Introduction

Health care expenditures in the Czech Republic (CR) totaled $4 billion in 1998 as compared to $3.1 billion in 1995 (21). If health care expenditures had only increased by the general rate of inflation, they would only have equaled $3.6 billion in 1998 (2). One reason for this increased rate of expenditures is the significant increase in the cost of medications. Medication costs in the CR in 1996 were five times higher than in 1990 (5). Health insurance companies have set financial limits and increased administrative regulations upon drug prescriptions in order to prevent further increases in medication costs. If medication costs are too high, the prescribing physician’s reimbursement is reduced. This strategy has not been entirely successful and has come at the cost of preventing patients from obtaining modern drugs that are known to cause fewer side effects.

Restrictions in the Czech Republic are designed to increase the use of older tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) instead of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) in the treatment of major depression. The international literature suggests that use of tricyclic antidepressants does not lead to savings in direct treatment costs in major depression in comparison with the SSRIs (4,9,13,17,18,25). No prospective pharmacoeconomic study related to this issue has been performed in a former communist country. This is an interesting setting to study this issue, given the rapid transformation of the health care system in these countries.

Amitriptyline, citalopram and fluoxetine are the most frequently used antidepressants in the CR (15).

Material and Methods

Subjects

All patients diagnosed with depressive episodes treated with amitriptyline, citalopram or fluoxetine, who had just been discharged from the inpatient unit of the Department of Psychiatry, University Hospital in Hradec Králové from September 1st, 1994 to August 31st, 1997 were included in the study. Patients provided informed consent. Ninety patients were followed. There were more women (N=69) than men (N=21). Diagnoses according to the International Classification of Diseases-10th Version (20) were as follows:

| Code | Diagnosis |
|------|-----------|
| 296.2 | Major depressive episode, recurrent, melancholic type |
| 300.4 | Major depressive episode, atypical features |
| 311.8 | Major depressive episode, due to substance use |
| 318.0 | Major depressive episode, due to a general medical condition |
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F 31 Bipolar Affective Disorder, Most Recent Episode Depressed (N=8), F 32 Major Depressive Episode, Single (N=44) and F 33 Major Depressive Episode, Recurrent (N=38). The average score on the Hamilton Psychiatric Rating Scale for Depression was 11.8 (2-22, S.D.=6.4).

Thirty-one patients were treated with amitriptyline, 29 with citalopram and 30 with fluoxetine at the beginning of the study. The treatment groups were comparable in gender (p=0.31, Chi-square test), age (p=0.98, Kruskal-Wallis test), diagnosis (P=0.05, Fisher test), duration of affective disorder (p=0.45, Kruskal-Wallis test), number of previous depressive episodes (p=0.49, Kruskal-Wallis test) and duration of recent depressive episode (p=0.65, Kruskal-Wallis test).

The subjects were randomized to the study antidepressant using computer randomization program (Excel) at the beginning of the initial hospitalization at the Dpt. of Psychiatry in Hradec Králové. Inpatient treatment lasting several weeks was assessed for efficacy and tolerability (7) and not pharmacoeconomic issues. This study, which assessed aspects of the cost and effectiveness of treatment, began immediately after the discharge of the patients from the inpatient unit.

Treatment

After the initial discharge from the university hospital the patients were treated at various outpatient psychiatric clinics in Eastern Bohemia and followed for the cost and outcome of therapy. Some of the patients were rehospitalized. The open, prospective study lasted six months and was based on an intent-to-treat model. This model suggests that the investigators exercise no control over physician practice after randomization, since the intention is to observe the impact of the treatments in ordinary practice settings. The physician is free to determine dose and duration of treatment and may change therapy, including the assigned antidepressant, at any time. Nearly all patients, in whom the randomized antidepressant had been discontinued (drop-out), were then treated with a tricyclic antidepressant.

The drop-outs were then included into the evaluation. Amitriptyline patients, 4 citalopram patients and 5 fluoxetine patients were rehospitalized one time during the six months observation. Eight amitriptyline patients, 4 citalopram patients and 5 fluoxetine patients were rehospitalized twice. The rest of the patients were not rehospitalized during the followed period.

