

## Supplementary article data

# Eliciting health state utilities for Dupuytren's contracture using a discrete choice experiment

Ning Yan Gu<sup>1,2</sup>, Marc F Botteman<sup>1</sup>, Robert A Gerber<sup>3</sup>, Xiang Ji<sup>1</sup>, Roelien Postema<sup>4,5</sup>, Yin Wan<sup>1</sup>, Grzegorz Sianos<sup>6</sup>, Iain Anthony<sup>6</sup>, Joseph C Cappelleri<sup>3</sup>, Piotr Szczypa<sup>7</sup>, and Ben van Hout<sup>8,9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pharmerit International, Bethesda, MD, USA; <sup>2</sup>University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA; <sup>3</sup>Pfizer Inc., Groton, CT, USA; <sup>4</sup>Pharmerit International, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; <sup>5</sup>Eli Lilly and Company, Houten, The Netherlands; <sup>6</sup>Royal Infirmary, Glasgow, UK; <sup>7</sup>Pfizer Ltd., Tadworth, Surrey, UK; <sup>8</sup>Pharmerit International, York, UK; <sup>9</sup>University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

Correspondence: ngu@salud.unm.edu

Submitted 12-11-30. Accepted 13-06-14.

Table 3. Sample characteristics

	Whole sample (n = 2,282)	Included sample (n = 1,745)	Excluded sample (n = 537)
Mean age (SD)	47.2 (17.1)	48.4 (16.9)	43.6 (17.1)
Gender, % female	51.9	53.4	46.9
Education, % with college education or higher degree	59.1	58.8	60.0
Employment/occupation			
% not working or unknown status	55.2	57.3	48.6
% non-manual labor/office based	27.8	27.4	29.2
% unskilled manual labor	7.0	6.8	7.5
% skilled manual labor	10.0	8.5	14.7
Know someone who has DC, % yes	6.1	6.5	4.7
Immediate family	21.0	23.9	8.0
Relative	18.8	17.7	24.0
Friend	46.4	44.3	56.0
Colleague	5.8	5.3	8.0
Other	8.0	8.9	4.0
General health status			
Excellent	10.3	9.3	13.2
Very good	36.3	36.2	36.5
Good	33.4	33.4	33.7
Fair	16.0	16.6	13.8
Poor	4.1	4.5	2.8
Hand use			
Right-handed	86.0	87.1	82.5
Left-handed	11.0	10.3	13.2
Ambidextrous	3.0	2.6	4.3
Inconsistent response, % yes	20.2	0.0	14.2
Average survey time, mean (SD) in min	2.9 (8.9)	2.6 (2.3)	3.9 (17.8)
Survey satisfaction, mean (SD)	76.1 (21.5)	76.4 (21.3)	75.1 (22.1)

Table 4. Conditional logistic model (CLM) estimates

Finger	Joint	Coeff.	SE	Joint model			Finger	Coeff.	Tubiana stage model			
				z	p > z	95% CI			SE	z	p > z	95% CI
Index	PIP	-0.013	0.001	-20.09	<0.001	-0.014 -0.011	Index	-0.513	0.023	-22.39	<0.001	-0.557 -0.468
	MCP	-0.015	0.001	-21.94	<0.001	-0.016 -0.013						
Middle	PIP	-0.009	0.001	-16.00	<0.001	-0.010 -0.008	Middle	-0.661	0.022	-30.13	<0.001	-0.704 -0.618
	MCP	-0.020	0.001	-34.63	<0.001	-0.021 -0.018						
Ring	PIP	-0.017	0.001	-29.20	<0.001	-0.018 -0.016	Ring	-0.692	0.020	-35.05	<0.001	-0.731 -0.654
	MCP	-0.013	0.001	-27.89	<0.001	-0.014 -0.012						
Little	PIP	-0.010	0.000	-21.53	<0.001	-0.011 -0.009	Little	-0.492	0.018	-27.73	<0.001	-0.527 -0.457
	MCP	-0.011	0.001	-22.13	<0.001	-0.012 -0.010						

N = 34,900; LL at convergence = -10,884; pseudo R2 = 0.1001                      N = 34,900; LL at convergence = -11,266; pseudo R2 = 0.0685

Table 5. Rescaled EQ-5D-5L utilities for different hand uses

	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Right-handed respondent				
Right hand utility	0.508	0.273	-0.594	1.000
Left hand utility	0.579	0.232	-0.594	1.000
Left-handed respondent				
Right hand utility	0.559	0.253	-0.241	1.000
Left hand utility	0.474	0.273	-0.280	1.000
Ambidextrous respondent				
Right hand utility	0.632	0.232	0.073	1.000
Left hand utility	0.637	0.220	0.074	1.000
Dominant hand utility		0.491		
Non-dominant hand utility		0.569		
Ambidextrous hand utility		0.634		

Dominant hand utility = average of (right hand utility for right-handed respondents + left hand utility for left-handed respondents).  
 Non-dominant hand utility = average of (left hand utility for right-handed respondents + right hand utility for left-handed respondents).  
 Ambidextrous hand utility = average of (right hand utility for ambidextrous respondents + left hand utility for ambidextrous respondents).

