

Online Supplementary Material

Title: Evidence used in model based economic evaluations for evaluating pharmacogenetic and pharmacogenomic tests: a systematic review protocol

Jaime L Peters¹, Chris Cooper¹, James Buchanan²

¹ Evidence Synthesis & Modelling for Health Improvement (ESMI), University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, United Kingdom.

² Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Modified Phillips checklist for the quality of decision models in health technology assessment

	Comments
Is there a clear statement of the decision problem?	
Is the primary decision-maker specified?	
Are the model inputs consistent with the stated perspective?	
Has the scope of the model been stated and justified?	
Is the structure of the model consistent with a coherent theory of the health condition under evaluation?	
Are the sources of the data used to develop the structure of the model specified?	
Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	
Is there a clear definition of the options under evaluation?	
Have all feasible and practical options been evaluated?	
Is there justification for the exclusion of feasible options?	
Is the time horizon of the model sufficient to reflect all important differences between the options?	
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?	
Is the cycle length defined and justified in terms of the natural history of disease?	
Are the data identification methods transparent and appropriate given the objectives of the model?	
Where choices have been made between data sources, are these justified appropriately?	
Has the quality of the data been assessed appropriately?	
Where expert opinion has been used are the methods described and justified?	
Is the choice of baseline data described and justified?	
Are transition probabilities calculated appropriately?	
Has a half-cycle correction been applied to both costs and outcomes?	
If not, has the omission been justified?	
Have the methods and assumptions used to extrapolate short-term results to final outcomes been documented and justified?	
Are the costs incorporated into the model justified?	
Has the source for all costs been described?	
Have discount rates been described and justified given the target decision-maker?	
Are the utilities incorporated into the model appropriate?	
Is the source of utility weights referenced?	
Have all data incorporated into the model been described and referenced in sufficient detail?	
Have methodological uncertainties been addressed by running alternative versions of the model with different methodological assumptions?	
Is there evidence that structural uncertainties have been addressed via sensitivity analysis?	
Has heterogeneity been dealt with by running the model separately for different subgroups?	
Are the methods of assessment of parameter uncertainty appropriate?	
Have the results been compared with those of previous models and any differences in results explained?	