

# Cohort State-Transition Models in R: A Tutorial

*Fernando Alarid-Escudero, PhD\**

*Eline Krijkamp, MSc†*

*Eva A. Enns, PhD‡*

*Alan Yang, MSc§*

*M.G. Myriam Hunink, PhD¶*

*Petros Pechlivanoglou, PhD||*

*Hawre Jalal, MD, PhD\*\**

2020-10-13

## Abstract

Decision models can synthesize evidence from different sources to simulate long-term consequences of different strategies in the presence of uncertainty. Cohort state-transition models (cSTM) are decision models commonly used in medical decision making to simulate hypothetical cohorts' transitions across various health states over time. This tutorial shows how to implement cSTMs in R, an open-source mathematical and statistical programming language. As an example, we use a previously published cSTM-based cost-effectiveness analysis. With this example, we illustrate both time-independent cSTMs, where transition probabilities are constant over time, and time-dependent cSTMs, where transition probabilities vary by age and are dependent on time spent in a health state (state residence). We also illustrate how to compute various epidemiological outcomes of interest, such as survival and prevalence. We demonstrate how to calculate economic outcomes and conducting a cost-effectiveness analysis of multiple strategies using the example model, and provide additional resources to conduct probabilistic sensitivity analyses. We provide a link to a public repository with all the R code described in this tutorial that can be used to replicate the example or be adapted for various decision modeling applications.

## 1 Introduction

Healthcare policy makers are often tasked to allocate healthcare resources under constrained budgets and uncertain contexts. Their final choice can be informed by health economic evaluations, which often rely on decision models to synthesize evidence from different sources and project long-term outcomes of different alternatives. A commonly used decision model is the cohort state-transition model (cSTM), often referred to as a Markov model.<sup>1</sup>

In a recent review, we illustrated the increased utilization of the statistical programming framework R in health decision sciences and provided a collection of resources for its application in medical decision making.<sup>2</sup> There are a number of packages that have been developed specifically to estimate and construct Markov

---

\*Division of Public Administration, Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE), Aguascalientes, AGS, Mexico

†Department of Epidemiology, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

‡Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota School of Public Health, Minneapolis, MN, USA

§The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

¶Center for Health Decision Sciences, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, USA

||The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto and University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

\*\*University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

models in R. However, these packages are necessarily inflexible and require the user to follow a specific cSTM structure. If the desired cSTM does not fit within this structure, using these packages can be challenging. For example, a realistic cSTM that accounts for both age- and time-dependency is challenging in the existing packages. In addition, the use of a package does not provide guidance on how to conceptualize and implement realistic cSTMs in a programming language, which is a current gap in the literature. The purpose of this tutorial is therefore twofold: (1) to conceptualize cSTMs in a programming language, and (2) to provide guidance on how to implement these cSTMs in base R. We focus on using base R to avoid the limitation of constructing cSTMs in a pre-specified structure defined by a package and to ensure modelers understand the concept and structure of cSTMs rather than implementing them as a “black box”.

A cSTM is a type of state transition models that is deterministic and simulates hypothetical cohorts over time while an individual-based state transition models (iSTM) is another variety that is stochastic and simulates hypothetical individuals over time.<sup>3</sup> We have previously published a tutorial on the implementation of iSTM in R.<sup>4</sup> This tutorial focuses on cSTM. We first provide a description of each of the components of a cSTM. Then, we illustrate the implementation of these components with an example. Our general conceptualization should apply to other programming languages (e.g., MATLAB, Python, C++). The full R code used in this tutorial is provided in the supplementary materials so that readers can replicate and modify the example to fit their needs. The most up-to-date model code and code to create the graphs of this tutorial can be found in the accompanying GitHub repository (<https://github.com/DARTH-git/Cohort-modeling-tutorial>). We assume that the reader is familiar with the basics of decision modelling and coding in programming languages. Thus, a prior introduction to R and to linear algebra for decision modelers is recommended.

## 2 Cohort state-transition models (cSTMs)

A cSTM is most appropriate when the decision problem can be described with a reasonable number of health states. cSTMs can often used because of their transparency, efficiency, ease of debugging and ability to conduct specific value-of-information analyses.<sup>3</sup> cSTMs have been used to evaluate screening and surveillance programs,<sup>5,6</sup> diagnostic procedures,<sup>7</sup> disease management programs,<sup>8</sup> and interventions.<sup>9,10</sup>

A cSTM consists of a set of  $n_s$  mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive health states. The cohort is assumed to be homogeneous within each health state. That is, all persons residing in a particular health state have the same characteristics and are indistinguishable from one another. The cohort transitions between health states with defined probabilities, called “transition probabilities”. A transition probability represents the chance that individuals in the cohort residing in a state in a given cycle, transition to another state or remain in the same state for the next cycle. Transition probabilities only depend on the current health state in a given cycle and do not depend on the history prior to that cycle, which is often referred to as the “Markovian assumption”.<sup>11–13</sup> This means that in a cSTM, transition probabilities do not depend on the history of past transitions or time spent in a given state (i.e., state residence).

cSTMs are classified as either time-independent (time-homogeneous) or time-dependent (time-inhomogeneous). Time-independent cSTMs have constant transition probabilities (i.e., the probability of any state transition is independent of time), while time-dependent cSTMs have transition probabilities that vary over time. Time-independent models are simpler to implement than time-dependent but most problems in healthcare are best modeled with time-dependent cSTMs. For example time-dependent cSTMs can capture the increasing age-specific background mortality as the cohort ages (age dependency) and dependency on the amount of

time spent in a given state (state residence). We cover both types in this tutorial.

### 3 Case study: Sick-Sicker model

We describe how to construct the previously published 4-state “Sick-Sicker” model to conduct a CEA of different strategies to illustrate the various aspects of cSTM implementation in R.<sup>14,4</sup> Figure 1 represents the state-transition diagram of the Sick-Sicker model.




Figure 1: State-transition diagram of the time-independent Sick-Sicker cohort state-transition model with the name of the health states and possible transitions with their corresponding transition probabilities.

The model simulates a cohort to quantify the expected costs and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) for individuals at risk of a hypothetical disease that has two stages: “Sick” and “Sicker”. All the parameters of the Sick-Sicker model and the corresponding R variable names are presented in Table 1 and follow the notation described in the DARTH coding framework.<sup>15</sup> Briefly, we define variables by  $\langle x \rangle_{\langle y \rangle_{\langle \text{var\_name} \rangle}}$ , where  $x$  is the prefix that indicates the data type (e.g., scalar (no prefix),  $v$  for vector,  $m$  for matrix,  $a$  for array,  $df$  for data frame),  $y$  is the prefix indicating variable type (e.g.,  $p$  for probability,  $r$  for rate,  $hr$  for hazard ratio,  $lor$  for log-odds ratio,  $c$  for cost,  $u$  for utility, etc.), and  $\text{var\_name}$  is some description of the variable presented separated by underscores. For example,  $v\_p\_HDage$  denotes the vector of transition probabilities from health state “H” to health state “D” that vary by age. In later sections we will define and name all the other parameters.

In the Sick-Sicker model, we simulate a hypothetical cohort of 25-year-old individuals over their lifetime (until a maximum age of 100 years) who all start in the “Healthy” state (denoted “H”). This means that we will simulate the cohort for 75 cycles. The total number of cycles is denoted as  $n_t$  and defined in R as  $n\_t$ . Healthy individuals are at risk of developing the disease, at which point they transition to the “Sick” state

(denoted by “S1”). Individuals who become sick incur a one-time utility decrement of 0.01 ( $du_{HS1}$ , disutility of transitioning from H to S1) and a transition cost of \$1,000 ( $ic_{HS1}$ ) that reflects the acute impacts of developing the illness. Sick individuals are at risk of further progressing to a more severe disease stage, the “Sicker” health state (denoted by “S2”). In the time-independent model, the risk of progressing from S1 to S2 is constant. In the time-dependent model, this risk is a function of the duration of time spent in S1. Individuals in S1 can recover and return to H. However, once individuals reach S2, they cannot recover; that is, the probability of transitioning to S1 or H from S2 is zero. Individuals in H face background mortality that could be either constant for the time-independent model or age-dependent for the time-dependent model. Individuals in S1 and S2 face an increased hazard of death, compared to Healthy individuals, in the form of a hazard ratio (HR) of 3 and 10, respectively, relative to the background mortality hazard rate. Individuals in S1 and S2 also experience increased health care costs (in addition to the one-time cost of \$1,000) and reduced QoL compared to individuals in H. Once simulated individuals die, they transition to the absorbing “Dead” state (denoted by “D”), where they remain, and incur a one-time cost of \$2,000 ( $ic_D$ ) that reflects the expected acute care preceding death. All transitions between non-death states are assumed to be conditional on surviving each cycle. The evolution of the cohort is simulated in one-year discrete-time cycles. Both costs and QALYs are discounted at an annual rate of 3%.

We are interested in evaluating the cost-effectiveness of four strategies: Strategy A, strategy B, a combination of A and B (Strategy AB), and the standard of care (SoC). Strategy A involves administering treatment A that increases the QoL of individuals in S1 from 0.75 (utility without treatment,  $u_{S1}$ ) to 0.95 (utility with treatment A,  $u_{trtA}$ ) and costs \$12,000 per year ( $c_{trtA}$ ).<sup>4</sup> This strategy does not have any impact on the QoL of individuals in S2, nor does it change the risk of becoming sick or progressing through the sick states. Strategy B uses treatment B that only reduces the odds of Sick individuals progressing to the Sicker state with an odds ratio (OR) of 0.6 ( $or_{S1S2}$ ) costs \$13,000 per year ( $c_{trtB}$ ), and does not have an effect of QoL. Strategy AB involves administering both treatments A and B.

We assume that it is not possible to distinguish between Sick and Sicker patients; therefore, individuals in both disease states receive the treatments. Note that for strategy A, the model has the same structure and identical transition probabilities to that of SoC. The only difference is the added cost of the treatment for those in S1 or S2 and the increase in QoL for those in S1. After comparing the four strategies in terms of expected QALYs and costs, we calculate the incremental cost per QALY gained between non-dominated strategies.

Table 1: Description of parameters, their R variable name, base-case values and distribution.

Parameter	R name	Base-case	Distribution
Number of cycles ( $n_t$ )	$n_t$	75 years	-
Names of health states ( $n$ )	$v\_names\_states$	H, S1, S2, D	-
Annual discount rate for costs	$d\_c$	3%	-
Annual discount rate for QALYs	$d\_e$	3%	-
Number of PSA samples ( $K$ )	$n\_sim$	1,000	-
Annual transition probabilities conditional on surviving			
- Disease onset (H to S1)	$p_{HS1}$	0.15	beta(30, 170)

Parameter	R name	Base-case	Distribution
- Recovery (S1 to H)	p_S1H	0.5	beta(60, 60)
- Disease progression (S1 to S2) in the time-independent model	p_S1S2	0.105	beta(84, 716)
- Time-dependent disease progression (S1 to S2)	v_p_S1S2_tunnels		
Weibull parameters			
Scale ( $\lambda$ )	n_lambda	0.08	lognormal(log(0.08), 0.02)
Shape ( $\gamma$ )	n_gamma	1.10	lognormal(log(1.10), 0.05)
Annual mortality			
- All-cause mortality (H to D)	p_HD	0.002 or age-specific	-
- Hazard ratio of death in S1 vs H	hr_S1	3.0	lognormal(log(3.0), 0.01)
- Hazard ratio of death in S2 vs H	hr_S2	10.0	lognormal(log(10.0), 0.02)
Annual costs			
- Healthy individuals	c_H	\$2,000	gamma(100.0, 20.0)
- Sick individuals in S1	c_S1	\$4,000	gamma(177.8, 22.5)
- Sick individuals in S2	c_S2	\$15,000	gamma(225.0, 66.7)
- Dead individuals	c_D	\$0	-
- Cost of treatment A as an additional costs on individuals treated in S1 or S2	c_trtA	\$12,000	gamma(576.0, 20.8)
- Cost of treatment B as an additional costs on individuals treated in S1 or S2	c_trtB	\$13,000	gamma(676.0, 19.2)
Utility weights			
- Healthy individuals	u_H	1.00	beta(200, 3)
- Sick individuals in S1	u_S1	0.75	beta(130, 45)
- Sick individuals in S2	u_S2	0.50	beta(230, 230)
- Dead individuals	u_D	0.00	-
Treatment A effectiveness			
- Utility for treated individuals in S1	u_trtA	0.95	beta(300, 15)
Treatment B effectiveness			
- Reduction in risk of disease progression (S1 to S2) as log odds ratio (LOR)	lor_S1S2	log(0.6)	lognormal(log(0.6), 0.1)
Transition rewards			
- Utility decrement of healthy individuals when transitioning to S1	du_HS1	0.01	beta(11,1088)
- Cost of healthy individuals when transitioning to S1	ic_HS1	\$1,000	gamma(25, 40)