## Appendix A. Overview of 54 hand profiles

Pair_id	Profile	Joint #1	Joint #2	Joint #3	Joint #4	Joint #5	Joint #6	Joint #7	Joint #8	Profile	Joint #1	Joint #2	Joint #3	Joint #4	Joint #5	Joint #6	Joint #7	Joint #8
1	A	45	0	0	0	90	0	45	0	B	45	0	0	0	90	45	90	45
2	C	0	0	45	0	0	45	0	0	D	45	90	0	45	0	0	0	0
3	E	0	45	90	0	45	0	0	0	F	0	0	0	45	45	45	0	90
4	G	0	0	0	45	45	0	90	45	H	0	0	0	45	45	90	45	0
5	I	0	0	45	0	0	0	90	90	J	0	0	45	0	0	90	45	45
6	K	90	45	0	0	0	0	45	90	L	90	45	0	0	0	90	0	45
7	M	0	45	0	90	90	0	0	45	N	90	45	0	0	0	45	90	0
8	O	45	90	45	0	45	0	0	45	P	90	0	90	45	0	0	0	45
9	Q	0	45	90	0	45	45	45	45	R	45	0	0	0	90	90	0	90
10	S	90	0	45	90	90	0	0	0	T	45	90	0	45	0	45	45	45
11	U	0	90	90	90	0	0	45	0	V	90	45	45	45	45	0	45	0
12	W	45	45	90	45	90	45	0	0	X	45	45	45	90	0	90	45	0
13	Y	45	45	45	90	0	45	0	90	Z	45	45	45	90	0	0	90	45
14	AA	90	90	0	90	45	45	0	0	AB	0	90	45	45	90	45	90	0
15	AC	45	0	90	90	45	45	90	0	AD	45	0	90	90	45	0	45	90
16	AE	0	90	45	45	90	0	45	90	AF	45	90	45	0	45	45	45	90
17	AG	90	0	90	45	0	45	45	90	AH	0	45	0	90	90	90	90	0
18	AI	45	90	45	0	45	90	90	0	AJ	0	90	45	45	90	90	0	45
19	AK	90	0	90	45	0	90	90	0	AL	45	0	90	90	45	90	0	45
20	AM	0	45	0	90	90	45	45	90	AN	90	45	45	45	45	90	0	90
21	AO	0	90	90	90	0	45	90	45	AP	45	90	0	45	0	90	90	90
22	AQ	90	0	45	90	90	45	45	45	AR	90	45	45	45	45	45	90	45
23	AS	0	45	90	0	45	90	90	90	AT	0	90	90	90	0	90	0	90
24	AU	90	90	0	90	45	90	45	45	AV	90	90	90	0	90	90	45	0
25	AW	90	90	0	90	45	0	90	90	AX	90	90	90	0	90	0	90	45
26	AY	45	45	90	45	90	90	45	45	AZ	45	45	90	45	90	0	90	90
27	AAA	90	90	90	0	90	45	0	90	AAB	90	0	45	90	90	90	90	90

## Note:

Joint #1: index finger, PIP joint  
 Joint #2: index finger, MCP joint  
 Joint #3: middle finger, PIP joint  
 Joint #4: middle finger, MCP joint  
 Joint #5: ring finger, PIP joint  
 Joint #6: ring finger, MCP joint  
 Joint #7: little finger, PIP joint  
 Joint #8: little finger, MCP joint

