

## 2009 International Campbell Collaboration (C2) Colloquium

---

### Submitter Information

Kevin Marsh

Email: kevin.marsh@matrixknowledge.com

### Abstract Information

**Abstract Title:**

Prioritising investment in public health: A review of the economic evidence

**Format:**

Paper

**Themes:**

systematic review, economic evaluation

**Authors:**

Dr Kevin Marsh, The Matrix Knowledge Group

**Abstract:**

The Department of Health in the UK commissioned Matrix Knowledge Group and Bazian Ltd to determine the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of 41 interventions in order to inform the prioritisation of investment in public health. The method employed comprised two stages. First, a review of effectiveness studies was undertaken to determine the impact of interventions. Effect size, reliability and relevance were scored using adapted international scoring schemes. These scores were combined to rate the effectiveness of the interventions. Second, recent reviews of economic evaluations of public health interventions were used to identify relevant economic studies, from which evidence of the cost, effect, health gain, and public sector costs savings associated with the interventions was extracted. Cost-effectiveness, reliability and relevance were scored using adapted international scoring schemes. These scores were combined to rate the cost-effectiveness of the interventions. The economic studies identified were heterogeneous in terms of their research design, intervention type, and measures of efficiency used. Hence, they could not be synthesised quantitatively. Therefore, a weighted vote-counting method was used to synthesise the economic data. The review identified 8 interventions that are both effective and cost-effective and should therefore be considered in any prioritisation process. A number of other interventions were found to be effective, but there was insufficient evidence to draw conclusions regarding their cost-effectiveness. Specifically, no economic evidence was identified for 15 of the 41 interventions. However, the analysis was unable to conclude regarding the cost-effectiveness of another 15 interventions, not because there was no data, but because the economic evidence that was identified took the form of a cost-effectiveness analysis where effectiveness was measured by change in behaviour. There is evidence to suggest that a number of public health interventions represent an efficient use of healthcare resources. However, there are important gaps in the evidence and further research is required before we can conclude which public health interventions should be prioritised.

---