

Author, year	Reason for exclusion
1. Almond <i>et al.</i> 2011 ³⁰⁸	Budget impact analysis, not a cost-effectiveness analysis
2. Barth 2001 ⁷²	Not a cost-effectiveness study
3. Benatar <i>et al.</i> 2003 ³⁰⁹	Trial-based analysis
4. Berg <i>et al.</i> 2004 ³¹⁰	Trial-based cost analysis
5. Chan <i>et al.</i> 2008 ³¹¹	Not RM
6. Davalos <i>et al.</i> 2009 ³¹²	Not a cost-effectiveness study
7. Eapen <i>et al.</i> 2011 ³¹³	Not RM
8. Gregory <i>et al.</i> 2006 ³¹⁴	Not RM
9. Herbert <i>et al.</i> 2008 ¹²⁵	Cost evaluation
10. Perl <i>et al.</i> 2011 ²⁶⁷	Cost evaluation
11. Postmus <i>et al.</i> 2011 ³¹⁵	Cost evaluation
12. Riegel <i>et al.</i> 2002 ⁸⁵	Commentary
13. Rojas <i>et al.</i> 2008 ³¹⁶	Systematic review
14. Scalvini <i>et al.</i> 2004 ³¹⁷	Cost evaluation
15. Scalvini <i>et al.</i> 2005 ¹⁶⁵	Not a cost-effectiveness study
16. Seto 2008 ³¹⁸	Not a cost-effectiveness study
17. Smith <i>et al.</i> 2008 ³¹⁹	Cost evaluation
18. Soran <i>et al.</i> 2010 ³²⁰	Not a cost-effectiveness study
19. Stafylas <i>et al.</i> 2008 ³²¹	Trial-based analysis
20. Stewart <i>et al.</i> 2002 ³²²	Not a cost-effectiveness study
21. Stone 2009 ³²³	Trial included home visit, trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis (not model based)
22. Van Montfort <i>et al.</i> 2006 ³²⁴	Not a cost-effectiveness study