



Cost-Utility Analysis of lower or higher oxygenation targets for Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure

A registry-based secondary analysis of the randomised Hot-ICU Trial

Christine Halling¹
Bodil Rasmussen²
Olav Schjørring²
Jakob Kjellberg³
Anders Perner⁴
Dorte Gyrd-Hansen⁵

¹ NHTA - Nordic Health Technology Assessment, Copenhagen SV, 84, Denmark
² Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
³ VIVE, Copenhagen, Denmark
⁴ University Hospital, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark
⁵ Danish Centre for Health Economics (DaCHE), University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Introduction and Objectives

Patients in the intensive care unit (ICU) with hypoxemic respiratory failure receive supplemental oxygen.

In the Handling Oxygenation Targets in the ICU (HOT-ICU) trial such patients were allocated to a lower target of partial pressure of arterial oxygen (PaO₂) of 8 kPa versus a higher PaO₂ target of 12 kPa.

The objectives of this study were to evaluate health care resource use, associated costs, labour market participation, and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) at one year after randomisation.

Data

Two sources:

- The Danish administrative registry patient-level data
- Clinical patient-level outcome measures collected through the HOT-ICU trial

Registries

- The National Health Registry
✓ Secondary sector
- The Danish Psychiatric Central Research Registry
✓ Psychiatric hospitals
- The National Health Service Registry
✓ Primary health care
- Elderly Indicators
✓ Home care and home nursing
- The Danish National Prescription Registry
✓ Home care and home nursing
- Danish Rational Economic Agents Model (DREAM)
✓ Home care and home nursing

Methods

- A cost-utility analysis based on Danish registry data was performed with a time horizon of one year after randomisation in the HOT-ICU trial.
- The registry data provided information on health service use and associated costs. QALYs were calculated based on the EuroQol five-dimension five-level (EQ-5D-5L) questionnaire.
- The registries and QALYs combined give an insight into the long-term (one-year) economic aspects of different oxygenation targets during ICU stay.
- In total, 2,282 Danish patients were included in the trial (1,143 allocated to the lower and 1,139 to the higher oxygenation target group). We obtained access to data from somatic hospitals for a subsample of 186 patients, making this study a pilot analysis of the one-year outcomes associated with HOT-ICU.

Results

- The highest cost category was somatic hospital stays.
- No differences in one-year costs or QALY gains
- Lower oxygenation target
✓ decreased number of bed days in somatic hospitals
✓ increased number of people in employment

**Partial pressure of arterial oxygen (PaO₂) of
8 kPa versus 12 kPa**



Mortality



GI bleedings



During ICU stay



Health care
service use



Labour market
participation



Associated
costs

Conclusion

In these preliminary analyses, targeting lower vs. higher oxygenation in ICU patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure did not result in QALY differences or one-year cost differences.

References

1. Halling, C (2022) Economic Evaluations Alongside Randomised Trials - Research from and Intensive Care Units & Specialised Palliative Care Teams, PhD Thesis, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
2. Schjørring OL, et al. (2019) Handling Oxygenation Targets in the Intensive Care Unit (HOT-ICU)—Protocol for a randomised clinical trial comparing a lower vs a higher oxygenation target in adults with acute hypoxaemic respiratory failure. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* ;63(7):956-965.
3. Chu DK et al. (2018) Mortality and morbidity in acutely ill adults treated with liberal versus conservative oxygen therapy (IOTA): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* ;391(10131):1693-1705.
4. Schjørring OL et al. (2021) Lower or Higher Oxygenation Targets for Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure. *N Engl J Med* ;384(14):1301-1311.
5. Schjørring OL et al. (2020) The handling oxygenation targets in the intensive care unit (HOT-ICU) trial: Detailed statistical analysis plan. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*;64(6):847-856.

Consort diagram

