

Vol. 28, No. 6, 2010

The authors have reported two instances of miscoding in their analyses. The following corrections are as a result of their re-analysis.

Page 464: The final sentence of the second paragraph of the abstract should read: “Submissions that include a modelled economic evaluation and have a higher cost per QALY get approved less often than submissions without an economic modelling ($p=0.01$).”

Page 468: Table II, numbers under the variable ‘Type of economic modelling’ should read:

Table II. Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee (PBAC) recommendations for meetings held between July 2005 and March 2008; univariate analysis of the effect of potentially confounding variables on the likelihood of PBAC approval

Variable	PBAC recommendation			p-value
	approval [n (%) ^a]	rejection/deferrals [n (%) ^a]	total	
Type of economic modelling (n = 225)				
CMA or no economic modelling ^b	63 (68)	30 (32)	93	<0.001
CEA ^b	15 (52)	14 (48)	29	
CUA: cost per QALY ≤\$A45 000	31 (50)	31 (50)	62	
CUA: cost per QALY >\$A45 000 to ≤\$A75 000	8 (29)	20 (71)	28	
CUA: cost per QALY >\$A75 000	0 (0)	13 (100)	13	

Page 469: The final sentence of the second paragraph of the Cancer versus Non-Cancer Drugs subsection should read: “Of the CUAs presented, a significantly higher proportion of non-cancer drug recommendations had a reported cost per QALY of ≤\$A45 000 (29% vs 21%; $p<0.001$), while a higher proportion of cancer drug recommendations had a reported cost per QALY of >\$A75 000 (17% vs 3%; $p<0.001$).”

Page 470: Table III, numbers under the variable ‘Type of economic modelling’ should read:

Table III. Comparison of cancer vs non-cancer drugs for recommendations made at July 2005 to March 2008 Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee (PBAC) meetings

Variable	Drug type		p-value
	cancer [n (%) ^a]	non-cancer [n (%) ^a]	
Type of economic modelling (n = 225)			
CMA or no economic modelling ^b	14 (29)	79 (45)	<0.001
CEA ^b	10 (21)	19 (11)	
CUA: cost per QALY ≤\$A45 000	10 (21)	52 (29)	
CUA: cost per QALY >\$A45 000 to ≤\$A75 000	6 (13)	22 (12)	
CUA: cost per QALY >\$A75 000	8 (17)	5 (3)	

Page 471: Multivariable Analyses subsection

The first three sentences of the second paragraph should read: “After adjusting for the other variables, the estimated odds of approving a cancer drug were 0.63 (95% CI 0.30, 1.31) times the odds of approving a non-cancer drug, but this difference was not statistically significant ($p=0.2$). In terms of economic modelling ($p=0.01$), the odds of approving a submission were lower if the cost per QALY

was >\$A45 000. Compared with CMA or no modelling, the odds were 0.18 (95% CI 0.07, 0.49) for >\$A45 000.”

The fifth and final sentences should read: “The odds of approving a submission with an estimated cost to the PBS of \geq \$A10 million per year were 0.48 (95% CI 0.24, 0.94) times the odds of approving a submission with an estimated cost to the PBS of <\$A10 million per year ($p=0.03$). The model was a reasonable fit to the data (Hosmer and Lemeshow^[15] goodness-of-fit test = 3.19, $df=7$; $p=0.9$).”

Page 472: Table IV should read:

Table IV. Multivariable logistic model results (n=221)

Variable	Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Economic modelling				
CMA or no economic modelling (no cost per QALY) ^{a,b}	1 (referent)	<0.001	1 (referent)	0.01
CEA (no cost per QALY) ^b	0.51 (0.22, 1.19)		0.59 (0.23, 1.51)	
CUA: cost per QALY \leq \$A45 000	0.48 (0.25, 0.92)		0.59 (0.27, 1.26)	
CUA: cost per QALY >\$A45 000	0.12 (0.05, 0.28)		0.18 (0.07, 0.49)	

[Chim L, Kelly PJ, Salkeld G, et al. Are cancer drugs less likely to be recommended for listing by the Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee in Australia? *Pharmacoeconomics* 2010; 28 (6): 463-75]