Costs

Utilization data on psychotropic medications, outpatient psychiatric examinations and rehospitalizations were obtained from the outpatient psychiatrists using a questionnaire. The treatment costs were calculated by multiplying units of service by their estimated cost. The cost of antidepressant medication and comitant psychotropic medications, outpatient psychiatric examinations and hospitalizations for depression were considered. The medication costs were calculated according to the Drug Price List of the General Health Insurance Company of the CR (24). For example, the cost of amitriptyline (75 mg) was $0.06 (U.S. Dollars) in comparison to $0.80 for citalopram (20 mg) and $0.59 for fluoxetine (20 mg). The cost of one outpatient psychiatric examination was $3.5 as fixed by the General Health Insurance Company (1). The cost of one day of hospitalization at the Department of Psychiatry in Hradec Králové in 1997 was $21.7 as reported by the hospital Department of Finances. The cost of one hospitalization day was $17.2 at the Department of Psychiatry in Nova Paka, $16.9 at Nové Město nad Metují and $16.5 in the State Mental Hospital in Havlíčkův Brod. No other direct medical costs (e.g. cost of structured psychotherapy, laboratory tests, psychiatric emergency visits or medical social work) were assessed because these services are provided very rarely in the psychiatric outpatient setting in the CR. All costs were considered in 1997 Czech Crowns (Kč) and recalculated to $ (Kč 33.5 = $ 1; 1997 values) (19).

The costs were assessed from the perspective of the General Health Insurance Company of the CR. That is why charges were used instead of open market values because these are not relevant for this dominant health care policy maker in the country. The indirect costs of depression, which usually three or more times higher than the direct treatment costs (11), were not calculated because they are not relevant for the General Health Insurance Company again.

Outcome

The outcome measure was the number of hospitalization-free days, which was defined as the number of days spent outside any psychiatric hospital during the six month follow-up. This outcome measure was chosen because it provides a reasonable measure of the effectiveness of the therapy after the initial hospitalization. More detailed evaluations of the subjects’ clinical states were not possible in this small, pilot study.

Statistical analysis

The Chi-square, Fischer exact and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to assess the comparability of the treatment groups with each other as for gender, age, diagnosis, duration of affective disorder, number of previous depressive episodes and duration of recent depressive episode. Normality of distribution of the cost and outcome values was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test and the Omnibus test. If the distribution was not normal, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used in all cases to compare the cost and outcome variables among the treatment groups as well as the sensitivity analysis. The Chi-square test was adequate for analysis of drop-out rates.

Ethical issues

The study was conducted in full conformity with the principles of the Helsinki Declaration as amended in Tokyo, Venice and South Africa. The study protocol was accepted by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital and the Charles University School of Medicine in Hradec Králové. The patients voluntarily signed the Informed Consent before the enrollment into the trial.

Results

Description of the study population is given in Table 1. The results are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. Amitriptyline was found to be significantly cheaper than the other two medications (p<0.00003). Total direct medical costs as well as outcome based on the number of hospitalization-free days were not significantly different among the treatment groups.

Tab. 1: Description of the study population (N=90).

| Variable | Mean value | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| Age (years) | 44.5 | 21 | 14.3 |
| Duration of the mood disorder (months) | 63.4 | 1 | 996 |
| Duration of the most recent depressive episode (months) | 5.9 | 1 | 36 |
| Number of previous depressive episodes | 1.7 | 0 | 28 |
| Number of previous manic episodes | 0.1 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of previous psychiatric hospitalizations | 2.1 | 0 | 29 |
| Weight (kg) | 67.2 | 41 | 101 |

Tab. 2: Costs of the six month continuation treatment with amitriptyline, citalopram and fluoxetine in major depression.