Parameter	R name	Base-case	Distribution
- Cost of dying when transitioning to D	ic_D	\$2,000	gamma(100, 20)

The following sections include R code snippets. All the code is stored as a GitHub repository, and can be accessed from <https://github.com/DARTH-git/Cohort-modeling-tutorial>. The R code below describes the initialization of the input parameters.

```
## General setup
n_age_init <- 25 # age at baseline
n_age_max <- 100 # maximum age of follow up
n_t <- n_age_max - n_age_init # number of cycles
v_names_states <- c("H", "S1", "S2", "D") # the 4 health states of the model:
# Healthy (H), Sick (S1), Sicker (S2), Dead (D)

n_states <- length(v_names_states) # number of health states
d_e <- 0.03 # discount rate for QALYs of 3% per cycle
d_c <- 0.03 # discount rate for costs of 3% per cycle
v_names_str <- c("Standard of care", # store the strategy names
               "Strategy A",
               "Strategy B",
               "Strategy AB")

## Transition probabilities (per cycle), hazard ratios and odds ratio (OR)
p_HD <- 0.002 # constant probability of dying when Healthy (all-cause mortality)
p_HS1 <- 0.15 # probability of becoming Sick when Healthy
p_S1H <- 0.5 # probability of becoming Healthy when Sick
p_S1S2 <- 0.105 # probability of becoming Sicker when Sick
hr_S1 <- 3 # hazard ratio of death in Sick vs Healthy
hr_S2 <- 10 # hazard ratio of death in Sicker vs Healthy
# For treatment B
or_S1S2 <- 0.6 # OR of transitioning from Sick to Sicker under treatment B
lor_S1S2 <- log(or_S1S2) # log-odds ratio of becoming Sicker when Sick
logit_S1S2 <- logit(p_S1S2) # log-odds of becoming Sicker when Sick
p_S1S2_trtB <- inv.logit(logit_S1S2 + lor_S1S2) # probability of becoming Sicker
# when Sick under treatment B

## State rewards
## Costs
c_H <- 2000 # cost of being Healthy for one cycle
c_S1 <- 4000 # cost of being Sick for one cycle
c_S2 <- 15000 # cost of being Sicker for one cycle
c_D <- 0 # cost of being dead for one cycle
c_trtA <- 12000 # cost of receiving treatment A for one cycle
c_trtB <- 13000 # cost of receiving treatment B for one cycle
# Utilities
```

```

u_H    <- 1      # utility of being Healthy for one cycle
u_S1   <- 0.75   # utility of being Sick for one cycle
u_S2   <- 0.5    # utility of being Sicker for one cycle
u_D    <- 0      # utility of being dead for one cycle
u_trtA <- 0.95   # utility when receiving treatment A for one cycle

## Transition rewards
du_HS1 <- 0.01  # one-time utility decrement when transitioning from Healthy to Sick
ic_HS1 <- 1000  # one-time cost when transitioning from Healthy to Sick
ic_D   <- 2000  # one-time cost when dying

```

To compute the mortality risks from the S1 and S2, we transform  $p_{HD}$  to a rate (i.e., a hazard),  $r_{HD}$ , assuming a constant exponential rate,  $-\log(1 - p_{HD})$ , multiply it by the hazard ratios  $hr_{S1}$  and  $hr_{S2}$ , respectively, and then convert back to probabilities. These calculations are required because hazard ratios can only be directly applied to rates and not to probabilities. The code below performs the computation in R. In the supplementary material, we provide R functions that compute transformations between rates and probabilities since these transformations are frequently used.

```

## Mortality rates
r_HD <- -log(1 - p_HD) # all-cause mortality rate (i.e., hazard)
r_S1D <- r_HD * hr_S1  # rate of dying when Sick
r_S2D <- r_HD * hr_S2  # rate of dying when Sicker

## Probabilities of dying
p_S1D <- 1 - exp(-r_S1D) # probability of dying when Sick
p_S2D <- 1 - exp(-r_S2D) # probability of dying when Sicker

```

To compute the risk of progression from S1 to S2 under treatment B, we first apply a logit transformation to  $p_{S1S2}$ , by taking the natural logarithm of its odds  $\log(p_{S1S2}/(1 - p_{S1S2}))$ ,  $\text{logit}_{S1S2}$ . Then, we add the log-odds ratio of treatment B to the log-odds of progressing from S1 to S2 and transform back to probabilities by applying an inverse-logit transformation.

```

## Logit-transform risk of progression from Sick to Sicker
logit_S1S2 <- log(p_S1S2/(1 - p_S1S2)) # log-odds of becoming Sicker when Sick
p_S1S2_trtB <- 1/(1 + exp(-(logit_S1S2 + lor_S1S2))) # probability to become
                                                    # Sicker when Sick under
                                                    # treatment B

```

## 4 Conceptualizing and implementing cSTM's dynamics

A cSTM consists of three core components: (1) a state vector,  $\mathbf{m}_t$ , that stores the distribution of the cohort across all health states in cycle  $t$  where  $t = 0, \dots, n_t$ ; (2) the cohort trace matrix,  $M$ , that stacks  $\mathbf{m}_t$  for all  $t$  and represents the distribution of the cohort in the various states over time; and (3) a transition probability matrix,  $P_t$ .<sup>16</sup> If the cSTM is comprised of  $n_s$  discrete health states,  $\mathbf{m}_t$  is a  $1 \times n_s$  vector and  $P_t$  is a  $n_s \times n_s$  matrix. The  $i$ -th element of  $\mathbf{m}_t$ , where  $i = 1, \dots, n_s$ , represents the proportion of the cohort in the  $i$ -th

health state in cycle  $t$ , referred to as  $m_{[t,i]}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{m}_t$  is written as:

$$\mathbf{m}_t = \begin{bmatrix} m_{[t,1]} & m_{[t,2]} & \cdots & m_{[t,n_s]} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The elements of  $P_t$  are the transition probabilities of moving from state  $i$  to state  $j$ , potentially as a function of time  $t$ ,  $p_{[i,j,t]}$ , where  $\{i,j\} = 1, \dots, n_s$  and  $t = 0, \dots, n_t$

$$P_t = \begin{bmatrix} p_{[1,1,t]} & p_{[1,2,t]} & \cdots & p_{[1,n_s,t]} \\ p_{[2,1,t]} & p_{[2,2,t]} & \cdots & p_{[2,n_s,t]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_{[n_s,1,t]} & p_{[n_s,2,t]} & \cdots & p_{[n_s,n_s,t]} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that all rows of the transition probability matrix in each cycle  $t$  must sum to one,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_s} p_{[i,j,t]} = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n_s$  and  $t = 0, \dots, n_t$ .

The state vector at cycle  $t + 1$  ( $\mathbf{m}_{t+1}$ ) is then calculated as the matrix product of the state vector at cycle  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_t$ , and the transition probability matrix that the cohort faces in cycle  $t$ ,  $P_t$ , such that,

$$\mathbf{m}_{t+1} = \mathbf{m}_t P_t \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, (n_t - 1),$$

where  $\mathbf{m}_1$  is computed from  $\mathbf{m}_0$  and represents the initial state vector with the distribution of the cohort across all health states at the start of the simulation (cycle 0). Then, this equation is iteratively applied until  $t = n_t$ .

The cohort trace matrix,  $M$ , is a matrix of dimensions  $(n_t + 1) \times n_s$  where each row is a state vector ( $-\mathbf{m}_t-$ ), such that

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{m}_0- \\ -\mathbf{m}_1- \\ \vdots \\ -\mathbf{m}_{n_t}- \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the initial cycle (i.e., cycle 0) corresponds to  $t = 0$ , which is on the first row of  $M$ . Thus,  $M$  stores the output of the cSTM, which could be used to compute various epidemiological outcomes, such as prevalence and survival probability, and economic outcomes, such as cumulative resource use and costs. Table 2 shows a description of the elements related to the core components of cSTM and their suggested R code names. For a more detailed description of the variable types, data structure, R name for all cSTM elements, please see the Supplementary Material.

Table 2: Components of cSTM with their R name

Element	Description	R name
$\mathbf{m}_0$	Initial state vector	<code>v_s_init</code>
$\mathbf{m}_t$	State vector in cycle $t$	<code>v_mt</code>
$M$	Cohort trace matrix	<code>m_M</code>



Element	Description	R name
$P$	Time-independent transition probability matrix	<code>m_P</code>
$\mathbf{P}$	Time-dependent transition probability array	<code>a_P</code>
$\mathbf{A}$	Transition-dynamics array	<code>a_A</code>

For the Sick-Sicker model, the entire cohort starts in the Healthy state. Therefore, we create the  $n_s \times 1$  initial state vector `v_s_init` with all of the cohort assigned to the H state.

```
v_s_init <- c(H = 1, S1 = 0, S2 = 0, D = 0) # initial state vector
v_s_init
```

```
## H S1 S2 D
## 1 0 0 0
```

The variable `v_s_init` is used to initialize  $M$  represented by `m_M` for the cohorts under SoC strategy and strategy A because the transition probabilities are the same under both strategies and treatment A, and by `m_M_trtB` for the cohorts under strategies B and AB because both transition probabilities under both strategies are affected by treatment B.

```
## Initialize cohort trace for SoC
m_M <- matrix(NA,
              nrow = (n_t + 1), ncol = n_states,
              dimnames = list(0:n_t, v_names_states))
# Store the initial state vector in the first row of the cohort trace
m_M[1, ] <- v_s_init
## Initialize cohort trace under treatment B
m_M_trtB <- m_M # structure and initial states remain the same.
```

Note that the initial state vector, `v_s_init`, can be modified to account for the distribution of the cohort across the states at the start of the simulation and might vary by strategy.

## 4.1 Time-independent cSTM

In a time-independent cSTM, transition probabilities are constant (i.e., do not vary over time). Thus,

$$P_t = P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{[1,1]} & p_{[1,2]} & \cdots & p_{[1,n_s]} \\ p_{[2,1]} & p_{[2,2]} & \cdots & p_{[2,n_s]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_{[n_s,1]} & p_{[n_s,2]} & \cdots & p_{[n_s,n_s]} \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, n_t,$$

and  $\mathbf{m}_{t+1} = \mathbf{m}_t P$ .

