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Abstract

**Background**: European direct and indirect cost data is missing for patients with chronic rhinosinusitis with nasal polyps (CRSwNP). This study was aimed to establish the economic burden of CRSwNP based on a Dutch cohort of patients.

**Methods**: A cross-sectional study was performed in adult patients with CRSwNP (N=115) to calculate mean annual direct medical costs and indirect costs per patient with CRSwNP. Outpatient visits, general practitioner visits, first aid visits, hospitalisation and patient travel expenses were measured with the iMTA medical consumption questionnaire. Missed workdays (absenteeism) and decreased productivity during paid work (presenteeism) or during daily life were measured with the and the iMTA productivity cost questionnaire.

**Results**: Total direct costs were €1501 per patient/year, primarily due to outpatient department visits and hospitalisation. Indirect costs were €5659 per patient/year, with productivity losses as major cost expense.

**Conclusion**: Adult patients with CRSwNP have higher indirect costs than direct costs and this forms a substantial burden to society. Total annual costs of patients with CRSwNP are estimated to be 1,9 billion/year in the Netherlands.
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Introduction

Chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS) is an inflammatory disease of the nose and the paranasal sinuses characterized by nasal blockage or nasal discharge with or without facial pressure/pain or reduction of smell (1). CRS is a highly common disease in Europe affecting about 11% of people based on epidemiologic data only (1, 2). However, when combining epidemiologic CRS with clinically based CRS (depending on a CT-scan Lund-Mackay cut-off point) the ‘real life’ prevalence in the general population is lower, between 3.0-6.4% (3). Treatment consists of local or systemic therapy and endoscopic sinus surgery in case where medical treatment has failed. A substantial impact on most aspects of quality of life is well-recognised as well as a decrease in work productivity (1, 4-8). The relatively high prevalence and the chronicity of the disease lead to high costs, due to healthcare resource use (direct costs) and due to less productivity at work (presenteeism) or absenteeism (indirect costs) (1, 2, 9). Evidence shows that the main costs are attributable to these indirect costs (10). Indirect costs are very important to understand from a socioeconomic point of view, since most patients with CRS are of working age (between 30-50 years of age) (1). Recent data suggests that costs of CRS are increasing in the US; the latest report in 2017 estimated indirect costs to be about $20 billion for CRS in general (11). However, also the total direct costs of CRS in the US are increasing and are estimated to be between $10 and $13 billion annually (11). CRS with nasal polyps (CRSwNP) has a significant incremental increase in direct costs on a yearly basis compared to without nasal polyps (CRSSNP) or no diagnosis of CRS (12, 13). In Europe, there are hardly any data on costs of CRS. We are aware of two studies evaluating direct costs of CRSSNP (4, 14). We are not aware of any European data on indirect cost of CRSwNP. To define the importance of CRSwNP as a burdensome diagnosis, the relative
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economic impact of CRSwNP to a population needs to be clear, including indirect costs. This study was aimed to establish the total economic burden of CRSwNP based on a Dutch cohort of patients.

Material and methods
Study design and sample population
A cross-sectional study was designed with inclusion of adult patients with CRSwNP from three academic hospitals and 11 local hospitals in the Netherlands. Inclusion criteria were patients older than 17 years of age with diagnosed CRSwNP. Exclusion criteria were comorbid vasculitis, cystic fibrosis, sarcoidosis, sinonasal malignancy or known immunodeficiency. Data on age, gender, smoking status, diagnosed asthma or diagnosed NSAID-exacerbated respiratory disease (N-ERD) and any previous sinus surgery were recorded. Ethical approval was obtained from the Medical Ethics Committee located in the Amsterdam UMC, location Academic Medical Centre (Amsterdam, The Netherlands). All patients signed written informed consent.

Outcome measures
Outcome parameters were direct and indirect costs. Direct costs of interest were outpatient visits, general practitioner visits, first aid visits, hospitalisation, endoscopic sinus surgery, use of at least one course of antibiotics or systemic corticosteroids in the previous year (specifically for CRSwNP) and patient travel expenses. Indirect costs were composed of missed workdays (absenteeism) and decreased productivity during paid work (presenteeism) or during daily life (unpaid work). Two patient-reported outcome measurements were used to measure the direct and indirect costs: the medical consumption questionnaire (iMCQ) and the productivity cost questionnaire (iPCQ). The Institute for Medical Technology Assessment (iMTA), an independent scientific committee that performs health economic research in the Netherlands, developed these questionnaires. Patients were able to complete the questionnaires online with a personal token. The iMCQ questions about individual healthcare resource use over the past three months and the iPCQ about any productivity losses in the past 4 weeks. Local nasal steroid sprays or drops were not included in the current evaluation, since this parameter was not included in the iMCQ. Total yearly estimates were calculated after extrapolation of the iMCQ (3 months) and iPCQ (1 month) to 12 months. Yearly data on endoscopic sinus surgery, antibiotic and systemic corticosteroid use were retrieved from the electronic patient medical record.

Cost calculations
The friction cost method was used for presenteeism and absenteeism, in accordance with the current guidelines on performing health economic evaluations, which prefers the friction cost method above the human capital approach. All costs are expressed in euros (€) and are based on 2014 reference prices if available. Prices of endoscopic sinus surgery for CRS were derived from the Dutch website of the ‘NederlandseZorgautoriteit’ (2018 data, www.opendisdata.nl/msz/zorgproduct/109799004). Medication costs were calculated using the Dutch website https://www.medicijnkosten.nl. Costs due to prescriptions of short courses of systemic corticosteroids were calculated by applying ‘Prednison’ 30 mg for 10 days as standard course and costs due to prescriptions of antibiotics by applying ‘Augmentin’ 500/125 mg for 7 days. Both chosen prescriptions are frequently used in the Netherlands for an exacerbation of CRSwNP.

