Title: The international trial of nasal oxygen therapy after cardiac surgery (NOTACS) in patients at high risk of
The international trial of nasal oxygen therapy after cardiac surgery (NOTACS) in patients at high risk of
nostanarativa nulmanary complications. Economic avaluation protocol and analysis plan
postoperative pulmonary complications: Economic evaluation protocol and analysis plan
Short title:
Economic evaluation protocol for NOTACS trial
Authors and affiliations:
Siddesh Shetty ¹ , Melissa Duckworth ² , Richard Norman ³ , Jacquita Affandi ^{3,4} , Sarah Dawson ^{2,5} , Julia Fox-
Rushby ^{1, *} , On behalf of NOTACS investigators ⁶ , On behalf of NOTACS Trial Steering Committee ⁶ , On
behalf of NOTACS DMEC Committee ⁶
¹ School of Life Course and Population Sciences, King's College London, United Kingdom
² Papworth Trials Unit Collaboration, Royal Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, United
Kingdom
³ Curtin School of Population Health, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia
⁴ Fiona Stanley Hospital, Perth, Western Australia
⁵ MRC Biostatistics Unit, School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

⁶ Membership of the NOTACS investigators, NOTACS Trial Steering Committee and NOTACS DMEC Committee is provided in the supplementary S2 appendix * Corresponding author E-mail: julia.fox-rushby@kcl.ac.uk (JF) **Abstract:** Introduction High-Flow Nasal Therapy (HFNT) is an innovative non-invasive form of respiratory support. Compared to standard oxygen therapy (SOT), there is an equipoise regarding the effect of HFNT on patient-centred outcomes among those at high risk of developing postoperative pulmonary complications after undergoing cardiac surgery. The NOTACS trial aims to determine the clinical and cost-effectiveness of HFNT compared to SOT within 90 days of surgery in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. This protocol describes the methods and analyses planned for economic evaluation embedded within the ongoing NOTACS trial. Methods and analysis The economic evaluation will identify, measure and value resources and health outcomes in both trial arms and compare changes in costs with 'days alive and at home' and EQ-5D-5L quality adjusted life years (QALYs) from the perspective most relevant to the decision-making country. Results from pooling data across the trial will use health and social care sector perspective. All patient-specific data including

hospital/community care and health outcomes will be collected prospectively. Unit costs will be sourced from national, published or local data. Missing data will be assessed, with values replaced depending on assumed mechanism of missingness, and impact of replacement on cost-effectiveness assessed. Costs and outcomes by trial arm will be presented as components and totals per patient using a range of descriptive statistics. Regression models for costs and effects will account for patient characteristics, quality of life and health service utilization at baseline. Uncertainty in parameters, sampling and heterogeneity will be addressed through deterministic, probabilistic and subgroup analyses to assess the impact of varying methods and assumptions for costs, outcomes and approaches used in base-case analysis. Results will be interpreted using recommended national cost-effectiveness thresholds. Registration details The study is registered with ISRCTN (ISRCTN14092678) on 13/05/2020. ISRCTN is a primary registry of the WHO ICTRP network and includes all items from the WHO Trial Registration data set.

Introduction:

United Kingdom (UK), Australia (AUS), and New Zealand (NZ) reported a total of 42,456 cardiac surgical procedures in 2022-23 (1,2). Patients undergoing cardiac surgery are at risk of developing postoperative pulmonary complications (PPC), leading to prolonged hospitalisation and an increase in healthcare costs (3,4). The risk is further exacerbated in patients having intrinsic respiratory disease and lower airway obstruction, obese patients, and heavy smokers (5). The peri-extubation period is crucial in managing such high-risk patients. These patients more often require prolonged ventilatory support and readmission during recovery (6,7).

High-Flow Nasal Therapy (HFNT) is an innovative non-invasive form of respiratory support that has increasingly gained attention as a bridge between low flow oxygen and continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) (8). HFNT has physiological benefits and is better tolerated by patients compared to other techniques of non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and conventional oxygen therapy (9). Recent systematic reviews have ascertained the efficacy and safety of HFNT in adult post-operative patients by demonstrating a reduction in length of hospital stay and the need for respiratory support (10,11). There is however an equipoise regarding the use of HFNT in patients at high risk of developing PPC undergoing cardiac surgery.

The NOTACS trial is an adaptive, multi-centre, multi-country, parallel group, randomised controlled trial (RCT) with embedded economic evaluation. The trial compares the use of HFNT versus SOT in patients at high risk of developing PPC after undergoing cardiac surgery. The trial has two primary aims; to determine whether prophylactic use of HFNT for a minimum of 16 hours after tracheal extubation increases days

alive and at home (DAH) at 90 days after surgery, and to estimate the incremental cost-effectiveness and

cost-utility of HFNT versus SOT at 90 days after surgery.

