DROP DEAD: IS IT TIME TO REMOVE ‘DEAD’ FROM HEALTH STATE VALUATION?
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The problem with dead in health state valuation

Health state valuation: 1=full health, 0=dead

The use of dead in valuation studies
’10 years in this health state is equal to x years in full health, followed by death’
Alternatives to dead?
Before the panellists present their arguments:
first polling question
‘Dead’ should have no role in health state valuation
a. Agree
b. Disagree
Are decision-makers indifferent between states ‘worse than dead’?
   a. Yes (and they should be)
   b. Yes (but they shouldn’t be)
   c. No (but they should be)
   d. No (and they shouldn’t be)
What is the best candidate for an alternative anchor state to ‘dead’?

a. Worst health state imaginable
b. Worst state defined by a measure
c. A state ‘as bad as being dead’
d. Minimum endurable quality of life
e. Unconsciousness
f. Sleep
g. Something else
h. N/A: there is no realistic alternative
i. N/A: no anchor state is necessary
Are current methods for valuing negative health states adequate?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Unsure
‘Dead’ should have no role in health state valuation
a. Agree
b. Disagree
Drop ‘dead’?
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Agenda

• Super quick intro to QALYs and time trade-off

• The TTO-task and how “negative” values arise?

• Why troublesome?

• Can they be ignored – some empirical evidence?
QALYs: The Basics
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Table 2 Underlying assumptions of the conventional QALY approach

1. A resource-allocation decision must be made.
2. The outcomes of the alternatives can be specified in terms of health states, changes, and durations.
3. Resources are limited, and each alternative has resource implications (costs).
4. A major objective of the decision-maker is to maximize health of the population, subject to resource constraints.
5. Health is defined as value-weighted time (QALYs) over the relevant time horizon.
6. Value is measured in terms of preference (desirability).
7. Each individual is risk neutral with respect to longevity and has utility that is additive across time.
8. Value scores (preferences) measured across individuals can be aggregated and used for the group.
9. QALYs can be aggregated across individuals; i.e., a QALY is a QALY regardless of who gains/loses it.

QALY, quality-adjusted life-year.
5. Health is defined as value-weighted time (QALYs) over the relevant time horizon.

6. Value is measured in terms of preference (desirability).
What is valued during a **Time Trade-Off** task?

Value (height) = ?

**Objective**

Value (height) = 1 QALY/year

**Definition**

I will **not** talk about SG, VAS, DCE etc, as TTO is **the theoretically correct** method.
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Value (height) = ?

*Objective*
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*Like so?*
What is valued during a **Time Trade-Off** task?

Value = \( \frac{y}{x} \)

Fixed duration = \( x \)

OK! = \( y \)

Value (height) = 1 QALY/year

**Definition**
But, **sometimes**:

\[ \text{Value (height)} < \lim_{y \to 0} \frac{y}{x} = 0 \]

\[ \text{Value (height)} = 1 \]

Regardless of how brief duration
And, even, ‘WTD’* states

Value (height) = 1
Definition

Value = \(-\frac{y}{x}\)
Objective

*Worse-Than-Death
Cannot be avoided* – theoretically, but…

* 7. Each individual is risk neutral with respect to longevity and has utility that is additive across time.
Problematic?
‘dead’ vs ‘(immediate death)’

• Do respondents perceive “being dead» as a “health state”? 

[Image of a warning sign: TOUCHING WIRES CAUSES INSTANT DEATH $200 FINE Newcastle Tramway Authority]
Cab be highly problematic

- Death is psychologically demanding.
- Invoking death: fear and anxiety.
- ‘Dying’ vs. ‘being dead’ vs. ‘death’.
- If ‘dead’ is a “health state”, a respondent may attribute non-zero value
- Instructions **do not** specify “death” as proxy for “zero time”
- Hard question: “irrelevance”

https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/34209
So far

• We ‘know’ WTDs exist for some respondents, but not zero-states

• We know values are impacted by elicitation protocols.

• Important question: Can values be TRUSTED?

“In this world, nothing is certain except death and taxes”

- Benjamin Franklin
That is, what happens here?
That is, what happens here?
Valuation of Health States Considered to Be Worse Than Death—An Analysis of Composite Time Trade-Off Data From 5 EQ-5D-5L Valuation Studies

Mithil Gandhi, MD a,b,c,1, Kim Rand, PhD a,1, Nan Luo, PhD a

https://xkcd.com/1838/
There seem to be no association – no information – between health state severity and mean value taken over negative values. Share of all values that are negative distinguishes.
Also when only “non-censored” respondents are included.

Also when only “non-censored” respondents are included.

All negative values in dataset substituted with a randomly sampled negative value.
However, when I consider each individual respondent, the jury is out…

All negative values in the dataset substituted with a randomly sampled negative value.

Higher values mean “worse” predictions.
THANK YOU

Mathias.barra(at)Ahus.no
Twitter: @mathbarra;
@SEVPRI1
THE CASE IN FAVOUR

Drop Dead
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What is the role of ‘dead’?

