

A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Comparing a Conventional Mechanical Needle to a Radiofrequency Device for Transseptal Punctures

Sanchez J. M., MD, Shah R., PharmD, Kouassi Y., PharmD, Chronowic M., MSc, Wilson L., PhD, Marcus G. M., MD, MAS

Sanchez et al., Journal of Cardiovascular Electrophysiology, Volume 31, Issue 7, 2020.

INTRODUCTION

- ▶ Previous studies have demonstrated that use of a dedicated radiofrequency (RF) transseptal puncture (TSP) device (NRG® Transseptal Needle, Baylis Medical) is associated with reductions in transseptal complications, failures to cross the septum and transseptal access time, as compared to use of a mechanical transseptal needle (BRK, Abbott).
- ▶ While the upfront cost of the RF TSP device is more than the mechanical needle, the cost-effectiveness of the two options has not previously been evaluated.

METHODS

- ▶ A decision tree was prepared to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the RF TSP device and the mechanical needle, as used during pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) procedures, in three different clinical scenarios: single TSP with one device (base case); double TSP with one device; and, double TSP with two devices.
- ▶ Probability and clinical cost inputs were located in peer-reviewed literature and healthcare databases, while costs of TSP materials were obtained from the University of California, San Francisco EP lab.
- ▶ The total cost at 30 days was the sum of PVI procedure costs and costs of TSP-related complications.
- ▶ Effectiveness was defined as probability of survival at day 30 following TSP success.

- ▶ Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) were calculated for these four scenarios.
- ▶ One-way and Monte-Carlo probabilistic sensitivity analyses were then performed, with the latter used to prepare a cost-effectiveness acceptability curve (CEAC).

RESULTS

- ▶ The cost-effectiveness rankings of the four scenarios are shown in **Table 1**.
- ▶ In all scenarios the RF TSP device was found to be dominant, as compared to the mechanical needle.
- ▶ The probabilistic sensitivity analysis and CEAC found that the RF TSP device was more cost-effective at any willingness-to-pay threshold.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ When all costs are accounted for, the RF TSP device is less costly and more effective than the mechanical needle, despite a greater upfront equipment cost.
- ▶ The modified base case analysis suggested that the shorter time-to-transseptal with the RF TSP device may further increase cost savings, which may enable faster lab turn-over and more efficient use of personnel and space.
- ▶ It is noted that variations in procedural and equipment costs between centers could influence the level of dominance or cost-effectiveness reported.

Table 1. Cost-Effectiveness of RF TSP device compared to mechanical needle

Scenario	Incremental Total Cost at 30 Days for RF TSP device (\$)*	Incremental Effectiveness at 30 Days for RF TSP Device (%)*	ICER**
Single TSP with 1 device (base case)	-41	+0.9	Dominant
Double TSP with 1 device	-338	+1.1	Dominant
Double TSP with 2 devices	-158	+1.1	Dominant
Single TSP with 1 device (modified base case, with PVI costs adjusted for transseptal time savings)	-774	+0.9	Dominant

*As compared to mechanical transseptal needle

**The term "Dominant" indicates a device was associated with higher effectiveness and lower cost
TSP denotes transseptal puncture; RF, radiofrequency; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; PVI, pulmonary vein isolation