Since the Sick-Sicker model consists of 4 states, we create a  $4 \times 4$  transition probability matrix, `m_P`. We initialize the matrix with default values of zero for all transition probabilities and then populate it with the corresponding transition probabilities. To access an element of `m_P`, we specify first the row number (or name) and then the column number (or name) separated by a comma. For example, the transition

probability of going from state Healthy (H) to state Sick (S1) could be accessed by `m_P[1, 2]` or by using the corresponding row or column state-names as characters `m_P["H", "S1"]`. We assume that all transitions to non-death states are conditional on not dying in a cycle. Thus, we first condition on surviving by multiplying the transition probabilities times  $1-p_{HD}$ , the probability of not dying in a cycle. For example, to obtain the probability of transitioning from H to S1, we multiply the transition probability from H to S1 conditional of being alive  $p_{HS1}$  by  $1-p_{HD}$ .

```
## Initialize transition probability matrix
m_P <- matrix(0,
              nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states,
              dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states)) # define row and column names

## Fill in matrix
# From H
m_P["H", "H"] <- (1 - p_HD) * (1 - p_HS1)
m_P["H", "S1"] <- (1 - p_HD) * p_HS1
m_P["H", "D"] <- p_HD

# From S1
m_P["S1", "H"] <- (1 - p_S1D) * p_S1H
m_P["S1", "S1"] <- (1 - p_S1D) * (1 - (p_S1H + p_S1S2))
m_P["S1", "S2"] <- (1 - p_S1D) * p_S1S2
m_P["S1", "D"] <- p_S1D

# From S2
m_P["S2", "S2"] <- 1 - p_S2D
m_P["S2", "D"] <- p_S2D

# From D
m_P["D", "D"] <- 1
```

Because treatment B alters progression from S1 to S2, we created a different transition probability matrix to model this treatment, `m_P_trtB`. We initialize `m_P_trtB` as a copy of `m_P` and update only the transition probabilities from S1 to S2 (i.e  $p_{S1S2}$  is replaced with  $p_{S1S2\_trtB}$ ).

```
## Initialize transition probability matrix for treatment B
m_P_trtB <- m_P

## Update only transition probabilities from S1 involving p_S1S2
m_P_trtB["S1", "S1"] <- (1 - p_S1D) * (1 - (p_S1H + p_S1S2_trtB))
m_P_trtB["S1", "S2"] <- (1 - p_S1D) * p_S1S2_trtB
```

Once both transition matrices are created, we verify they are valid by checking that all of their rows sum to one and that each of the transition probabilities of both matrices are between 0 and 1 using the functions `check_sum_of_transition_array` and `check_transition_probability`, respectively, which have been used previously<sup>15</sup> and are provided in the supplementary material. If a transition matrix is not valid, they will produce an error message.

```
### Check if transition probability matrices are valid
## Check that transition probabilities are [0, 1]
check_transition_probability(m_P)
```

```

check_transition_probability(m_P_trtB)
## Check that all rows sum to 1
check_sum_of_transition_array(m_P,      n_states = n_states, n_t = n_t)
check_sum_of_transition_array(m_P_trtB, n_states = n_states, n_t = n_t)

```

Next, to obtain the cohort distribution across the 4 states over 75 cycles using a time-independent cSTM under SoC and treatment B, we iteratively compute the matrix product between each of the rows of  $m_M$  and  $m_P$ , and between  $m_{M\_trtB}$  and  $m_{P\_trtB}$ , using the `%%` symbol in R at each cycle using a `for` loop

```

# Iterative solution of time-independent cSTM
for(t in 1:n_t){
  # For SoC
  m_M[t + 1, ] <- m_M[t, ] %% m_P
  # For treatment B
  m_M_trtB[t + 1, ] <- m_M_trtB[t, ] %% m_P_trtB
}

```

Table 3 shows the cohort trace matrix  $M$  of the Sick-Sicker model under the SoC strategy for the first six cycles. The whole cohort starts in H state and transitions to the rest of the states over time. Given that D state is an absorbing state, the proportion in this state increases over time. A graphical representation of the cohort trace for all the cycles is shown in Figure 2.

Table 3: The distribution of the cohort under SoC for the first six cycles of the time-independent Sick-Sicker model. The first row, labeled with cycle 0, contains the distribution of the cohort at time zero.

Cycle	H	S1	S2	D
0	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1	0.848	0.150	0.000	0.002
2	0.794	0.186	0.016	0.005
3	0.766	0.192	0.035	0.008
4	0.745	0.190	0.054	0.011
5	0.726	0.186	0.073	0.015




Figure 2: Cohort trace of the time-independent cSTM.

## 4.2 Time-dependent cSTM

Time-dependency in cSTMs means that transition probabilities or rewards are not fixed over time. Time dependency in the transition probabilities of cSTMs is desirable to accurately represent disease processes over relatively long periods of time. In this tutorial, we describe two types of time dependency: (1) Wall time-dependency, which reflects transition probabilities' dependence on the time since the simulation starts, with age-specific background mortality being an important example,<sup>17</sup> and (2) state-residence time dependency, which means that transition probabilities depend on the duration of time the cohort spends in a given state.

### 4.2.1 Wall time-dependency

Transition probabilities that depend on the time since the start of the simulation (wall time-dependency) are accounted for by the transition probability matrix being a function of time ( $P_t$ ). To illustrate the implementation of this time-dependence in the Sick-Sicker cSTM, we model all-cause mortality as a function of age. It is common to obtain all-cause mortality from life tables in the form of age-specific mortality hazard rates,  $\mu(a)$ , where  $a$  refers to age. For this example, we create a vector `v_r_mort_by_age` with age-specific background mortality hazard rates for 0 to 100 year-olds obtained from the 2015 US life-tables.<sup>18</sup> To compute the transition probability from H to D states, corresponding to the age of the cohort at each cycle, we

transform  $\mu(a)$  to a transition probability assuming constant exponential hazard rate within each year of age

$$p_{[H,D,t]} = 1 - \exp[-\mu(a_0 + t)],$$

where  $a_0 = 25$  is the starting age of the cohort. We will run the Sick-Sicker model for 75 cycles for ages 25 through 100. Instead of iterating through the hazard mortality rates, we obtain a vector of background mortality hazard rates for the ages of interest between 25 through 100 by subsetting  $\mu(a)$  (R variable name `v_r_mort_by_age`) for these ages. We transform the resulting R variable, `v_r_HDage`, to a probability.

```
# Age-specific mortality rate in the Healthy state (background mortality)
v_r_HDage <- v_r_mort_by_age[(n_age_init + 1) + 0:(n_t - 1)]
# Transform to age-specific background mortality risk
v_p_HDage <- 1 - exp(-v_r_HDage)
```

Because mortality in S1 and S2 are relative to background mortality, adding age dependency on background mortality results in age-dependent mortality in S1 and S2 as well as in H. To generate the age-specific mortality for S1 and S2, we multiply the age-specific background mortality rate, `v_r_HDage`, by the constant hazard ratios `hr_S1` and `hr_S2`, respectively. We then convert the resulting stage-specific mortality rates to probabilities to ensure that the transition probabilities to D are bounded between 0 and 1.

```
## Age-specific mortality rates in the Sick and Sicker states
v_r_S1Dage <- v_r_HDage * hr_S1 # when Sick
v_r_S2Dage <- v_r_HDage * hr_S2 # when Sicker
## Age-specific probabilities of dying in the Sick and Sicker states
v_p_S1Dage <- 1 - exp(-v_r_S1Dage) # when Sick
v_p_S2Dage <- 1 - exp(-v_r_S2Dage) # when Sicker
```

To incorporate age-dependency into the transition probability matrix, we expand the dimensions of the matrix and create a 3-dimensional transition probability array,  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_P$  in R, of dimensions  $n_s \times n_s \times n_t$ , where the first two dimensions correspond to transitions between states and the third dimension to time. That is, the  $t$ -th element in the third dimension corresponds to the transition probability matrix at cycle  $t$ . A visual representation of  $\mathbf{a}_P$  is shown in Figure 3.

$$\mathbf{a\_P} = \begin{matrix} & & \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{n_t} \\ \xrightarrow{n_s} \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{P}[H,H,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[H,S1,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[H,S2,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[H,D,n_t] \\ \mathcal{P}[H,H,2] & \mathcal{P}[H,S1,2] & \mathcal{P}[H,S2,2] & \mathcal{P}[H,D,2] \\ \mathcal{P}[S1,D,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[S2,D,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[D,D,n_t] & \mathcal{P}[D,D,n_t] \\ \mathcal{P}[S1,D,2] & \mathcal{P}[S2,D,2] & \mathcal{P}[D,D,2] & \mathcal{P}[D,D,2] \end{bmatrix} \\ \downarrow n_s & \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{P}[H,H,1] & \mathcal{P}[H,S1,1] & \mathcal{P}[H,S2,1] & \mathcal{P}[H,D,1] \\ \mathcal{P}[S1,H,1] & \mathcal{P}[S1,S1,1] & \mathcal{P}[S1,S2,1] & \mathcal{P}[S1,D,1] \\ \mathcal{P}[S2,H,1] & \mathcal{P}[S2,S1,1] & \mathcal{P}[S2,S2,1] & \mathcal{P}[S2,D,1] \\ \mathcal{P}[D,H,1] & \mathcal{P}[D,S1,1] & \mathcal{P}[D,S2,1] & \mathcal{P}[D,D,1] \end{bmatrix} & \end{matrix}$$

Figure 3: A 3-dimensional representation of the transition probability array of the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model with wall time-dependency.

First, we initialize `a_P` with a default value of zero for all transition probabilities.

```
# Initialize the transition probability array
a_P <- array(0, dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t),
            dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:(n_t - 1)))
```

Filling `a_P` with the corresponding transition probabilities of the cohort the SoC strategy is comparable with filling `m_P` above, with the addition of accounting for the time dimension. However, this requires a slight modification of the code from the time-independent cSTM.

The code below illustrates how to assign age-dependent transition probabilities in the third dimension of the array. For those transitions that are constant over time, only one transition probability is provided and R replicates the value of such transitions as many times as the length of the dimension of time, for our example  $n_t + 1$  times.

```
### Fill in array
## From H
a_P["H", "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_HDage) * (1 - p_HS1)
a_P["H", "S1", ] <- (1 - v_p_HDage) * p_HS1
a_P["H", "D", ] <- v_p_HDage
## From S1
a_P["S1", "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1H
a_P["S1", "S1", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * (1 - (p_S1H + p_S1S2))
a_P["S1", "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1S2
a_P["S1", "D", ] <- v_p_S1Dage
## From S2
a_P["S2", "S2", ] <- 1 - v_p_S2Dage
a_P["S2", "D", ] <- v_p_S2Dage
## From D
```

```
a_P["D", "D", ] <- 1
```

As mentioned above, each of the elements on the third dimension of `a_P` correspond to a transition probability matrix. For example, the transition matrix for 25-year-olds in the Sick-Sicker model under the SoC strategy can be retrieved using:

```
a_P[, , 1]
```

```
##           H           S1           S2           D
## H  0.8489865 0.1500000 0.0000000 0.001013486
## S1 0.5000000 0.3919626 0.1050000 0.003037378
## S2 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.9899112 0.010088764
## D  0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 1.000000000
```

Similar to the time-independent cSTM, treatment A does not change the transition probabilities. For treatment B, we first initialize the three-dimensional array of transition probabilities, `a_P_trtB` as a copy of `a_P` and update only the transition probabilities from S1 to S2 (i.e., `p_S1S2` is replaced with `p_S1S2_trtB`).

```
## Initialize transition probability array for treatment B
a_P_trtB <- a_P
## Update only transition probabilities from S1 involving p_S1S2
a_P_trtB["S1", "S1", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * (1 - (p_S1H + p_S1S2_trtB))
a_P_trtB["S1", "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1S2_trtB
```

Once both three-dimensional transition arrays are created, we check they are valid as described above.

```
### Check if transition probability matrices are valid
## Check that transition probabilities are [0, 1]
check_transition_probability(a_P)
check_transition_probability(a_P_trtB)
## Check that all rows sum to 1
check_sum_of_transition_array(a_P, n_states = n_states, n_t = n_t)
check_sum_of_transition_array(a_P_trtB, n_states = n_states, n_t = n_t)
```

To simulate the cohort over the  $n_t$  cycles for the age-dependent cSTM, we initialize two new cohort trace matrices `m_M_ad` and `m_M_ad_trtB`

```
## Initialize cohort trace for age-dependent (ad) cSTM under SoC
m_M_ad <- matrix(NA,
                 nrow = (n_t + 1), ncol = n_states,
                 dimnames = list(0:n_t, v_names_states))
# Store the initial state vector in the first row of the cohort trace
m_M_ad[1, ] <- v_s_init
## Initialize cohort trace under treatment B
m_M_ad_trtB <- m_M_ad # structure and initial states remain the same.
```

and then use the matrix product to get the state vector at cycle  $t$ . This is similar to the time-independent model. The only modification that is required is to also index the transition probability arrays `a_P` and

$a_{P\_trtB}$  by  $t$  to obtain the cycle-specific transition probability matrices.

```
# Iterative solution of age-dependent cSTM
for(t in 1:n_t){
  # For SoC
  m_M_ad[t + 1, ] <- m_M_ad[t, ] %*% a_P[, , t]
  # Under treatment B
  m_M_ad_trtB[t + 1, ] <- m_M_ad_trtB[t, ] %*% a_P_trtB[, , t]
}
```

A graphical representation of the cohort trace for all cycles of the age-dependent cSTM under SoC is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Cohort trace of the age-dependent cSTM under SoC.

#### 4.2.2 Time dependency on state residence

A slightly more complex time dependency *state-residence* for which transition probabilities or rewards depend on the time spent in a given state. One way to account for state-residence is to expand the number of states with as many transient states as the number of cycles for which state-residence is required. These transient states are referred to as *tunnel* states where the cohort can stay for only one cycle and must either transition



to the next tunnel state or exit the tunnel completely. The set of tunnel states then essentially equals to the amount of time that the cohort has spent in the tunnel representing a specific health state.

If state-residence in a given state lasts  $T$  cycles, such a state needs to be expanded  $T$  times, and the transition probability matrix also needs to be expanded to incorporate these additional states. This will result in a transition probability matrix (or array if the transition probabilities are also dependent on  $t$ ) of dimensions  $n_{sT} \times n_{sT}$  (or  $n_{sT} \times n_{sT} \times n_t$ ), where  $n_{sT}$  is the total number of health states ( $n_{sT} = n_s + T - 1$ ). Figure 5 shows the state-transition diagram of the Sick-Sicker model that includes state residence dependency with  $T$  tunnel states for S1.




Figure 5: State-transition diagram of the Sick-Sicker model with tunnel states expanding the Sick state ( $S1_1, S1_2, \dots, S1_T$ ).

To illustrate state-residence in the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model defined above, we assume the risk of progression from S1 to S2 increases the longer the cohort has been Sick. This increase follows a Weibull hazard function, defined as

$$p_{[S1_\tau, S2, \tau]} = \lambda \gamma \tau^{(\lambda-1)},$$

where  $\tau = 1, \dots, T$  represents the duration that the cohort has been in S1, and  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma$  are the scale and shape parameters of the Weibull function, respectively. We assume that state-residence lasts the whole simulation (i.e.,  $T = n_t$ ) and create a new variable called `n_tunnel_size` with the length of the tunnel equal to `n_t`. Thus, there will be 75 S1 tunnel states plus 3 more states (H, S2, D) resulting in a total of  $n_{sT} = 78$ .

To implement state-residence in the Sick-Sicker model using tunnels, we create five new parameters listed in Table 4.

Table 4: Extra R variables to add state-residence to the Sick-Sicker model using tunnels

R name	Description
<code>n_tunnel_size</code>	number of tunnel states
<code>v_Sick_tunnel</code>	vector with the names of the Sick tunnel states
<code>v_names_states_tunnels</code>	vector with state names including tunnel states
<code>n_states_tunnels</code>	number of states including tunnel states
<code>v_s_init_tunnels</code>	initial state vector for the model with tunnel states

```
## Number of tunnels
n_tunnel_size <- n_t
## Name for tunnel states of Sick state
v_Sick_tunnel <- paste("S1_", seq(1, n_tunnel_size), "Yr", sep = "")
## Create variables for model with tunnels
v_names_states_tunnels <- c("H", v_Sick_tunnel, "S2", "D") # state names
n_states_tunnels <- length(v_names_states_tunnels) # number of states
## Initialize first cycle of Markov trace accounting for the tunnels
v_s_init_tunnels <- c(1, rep(0, n_tunnel_size), 0, 0)
```

Based on the updated parameters, the state-residence-dependent transition probability from Sick to Sicker based on a Weibull function, `v_p_S1S2_tunnels`, is:

```
# Weibull parameters
n_lambda <- 0.08 # scale
n_gamma <- 1.1 # shape
# Weibull function
v_p_S1S2_tunnels <- n_lambda * n_gamma * (1:n_tunnel_size)^{-n_gamma-1}
```

To adapt the transition probability array to incorporate both age-dependence and state-residence in the Sick-Sicker model under SoC, we first create an expanded 3-dimensional array accounting for tunnels, `a_P_tunnels`, of dimension  $n_{s_T} \times n_{s_T} \times n_t$ . A visual representation of `a_P_tunnels` of the Sick-Sicker model with tunnel states expanding the Sick state is shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: The 3-dimensional transition probability array of the Sick-Sicker model expanded to account for age-dependence and S1 state-residence using tunnel states.

```
# Initialize array
a_P_tunnels <- array(0, dim = c(n_states_tunnels, n_states_tunnels, n_t),
                    dimnames = list(v_names_states_tunnels, v_names_states_tunnels, 0:(n_t - 1)))
```

Filling `a_P_tunnels` with the corresponding transition probabilities is similar to the `a_P` above, with the difference being that we now fill the transition probabilities from all the S1 tunnel states by iterating through all tunnel states and assigning the corresponding disease progression transition probabilities.

```
### Fill in array
## From H
a_P_tunnels["H", "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_HDage) * (1 - p_HS1)
a_P_tunnels["H", v_Sick_tunnel[1], ] <- (1 - v_p_HDage) * p_HS1
a_P_tunnels["H", "D", ] <- v_p_HDage
## From S1
for(i in 1:(n_tunnel_size - 1)){
  a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1H
  a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[i],
              v_Sick_tunnel[i + 1], ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
              (1 - (p_S1H + v_p_S1S2_tunnels[i]))
  a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * v_p_S1S2_tunnels[i]
  a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "D", ] <- v_p_S1Dage
}
## repeat code for the last cycle to force the cohort stay in the last tunnel state of Sick
a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1H
a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size],
            v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
            (1 - (p_S1H + v_p_S1S2_tunnels[n_tunnel_size] ))
a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
            v_p_S1S2_tunnels[n_tunnel_size]
a_P_tunnels[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "D", ] <- v_p_S1Dage
### From S2
```

```

a_P_tunnels["S2", "S2", ] <- 1 - v_p_S2Dage
a_P_tunnels["S2", "D", ] <- v_p_S2Dage
# From D
a_P_tunnels["D", "D", ] <- 1

```

Accounting for the effectiveness treatment B is similar to the time-independent and age-dependent approaches. We first take the log-odds of `v_p_S1S2_tunnels` and add the log-odds ratio of treatment B and apply an inverse-logit transformation to transform back to probabilities to produce `v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB`. The resulting `v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB` is a vector of transition probabilities that account for the duration of S1 state-residence under treatment B.

```

## Logit-transform risk of progression from Sick to Sicker
# vector of log-odds of becoming Sicker when Sick
v_logit_S1S2_tunnels <- log(v_p_S1S2_tunnels/(1-v_p_S1S2_tunnels))
# probability to become Sicker when Sick under treatment B conditional on surviving
v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB <- 1/(1 + exp(-(v_logit_S1S2_tunnels + lor_S1S2)))

```

Then, we initialize the three-dimensional transition probability array for treatment B, `a_P_tunnels_trtB`, based on `a_P_tunnels`. The only difference is that we update the transition probabilities from S1 involving `v_p_S1S2_tunnels` to using `v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB` instead.

```

## Initialize transition probability array for treatment B
a_P_tunnels_trtB <- a_P_tunnels
## Update only transition probabilities from S1 involving v_p_S1S2_tunnels
for(i in 1:(n_tunnel_size - 1)){
  a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1H
  a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[i],
    v_Sick_tunnel[i + 1], ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
    (1 - (p_S1H + v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB[i]))
  a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB[i]
  a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[i], "D", ] <- v_p_S1Dage
}
# repeat code for the last cycle to force the cohort stay in the last tunnel state of Sick
a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "H", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) * p_S1H
a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size],
  v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
  (1 - (p_S1H + v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB[n_tunnel_size]))
a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "S2", ] <- (1 - v_p_S1Dage) *
  v_p_S1S2_tunnels_trtB[n_tunnel_size]
a_P_tunnels_trtB[v_Sick_tunnel[n_tunnel_size], "D", ] <- v_p_S1Dage

```

Once both three-dimensional transition probability arrays with tunnels are created, we check they are valid.

```

### Check if transition probability matrices are valid
## Check that transition probabilities are [0, 1]
check_transition_probability(a_P_tunnels)

```

```

check_transition_probability(a_P_tunnels_trtB)
## Check that all rows sum to 1
check_sum_of_transition_array(a_P_tunnels,      n_states = n_states_tunnels, n_t = n_t)
check_sum_of_transition_array(a_P_tunnels_trtB, n_states = n_states_tunnels, n_t = n_t)

```

To simulate the cohort over the  $n_t$  cycles for the state-residence cSTM, we initialize two new cohort trace matrices for the SoC and treatment B, `m_M_tunnels` and `m_M_tunnels_trtB`, respectively. The dimensions of both matrices are  $(n_t + 1) \times n_{S_T}$

```

# Initialize cohort for state-residence-dependent cSTM under SoC
m_M_tunnels <- matrix(0,
                     nrow = (n_t + 1), ncol = n_states_tunnels,
                     dimnames = list(0:n_t, v_names_states_tunnels))
# Store the initial state vector in the first row of the cohort trace
m_M_tunnels[1, ] <- v_s_init_tunnels
## Initialize cohort trace under treatment B
m_M_tunnels_trtB <- m_M_tunnels

```

and then we use the matrix product, similar to the age-dependent cSTM, to generate the full cohort trace

```

# Iterative solution of state-residence-dependent cSTM
for(t in 1:n_t){
  # For SoC
  m_M_tunnels[t + 1, ] <- m_M_tunnels[t, ] %*% a_P_tunnels[, , t]
  # Under treatment B
  m_M_tunnels_trtB[t + 1, ] <- m_M_tunnels_trtB[t, ] %*% a_P_tunnels_trtB[, , t]
}

```

To compute a summarized cohort trace under SoC comparable with the time-independent and age-dependent cSTM, we aggregate over the tunnel states of the S1 state in each cycle.

```

# Create aggregated trace
m_M_tunnels_sum <- cbind(H = m_M_tunnels[, "H"],
                       S1 = rowSums(m_M_tunnels[, which(v_names_states=="S1"):
                                     (n_tunnel_size + 1)]),
                       S2 = m_M_tunnels[, "S2"],
                       D = m_M_tunnels[, "D"])

```

## 5 Epidemiological and economic outputs

cSTMs can be used to generate different epidemiological and economic outputs. In a CEA, the final outcomes are typically the total expected QALYs and total costs accrued by the cohort over a predefined time horizon. However, epidemiological outcomes are often also used to simulate measures of interest, or for model calibration and validation. Some common epidemiological outcomes include survival, prevalence, incidence, average number of events and lifetime risk of events.<sup>3</sup>

## 5.1 Epidemiological outcomes

Below, we provide the epidemiological definition of some of these outcomes and how they can be generated from a cSTM using the age-dependent Sick-Sicker cSTM under SoC as an example.

### 5.1.1 Survival probability

The survival function,  $S(t)$ , captures the probability of the cohort remaining alive by cycle  $t$ . To estimate  $S(t)$  from the simulated cohort of the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model, we sum the proportions of the non-death states for all  $n_t$  cycles in `m_M_ad`.

```
v_S_ad <- rowSums(m_M_ad[, -which(v_names_states=="D")]) # vector with survival curve
```

and is shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Survival curve of time-dependent cSTM.

### 5.1.2 Prevalence

Prevalence is defined as the proportion of the population or cohort with a specific condition (or being in a specific health state) among those alive.<sup>19</sup> To calculate the prevalence of S1 at cycle  $t$ ,  $\text{prev}(t)_i$ , we compute the ratio between the proportion of the cohort in S1 and the proportion alive at that cycle.<sup>20</sup> The proportion

of the cohort alive is given by the survival probability  $S(t)$  defined above. The individual prevalence of the S1 and S2 health states, and the overall prevalence of sick individuals (i.e., S1 + S2) of the age-dependent Sick-Sicker cSTM at each cycle  $t$  is computed as follows and are shown in Figure 8.

```
v_prev_S1 <- m_M_ad[, "S1"] / v_S_ad      # vector with prevalence of Sick
v_prev_S2 <- m_M_ad[, "S2"] / v_S_ad      # vector with prevalence of Sicker
v_prev_S1S2 <- rowSums(m_M_ad[, c("S1", "S2")]) / v_S_ad # prevalence of Sick and Sicker
```




Figure 8: Prevalence of sick states in age-dependent cSTM.

Another epidemiological outcome that could be of interest, is the proportion of S2 among all individuals with the disease. To compute this outcome at each cycle  $t$ , we divide  $m_{[S2,t]}$  by  $\text{prev}(t)_{\{S1,S2\}}$  where  $t > 0$ , as presented in Figure 9. Note that  $t$  does not start at 0 because it takes one cycle for the cohort to get sick.

```
# Vector with proportion of Sicker among sick individuals
v_prop_S2 <- m_M_ad[-1, "S2"] / v_prev_S1S2[-1]
```




Figure 9: Proportion of Sicker (S2) individuals among all sick patients of age-dependent cSTM.

### 5.1.3 Life expectancy

Life expectancy (LE) refers to the expected number of years remaining to be lived.<sup>21</sup> LE is the area under the entire survival curve.<sup>22</sup>

$$LE = \int_{t=0}^{\infty} S(t)dt.$$

In discrete time using cSTMs, LE is often calculated over a fixed time horizon at which most of the cohort has transitioned to the Dead state,  $n_t$ , and is defined as

$$LE = \sum_{t=0}^{n_t} S(t).$$

In the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model, where we simulated a cohort over  $n_t = 75$  annual cycles, life expectancy `le_ad` is 41.2 cycles, which is calculated as

```
le_ad <- sum(v_S_ad) # life expectancy
```

Note that this equation expresses LE in the units of  $t$ . In our example, we use an annual cycle length, thus the resulting LE will be in years. Other cycle lengths (e.g., monthly or daily) can also be used, but the LE



must be correctly converted to the desired unit if other than the cycle length units.

## 5.2 Economic outcomes

### 5.2.1 State rewards

A state reward refers to a value assigned to individuals for being in a given state. In a cost-utility context, these could be either utilities or costs associated with remaining in a certain health state for one cycle. The total expected reward of an outcome of interest for the entire cohort at each cycle can be represented by a column vector  $\mathbf{y}$  of size  $(n_t + 1)$ . To calculate  $\mathbf{y}$ , we compute the matrix product of the cohort trace matrix times a *vector* of state rewards  $\mathbf{r}$  of the same dimension as the number of states ( $n_s$ ), such that

$$\mathbf{y} = M\mathbf{r}. \quad (1)$$

Note that rewards can also be time- or age-dependent; in such cases, the vector of state rewards will be time-dependent,  $\mathbf{r}_t$ . For the Sick-Sicker model, we create a vector of utilities and costs for each of the four strategies considered. The vectors of utilities and costs in R,  $\mathbf{v\_u\_SoC}$  and  $\mathbf{v\_c\_SoC}$ , respectively, contain the utilities and costs corresponding with being in each of the four health states under SoC, which are shown in Table 1.

```
# Vector of state utilities under SOC
v_u_SoC <- c(H = u_H, S1 = u_S1, S2 = u_S2, D = u_D)
# Vector of state costs under SoC
v_c_SoC <- c(H = c_H, S1 = c_S1, S2 = c_S2, D = c_D)
```

We account for the benefits and costs of both treatments individually and their combination to create the state-reward vectors under treatments A and B (strategies A and B, respectively), and when applied jointly (strategy AB). Only treatment A affects QoL, so we create a vector of utilities for strategy A,  $\mathbf{v\_u\_strA}$ , where we substitute the utility of being in S1 under SOC,  $u\_S1$ , with the utility associated with the benefit of treatment A in being in that state,  $u\_trtA$ . Treatment B does not affect QoL so the vector of utilities for strategy B,  $\mathbf{v\_u\_strB}$ , is the same as for SoC. However, when both treatments A and B are applied jointly (strategy AB), the resulting vector of utilities  $\mathbf{v\_u\_strAB}$  equals that of strategy A.

```
# Vector of state utilities for strategy A
v_u_strA <- c(H = u_H, S1 = u_trtA, S2 = u_S2, D = u_D)
# Vector of state utilities for strategy B
v_u_strB <- v_u_SoC
# Vector of state utilities for strategy AB
v_u_strAB <- v_u_strA
```

Both treatments A and B incur a cost. To create the vector of state costs for strategy A,  $\mathbf{v\_c\_strA}$ , we add the cost of treatment A,  $c\_trtA$ , to the state costs of S1 and S2. Similarly, when constructing the vector of state costs for strategy B,  $\mathbf{v\_c\_strB}$ , we add the cost of treatment B,  $c\_trtB$ , to state costs of S1 and S2. Finally, for the vector of state costs for strategy AB,  $\mathbf{v\_c\_strAB}$ , we add both treatment costs to the state costs of S1 and S2.

```

# Vector of state costs for strategy A
v_c_strA <- c(H = c_H,
             S1 = c_S1 + c_trtA,
             S2 = c_S2 + c_trtA,
             D = c_D)

# Vector of state costs for strategy B
v_c_strB <- c(H = c_H,
             S1 = c_S1 + c_trtB,
             S2 = c_S2 + c_trtB,
             D = c_D)

# Vector of state costs for strategy AB
v_c_strAB <- c(H = c_H,
              S1 = c_S1 + (c_trtA + c_trtB),
              S2 = c_S2 + (c_trtA + c_trtB),
              D = c_D)

```

To compute the expected QALYs and costs for the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model under SoC and strategy A, we apply Eq. (1) by multiplying the cohort trace matrix,  $\mathbf{m}_{M\_ad}$ , times the corresponding strategy-specific state vectors of rewards. Similarly, To compute the expected rewards for strategies B and AB, we multiply the cohort trace matrix accounting for the effectiveness of treatment B,  $\mathbf{m}_{M\_ad\_trtB}$ , times their corresponding state vectors of rewards.

```

# Vector of QALYs under SoC
v_qaly_SoC <- m_M_ad %*% v_u_SoC
# Vector of costs under SoC
v_cost_SoC <- m_M_ad %*% v_c_SoC
# Vector of QALYs for strategy A
v_qaly_strA <- m_M_ad %*% v_u_strA
# Vector of costs for strategy A
v_cost_strA <- m_M_ad %*% v_c_strA
# Vector of QALYs for strategy B
v_qaly_strB <- m_M_ad_trtB %*% v_u_strB
# Vector of costs for strategy B
v_cost_strB <- m_M_ad_trtB %*% v_c_strB
# Vector of QALYs for strategy AB
v_qaly_strAB <- m_M_ad_trtB %*% v_u_strAB
# Vector of costs for strategy AB
v_cost_strAB <- m_M_ad_trtB %*% v_c_strAB

```

### 5.2.2 Discounting future rewards

Future costs and benefits are often discounted by a specific rate to calculate net present value of these rewards. To account for discounting, the generated rewards per cycle are multiplied by the cycle specific discount weight. The vector of expected rewards,  $\mathbf{y}$ , is multiplied by a discounting column vector  $\mathbf{d}$  of size  $n_t + 1$

where each of its  $t$ -th entry represents the discounting for cycle  $t$

$$\mathbf{d} = \left[ 1, \frac{1}{(1+d)^1}, \frac{1}{(1+d)^2}, \dots, \frac{1}{(1+d)^{n_t}} \right],$$

where  $d$  is the cycle-length discount rate. Therefore, the total expected discounted outcome over the  $n_t$  cycles,  $y$ , is obtained by the inner product between  $\mathbf{y}$  transposed,  $\mathbf{y}'$ , and  $\mathbf{d}$ ,

$$y = \mathbf{y}' \mathbf{d}. \quad (2)$$

The discount vectors for costs and QALYs for the Sick-Sicker model,  $\mathbf{v\_dwc}$  and  $\mathbf{v\_dwe}$ , respectively, are

```
# Discount weight for effects
v_dwe <- 1 / ((1 + d_e) ^ (0:(n_t)))
# Discount weight for costs
v_dwc <- 1 / ((1 + d_c) ^ (0:(n_t)))
```

### 5.2.3 Discounting and half-cycle correction

To better approximate the expected rewards of a continuous-time process using a discrete-time model, we use a half-cycle correction by assuming transitions occur halfway through the cycle.<sup>3,23</sup> To account for half-cycle correction, we multiply the rewards (e.g., costs and effectiveness) for the first and final cycle by 0.5. We implement the half-cycle correction by generating a column vector  $\mathbf{hcc}$  of size  $n_t + 1$  with values corresponding to the first,  $t = 0$ , and last cycle,  $t = n_t + 1$ , equal to 0.5, and the rest equal to 1.

$$\mathbf{hcc} = [0.5, 1, 1, \dots, 0.5]$$

To account for both discounting and half-cycle correction, we incorporate  $\mathbf{hcc}$  in equation 2 using an element-wise multiplication with  $\mathbf{d}$ , indicated by the  $\odot$  sign.

$$y = \mathbf{y}' (\mathbf{d} \odot \mathbf{hcc}). \quad (3)$$

The half-cycle correction vector is the same for both costs and QALYs; thus, only one vector,  $\mathbf{v\_hcc}$ , is required.

```
# Initialize half-cycle correction vector
v_hcc <- rep(1, n_t + 1)
# half-cycle correction weight
v_hcc[1] <- v_hcc[n_t + 1] <- 0.5
```

To compute the total expected discounted QALYs and costs under all four strategies accounting for half-cycle correction, we apply equation (3) to the vectors with the rewards, discounts and half-cycle correction

```
## Expected discounted QALYs under SoC
n_tot_qaly_SoC <- t(v_qaly_SoC) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted costs under SoC
```

```

n_tot_cost_SoC <- t(v_cost_SoC) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted QALYs for strategy A
n_tot_qaly_strA <- t(v_qaly_strA) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted costs for strategy A
n_tot_cost_strA <- t(v_cost_strA) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted QALYs for strategy B
n_tot_qaly_strB <- t(v_qaly_strB) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted costs for strategy B
n_tot_cost_strB <- t(v_cost_strB) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted QALYs for strategy AB
n_tot_qaly_strAB <- t(v_qaly_strAB) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Expected discounted costs for strategy AB
n_tot_cost_strAB <- t(v_cost_strAB) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)

```

Table 5: Total expected discounted QALYs and costs per average individual in the cohort of the age-dependent Sick-Sicker by strategy accounting for half-cycle correction .

	Costs	QALYs
Standard of care (SoC)	\$112,444	19.490
Strategy A	\$210,019	20.192
Strategy B	\$193,403	20.778
Strategy AB	\$281,871	21.599

The total expected QALYs and costs for the Sick-Sicker model under the four strategies accounting for half-cycle correction examined are shown in Table 5.

#### 5.2.4 Transition rewards

In addition to the state rewards (e.g., costs and utilities associated with residing in a given state), an act of transitioning from one state to another may in itself be associated with a one-time cost or utility impact. This is often referred to as a “transition reward”. For example, in the Sick-Sicker model, we previously mentioned that dying (i.e., transitioning to the Dead state) incurs a one-time cost of \$2,000 that reflects the acute care that might be received immediately preceding death. This could include emergency services, hospitalization, or other healthcare utilization to address the ultimately fatal health complication. We also include a utility decrement and a cost increment on the transition from H to S1. Whereas the cost and utility of S1 reflects the cost and utility of being chronically sick, transition rewards capture the short-term impact of the acute events of becoming sick, such as hospitalization, stabilization, and so on.

Incorporating transition rewards requires to keep track of the proportion of the cohort that transitions between health states in each cycle while capturing what the states of origin and destination are. This information is not captured by the cohort trace,  $M$ . However, recovering this information is relatively straightforward and has been described in detail by Krijkamp et al. (2020).<sup>24</sup> Briefly, this approach involves changing the core computation in a traditional cSTM, from  $m_t P_t$  to  $\text{diag}(m_t) P_t$ . This simple change allows us to compute the proportion of the cohort that transitions between the states of origin and destination in cycle  $t$ . The result is no longer a cohort trace matrix, but rather a three-dimensional array that we refer to as a transition-dynamics

array ( $\mathbf{A}$ ) with dimensions  $n_s \times n_s \times [n_t + 1]$ . The  $t$ -th slice of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $A_t$ , is a matrix that stores the proportion of the population that transition between states of origin and destination between cycles  $t - 1$  and  $t$ . Similarly, we define the transition rewards by the states of origin and destination.

To account for both state and transition rewards, we replace the *vector* of state rewards  $\mathbf{r}$  with a *matrix* of rewards  $R_t$  of dimensions  $n_s \times n_s$ . The off-diagonal entries of  $R_t$  store the transition rewards and the diagonal of  $R_t$  stores the state rewards for cycle  $t$  and assumes that rewards occur at the beginning of the cycle.<sup>24</sup> Finally, we multiply this matrix by  $A_t$ , the  $t$ -th slice of  $A$ , apply discounting, half-cycle correction, and compute the overall reward for each strategy outcome. Below, we illustrate these concepts in R.