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

There is very little evidence available on the cost-effectiveness of HFNT. A decision model from England

found HFNT to be cost saving in ICU patients but indicated limitations with clinical effectiveness and

costing methods (12). Similarly, a US-based model found HFNT to be cost-effective in COPD patients on

long-term oxygen but is based on findings from a single-centre trial that used outcomes from a different

healthcare setting (13). The limited available economic evidence is mostly based on decision models,

heterogenous population subgroups, different settings that have limitations for input costs, consequences

or are funded by manufacturers (12–16). Therefore, the actual cost-effectiveness of HFNT in adult patients

at high risk of developing PPC undergoing cardiac surgery is currently unknown.

The economic evaluation alongside NOTACS is designed to provide the first international economic

evidence on the use of HFNT for adults at high risk of developing PPC undergoing cardiac surgery. The

primary objective is to assess the cost-effectiveness (i.e. incremental cost per gain in 'days alive and at

home' at 90 days after surgery (DAH90)) and cost-utility (i.e. incremental cost per Quality Adjusted Life

Years (QALY) gained) for HFNT versus SOT comparison from the health and social care sector perspective.

The secondary objectives include addition of patient/family perspective and estimation of cost-

effectiveness at 30 days after surgery. This protocol paper (Version 1.0, 23rd September 2024) describes

5

the methods and analyses planned for this economic evaluation.

Methods and analysis:

106

107

108109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121122

123

124

125

126

127

Study design The NOTACS trial protocol (Trial registration ID: ISRCTN14092678) and statistical analysis plan are published elsewhere following the SPIRIT recommendations (Fig 1 & Table S1; S1 Appendix) (17–19). The trial examines patient centred outcomes for HFNT versus SOT comparison by using a single-blind strategy that assigns eligible patients randomly in a 1:1 allocation ratio, until a sample size of 1280 cases is achieved by recruiting participants from 10 sites in the UK, 7 in AUS and 1 in NZ. The trial population includes adult patients undergoing elective or urgent first-time or redo cardiac surgery performed on cardiopulmonary bypass, having one or more clinical risk factors for PPC. Randomisation is performed after surgery initiation and patients are followed up for 90 days after surgery. Fig 1. Outlines study components in accordance with SPIRIT guidelines (EuroSCORE II: European System for Cardiac Operative Risk Evaluation, ARISCAT risk assessment: Assess Respiratory Risk in Surgical Patients in Catalonia, EQ-5D-5L: EuroQol 5-Dimensions 5-Levels, ROX index: Ratio of Oxygen Saturation to FiO2 and Respiratory Rate) Intervention and control arms After cardiac surgery, patients are transferred to intensive care units (ICU). Once a patient fulfils the local hospital criteria for extubation, they are extubated as per the trial extubation protocol (17). Those randomised to the intervention arm receive HFNT for a minimum of 16 hours with up to one hour off treatment allowed for hospital moves or physiotherapy mobilisation. Following the extubation protocol, patients allocated HFNT are started off on 40% fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO2) and a flow of 30 litres per minute (L/min) then up to 50 L/min over 5 to 10 minutes. Patients are monitored and clinically

assessed at least every 24 hours to either discontinue, continue, or escalate respiratory support as recommended by the trial protocol (17).

Patients assigned to control arm follow the exact same pathway except for a difference in the mode of oxygen therapy delivery following extubation. Patients receive SOT via nasal prongs or non-rebreathing masks (not humidified and not heated) as is currently practiced. Patients on SOT are started on 30–40% inspired oxygen at a flow of 2 to 6 L/min, monitored and assessed as recommended (17).

Within trial economic evaluation

The economic analysis is designed to inform decisions in the UK, AUS, and NZ. Given the difference between these health systems, the perspective most relevant to decision-making country will be chosen first for analysis. This includes the National Health Service (NHS) and Personal Social Services (PSS) perspective in the UK, the health care system (Medicare/Australian Government Department of Social Services, including costs accruing both in public and private hospitals) perspective in AUS and the health sector and individual perspective in NZ (20–22). A trial wide pooled cost-effectiveness results, if determined following analyses, will use a health and social care sector perspective. The time horizon for the analysis is 90 days post-surgery.