| Variable | Amitriptyline (N=31) | Citalopram (N=29) | Fluoxetine (N=30) | Analysis |
|----------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Cost of antidepressant ($) | Median 122 | Minimum 11 | Maximum 841 | Kruskal-Wallis test |
| Cost of other psychotropic drugs ($) | Median 341 | Minimum 0 | Maximum 841 | P=0.00003 |
| Cost of outpatient examinations ($) | Median 19 | Minimum 0 | Maximum 231 | 1 differs from 2,3 (Duncan’s multiple comparison test) |
| Cost of rehospitalizations for depression ($) | Median 34 | Minimum 0 | Maximum 148 | P=0.59 |
| Total direct treatment cost ($) | Median 1007 | Minimum 32 | Maximum 3548 | P=0.97 |

Tab. 3: Outcome of the six month continuation treatment with amitriptyline, citalopram and fluoxetine in major depression.

| Variable | Amitriptyline (N=31) | Citalopram (N=29) | Fluoxetine (N=30) | Analysis |
|----------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Number of hospitalization-free days | Median 140 | Minimum 35 | Maximum 180 | Kruskal-Wallis test |

Amitriptyline was discontinued in 26 (83.9%) patients, citalopram was discontinued in 17 (58.6%) patients, and fluoxetine was discontinued in 19 (63.3%) patients (drop-outs). Overall there was no significant difference in drop-out rates, but the numbers did suggest a trend to a significant difference in favour of the SSRIs (AMI vs CTT p=0.07, AMI vs FLU p=0.07, CTT vs FLU p=0.93, chi-square value = 5.11, df=2, Chi-square test). The drop-outs were included in the assessment. Ten amitriptyline patients were switched to dosulepine, 6 to dibenzepine, 5 to imipramine, 1 to citalopram, 1 to clomipramine, 1 to moclobemide, 1 to nortriptyline, and 1 to sertraline. The medication switch in the amitriptyline patients came after 1.8 months of the treatment on average. Five citalopram patients were switched to amitriptyline, 5 to dibenzepine, 4 to dosulepine, 1 to fluoxetine, 1 to trazodone, 1 to fluoxetin, 1 to amitriptyline, 1 to clomipramine, 1 to moclobemide, 1 to nortriptyline, and 1 to sertraline. The medication switch in the citalopram patients came after 2.9 months of the treatment on average. Five fluoxetine patients were switched to amitriptyline, 5 to dibenzepine, 4 to dosulepine, 1 to fluoxetine, 1 to trazodone, 1 to fluoxetin, 1 to amitriptyline, 1 to clomipramine, 1 to moclobemide, 1 to nortriptyline, and 1 to sertraline. The medication switch in the fluoxetine patients came after 2.9 months of the treatment on average.
Health Insurance Company of the CR (24). For example, the cost of amitriptyline (75 mg) was $0.06 (U.S. Dollars) in comparison to $0.80 for citalopram (20 mg) and $0.59 for fluoxetine (20 mg). The cost of one outpatient psychiatric examination was $3.5 as fixed by the General Health Insurance Company (1). The cost of one day of hospitalization at the Department of Psychiatry in Hradec Králové in 1997 was $21.7 as reported by the hospital Department of Finances. The cost of one hospitalization day was $17.2 at the Department of Psychiatry in Nová Paka, $16.9 at Nové Město nad Metují and $16.5 in the State Mental Hospital in Havlíčkův Brod. No other direct medical costs (e.g. cost of structured psychotherapy, laboratory tests, psychiatric emergency visits or medical social work) were assessed because these services are provided very rarely in the psychiatric outpatient setting in the CR. All costs were considered in 1997 Czech Crowns (Kč) and recalculated to $ (Kč 33.5 = $ 1; 1997 values) (19).

The costs were assessed from the perspective of the General Health Insurance Company of the CR. That is why charges were used instead of open market values because these are not relevant for the General Health Insurance Company again.

Outcome
The outcome measure was the number of hospitalization-free days, which was defined as the number of days spent outside any psychiatric hospital during the six month follow-up period. This outcome measure was chosen because it provides a reasonable measure of the effectiveness of the therapy after the initial hospitalization. More detailed evaluations of the subjects' clinical states were not possible in this small, pilot study.