To compute  $\mathbf{A}$  for the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model under SoC, we initialize a three-dimensional array  $\mathbf{a\_A}$  of dimensions  $n_s \times n_s \times [n_t + 1]$  and set the diagonal of the first slice to the initial state vector  $\mathbf{v\_s\_init}$ . We create three-dimensional array for the cohort under treatment B  $\mathbf{a\_A\_trtB}$  as a copy of the array under SoC.

```
# Initialize transition-dynamics array under SoC
a_A <- array(0,
             dim = c(n_states, n_states, (n_t + 1)),
             dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Set first slice to the initial state vector in its diagonal
diag(a_A[, , 1]) <- v_s_init
# Initialize transition-dynamics array under treatment B
a_A_trtB <- a_A
```

We then compute a matrix multiplication between a diagonal matrix of each of the  $t$ -th rows of the cohort trace matrix under SoC and treatment B, denoted as  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{m\_M\_ad}[t, ])$  and  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{m\_M\_ad\_trtB}[t, ])$ , by the  $t$ -th matrix of the array of transition matrices,  $\mathbf{a\_P}[, , t]$  and  $\mathbf{a\_P\_trtB}[, , t]$ , respectively, over all  $n_t$  cycles.

```
# Iterative solution to produce the transition-dynamics array
for (t in 1:n_t){
  # For SoC
  a_A[, , t + 1] <- diag(m_M_ad[t, ]) %*% a_P[, , t]
  # For treatment B
  a_A_trtB[, , t + 1] <- m_M_ad_trtB[t, ] * a_P_trtB[, , t]
}
```

To create the arrays of rewards for costs and utilities for the Sick-Sicker cSTM, we create strategy-specific three-dimensional arrays of rewards that each of their rows across the third dimension are filled with the vector of state rewards.

```
# Arrays of state and transition rewards
# Utilities under SoC
a_R_u_SoC <- array(matrix(v_u_SoC, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Costs under SoC
```

```

a_R_c_SoC <- array(matrix(v_c_SoC, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Utilities under Strategy A
a_R_u_strA <- array(matrix(v_u_strA, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Costs under Strategy A
a_R_c_strA <- array(matrix(v_c_strA, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Utilities under Strategy B
a_R_u_strB <- array(matrix(v_u_strB, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Costs under Strategy B
a_R_c_strB <- array(matrix(v_c_strB, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Utilities under Strategy AB
a_R_u_strAB <- array(matrix(v_u_strAB, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))
# Costs under Strategy AB
a_R_c_strAB <- array(matrix(v_c_strAB, nrow = n_states, ncol = n_states, byrow = T),
                  dim = c(n_states, n_states, n_t + 1),
                  dimnames = list(v_names_states, v_names_states, 0:n_t))

```

To account for the transition rewards, we either add or subtract them in the corresponding location of the reward matrix that represents the transitions of interest. For example, to account for the disutility of transitioning from H to S1 for strategy A, we subtract the disutility to the entry of the array of rewards corresponding to the transition from H to S1 across all cycles.

```

# Add disutility due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_u_strA["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_u_strA["H", "S1", ] - du_HS1

```

In a similar approach, we add the costs of transitioning from H to S1 and the cost of dying for strategy A.

```

# Add transition cost due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_c_strA["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_c_strA["H", "S1", ] + ic_HS1
# Add transition cost of dying from all non-dead states
a_R_c_strA[-n_states, "D", ] <- a_R_c_strA[-n_states, "D", ] + ic_D
a_R_c_strA[, , 1]

```

```

##           H     S1     S2     D

```

```
## H 2000 17000 27000 2000
## S1 2000 16000 27000 2000
## S2 2000 16000 27000 2000
## D 2000 16000 27000 0
```

Below, we show how the transition rewards are added to the reward matrices corresponding to SoC and strategies B and AB.

```
## SoC
# Add disutility due to transition from H to S1
a_R_u_SoC["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_u_SoC["H", "S1", ] - du_HS1
# Add transition cost due to transition from H to S1
a_R_c_SoC["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_c_SoC["H", "S1", ] + ic_HS1
# Add transition cost of dying from all non-dead states
a_R_c_SoC[-n_states, "D", ] <- a_R_c_SoC[-n_states, "D", ] + ic_D

## Strategy B
# Add disutility due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_u_strB["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_u_strB["H", "S1", ] - du_HS1
# Add transition cost due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_c_strB["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_c_strB["H", "S1", ] + ic_HS1
# Add transition cost of dying from all non-dead states
a_R_c_strB[-n_states, "D", ] <- a_R_c_strB[-n_states, "D", ] + ic_D

## Strategy AB
# Add disutility due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_u_strAB["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_u_strAB["H", "S1", ] - du_HS1
# Add transition cost due to transition from Healthy to Sick
a_R_c_strAB["H", "S1", ] <- a_R_c_strAB["H", "S1", ] + ic_HS1
# Add transition cost of dying from all non-dead states
a_R_c_strAB[-n_states, "D", ] <- a_R_c_strAB[-n_states, "D", ] + ic_D
```

The state and transition rewards are applied to the model dynamics by element-wise multiplication between  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ , indicated by the  $\odot$  sign, which produces the array of outputs for all  $n_t$  cycles,  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Formally,

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A} \odot \mathbf{R} \quad (4)$$

To obtain  $\mathbf{Y}$  for QALYs and costs for all four strategies, we apply Equation (4) by the element-wise multiplication of the transition array  $\mathbf{a}_A$  by the corresponding array of rewards

```
# For SoC
a_Y_c_SoC <- a_A * a_R_c_SoC
a_Y_u_SoC <- a_A * a_R_u_SoC
# For Strategy A
a_Y_c_strA <- a_A * a_R_c_strA
```

```

a_Y_u_strA <- a_A * a_R_u_strA
# For Strategy B
a_Y_c_strB <- a_A_trtB * a_R_c_strB
a_Y_u_strB <- a_A_trtB * a_R_u_strB
# For Strategy AB
a_Y_c_strAB <- a_A_trtB * a_R_c_strAB
a_Y_u_strAB <- a_A_trtB * a_R_u_strAB

```

The total rewards for each health state at cycle  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_t$ , is obtained by summing the rewards across all  $j = 1, \dots, n_s$  health states for all  $n_t$  cycles.

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{1}^T Y_t = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} Y_{[i,1,t]}, \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} Y_{[i,2,t]}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} Y_{[i,n_s,t]} \right]. \quad (5)$$

To obtain the expected costs and QALYs per cycle for each strategy,  $\mathbf{y}$ , we apply again Equation (5) across all the matrices of the third dimension of  $\mathbf{Y}$  for all the outcomes

```

# Vectors of rewards
# QALYs under SoC
v_qaly_SoC <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_u_SoC)))
# Costs under SoC
v_cost_SoC <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_c_SoC)))
# QALYs under Strategy A
v_qaly_strA <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_u_strA)))
# Costs under Strategy A
v_cost_strA <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_c_strA)))
# QALYs under Strategy B
v_qaly_strB <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_u_strB)))
# Costs under Strategy B
v_cost_strB <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_c_strB)))
# QALYs under Strategy AB
v_qaly_strAB <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_u_strAB)))
# Costs under Strategy AB
v_cost_strAB <- rowSums(t(colSums(a_Y_c_strAB)))

```

The total expected discounted costs and QALYs under all four strategies accounting for half-cycle correction,  $y$ , is obtained by applying Equation (1) to the expected outcomes accounting for transition rewards.

```

### For SoC
## QALYs
n_tot_qaly_SoC <- t(v_qaly_SoC) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Costs
n_tot_cost_SoC <- t(v_cost_SoC) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
### For Strategy A
## QALYs

```



```

n_tot_qaly_strA <- t(v_qaly_strA) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Costs
n_tot_cost_strA <- t(v_cost_strA) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
### For Strategy B
## QALYs
n_tot_qaly_strB <- t(v_qaly_strB) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Costs
n_tot_cost_strB <- t(v_cost_strB) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)
### For Strategy AB
## QALYs
n_tot_qaly_strAB <- t(v_qaly_strAB) %*% (v_dwe * v_hcc)
## Costs
n_tot_cost_strAB <- t(v_cost_strAB) %*% (v_dwc * v_hcc)

```

## 6 Cost-effectiveness analysis and incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs)

We combine the total expected discounted costs and QALYs for all four strategies into outcome-specific vectors, `v_cost_str` for costs and `v_qaly_str` for QALYs. We use the R package `dampack` (<https://github.com/DARTH-git/dampack>) to calculate the incremental costs and effectiveness, and the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of the non-dominated strategies and create the data frame `df_cea` with this information.

```

### Vector of costs
v_cost_str <- c(n_tot_cost_SoC, n_tot_cost_strA, n_tot_cost_strB, n_tot_cost_strAB)
### Vector of effectiveness
v_qaly_str <- c(n_tot_qaly_SoC, n_tot_qaly_strA, n_tot_qaly_strB, n_tot_qaly_strAB)

### Calculate incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs)
df_cea <- dampack::calculate_icers(cost = v_cost_str,
                                  effect = v_qaly_str,
                                  strategies = v_names_str)

```

The results of the CEA of the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model are presented in Table 6. SoC is the least costly and effective strategy, followed by Strategy B producing an expected benefit of 1.286 QALYs per individual for an additional expected cost of \$81,133 with an ICER of \$63,090/QALY followed by Strategy AB with an ICER \$107,757/QALY. Strategy A is a dominated strategy.

Figure 10 shows the cost-effectiveness efficient frontier of all four strategies for the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model.

Table 6: Cost-effectiveness analysis results for the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model. ND: Non-dominated strategy; D: Dominated strategy.

Strategy	Costs (\$)	QALYs	Incremental Costs (\$)	Incremental QALYs	ICER (\$/QALY)	Status
Standard of care	115,275	19.468	NA	NA	NA	ND
Strategy B	196,408	20.754	81,133	1.286	63,090	ND
Strategy AB	284,877	21.575	88,469	0.821	107,757	ND
Strategy A	212,851	20.170	NA	NA	NA	D




Figure 10: Cost-effectiveness efficient frontier of all four strategies for the age-dependent Sick-Sicker model.

## 7 Probabilistic sensitivity analysis

To quantify the effect of model parameter uncertainty on cost-effectiveness outcomes, we conducted a probabilistic sensitivity analysis (PSA).<sup>25</sup> In a PSA, we randomly draw parameter sets from distributions that reflect the current uncertainty in model parameter estimates. The distribution for all the parameters and their values are described in Table and in more detailed in the Supplementary Material. For each sampled set of parameter values, we compute model outcomes (e.g., total discounted cost and QALYs) for each strategy.

In a previously published manuscript, we describe the implementation of these steps in R.<sup>15</sup> Briefly, to conduct the PSA, we create three R functions, which are provided in the supplementary material and in the accompanying GitHub repository:

1. A function called `generate_psa_params(n_sim, seed)` that generates a sample of size `n_sim` for the model parameters from their distributions defined in Table 1. The function also takes a seed number as input, which ensures reproducibility of the PSA results. By calling this function, we generate the sample of parameter sets for the PSA: `df_psa_input <- generate_psa_params(n_sim = n_sim)`
2. A function called `decision_model` that wraps the R code of the time-dependent cSTM described in section Wall time-dependency and requires as input a list of model parameter values.
3. Create a function called `calculate_ce_out` that calculates outcomes of interest (e.g., total discounted costs and QALYs) based on the `decision_model` function output.

In Figure 11, we present the cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEACs), which shows the probability that each strategy is cost-effective, and the cost-effectiveness frontier (CEAF) which shows the strategy with the highest expected monetary benefit, over a range of willingness-to-pay (WTP) thresholds. The net monetary benefit for each strategy is defined as the product of total discounted QALYs and the WTP threshold minus the total discounted costs, calculated for each PSA parameter set sample. At WTP thresholds less than \$65,000 per QALY, SoC is the strategy with the highest probability of being cost-effective and the highest expected net monetary benefit. Strategy B has the highest probability of being cost-effective and the highest expected net monetary benefit for WTP thresholds between \$65,000 and \$100,000 per QALY. Strategy AB, has the highest expected net monetary benefit for WTP thresholds greater than or equal to \$100,000 per QALY and is the strategy with the highest probability of being cost-effective.




Figure 11: Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEACs) and frontier (CEAF).

The code provided above also produces expected loss curves (ELCs). These curves quantify the expected loss from each strategy over a range of WTP thresholds (Figure 12). The expected loss considers both the probability of making the wrong decision and the magnitude of the loss due to this decision, which represents the foregone benefits of choosing a suboptimal strategy. The expected loss of the optimal strategy represents the lowest envelope of the ELCs because given current information, the loss cannot be minimized further. The lower envelope also represents the expected value of perfect information (EVPI), which quantifies the value of eliminating parameter uncertainty. The strategy SoC has the lowest expected loss for WTP thresholds less than \$65,000 per QALY, strategy B has the lowest expected loss for WTP threshold greater than or equal to \$65,000 and less than \$105,000, and strategy AB has the lowest expected loss for WTP threshold greater than or equal to \$105,000 per QALY. At a WTP threshold of \$100,000 per QALY, the EVPI is highest at \$5,162. For a more detailed description of these outputs and the R code to generate them, we refer the reader to a previous publication by our group.<sup>26</sup>




Figure 12: Expected loss curves (ELCs) and expected value of perfect information (EVPI).

