



This is a repository copy of *Mapping from the Health Assessment Questionnaire to the EQ-5D: The Impact of Different Algorithms on Cost-Effectiveness Results*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/98515/>

Version: Supplemental Material

---

**Article:**

Pennington, B. and Davis, S. [orcid.org/0000-0002-6609-4287](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6609-4287) (2014) Mapping from the Health Assessment Questionnaire to the EQ-5D: The Impact of Different Algorithms on Cost-Effectiveness Results. *Value in Health*, 17 (8). pp. 762-771. ISSN 1098-3015

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2014.11.002>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Table 4: Sensitivity analysis – high and low effects on pain

Pain measured on a VAS H = high, L=low					QALYs <i>Bold Italics = most effective</i>					ICER D = Dominated			
A	E	I	R	A	ADA	ETN	IFX	RTX	ABT	RTX vs. DMARD	ABT vs. RTX	ADA vs. RTX	ABT vs. ADA
D	T	F	T	B									
A	N	X	X	T									
L	L	L	L	L	3.32	3.27	3.28	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	£131,370	-	-
H	L	L	L	L	3.51	3.27	3.28	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£126,071
L	H	L	L	L	3.32	3.47	3.28	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	£131,370	-	-
H	H	L	L	L	3.51	3.47	3.28	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£126,071
L	L	H	L	L	3.32	3.27	3.45	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	£131,370	-	-
H	L	H	L	L	3.51	3.27	3.45	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£126,071
L	H	H	L	L	3.32	3.47	3.45	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	£131,370	-	-
H	H	H	L	L	3.51	3.47	3.45	3.48	<b>3.68</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£126,071
L	L	L	H	L	3.32	3.27	3.28	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
H	L	L	H	L	3.51	3.27	3.28	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
L	H	L	H	L	3.32	3.47	3.28	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
H	H	L	H	L	3.51	3.47	3.28	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
L	L	H	H	L	3.32	3.27	3.45	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
H	L	H	H	L	3.51	3.27	3.45	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
L	H	H	H	L	3.32	3.47	3.45	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
H	H	H	H	L	3.51	3.47	3.45	<b>3.81</b>	3.68	£20,383	D	D	-
L	L	L	L	H	3.32	3.27	3.28	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	£53,313	-	-
H	L	L	L	H	3.51	3.27	3.28	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£46,979
L	H	L	L	H	3.32	3.47	3.28	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	£53,313	-	-
H	H	L	L	H	3.51	3.47	3.28	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£46,979
L	L	H	L	H	3.32	3.27	3.45	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	£53,313	-	-

H	L	H	L	H	3.51	3.27	3.45	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£46,979
L	H	H	L	H	3.32	3.47	3.45	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	£53,313	-	-
H	H	H	L	H	3.51	3.47	3.45	3.48	<b>3.97</b>	£28,716	-	£166,726	£46,979
L	L	L	H	H	3.32	3.27	3.28	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
H	L	L	H	H	3.51	3.27	3.28	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
L	H	L	H	H	3.32	3.47	3.28	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
H	H	L	H	H	3.51	3.47	3.28	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
L	L	H	H	H	3.32	3.27	3.45	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
H	L	H	H	H	3.51	3.27	3.45	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
L	H	H	H	H	3.32	3.47	3.45	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-
H	H	H	H	H	3.51	3.47	3.45	3.81	<b>3.97</b>	£20,383	£159,363	-	-

VAS: visual analogue scale, QALYs: quality-adjusted life years, ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness

ratio, ADA: adalimumab, ETN: etanercept, IFX: infliximab, RTX: rituximab, ABT: abatacept, DMARDs:

disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs.