading positions in the number of publications.

PP052 Hospital-based Health Technology Assessment Of Prasugrel In Patients With Stent: Outpatient Use

AUTHORS:

Márcia Gisele Costa (marisaccih@gmail.com), Marisa Santos, Rafaela Peixoto

INTRODUCTION:

A reference hospital, specialized in cardiology, has standardized clopidogrel, ticagrelor and recently the incorporation of prasugrel was approved with an estimate of fifteen patients with stent implantation monthly. Stent thrombosis is a rare but serious complication and it is recommended that patients be treated with antiplatelet therapy. Considering the existing therapeutic options and the low adherence to treatment, a cost study was requested to discuss a disinvestment proposal.

METHODS:

Perspective of the hospital; Population: patients with myocardial infarction and stent implantation; Intervention: prasugrel; Comparators: clopidogrel and

ticagrelor; Outcomes of interest: stent thrombosis and major bleeding; and types of study: meta-analyses and randomized clinical trials. Literature review was performed in the Medline database, via Pubmed and performed meta-analysis. Cost estimates: data collection made in the institution's database.

RESULTS:

Thirteen articles were selected; there are no differences in the outcomes for prasugrel and ticagrelor; discontinuation of treatment is the most important risk factor for stent thrombosis and major bleeding is an important predictor of nonadherence to treatment. Quantitative analysis: three clinical trials. All showed a superiority of prasugrel and ticagrelor over clopidogrel for outcome of stent thrombosis (Odds Ratio, OR .60 Confidence Interval, CI 95 percent [.40; .90]), which was committed by the heterogeneity of studies ($I^2 = 64$ percent); and favorable outcome for clopidogrel compared to ticagrelor and prasugrel for the outcome of major bleeding (OR 1.28 CI 95 percent [1.10; 1.50]). Annual cost with treatment of the fifteen patients: clopidogrel = USD5,765.86; prasugrel = USD41,047.48; and ticagrelor = USD44,081.30.

CONCLUSIONS:

The evidences found support the opening of a disinvestment process and suggest to the managers of the institution a reflection on: strategy to optimize adherence to treatment; and especially in the cost of opportunity with new technologies about 10 times more expensive.

PP053 A Case Study: Collective Individual Basis For The Judiciary Debate

AUTHORS:

Daniela Melo, Evelinda Trindade (evelinda.trindade@incor.usp.br), Daniel Oliveira, Patricia Martins, Lúcia Ribeiro