## 8 Discussion

In this tutorial, we provided a conceptualization of various types of cSTMs with their mathematical description and a walk-through of their implementation for CEA in R using a previously published example. We used R as the programming language of choice to show the implementation of these models with accompanying code throughout the tutorial. We describe both time-independent and time-dependent models. We showed two different implementations of the time-dependent model, accounting for transition probabilities that are dependent on wall-time (e.g., age-dependence) and those that are dependent on state-residence.

We should note that a number of alternative approaches can be applied in the incorporation of time-dependency in cSTMs in R and in various programming languages. For example, another approach to incorporate age-dependency involves the updating of the time varying elements of the transition probability matrix  $P_t$  at each time point  $t$ . That would alleviate the need for the construction of the array `a_P`. This can reduce computer memory requirements, but at the expense of increasing the number of operations in the update of  $P_t$  at every cycle. Another approach to account for state residence dependency, is to also use a 3-dimensional transition probability matrix with dimensions for current state, future state, and time in current state.<sup>27</sup> However, to incorporate age-dependence, this multidimensional matrix will have to be expanded by another dimension or

the states will have to be replicated for as many age groups are considered in the model. In this tutorial we decided to use the third dimension as the age of the cohort and incorporate state-residence by expanding the corresponding health states on the second dimension of the 3-dimensional array to account for time spent in the current state. A benefit of this approach is that we can use the transition dynamics array to capture all transitions between all states for all cycles.

The parameterization of our example model assumes all parameters are known or at least, the characterization of their uncertainty is known (i.e., we know their distributions). However, to construct a real-world cSTM it is important that modelers conduct a thorough synthesis of current evidence to determine the appropriate structure of these models and inform all parameters. For example, determining whether transitions between non-death health states are estimated conditional on being alive or mortality risks are also considered competing risks.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, our PSA analysis is a simplification of reality where all model parameters are assumed to be independent from each other. However, parameters could be correlated with each other or have a rank ordering, and appropriate statistical methods that simulate these correlations or rank ordering might be needed.<sup>28</sup> We encourage modelers to use appropriate statistical methods to accurately synthesize and quantify model parameters uncertainty. In addition, all model parameters should be correctly specified for the cycle length of the model. For example, some probability revision is required to correctly adjust an annual mortality rate to a weekly probability.<sup>23</sup>

In general, cSTMs are recommended when the number of states is “not too large”.<sup>3</sup> This recommendation arises because as the number of states increase, it becomes more difficult to keep track of their construction but not because of the added computational expense. It is possible to build fairly complex cSTMs in R as long as the size of the transition probability matrix and outputs of interest can be stored in the RAM memory of the computer running the analysis. For example, a typical PC with 8GB of RAM can handle a transition probability array of about 1000 states and 600 slices. However, these matrices can grow quickly, and if the required number of state descriptions gets too large and difficult to manage its coding, it becomes preferable to use a stochastic (Monte Carlo) version of the state-transition model –often called individual-based state transition models (iSTM) or microsimulation models– rather than a cohort simulation model.<sup>3</sup> This is because in iSTM the risks and rewards of simulated individuals do not need to depend only on a specific health state, but also on their individual characteristics and attributes. In addition, health state history and other events can be stored over time for each individual to determine the risk of new events and corresponding costs and effects. It is recommended to think about the required model structure before implementing the model in R or any other tool because turning a cSTM to an iSTM requires a different code structure. However, most input parameters and some model structure might remain the same, but an iSTM will also require additional functions to describe the dependency of transition probabilities and rewards on individuals’ history. In a previous tutorial, we showed how to write these additional functions for the Sick-Sicker example model.<sup>4</sup>

With increasing model complexity and the use of functions for PSA, it is important to ensure all code and functions work as expected and all elements of cSTM are valid. This can be achieved by functions that help with model debugging and validation and through unit testing. In the accompanying GitHub repository, we provided functions to check that transition probability matrices and their elements are valid. However, unit testing is beyond the scope of this tutorial but we refer the reader to previously published manuscript where we describe unit testing in more detail and provide accompanying code.<sup>15</sup>

We focused on discrete-time matrix-form cSTMs but these can also be implemented via a set of difference equations and in continuous time using differential equations in R.<sup>29,30</sup> We refer readers interested in learning

more on continuous-time cSTMs to previously published manuscripts<sup>31–34</sup> and a tutorial using R.<sup>35</sup> There are other approaches to construct Markov models in R, most of them through purpose-specific R packages. For example, the `heemod`<sup>36</sup> package is designed to build Markov models that account for time dependency using a pre-defined structure. Although `heemod` is a well-structured package, it requires users to set up the structure of the Markov model, specify the parameters and run analyses in a pre-specified approach. This, however, limits the understanding on how cSTMs and Markov models work and are constructed. In this tutorial, we show how cSTMs are constructed, parameterized and run by using only base R so readers get a deep understanding of this type of decision models. Finally, the variable names used in this paper reflect our own style. While we provide guidance on standardized variable names, the adoption of these conventions are ultimately a personal preference.

In summary, this tutorial provides a conceptualization of cSTMs and a step-by-step guide to implement them in R. We aim to add to the current body of literature and material on building this type of decision models so health decision scientists and health economists are able to develop cSTMs in a more flexible, efficient, open-source manner, and encouraging increased transparency and reproducibility.

## Acknowledgements

Dr Alarid-Escudero was supported by a grant from the National Cancer Institute (U01-CA-199335) as part of the Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET), and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Miss Krijkamp was supported by the Society for Medical Decision Making (SMDM) fellowship through a grant by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (GBMF7853). Dr Enns was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under award no. K25AI118476. Dr Hunink receives Royalties from Cambridge University Press for a textbook on Medical Decision Making, reimbursement of expenses from the European Society of Radiology (ESR) for work on the ESR guidelines for imaging referrals, reimbursement of expenses from the European Institute for Biomedical Imaging Research (EIBIR) for membership of the Scientific Advisory Board, and research funding from the American Diabetes Association, the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development, the German Innovation Fund, Netherlands Educational Grant (“Studie Voorschot Middelen”), and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Dr Jalal was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse of the National Institute of Health under award no. K01DA048985. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. The funding agencies had no role in the design of the study, interpretation of results, or writing of the manuscript. The funding agreement ensured the authors’ independence in designing the study, interpreting the data, writing, and publishing the report. We also want to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Medical Decision Making* for their valuable suggestions and the students that took our classes to try our materials.

## References

1. Kuntz KM, Russell LB, Owens DK, et al. Decision Models in Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. In: Neumann PJ, Sanders GD, Russell LB, et al. (eds) *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 105–136.
2. Jalal H, Pechlivanoglou P, Krijkamp E, et al. An Overview of R in Health Decision Sciences. *Medical*

- Decision Making*; 37: 735–746, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X16686559> (2017).
3. Siebert U, Alagoz O, Bayoumi AM, et al. State-Transition Modeling: A Report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices Task Force-3. *Medical Decision Making*; 32: 690–700, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X12455463> (2012).
  4. Krijkamp EM, Alarid-Escudero F, Enns EA, et al. Microsimulation Modeling for Health Decision Sciences Using R: A Tutorial. *Medical Decision Making*; 38: 400–422, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X18754513> (2018).
  5. Suijkerbuijk AW, Van Hoek AJ, Koopsen J, et al. Cost-effectiveness of screening for chronic hepatitis B and C among migrant populations in a low endemic country. *PLoS ONE* 2018; 13: 1–16.
  6. Sathianathen NJ, Konety BR, Alarid-Escudero F, et al. Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Active Surveillance Strategies for Men with Low-risk Prostate Cancer. *European Urology*; 75: 910–917, <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0302283818308534> (2019).
  7. Lu S, Yu Y, Fu S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of ALK testing and first-line crizotinib therapy for non-small-cell lung cancer in China. *PLoS ONE* 2018; 13: 1–12.
  8. Djatche LM, Varga S, Lieberthal RD. Cost-Effectiveness of Aspirin Adherence for Secondary Prevention of Cardiovascular Events. *PharmacoEconomics - Open*; 2: 371–380, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41669-018-0075-2> (2018).
  9. Pershing S, Enns EA, Matesic B, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Treatment of Diabetic Macular Edema. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2014; 160: 18–29.
  10. Smith-Spangler CM, Juusola JL, Enns EA, et al. Population Strategies to Decrease Sodium Intake and the Burden of Cardiovascular Disease: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *Annals of Internal Medicine*; 152: 481–487, <http://annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=745729> (2010).
  11. Kuntz KM, Weinstein MC. Modelling in economic evaluation. In: Drummond MF, McGuire A (eds) *Economic evaluation in health care: Merging theory with practice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 141–171.
  12. Sonnenberg FA, Beck JR. Markov models in medical decision making: A practical guide. *Medical Decision Making*; 13: 322–338, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X9301300409> (1993).
  13. Beck J, Pauker SG. The Markov process in medical prognosis. *Medical Decision Making*; 3: 419–458, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X8300300403> (1983).
  14. Enns EA, Cipriano LE, Simons CT, et al. Identifying Best-Fitting Inputs in Health-Economic Model Calibration: A Pareto Frontier Approach. *Medical Decision Making*; 35: 170–182, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24799456> (2015).
  15. Alarid-Escudero F, Krijkamp E, Pechlivanoglou P, et al. A Need for Change! A Coding Framework for Improving Transparency in Decision Modeling. *PharmacoEconomics*; 37: 1329–1339, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-019-00837-x> (2019).
  16. Iskandar R. A theoretical foundation of state-transition cohort models in health decision analysis. *PLoS ONE*; 13: e0205543, <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2018/09/28/430173> (2018).



17. Snowsill T. A New Method for Model-Based Health Economic Evaluation Utilizing and Extending Moment-Generating Functions. *Medical Decision Making*; 39: 523–539, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X19860119> (2019).
18. Arias E, Heron M, Xu J. United States Life Tables, 2014. *National Vital Statistics Reports*; 66: 63, [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr66/nvsr66{\\\_}04.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr66/nvsr66{\_}04.pdf) (2017).
19. Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.
20. Keiding N. Age-Specific Incidence and Prevalence: A Statistical Perspective. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A (Statistics in Society)* 1991; 154: 371–412.
21. Lee ET, Wang JW. *Statistical methods for Survival Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2003.
22. Klein JP, Moeschberger ML. *Survival Analysis: Techniques for Censored and Truncated Data*. 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, <http://www.springer.com/statistics/life+sciences,+medicine+{\&}+health/book/978-0-387-95399-1> (2003).
23. Hunink MGM, Weinstein MC, Wittenberg E, et al. *Decision Making in Health and Medicine*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, <http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139506779> (2014).
24. Krijkamp EM, Alarid-Escudero F, Enns E, et al. A Multidimensional Array Representation of State-Transition Model Dynamics. *Medical Decision Making* 2019; In Press.
25. Briggs AH, Weinstein MC, Fenwick EAL, et al. Model Parameter Estimation and Uncertainty Analysis: A Report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices Task Force Working Group-6. *Medical Decision Making* 2012; 32: 722–732.
26. Alarid-Escudero F, Enns EA, Kuntz KM, et al. "Time Traveling Is Just Too Dangerous" But Some Methods Are Worth Revisiting: The Advantages of Expected Loss Curves Over Cost-Effectiveness Acceptability Curves and Frontier. *Value in Health* 2019; 22: 611–618.
27. Hawkins N, Sculpher M, Epstein D. Cost-effectiveness analysis of treatments for chronic disease: Using R to incorporate time dependency of treatment response. *Medical Decision Making*; 25: 511–9, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16160207> (2005).
28. Goldhaber-Fiebert JD, Jalal HJ. Some Health States Are Better Than Others: Using Health State Rank Order to Improve Probabilistic Analyses. *Medical Decision Making*; 36: 927–940, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X15605091> (2015).
29. Grimmett G, Welsh D. Markov Chains. In: *Probability: An introduction*. Oxford University Press, pp. 203, [www.statslab.cam.ac.uk/~grg/teaching/chapter12.pdf](http://www.statslab.cam.ac.uk/~grg/teaching/chapter12.pdf) (2014).
30. Axler S, Gehring FW, Ribet KA. *Difference Equations*. New York, NY: Springer, <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/0-387-27645-9> (2005).
31. Cao Q, Buskens E, Feenstra T, et al. Continuous-Time Semi-Markov Models in Health Economic Decision Making: An Illustrative Example in Heart Failure Disease Management. *Medical Decision Making*; 36: 59–71, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X15593080> (2016).

