Memo

Bijan J. Borah, PhD, MSc

Division of Health Care Policy & Research

Mayo Clinic

Phone: 507-284-2873

Date: 15 November 2012

To: Matthew D.C. Eames, Ph.D.
Director of Extramural Research
Focused Ultrasound Surgery Foundation
1230 Cedars Court, Suite F, Charlottesville, VA 22903
434.326.9834 (P) 434.220.4978 (F)

From: Bijan Borah, PhD

Re: Progress report on the Focused Ultrasound Surgery (FUS) Foundation grant titled "Costs of Uterine Fibroid Treatments Including Focused Ultrasound Surgery"

Dear Matt,

I am writing to report the progress of the above mentioned grant from the FUS Foundation. The research project has been complete in terms of all the data collection/extraction and analyses. The output of this research has culminated in two research manuscripts. The drafts of these manuscripts are currently being revised by the coauthors before being submitted for publication. The preliminary results were also presented in the 3rd International Symposium of Focused Ultrasound, October 14-17, 2012 in Bethesda, MD, USA. The major findings from the first manuscript, which is tentatively titled "Comparison of Overall Uterine Fibroid-related Health Care Costs between Magnetic-Resonance Focused Ultrasound, Myomectomy and Uterine Artery Embolization (UAE)" were:

1. There was no significant difference in costs between FUS, UAE and myomectomy
2. Compared to UAE and myomectomy, women undergoing FUS appear to be:
 - a. Older
 - b. More medically complicated
 - c. Reside in areas with smaller proportion of black residents
3. Few women appear to have successful commercial coverage of FUS

The adjusted and unadjusted costs are reported in Table 1 below. The second manuscript titled "Cost-Effectiveness of Uterine-Preserving Procedural Treatments for Uterine Fibroids among Women of Childbearing Age" has the following major findings:

1. MRgFUS is 'in the mix' of cost-effective options along with myomectomy and UAE.
2. MRgFUS becomes more cost-effective when incorporating lost productivity costs.
3. UAE and myomectomy covered more often by insurers, but MRgFUS is comparably effective in our model.

We plan to submit these two manuscripts before the end of the current year. On behalf of my team, I thank FUS Foundation for its support for the important mission of gathering evidence of effectiveness for MRgFUS compared to other alternatives for treatment of uterine fibroids.

Sincerely,

Bijan Borah

Table 1: Unadjusted and Adjusted Mean Costs of Surgical Procedures Uterine Fibroid Treatment (95% Confidence Interval)

Time Periods	Unadjusted Costs			Adjusted Costs		
	FUS (n=14)	UAE (n=4,143)	Myomectomy (n=10,409)	FUS (n=14)	UAE (n=4,143)	Myomectomy (n=10,409)
Baseline Period	\$14,483 (\$2,755, \$26,211)	\$7,711 (\$7,407, \$8,014)	\$7,511 (\$7,257, \$7,765)	\$11,637 (\$7,235, \$18,728)	\$9,038 (\$8,696, \$9,390)	\$7,458 (\$7,176, \$7,745)
Perioperative Period	\$718 (\$49, \$1,387)	\$911 (\$828, \$993)	\$670 (\$625, \$715)	\$604 (\$117, \$3,131)	\$923 (\$808, \$1,053)	\$670 (\$587, \$765)
Operative Period	\$9,495 (\$6,039, \$12,951)	\$14,252 (\$13,811, \$14,693)	\$12,110 (\$11,933, \$12,287)	\$9,819 (\$6,555, \$14,704)	\$14,620 (\$14,152, \$15,111)	\$11,983 (\$11,594, \$12,383)
Post-operative Period	\$14,956 (\$3,027, \$26,884)	\$7,599 (\$7,086, \$8,113)	\$6,896 (\$6,643, \$7,148)	\$15,417 (\$5,793, \$41,013)	\$8,698 (\$8,051, \$9,396)	\$6,659 (\$6,167, \$7,193)
1-year Operative Period	\$25,169 (\$14,233, \$36,105)	\$22,762 (\$22,022, \$23,502)	\$19,675 (\$19,349, \$20,002)	\$25,840 (\$17,428, \$38,618)	\$24,241 (\$23,458, \$25,054)	\$19,313 (\$18,684, \$19,957)