



# Methodology Checklist 6: Economic Evaluations

This checklist is based on the BMJ requirements for authors submitting economic studies for publication in that journal. Drummond M, Jefferson TO. Guidelines for authors and peer reviewers of economic submissions to the BMJ BMJ 1996;313;275

Study identification (Include author, title, year of publication, journal title, pages)

Guideline topic:

Key Question No:

Reviewer:

**Before** completing this checklist, consider:

1. Is the paper an economic study (ie assessing the cost **effectiveness** of something), or is it just a study of costs? REJECT IF THE LATTER IS TRUE.
2. Is the paper relevant to the key question? Analyse using PICO (Patient or Population Intervention Comparison Outcome). IF NO REJECT (give reason below). IF YES complete the checklist.

Reason for rejection: 1. Not an economic study  2. Paper not relevant to key question

3. Other reason  (please specify):

## SECTION 1: INTERNAL VALIDITY

*In a well conducted economic study...*

*Does this study do it?*

1.1	The study addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Can't say <input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	The economic importance of the question is clear	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Can't say <input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	The choice of study design is justified	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Can't say <input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	All costs that are relevant from the viewpoint of the study are included and are measured and valued appropriately	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
1.5	The outcome measures used to answer the study question are relevant to that purpose and are measured and valued appropriately	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Can't say <input type="checkbox"/>
1.6	If discounting of future costs and outcomes is necessary, it been performed correctly	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
1.7	Assumptions are made explicit and a sensitivity analysis performed	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Can't say <input type="checkbox"/>
1.8	The decision rule is made explicit and comparisons are made on the basis of incremental costs and outcomes.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
1.9	The results provide information of relevance to policy makers	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

## SECTION 2: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDY

2.1	How well was the study conducted?	High quality (++) <input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable (+) <input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable – reject 0
-----	-----------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------

2.2	Are the results of this study directly applicable to the patient group targeted by this guideline?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
2.3	<b>Notes.</b> Summarise the author's conclusions. Add any comments on your own assessment of the study, and the extent to which it answers your question and mention any areas of uncertainty raised above.		