

# Economic evaluation of strategies for restarting anticoagulation therapy with warfarin based on Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) risk after an index unprovoked VTE event

Monahan, Mark; Ensor, Joie; Moore, David; Fitzmaurice, David; Jowett, Sue

DOI:  
[10.1111/jth.13739](https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.13739)

License:  
None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*  
Monahan, M, Ensor, J, Moore, D, Fitzmaurice, D & Jowett, S 2017, 'Economic evaluation of strategies for restarting anticoagulation therapy with warfarin based on Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) risk after an index unprovoked VTE event', *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 1591–1600.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.13739>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**  
Eligibility for repository: Checked on 2/5/2017

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.


## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.


If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 06. Jul. 2022


Fig I-Model patient pathways




Appendix Fig I- Patient flow model summary




Appendix Fig II- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 25% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy



Appendix Fig III- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 22.5% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig IV- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 20% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig V- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 17.5% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig VI- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 15% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig VII- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 12.5% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig VIII- Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Scatterplot of incremental costs and effects of 10% Decision Rule versus treat no one strategy




Appendix Fig IX Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of Treat No one versus 17.5% Decision Rule




Appendix Fig X Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 25% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule




Appendix Fig XI Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 22.5% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule



Appendix Fig XII Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 20% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule




Appendix Fig XIII Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 15% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule





Appendix Fig XIV Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 12.5% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule



Appendix Fig XV Cost Effectiveness Acceptability Curve of 10% Decision Rule versus 17.5% Decision Rule

