

27-9-2010

Pharmacoeconomic report on corifollitropin alfa (Elonva®) for the indication 'Controlled ovarian stimulation (COS)'

English Summary

The Medicinal Products Reimbursement Committee (CFH) has approved the pharmacoeconomic report assessing the cost-effectiveness of corifollitropin alfa (Elonva®) on controlled ovarian stimulation in assisted reproductive technology.

The committee reached the following conclusions:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Economic Evaluation | The manufacturer carried out a cost-minimization analysis based on a simple calculation of treatment costs. |
| Comparator | Corifollitropin alfa was compared with follitropin- β . |
| Important Clinical Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none">– corifollitropin alfa and follitropin-β are equally effective in controlled ovarian stimulation– indirect non-medical costs due to absence from work are the same/irrelevant to the analysis– there is no difference in side effects between corifollitropin alfa and follitropin-β |
| Effects | Because the therapeutic value of corifollitropin alfa is considered equal to that of the recombinant FSH products, the effects were not included in the analysis. |
| Costs | Direct medical and non-medical costs were included in the analysis. The costs of treatment with corifollitropin alfa amount to €1378 per COS cycle for patients <60 kg, and €1587 for patients >60 kg. The incremental costs of treatment with corifollitropin alfa compared to follitropin beta amount to €17.78 for patients <60 kg and €44.01 for patients >60 kg. |
| Cost-effectiveness | The manufacturer claims that the costs and efficacy of treatment with corifollitropin alfa are equal to the costs and efficacy of treatment with follitropin- β . |
| Conclusion | The manufacturer claims that corifollitropin alfa is a cost-effective intervention for controlled ovarian stimulation. The Medicinal Products Reimbursement Committee (CFH) concludes that the cost-effectiveness of corifollitropin alfa for controlled ovarian stimulation has been sufficiently substantiated. |

*The original text of the summary of this **CFH-report** was in Dutch. Although great care was taken in translating the text from Dutch to English, the translation may nevertheless have resulted in discrepancies. Rights may only be derived on the basis of the Dutch version of the summary of the CFH-report.*

Furthermore, CVZ points out that only the summary of this report was translated. A proper understanding of all relevant considerations and facts would require familiarity with the Dutch version of this report, including all appendices.