Statistical analysis
The Chi-square, Fischer exact and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to assess the comparability of the treatment groups with each other as for gender, age, diagnosis, duration of affective disorder, number of previous depressive episodes and duration of recent depressive episode. Normality of distribution of the cost and outcome values was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality and the Omnibus test of the distribution was not normal, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used in all cases to compare the cost and outcome variables among the treatment groups as well as the sensitivity analysis. The Chi-square test was adequate for analysis of dropout rates.

Ethical issues
The study was conducted in full conformity with the principles of the Helsinki Declaration as amended in Tokyo, Venice and South Africa. The study protocol was accepted by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital and the Charles University, School of Medicine in Hradec Králové. The patients voluntarily signed the Informed Consent before the enrollment into the trial.

Results
Description of the study population is given in Table 1. The results are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. Amitriptyline was found to be significantly cheaper than the other two medications (p<0.00003). Total direct medical costs as well as outcome based on the number of hospitalization-free days were not significantly different among the treatment groups.

Tab. 1: Description of the study population (N=90).

| Variable                          | Mean value | Minimum | Maximum | S.D. |
|----------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|------|
| Age (years)                      | 44.5       | 21      | 143     |      |
| Duration of the mood disorder (months) | 63.4       | 396     | 136     | 93.7 |
| Duration of the most recent depressive episode (months) | 5.9        | 396     | 136     | 93.7 |
| Number of previous depressive episodes | 1.7        | 28      | 394     | 3.3  |
| Number of previous manic episodes | 0.3        | 3       | 35      | 0.5  |
| Number of previous psychiatric hospitalizations | 2.1      | 29      | 4       |      |
| Weight (kg)                      | 67.2       | 41      | 101     | 12.2 |

Tab. 2: Costs of the six month continuation treatment with amitriptyline, citalopram and fluoxetine in major depression.

| Variable                          | Amitriptyline (N=31) | Citalopram (N=29) | Fluoxetine (N=30) | Analysis |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Mean value                        | 122                   | 341               | 307               | P=0.00003|
| Minimum                           | 11                    | 0                 | 42                |         |
| Maximum                           | 841                   | 841               | 841               |          |
| Median                            | 1067                  | 1128              | 1083              | P=0.97   |
| Duration of hospitalization-free days | 63.4                  | 396               | 136               | 93.7     |
| Duration of the most recent depressive episode (months) | 5.9                    | 396              | 136               | 93.7     |
| Number of previous depressive episodes | 1.7                   | 28                | 394               | 3.3      |
| Number of previous manic episodes | 0.3                   | 3                 | 35                | 0.5      |
| Number of previous psychiatric hospitalizations | 2.1                | 29                | 4                 |          |
| Weight (kg)                      | 67.2                   | 41                | 101               | 12.2     |

Tab. 3: Outcome of the six month continuation treatment with amitriptyline, citalopram and fluoxetine in major depression.

| Variable                          | Amitriptyline (N=31) | Citalopram (N=29) | Fluoxetine (N=30) | Analysis |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Mean value                        | 140                   | 155               | 152               | P=0.18   |
| Minimum                           | 140                   | 155               | 152               |          |
| Maximum                           | 180                   | 180               | 180               |          |
| Median                            | 140                   | 155               | 152               |          |

Amitriptyline was discontinued in 26 (83.9%) patients, citalopram was discontinued in 17 (58.6%) patients, and fluoxetine was discontinued in 19 (63.3%) patients (dropout). Overall there was no significant difference in drop-out rates, but the numbers did suggest a trend to a significant difference in favour of the SSRIs (AMI vs CIT P=0.07, AMI vs FLU P=0.07, CIT vs FLU P=NS, chisquare value = 5.11, df=2, Chi-square test). The drop-outs were included in the assessment. Ten amitriptyline patients were switched to dosulepine, 6 to dibenzepine, 5 to imipramine, 1 to citalopram, 1 to clomipramine, 1 to moclobemide, 1 to nortriptyline, and 1 to sertraline. The medication switch in the amitriptyline patients came after 1.8 months of the treatment on average. Five citalopram patients were switched to amitriptyline, 5 to dibenzepine, 4 to dosulepine, 1 to fluoxetine.