32. Rosmalen J van, Toy M, O'Mahony JF. A Mathematical Approach for Evaluating Markov Models in Continuous Time without Discrete-Event Simulation. *Medical Decision Making*; 33: 767–779, <http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0272989X13487947> (2013).
33. Begun A, Icks A, Waldeyer R, et al. Identification of a multistate continuous-time nonhomogeneous Markov chain model for patients with decreased renal function. *Medical Decision Making*; 33: 298–306, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23275452> (2013).
34. Soares MO, Canto E Castro L. Continuous time simulation and discretized models for cost-effectiveness analysis. *Pharmacoeconomics*; 30: 1101–1117, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23116289> (2012).
35. Frederix GWJ, Hasselt JGC van, Severens JL, et al. Development of a framework for cohort simulation in cost-effectiveness analyses using a multistep ordinary differential equation solver algorithm in R. *Medical Decision Making*; 33: 780–92, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23515213> (2013).
36. Filipović-Pierucci A, Zarca K, Durand-Zaleski I. Markov Models for Health Economic Evaluation: The R Package heemod. *arXiv:170203252v1*; April: 30, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.03252> (2017).

# Supplementary material to: Cohort State-Transition Models in R: A Tutorial

*Fernando Alarid-Escudero, PhD\**

*Eline Krijkamp, MSc†*

*Eva A. Enns, PhD‡*

*Alan Yang, MSc§*

*M.G. Myriam Hunink, PhD¶*

*Petros Pechlivanoglou, PhD||*

*Hawre Jalal, MD, PhD\*\**

2020-10-13

## Cohort tutorial model components

**Table I: Input parameters**

This table contains an overview of the key model components used in the code for the Sick-Sicker example from the DARTH manuscript: “Implementation of cohort state-transition models in R”. The first column gives the mathematical notation for some of the model components that are used in the equations in the manuscript. The second column gives a description of the model component with the R name in the third column. The fourth gives the data structure, e.g. scalar, list, vector, matrix etc, with the according dimensions of this data structure in the fifth column. The final column indicated the type of data that is stored in the data structure, e.g. numeric (5,2,6,3,7.4), categoric (A,B,C), integer (5,6,7), logical (TRUE, FALSE).

Element	Description	R name	Data structure	Dimensions	Data type
$n_t$	Time horizon	<code>n_t</code>	scalar		numeric
$v_s$	Names of the health states	<code>v_n</code>	vector	<code>n_states</code> x 1	categorical
$n_s$	Number of health states	<code>n_states</code>	scalar		numeric
$v_{str}$	Names of the strategies	<code>v_names_str</code>	scalar		categorical
$n_{str}$	Number of strategies	<code>n_str</code>	scalar		numeric
$d_c$	Discount rate for costs	<code>d_c</code>	scalar		numeric
$d_e$	Discount rate for effects	<code>d_e</code>	scalar		numeric
	Discount weights for costs	<code>v_dwc</code>	vector	<code>(n_t x 1) + 1</code>	numeric
	Discount weights for effects	<code>v_dwe</code>	vector	<code>(n_t x 1) + 1</code>	numeric

\*Division of Public Administration, Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE), Aguascalientes, AGS, Mexico

†Department of Epidemiology, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

‡Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota School of Public Health, Minneapolis, MN, USA

§The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

¶Center for Health Decision Sciences, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, USA

||The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto and University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

\*\*University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Element	Description	R name	Data structure	Dimensions	Data type
$\mathbf{v}_{hcc}$	half-cycle correction	$\mathbf{v}_{hcc}$	vector	$(\mathbf{n}_t \times 1) + 1$	numeric
$age_0$	Age at baseline	$\mathbf{n}_{age\_init}$	scalar		numeric
$age$	Maximum age of follow up	$\mathbf{n}_{age\_max}$	scalar		numeric
$M$	Cohort trace	$\mathbf{m}_M$	matrix	$(\mathbf{n}_t + 1) \times \mathbf{n}_{states}$	numeric
$m_0$	Initial state vector	$\mathbf{v}_{s\_init}$	vector	$1 \times \mathbf{n}_{states}$	numeric
<b>Transition probabilities</b>					
$p_{[H,S1]}$	From Healthy to Sick conditional on surviving	$\mathbf{p}_{HS1}$	scalar		numeric
$p_{[S1,H]}$	From Sick to Healthy conditional on surviving	$\mathbf{p}_{S1H}$	scalar		numeric
$p_{[S1,S2]}$	From Sick to Sicker conditional on surviving	$\mathbf{p}_{S1S2}$	scalar		numeric
$p_{[H,D]}$	Annual all-cause mortality	$\mathbf{p}_{HD}$	scalar		numeric
$hr_{[S1,H]}$	Hazard ratio of death in Sick vs Healthy	$\mathbf{hr}_{S1}$	scalar		numeric
$hr_{[S2,H]}$	Hazard ratio of death in Sicker vs Healthy	$\mathbf{hr}_{S2}$	scalar		numeric
$or_{[S1,S2]}$	Odds ratio of becoming Sicker when Sick under New treatment 2	$\mathbf{or}_{S1S2}$	scalar		numeric
$\gamma$	Weibull parameters gamma	$\mathbf{n}_{gamma}$	scalar		numeric
$\lambda$	Weibull parameters lambda	$\mathbf{n}_{lambda}$	scalar		numeric
$P$	Transition probability matrix	$\mathbf{m}_P$	matrix	$\mathbf{n}_{states} \times \mathbf{n}_{states}$	numeric
$p_{[S1,S2,t]}$	Time dependent transition probability from sick to sicker	$\mathbf{v}_{p\_S1S2\_tunnels}$	vector	$\mathbf{n}_t \times 1$	numeric
$r_{[H,D,t]}$	Age-specific background mortality rates	$\mathbf{v}_{r\_mort\_by\_age}$	vector	$(\mathbf{n}_{age\_max} + 1) \times 1$	numeric
$p_{[H,D,t]}$	Age-specific mortality risk in the Healthy state	$\mathbf{v}_{p\_HDage}$	vector	$\mathbf{n}_t \times 1$	numeric
$p_{[S1,D,t]}$	Age-specific mortality risk in the Sick state	$\mathbf{v}_{p\_S1Dage}$	vector	$\mathbf{n}_t \times 1$	numeric
$p_{[S2,D,t]}$	Age-specific mortality risk in the Sicker state	$\mathbf{v}_{p\_S2Dage}$	vector	$\mathbf{n}_t \times 1$	numeric
<b>Annual costs</b>					
	Healthy individuals	$\mathbf{c}_H$	scalar		numeric
	Sick individuals in the Sick state	$\mathbf{c}_{S1}$	scalar		numeric

Element	Description	R name	Data structure	Dimensions	Data type
	Sick individuals in the Sicker state	<code>c_S2</code>	scalar		numeric
	Dead individuals	<code>c_D</code>	scalar		numeric
	Additional costs of New treatment 1	<code>c_trt1</code>	scalar		numeric
	Additional costs of New treatment 2	<code>c_trt2</code>	scalar		numeric
	<b>Utility weights</b>				
	Healthy individuals	<code>u_H</code>	scalar		numeric
	Sick individuals in the Sick state	<code>u_S1</code>	scalar		numeric
	Sick individuals in the Sicker state	<code>u_S2</code>	scalar		numeric
	Dead individuals	<code>u_D</code>	scalar		numeric
	Being treated	<code>u_trt1</code>	scalar		numeric
	<b>Transition weights</b>				
	Utility decrement of healthy individuals when transitioning to the Sick state	<code>du_HS1</code>	scalar		numeric
	Cost of healthy individuals when transitioning to the Sick state	<code>ic_HS1</code>	scalar		numeric
	Cost of dying	<code>ic_D</code>	scalar		numeric
<b>P</b>	Age-dependent transition probability array	<code>a_P</code>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times n\_t$	numeric
<b>A</b>	Transition dynamics array	<code>a_A</code>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
	Number of tunnel states	<code>n_tunnel_size</code>	scalar		numeric
	Tunnel names of the Sick state	<code>v_Sick_tunnel</code>	vector	$1 \times n\_t$	numeric
	Number of states including tunnel states	<code>n_states_tunnels</code>	scalar		numeric
	State names including tunnel states	<code>v_n_tunnels</code>	vector	$1 \times n\_states\_tunnels$	categorical
	Initial state vector for the model with tunnels	<code>v_s_init_tunnels</code>	vector	$1 \times n\_states\_tunnels$	numeric

Element	Description	R name	Data structure	Dimensions	Data type
	Transition dynamics array for the model with tunnels	<b>a_A_tunnels</b>	array	$n\_states\_tunnels \times n\_states\_tunnels$	numeric
	Transition probability array for the model with tunnels	<b>a_P_tunnels</b>	array	$n\_states\_tunnels \times n\_states\_tunnels$	numeric
<b>R<sub>u</sub></b>	Transition rewards for effects	<b>a_R_u</b>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
<b>R<sub>c</sub></b>	Transition rewards for costs	<b>a_R_c</b>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
<b>Y<sub>u</sub></b>	Expected effects per states per cycle	<b>a_Y_u</b>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
<b>R<sub>c</sub></b>	Expected costs per state per cycle	<b>a_Y_c</b>	array	$n\_states \times n\_states \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
	Expected QALYs per cycle	<b>v_qaly</b>	vector	$1 \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
	Expected costs per cycle	<b>v_cost</b>	vector	$1 \times (n\_t + 1)$	numeric
	Total expected discounted QALYs for all strategies	<b>v_tot_qaly</b>	vector	$1 \times n\_str$	numeric
	Total expected discounted costs for all strategies	<b>v_tot_cost</b>	vector	$1 \times n\_str$	numeric
	Summary of the model outcomes	<b>df_cea</b>	data frame		
	Summary of the model outcomes - reformatted	<b>table_cea</b>	table		

**Table II: Input parameters for probabilistic analysis**

Parameter	Distribution	Distribution values	Parameter mean	Parameter standard error
Number of simulation	<code>n_sim</code>	1000		
Annual transition probabilities				
- Disease onset (H to S1)	Beta	$\alpha = 30, \beta = 170$	0.15	0.025
- Recovery (S1 to H)	Beta	$\alpha = 60, \beta = 60$	0.5	0.045
- Disease progression (S1 to S2) in the age-dependent model	Beta	$\alpha = 84, \beta = 716$	0.105	0.01
- Weibull scale parameter (S1 to S2) in the model with tunnel states	Lognormal	$\log(\mu) = \log(0.08), \log(\sigma) = 0.02$	0.08	0.002
- Weibull shape parameter (S1 to S2) in the model with tunnel states	Lognormal	$\log(\mu) = \log(1.1), \log(\sigma) = 0.02$	1.1	0.02
Annual mortality				
- Hazard ratio of death in S1 vs H	Lognormal	$\log(\mu) = \log(3), \log(\sigma) = 0.01$	3	0.03
- Hazard ratio of death in S2 vs H	Lognormal	$\log(\mu) = \log(10), \log(\sigma) = 0.02$	10	1
- Log odds ratio of S1 to S2	Normal	$\mu = \log(0.6), \sigma = 0.1$	-0.51	0.1
Annual costs				
- Healthy individuals	Gamma	shape = 100, scale = 20	2000	200
- Sick individuals in S1	Gamma	shape = 177.8, scale = 22.5	4000	300
- Sick individuals in S2	Gamma	shape = 225, scale = 66.7	15000	1000
- Cost of treatment A for individuals in S1 or S2	Gamma	shape = 576, scale = 20.8	12000	500
- Cost of treatment B for individuals in S1 or S2	Gamma	shape = 676, scale = 19.2	13000	500
Utility weights				
- Healthy individuals	Beta	$\alpha = 200, \beta = 3$	0.985	0.008
- Sick individuals in S1	Beta	$\alpha = 130, \beta = 45$	0.74	0.033
- Sick individuals in S2	Beta	$\alpha = 230, \beta = 230$	0.5	0.023
Intervention effect				
- Utility for treated individuals in S1	Beta	$\alpha = 300, \beta = 15$	0.95	0.012
Transition rewards				
- Disutility (H to S1)	Beta	$\alpha = 11, \beta = 1088$	0.01	0.003

Parameter	Distribution	Distribution values	Parameter	
			mean	standard error
- Increase in cost (H to S1)	Gamma	$\alpha = 25, \beta = 40$	1000	200
- Increase in cost (D)	Gamma	$\alpha = 100, \beta = 20$	2000	200