- The role of ‘dead’ is poorly defined
- The way we talk about states ‘worse than dead’ is problematic
- 0 QALYs ≠ 0 QALYs ≠ 0 QALYs

1. The bottom of the QALY scale?

2. A reference state for the valuation of other states?

3. A useful shorthand for ‘no health’?
Dead in TTO

“Which would you prefer, 5 years in full health in Life A followed by death, or 10 years in the blue health state followed by death?”

“The health state may even be so bad that you would rather be dead at once than have to spend 10 years living with those health problems...”
The problem with ‘dead’

- Dead vs death vs dying
- What does it mean to value ‘dead’? (Devlin et al, 2004)

1 = full health*  
0 = dead*  

* or a state of equivalent value
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The problem with ‘dead’

- Dead vs death vs dying
  - What does it mean to value ‘dead’? (Devlin et al, 2004)
- Invokes considerations beyond health
  - Time preference, probability of survival (Sharma & Stano, 2010)
  - Views on euthanasia (Augestad et al, 2013)
- Indefinable with respect to time
- The negative scale is limitless
- Health state “of equivalent value to being dead” is hard to conceive
  - EQ-5D-5L state 55511?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1 = full health*} \\
\text{0 = dead*}
\end{array}
\]
Do we really need ‘dead’?

Scale measurement
‘Dead’ is not necessary to construct a meaningful scale of health state values

Utility
‘Dead’ is not required to elicit preferences / utilities

BTD vs WTD
We do not need to know whether a state is better or worse than ‘dead’

CEA
The ‘dead’ state necessarily generates no value in time, regardless of its role in health state valuation
Why we don’t need ‘dead’

- Zero can be anything

1 = full health*
0 = a very bad state
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Why we don’t need ‘dead’

- Zero can be anything
- Ratio scale > interval scale
  - Requires an absolute zero
- ‘Dead’ can still be zero
  - And it must (Roudijk et al, 2018)
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1 = full health*
0 = a very bad state (and dead)

* or a state of equivalent value
Why we don’t need ‘dead’

- Zero can be anything
- Ratio scale > interval scale
  - Requires an absolute zero
- ‘Dead’ can still be zero
  - And it must (Roudijk et al, 2018)
- Resource allocation trade-offs are not health vs death
  - They are QALYs vs QALYs

1 = full health*  
0 = a very bad state (and dead)

* or a state of equivalent value
What we should do instead

- Dropping dead may make a big difference (Sutherland et al, 1983; Nord, 1991)
- Lots more research needed

1. Adopt an alternative anchor as an absolute zero
   a) Worst health state imaginable
   b) Worst health state defined by the measure (e.g. EQ-5D)
   c) A minimum endurable health state
2. Redefine QALYs as a decision-making tool
   a) Zero is a point where no value is created
   b) QALYs may be rescaled
3. Keep calm and carry on estimating QALYs
Conclusion

Vote ‘drop dead’!

- It isn’t clear what we’re seeking to achieve by referring to ‘dead’
- Doing so seems problematic in theory and in evidence
- We don’t need to use ‘dead’
Is anchoring at ‘dead’ a theoretical requirement? it depends!
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what are the issues?

health scale anchors

- Dead
- Worst

drop dead altogether

- Worst

8-6-2021
Approach

• 5 reasons to drop dead
• analyse them in turn
Approach

• Zero points
• Distance travelled = duration x speed
• quality adjusted life year (QALY) = duration x weight
• For which HS is value equal to zero
Proposition 1

• anchoring health state values at ‘dead’ is not required by scale measurement

• interval or cardinal scale assumptions so anchoring on dead is not necessary
Proposition 2

• **QALYs** do not require a distinction between states better or worse than dead

• But QALY’s require a distinction between states in which you would rather live longer in, or states for which shorter durations are preferred to longer durations.
Proposition 3

- Cost-effectiveness analysis does not require that ‘dead’ has a value relative to health states;
- What is the zero HS? Ratio scales have absolute zero.
- ‘Dead’ is practical (Decision Analyses), unambiguous (stakeholders, epidemiology)
I'd rather be dead, than wet my bed (Harry Nilsson)
Proposition 4

- using ‘dead’ … causes problems …. studies difficult to conduct and interpret ……many arbitrary choices

- 😞 arbitrary choices, freedom of social sciences 😊
- but using other anchors, will life be easier ?
Proposition 5

• alternative anchors to dead (sleep, unconscious)
• the anchor should have meaning in duration ??
• Well defined, easily understood?
• value of anchor depends on duration
How about the zero points?

- for QALYs, zero points are needed
- QALY = weight (HS) x duration
- duration intuitively is 0 at zero seconds
- but for which HS is weight zero?
Zero condition for duration

\[ (HS_1, t) \sim (HS_1, 0) \]
\[ (HS_2, t) \sim (HS_2, 0) \]

All episodes followed by dead

Miyamoto, et al. 1998
Zero condition for health

All episodes followed by dead

(Roudijk, et al., 2018)
Zero condition for health

\[
\begin{align*}
(HS, t_1) & \sim (HS, t_2) \\
t_1 & \neq t_2
\end{align*}
\]

All episodes followed by dead

a) dead
b) sleep
c) worst imgn
d) unconscious
Discussion

• if dead is a zero point, dead is not just something theoretical

• if dead is a zero-point, the propositions need to be reconsidered