F 31 Bipolar Affective Disorder, Most Recent Episode Depressed (N=8), F 32 Major Depressive Episode, Single (N=44) and F 33 Major Depressive Episode, Recurrent (N=38). The average score on the Hamilton Psychiatric Rating Scale for Depression was 11.6 (2-22, S.D.=4.4). Thirty-one patients were treated with amitriptyline, 29 with citalopram and 30 with fluoxetine at the beginning of the study. The treatment groups were comparable in gender (p=0.31, Chi-square test), age (p=0.98, Kruskal-Wallis test), diagnosis (Fisher exact test), duration of affective disorder (p=0.45, Kruskal-Wallis test), number of previous depressive episodes (p=0.49, Kruskal-Wallis test) and duration of recent depressive episode (p=0.65, Kruskal-Wallis test).

The subjects were randomized to the study antidepressants using computer randomization program (Excel) at the beginning of the initial hospitalization at the Dpt. of Psychiatry in Hradec Králové. Inpatient treatment lasting several weeks was assessed for efficacy and tolerability (7) and not pharmacoeconomic issues. This study, which assesses aspects of the cost and effectiveness of treatment, began immediately after the discharge of the patients from the inpatient unit.

Treatment
After the initial discharge from the university hospital the patients were treated at various outpatient psychiatric clinics in Eastern Bohemia and followed for the cost and outcome of therapy. Some of the patients were rehospitalized (8), this open, prospective study lasted six months and was based on an intent-to-treat model. This model suggests that the investigators exercise no control over physician practice after randomization, since the intention is to observe the impact of the treatments in ordinary practice settings. The physician is free to determine dose and duration of treatment and may change therapy, including the assigned antidepressant, at any time. Nearly all patients, in whom the randomized antidepressant had been discontinued (drop-out), were then treated with a tricyclic antidepressant. The drop-outs were included into the evaluation. Eight amitriptyline patients, 4 citalopram patients and 5 fluoxetine patients were rehospitalized one time during the six months follow-up period. The dropout patients and 1 fluoxetine patient were rehospitalized twice. The rest of the patients were not rehospitalized during the followed period.

Costs
Utilization data on psychotropic medications, outpatient psychiatric examinations and rehospitalizations were obtained from the outpatient psychiatrists using a questionnaire. The treatment costs were calculated by multiplying units of service by their estimated cost. The cost of antidepressants, concomitant psychotropic medications, outpatient psychiatric examinations and hospitalizations for depression were considered. The medication costs were calculated according to the Drug Price List of the General Health Insurance Company of the CR (24).
voxamine, 1 to moclobemide, and 1 to sertraline. The treat-
mmt with citalopram usually lasted 2.2 months on average in
the drop-outs was 2.1 months. The anti-
depressants were switched because of a lack of efficacy or adverse
effects.
One-way sensitivity analysis in which all variables were
sequentially multiplied and divided by a coefficient of 2, 5
and 10 revealed that the cost of antidepressant was the most
sensitive factor influencing the overall direct costs (coefficient 10, amitriptyline differs from citalopram and
fluoxetine, p<0.03, Kruskal-Wallis test). No significant sen-
sitivity was proven in all other variables (coefficients 2, 5
and 10, p>0.98, Kruskal-Wallis test).

Discussion
The results suggest that treatment of major depression
with the SSRIs is neither more expensive nor less effective
than therapy with amitriptyline. Limitation of prescription
of the SSRIs by health insurance companies does not ap-
pear to lead to cost savings, while it may lead to patients suffering unnecessarily from adverse effects of TCAs
(10,14,22). The adverse effects may be the cause of the high
drop-out rate in the amitriptyline patients. Good clinical
practice requires at least 6 months continuance of anti-
depressant treatment following successful acute treatment
in major depression and may even require chronic anti-de-
pressant treatment in cases of recurrent depression (12,23).

Continued treatment with TCAs entails greater risks to pa-
tients given the higher risk of lethal overdose in suicidal pa-
tients with TCAs (8). These facts should persuade the
Czech health insurance companies not to punish physicians
for prescribing the SSRIs antidepressants.