Appendix B-1. Calculating EQ-5D-5L dominant hand utilities using sample hands

		$\beta$	"Best" hand	"Worst" hand	Hand #1	Hand #2	
<b>The Joint Model</b>							
Index	PIP	-0.012550	0	90	90	0	
	MCP	-0.014750	0	90	0	0	
Middle	PIP	-0.008810	0	90	90	0	
	MCP	-0.019487	0	90	45	0	
Ring	PIP	-0.016765	0	90	0	0	
	MCP	-0.013084	0	90	0	90	
Little	PIP	-0.009609	0	90	0	0	
	MCP	-0.010892	0	90	45	90	
	V(hand)		0.0000	-9.5352	-3.2895	-2.1578	
			U(hand)	1.0000	0.4909	0.8244	0.8848
<b>The Tubiana Stage Model</b>							
Index	0	0.000000	0	4	2	0	
	1	-3.477461					
	2	-4.416257					
	3	-3.356156					
	4	-9.924247					
Middle	0	0.000000	0	4	3	0	
	1	-1.569192					
	2	-0.534170					
	3	-1.947996					
	4	-3.378112					
Ring	0	0.000000	0	4	0	2	
	1	-1.138544					
	2	-2.548062					
	3	-3.799231					
	4	-5.008510					
Little	0	0.000000	0	4	1	2	
	1	-1.748863					
	2	-2.398389					
	3	-3.580404					
	4	-5.218915					
			V(hand)	0.0000	-23.5298	-8.1131	-4.9465
			U(hand)	1.0000	0.4909	0.8245	0.8930

Appendix B-2. Illustration of the numerical computations for Hand #1 in Appendix B-1

$V(\text{hand})$  for hand #1 =  $(-0.012550 \cdot 90) + (-0.014750 \cdot 0) + (-0.008810 \cdot 90) + (-0.019487 \cdot 45) + (-0.016765 \cdot 0) + (-0.013084 \cdot 0) + (-0.009609 \cdot 0) + (-0.010892 \cdot 45) = -3.2895$

$V(\text{hand})$  for the "Best" hand =  $(-0.012550 \cdot 0) + (-0.014750 \cdot 0) + (-0.008810 \cdot 0) + (-0.019487 \cdot 0) + (-0.016765 \cdot 0) + (-0.013084 \cdot 0) + (-0.009609 \cdot 0) + (-0.010892 \cdot 0) = 0$

$V(\text{hand})$  for the "Worst" hand =  $(-0.012550 \cdot 90) + (-0.014750 \cdot 90) + (-0.008810 \cdot 90) + (-0.019487 \cdot 90) + (-0.016765 \cdot 90) + (-0.013084 \cdot 90) + (-0.009609 \cdot 90) + (-0.010892 \cdot 90) = -9.5352$ .

Hence,

$$U(\text{hand}) \text{ for hand \#1} = (-3.2895 - (-9.5352)) / (0 - (-9.5352)) * (1 - 0.4909) + 0.4909 = 0.8244$$

Using the same approach, the estimated utility for hand #1 using the Tubiana stage model is 0.8245, as shown in Appendix B-1.

## Appendix C. Profile frequencies

Choice set	Profile	Choice (n, %)		Total frequency (n, %)
		0	1	
1	A vs B	461 (20.20)	1,821 (79.80)	2,282 (0.10)
2	C vs D	217 (27.43)	574 (72.57)	791 (0.03)
3	E vs F	295 (37.39)	494 (62.61)	789 (0.03)
4	G vs H	176 (22.31)	613 (77.69)	789 (0.03)
5	I vs J	452 (57.29)	337 (42.71)	789 (0.03)
6	K vs L	242 (30.59)	549 (69.41)	791 (0.03)
7	M vs N	657 (83.16)	133 (16.84)	790 (0.03)
8	O vs P	400 (50.63)	390 (49.37)	790 (0.03)
9	Q vs R	94 (11.90)	696 (88.10)	790 (0.03)
10	S vs T	694 (87.85)	96 (12.15)	790 (0.03)
11	U vs V	716 (90.52)	75 (9.48)	791 (0.03)
12	W vs X	95 (12.04)	694 (87.96)	789 (0.03)
13	Y vs Z	194 (24.53)	597 (75.47)	791 (0.03)
14	AA vs AB	597 (75.57)	193 (24.43)	790 (0.03)
15	AC vs AD	185 (23.45)	604 (76.55)	789 (0.03)
16	AE vs AF	450 (57.03)	339 (42.97)	789 (0.03)
17	AG vs AH	154 (19.52)	635 (80.48)	789 (0.03)
18	AI vs AJ	515 (65.11)	276 (34.89)	791 (0.03)
19	AK vs AL	337 (42.66)	453 (57.34)	790 (0.03)
20	AM vs AN	578 (73.26)	211 (26.74)	789 (0.03)
21	AO vs AP	324 (41.06)	465 (58.94)	789 (0.03)
22	AQ vs AR	715 (90.39)	76 (9.61)	791 (0.03)
23	AS vs AT	315 (39.87)	475 (60.13)	790 (0.03)
24	AU vs AV	200 (25.32)	590 (74.68)	790 (0.03)
25	AW vs AX	634 (80.15)	157 (19.85)	791 (0.03)
26	AY vs AZ	311 (39.37)	479 (60.63)	790 (0.03)
27	AAA vs AAB	488 (61.77)	302 (38.23)	790 (0.03)
Total				22,820 (100)

