malignancies (colon, breast and lung cancer) and three supportive care measures. Total cost results are given below:

TREATMENT	HOME CARE	AMBULATORY CARE
5-FU+Leucovorin (5 days)	$799	$151
Cyclophosphamide+Doxorubicin	$797	$249
Cisplatin+Etoposide	$2196	$1096
Cisplatin, Mitomycin+Vinblastine	$2063	$1107
Hydration	$308	$151
Transfusion	$435	$359
Amphotericin	$277	$181

In each treatment type, home care was more expensive when compared with an ambulatory setting in which economies of scale could be realized (mean: 109% more expensive, range 21% to 429%, $p<0.05$). To control for lower drug costs found in the ambulatory setting, costs were also examined independent of pharmaceuticals; home care remained more expensive (mean 140%, $p<0.05$). Patients receiving ambulatory chemotherapy and supportive care measures were surveyed to determine satisfaction and related parameters. Patients were highly satisfied with ambulatory care (median rating 98 on a 100 mm VAS). While both ambulatory and home care are alternatives to inpatient treatment, we conclude that an efficient ambulatory setting is associated with greater cost savings and high patient satisfaction.

Grusenmeyer PA, Ochsner Cancer Institute, 1516 Jefferson Highway, New Orleans, LA 70121, USA

PP29. Economic evaluation of the use of prophylactic Clodronate to treat multiple myeloma

Bruce NJ[1], McCloskey EV[2], Kanis JA[2], Guest JF[1].
[1]CATALYST Healthcare Communications, London, UK; [2]University of Sheffield Medical School, Sheffield, UK

Background: The aim of this study was to establish the economic implications of using prophylactic clodronate therapy in patients with multiple myeloma, using the results of the MRC VI myelomatosis trial as the clinical basis of the study. The trial examined the effect of oral clodronate on the incidence of skeletal morbidity in a double-blind placebo controlled trial. A total of 612 patients were randomised at the time of diagnosis to receive either clodronate (1 600 mg daily) or an identical placebo in addition to chemotherapy and radiotherapy. Treatment was continued indefinitely or until the patient showed evidence of progressive osteolytic lesions or developed hypercalcaemia that was unresponsive to a high fluid intake and cytotoxic chemotherapy. Patients were followed up for four years.
Methods: This was a retrospective cost and consequences analysis based on clinical data from the MRC VI myelomatosis trial. A model of National Health Service (NHS) resource use and costs was constructed using the clinical data and information obtained from interviews with trialists (n=10) who treated 30% of the trial patients. The model compartmentalised the standard management of multiple myeloma into eight discrete stages: diagnosis; diagnosis to first plateau; diagnosis to death; first plateau to first relapse; first relapse to second plateau; first relapse to death; second plateau to second relapse; and second plateau to death. Information on patient management including NHS resource use, length of time in each stage and transition probabilities was obtained from each trialist. Additionally, patient management and NHS resource use for managing severe hypercalcaemia, vertebral fractures and non-vertebral fractures was collected. The average cost of managing the cohort of patients with multiple myeloma with and without clodronate during the MRC VI trial was calculated by combining the clinical and resource use data.
Results: The study will show the average cost of managing a patient in each disease state and the average cost of managing an episode of severe hypercalcaemia; a vertebral fracture and a non-vertebral fracture. The average cost for standard management of multiple myeloma together with the average cost of managing adverse events will be provided for the whole cohort of patients in the trial. The analysis will put the cost of clodronate into context by comparing the average cost of managing patients in the trial with and without clodronate. The additional cost of clodronate over four years will be compared with the cost of managing adverse events over this period for those patients who received clodronate compared to those who received placebo.

Guest JF, CATALYST Healthcare Communications, The Folly, Pinner Hill Road, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 3YQ, UK

PP30. Economic assessment of Clodronate in the preventive treatment of bone resorption in patients with metastatic breast cancer

Guignard E, Dardenne J, Pelc A
IMS France, Health Economics Department

Osteolytic bone metastases are frequent in patients with breast cancer and cause a severe morbidity, due to tumour-induced bone resorption, such as bone pain, pathological fractures, and hypercalcemia. This leads to an important medical care consumption, particularly in hospitalisation and antalgic radiotherapy. The aim of this study was to assess and compare, over a 1-year period, the different medical resources consumptions between patients with metastatic breast cancer treated by clodronate and those followed up by a watchful waiting strategy but not preventively treated by clodronate.
We carried out a retrospective study based on the medical files of 57 patients included in a randomised clinical trial comparing clodronate (n = 29) to a placebo (n = 28). All these patients were surviving at 1 year. We assumed that the placebo strategy was close to the "watchful waiting" strategy. We used a standardised questionnaire form to collect the different medical resources used : outpatient consultations (reason, number), drugs prescribed (brand names, posology, length of treatment), laboratory tests, X-rays and CT scans, bone scintigraphies, echographies, hospitalisations (nature of ward, reason, length of stay) and radiotherapy on bones for pain relief. These items were collected during the 12-month period following the inclusion of the patient in the trial, and if they were related to bone resorption consequences or to a side-effect of clodronate. Treatment for the primary malignancy was not considered.
Patients treated by clodronate were less often hospitalised (24,1 % versus 42,9 %;p: 0,13), and their average length of stay was shorter (2,6 days (d.) versus 9,1 d; p: 0,11), than patients not treated. They had also less antalgic radiotherapy on bones (17 % versus 39 %; p: 0,06). Consumption of the other medical resources was comparable in the two groups. These differences resulted in a cost reduction of 12,107 FF for hospitalisation (5635 FF versus 17742 FF) and 1659 FF for radiotherapy (895 FF versus 2554 FF). Overall, the total cost per patient was higher for those treated with clodronate (48,036 FF versus 40,060 FF), but it must be compared to the incremental gain in efficacy: the clinical results showed that clodronate significantly delayed the occurrence of bone events (244 d. versus 180 d.) and increased the percentage of patients without bone event one year after the treatment (30 % versus 21 %). Cost-effectiveness ratios were in favour of the preventive treatment by clodronate.
This study was the first one which provided information on the 1-year cost of care for bone resorption in patients with metastatic breast cancer. Its results suggest that the preventive treatment by clodronate should be considered for these patients as it reduces hospitalisation and antalgic radiotherapy.

Guignard E, IMS France, Health Economics Department, 345, avenue Georges Clémenceau, 92882 Nanterre, France

PP31. The relative economics of screening for colorectal cancer, breast cancer and cervical cancer

Gyrd-Hansen D
Centre for Health and Social Policy, Odense, Denmark

Background: This paper presents previous works by the author on the economics of colorectal cancer screening, breast cancer screening and cervical cancer screening. The technologies analysed are the unhydrated