

Philips criteria: model-based economic evaluations

		Berto 2006 ²²⁶	Brüggenjürgen 2008 ²²⁹	Omnes 2007 ²²⁷	Schädlich and Brecht 2000 ²³⁵	Claes 2009 ²²⁴
Structure						
1.	Is there a clear statement of the decision problem?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Is the objective of the model specified and consistent with the stated decision problem?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Is the primary decision-maker specified?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4.	Is the perspective of the model stated clearly?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5.	Are the model inputs consistent with the stated perspective?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6.	Is the structure of the model consistent with a coherent theory of the health condition under evaluation?	N	N	Y	Y	Y
7.	Are the sources of the data used to develop the structure of the model specified?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8.	Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	UC	Y	UC	UC	UC
9.	Is there a clear definition of the options under evaluation?	Y	N	Y	N	Y
10.	Have all feasible and practical options been evaluated?	N	N	Y	N	Y
11.	Is there justification for the exclusion of feasible options?	Y	N	N/A	N	N/A
12.	Is the chosen model type appropriate given the decision problem and specified casual relationships within the model?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13.	Is the time horizon of the model sufficient to reflect all important differences between the options?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14.	Do the disease states (state transition model) or the pathways (decision tree model) reflect the underlying biological process of the disease in question and the impact of interventions?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15.	Is the cycle length defined and justified in terms of the natural history of disease?	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y

Philips criteria: model-based economic evaluations

		Berto 2006 ²²⁶	Brüggenjürgen 2008 ²²⁹	Omnes 2007 ²²⁷	Schädlich and Brecht 2000 ²³⁵	Claes 2009 ²²⁴
Data						
16.	Are the data identification methods transparent and appropriate given the objectives of the model?	Y	N	N	N	N
17.	Where choices have been made between data sources, are these justified appropriately?	UC	N	N	N	N
18.	Where expert opinion has been used are the methods described and justified?	N/A	N/A	Y	UC	N/A
19.	Is the choice of baseline data described and justified?	N	N/A	N	N	N/A
20.	Are transition probabilities calculated appropriately?	UC	UC	Y	Y	UC
21.	Has a half-cycle correction been applied to both costs and outcomes?	N	N	UC	N	N
22.	If not, has the omission been justified?	N	N	UC	N	UC
23.	Have the methods and assumptions used to extrapolate short-term results to final outcomes been documented and justified?	N	N	N	N	N
24.	Are the costs incorporated into the model justified?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
25.	Has the source for all costs been described?	N	N	N	N	N
26.	Have discount rates been described and justified given the target decision-maker?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
27.	Are the utilities incorporated into the model appropriate?	N/A	UC	N/A	N/A	N/A
28.	Is the source of utility weights referenced?	N/A	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
29.	If data have been incorporated as distributions, has the choice of distributions for each parameter been described and justified?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
30.	If data are incorporated as point estimates, are the ranges used for sensitivity analysis stated clearly and justified?	N	N	N	Y	N
31.	Has heterogeneity been dealt with by running the model separately for different subgroups?	N	N	Y	N	N
32.	Have the results been compared with those of previous models and any differences in results explained?	Y	N	N	Y	Y

N, no; N/A, not applicable; UC, unclear; Y, yes.

	Ariano 2006 ²²²	Bachert 2007 ²²⁸	Beriot-Mathiot 2007 ²³²	Berto 2005 ²²³	Canonica 2007 ²³⁰	Keiding & Jørgensen 2008 ²³³	Nasser 2008 ²³¹	Petersen 2005 ²³⁴	Pokladnikova 2007 ²²⁵
12. Are outcomes valued appropriately?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13. Is an incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14. Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15. Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
16. Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
17. Does the study discuss the generalisability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
18. Does the article indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
19. Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

N, no; Y, yes.