# **Appendix 4 – Supportive results**

An alternative or supportive description of the impact that the use of QBA methods can have when implemented in a CEM, is to estimate the proportion of iterations where the ICER for the true treatment effects is below the cost-effectiveness threshold, and the ICER for unadjusted estimate and each of the alternative methods [1, 2] is above the cost-effectiveness threshold (Table 1). The results show that as knowledge of the unmeasured confounder improves there is a reduction in the proportion of iterations leading to a potential misallocation of resources for both QBA methods.

Table 1. Proportion of iterations leading to potential misallocation of resources

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scenario** | **Unadjusted** | **QBA method** | |
| **Huang et al. (2020)** | **Ding et al. (2016)** |
| Incorrect | 33.78% | 32.30% | 34.95% |
| Poor | 33.10% | 26.25% | 29.85% |
| Good | 33.33% | 19.59% | 21.92% |
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