Statistical analysis
Descriptive analyses were conducted and frequencies or means with SD were reported for direct and indirect outcome measures. Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 25.0.

Results
In total 115 patients (56.5% males and 43.5% females) with CRSwNP were enrolled with a mean age of 50.8 (SD 12.7) years. The characteristics are outlined in Table 1. In total 44.3% of patients were former smokers, 59.1% had comorbid asthma and 20.9% had NSAID-exacerbated respiratory disease (N-ERD). Previous endoscopic sinus surgery was performed in 68.7% of patients.

Direct costs
Annual direct costs were € 1501,20 per individual patient with CRSwNP. The largest contributors to these costs were outpatient department visits, endoscopic sinus surgery and hospitalisation. An overview of expenditures is presented in Table 2. Patient travel expenses to hospitals covered a mean € 33.80 (SD 109,4) yearly per patient. Additional yearly parking costs were € 14.53 per patient (SD 84,5).
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Discussion

This evaluation of the economic burden of CRSwNP found a large cost difference between direct medical costs and indirect costs. Mean direct medical costs were at least €1501 and mean indirect costs were at least €5659 annually per patient. Larger indirect costs were expected based on the figures from the United States.

Annual direct and indirect costs of CRS on an individual patient level have been evaluated before (4, 12, 13, 19-22), however there are no studies that evaluated CRSsNP and CRSwNP as separate disease phenotypes for indirect costs. Moreover, not many European cost evaluations are available to compare with (4, 14).

Bhattacharyya demonstrated in 2003 that patients with CRS (N=322) in the United States were absent for 4.8 days annually (23). A follow-up study in 2009 using data from the National Health Interview Survey reported that patients with any form of sinusitis missed 5.7 days annually (21). CRSsNP patients in the United States were absent for 5.8 days annually (21). Our absence rate of 10.6 days for CRSwNP is significantly higher. Rudmik et al. showed that patients with recalcitrant CRS (N=55) had mean annual presenteeism and absenteeism rates of 25-39 days/year, with costs $10,000 per patient/year (~€9000). Apart from severity, the type of CRS symptoms is also of influence on indirect costs (24). The current study did not evaluate the influence of severity and symptoms on costs in patients with CRSwNP.

The Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics published data of absenteeism rates in the general population (2018). Compared to...
their reported average 7.6 days absence/year, our finding of 10.6 days/year is significantly higher than what would be expected as normal. When these additional ~ 3 workdays would be multiplied with 2% (prevalence of CRS 1-4%) of 13.4 million adults, this would generate 1 million lost workdays/year. Some caution is warranted with this estimate given this is a cross-sectional study. However, our findings generally support the available evidence that absenteeism forms a large expenditure.

The main costs of patients with CRSwNP were due to productivity losses in both paid and unpaid patients. Since 72% of patients had paid work, we felt that we could divide total costs among all included patients to provide an estimate of mean annual indirect costs per patient independent of working status. Higher productivity losses in unpaid patients during unpaid work were found. An explanation could be older age (50% of patients were retired, N=16).

Direct costs formed only 21% of total costs and main contributors were outpatient department visits and hospitalisation. Murphy et al. showed higher direct costs (~€2400) of CRS patients in the United States compared to controls, mainly due to non-urgent outpatient visits (~€920) and drug treatment (~€320). A good comparison could not be made since our study did not include full pharmacy costs. Van Agthoven calculated direct costs of severe CRS patients to be €1792/year (N=35). This study also included costs of medical treatment, but seems to compare well to our current direct cost value of €1501. The cost estimates of this study are reflections of CRSwNP burden in the Netherlands measured by the IMCQ and iPCQ. Although the prevalence of CRSwNP can be similar between countries, costs do not necessarily have to be so. A generalisation cannot be made directly due to country-level differences in medical costs, reference prices used and mean income per individual.

This study has some limitations: 1. This was a cross-sectional study design with extrapolation of data. Care must be taken with cost estimates, since the moment of assessment of questionnaires is not guaranteed to be representative. We feel that the sample size is large enough to provide reliable cost figures; 2. Self-reported data in questionnaires are subject to recall bias and so the results must be interpreted with caution; however, these questionnaires are validated to such an extent that recall bias is limited; 3. Intranasal (mainstay) therapy for CRSwNP was not included in our analysis and consequently annual direct costs will most likely be an underestimation of total costs.

The focus of this study was to evaluate direct and indirect costs per patient with CRSwNP in general, rather than to make a comparison with objective findings of disease or severity of disease based on validated patient reported outcome measurements for CRSwNP, such as the SNOT-22. It would be very helpful in future studies to relate healthcare utilization costs and costs of lost productivity or absenteeism to the severity of sinonasal symptoms measured by the SNOT-22, total symptom scores or a more objective measurement such as nasal endoscopy.

Our findings show a skewed distribution of costs in Dutch patients with CRSwNP indicating that indirect costs, particularly productivity losses, form the main part of the large annual costs found. Future interventions should be directed to lowering absence rates and improve productivity at work and at home. More (European) research should be performed on the extent of productivity losses in patient with CRSwNP and the influence of treatment on productivity.

**Conclusion**

We showed the economic burden of CRSwNP to be at least €1501 per patient/year for direct medical costs and €5659 per patient/year due to productivity losses and absenteeism. The high indirect costs produce a significant burden to the Dutch economy, to companies and to patients. In current times, healthcare policy makers become more interested in costs of illness and the effect of the applied interventions on these costs, which further justify any procedure or medical intervention for CRSwNP. Therefore, awareness must be created among ENT-specialists that indirect costs form the biggest cost expense.
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