It is necessary to state the limitations of the study. The number of the subjects in the individual treatment groups was relatively small. That is why the study can only be con-
sidered exploratory. Drop-outs were included into the final
evaluation when nearly all drop-out patients were switched to a tricyclic antidepressant. This change of medication
carried decreased costs in the citalopram and fluoxetine
groups but was counterbalanced by an increase in adverse
effects. The intent-to-treat approach in pharmacoeconomic
research is fully accepted in the literature (16) and widely
used because it reflects real clinical practice. The fact that
the analysis was focused on psychiatric treatment while the
majority of the depressive patients are treated by general
practitioners may be considered problematic, but in fact, it
represents the actual clinical situation in the CR. Indirect
costs were not considered even if they are more important
than the direct ones in depression (6,11). Evaluation of in-
direct costs would be necessary to conduct a true cost-eff-
ficentmetry study.

There are also some strengths in this study. Patients, health care providers and policy makers in communist
countries were educated that money was irrelevant in a ful-
ly communist regime (3). Even after the fall of communism
economic considerations in the health care system are of-
ten considered as unethical. However, the reality is that eco-

nomic forces are present in any health care system and need
to be addressed. This paper describes the first pro-
spective pharmacoeconomic study in psychiatry in the
postcommunist world to the authors’ knowledge.

Further research through a larger, controlled, prospec-
tive, intent-to-treat, long-term medical effectiveness study of the treatment of depression by general practitioners who
considers indirect costs and quality of life of the patients
should be performed to confirm or reject the results pre-
sented in this exploratory study.
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ment with citalopram usually lasted 2.2 months on average
in the drop-outs was 2.1 months. The anti-depressants were switched because of a lack of efficacy or adverse
effects.

One-way sensitivity analysis in which all variables were
sequentially multiplied and divided by a coefficient of 2, 5
and 10 revealed that the cost of antidepressant was the
most sensitive factor influencing the overall direct costs
(coefficient 10, antidepressants differ from citalopram and
fluoxetine, p<0.03, Kruskal-Wallis test). No significant sen-
sitivity was proven in all other variables (coefficients 2, 5
and 10, p>0.05, Kruskal-Wallis test).

Discussion
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depressant treatment following successful acute treatment
in major depression and may even require chronic anti-de-
pressant treatment in cases of recurrent depression (12,23).

Continued treatment with TCAs entails greater risks to pa-
tients given the higher risk of lethal overdose in suicidal pa-
tients with TCAs (8). These facts should persuade the
Czech health insurance companies not to punish physici-
ans for prescribing the SSRI antidepressants.

It is necessary to state the limitations of the study. The
number of the subjects in the individual treatment groups
was relatively small. That is why the study can only be con-
sidered exploratory. Drop-outs were included into the final
evaluation when nearly all drop-out patients were switched
to a tricyclic antidepressant. This change of medication
caus ed decreased costs in the citalopram and fluoxetine
groups but was counterbalanced by an increase in adverse
effects. The intent-to-treat approach in pharmacoeconomic
research is fully accepted in the literature (16) and widely
used because it reflects real clinical practice. The fact that
the analysis was focused on psychiatric treatment while
the majority of the depressive patients are treated by general
drivers may be considered problematic, but in fact, it
represents the actual clinical situation in the CR. Indirect
costs were not considered even if they are more important
than the direct ones in depression (6,11). Evaluation of in-
direct costs would be necessary to conduct a true cost-effec-
tiveness study.

There are also some strengths in this study. Patients,
health care providers and policy makers in communist
countries were educated that money was irrelevant in a ful-
ly communist regime (3). Even after the fall of communism
economic considerations in the health care system are of-
ten considered as unethical. However, the reality is that eco-
nomic forces are present in any health care system and need
to be addressed. This paper describes the first pro-
spective pharmacoeconomic study in psychiatry in the
postcommunist world to the authors' knowledge.

Further research through a larger, controlled, prospec-
tive, intent-to-treat, long-term medical effectiveness study of
the treatment of depression by general practitioners which
considers indirect costs and quality of life of the patients
should be performed to confirm or reject the results pre-
sented in this exploratory study.
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