Data collection takes place at five main time points; baseline (surgery admission), randomisation (during or after surgery, prior to extubation), on day of discharge, and on days 30 (+30-day follow-up window) and 90 (+90-day follow-up window) following surgery. The first patient was recruited on 7/10/2020, the last patient recruited on 19/06/2024 and final follow-up is expected to be completed by 16/12/2024. Some data is also collected between time points, for example inpatient location and patient location diary

during follow-up. Data collection records patient outcomes, resources and services utilised from both the health/social care sector and patient/family perspective. Data collection tools were designed in the UK following inputs from the trial team, patients, their carers, and members of the public. The tools were adapted for use in AUS with advice from the trial team and patient public representatives and in NZ with advice from the trial team. The data collection tools use country specific questions or response categories where necessary and accounts for good practice and methods guidance (20,23).

Costing: identification, measurement, and valuation of resources

a) Identification of resource use

Resource use relates to setting up and delivery of HFNT (including the HFNT device, level of use, associated oxygen consumption, training, and maintenance) or SOT (oxygen flow rate, delivery using nasal mask or prong) and its consequences i.e. use of hospital, primary, community and social care until 90 days after surgery for both trial arms. Resource use from the individual/family perspective include expenses for medical, non-medical and social care support services, and time spent by patients and caregivers following randomisation. Table 1 provides a summary of all resources and services identified and collected alongside the trial. As an incremental approach is used in costing, resources common to both arms and those related to conducting the research are excluded.

b) Measurement of resource use

Health and social care resources are collected using a variety of patient-specific case report forms (CRFs). Some are completed by research nurses abstracting data from patient-specific records (e.g. oxygen therapy, in-patient location, discharge details), some through research nurses interviewing patients face-to-face or using online, telephone or paper questions as preferred (e.g. quality of life, costs over hospital

stay, service use and expenditure post-surgery). Participant location and medication diary following discharge is the only record directly filled in by the patients. Relevant resources used to provide the service but not limited to specific patients (for example, HFNT training, equipment and maintenance) are measured using research records if available. The source and level of resource use measurements taken are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Identification and measurement of costs

Resource Use	Resource Use		Source, level data collected					
Health & social care sector perspective								
HFNT	- HFNT device	- Unit cost	- Published/local sources					
intervention	- Training	- Number of	- Project records					
setup	- Maintenance	trainings	- Published/local sources					
		- Unit cost						
Initial admissio	Initial admission							
HFNT	- Amount of oxygen used	- FiO2, flow rate	- CRF, patient specific					
	- Consumables	- Duration	- Published manual					
SOT	- Amount of oxygen used	- Flow rate	- CRF, patient specific					
	- Consumables	- Duration	- Clinical expert opinion					
Other	- CPAP, mechanical	- Duration	- CRF, patient specific					
ventilation	ventilation, etc.							
support								

Inpatient	- Admission to wards, high	- Duration	- CRF, patient specific
admission, by	dependency unit,		
ward	intensive care unit, etc.		
Constitution	·		CDE validation (fig.
Complications	- Return to operation	- Frequency	- CRF, patient specific
after surgery	theatre after initial		
	surgery		
Medications	- All medications during	- Number of drugs	- CRF, patient specific
	admission		
Diagnostics	- Blood tests, x-ray, ECG, CT	- Number of tests	- CRF, patient specific
	scan, microbiology, etc.		
Health	- Physiotherapy,	- Number of visits	- CRF, patient specific
professional	occupational therapy,		
visits	social worker, etc.		
Transport -	- Travel to hospital	- Number of visits	- CRF, patient specific
Ambulance			
use			
Discharge to da	y 90 after initial surgery		
Transport -	- Travel to hospital	- Number of visits	- CRF, patient specific
Ambulance			
use			
Hospital	- Overnight admission to	- Number of visits	- CRF/GP records, patient
admission	hospital, nursing home		specific

pecific pecific
pecific
pecific
oecific
oecific
pecific
оесітіс
pecific
pecific
pecific
pecific

	- Visitor travel		
Miscellaneous	Miscellaneous - Food, drink,		- CRF, patient specific
	accommodation expense	cost	
Time lost to	- Main activity done by	- Time lost	- CRF, patient specific
illness	patient if not in surgery.		
	For example, paid work,		
	unpaid work, caring etc.		
Accompanying	- Main activity done by	- Time spent	- CRF, patient specific
person time	accompanying person if		
spent in caring	not caring		
Discharge to da	y 90 after initial surgery		I
Admission	- Contribution/payment for	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
	nursing home, residential	cost	
	care, etc.		
Diagnostics	- Contribution/payment for	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
	blood tests, x-ray, etc.	cost	
Social support	- Contribution/payment for	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
services	home help, night care,	cost	
	meals on wheels, etc.		
Medical	- Medical supplies: For	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
supplies and	example, prescriptions,	cost	
equipment	aspirin, compression		- CRF, patient specific
	socks, nebulizer, etc.		

	- Equipment: For example,	- Patient reported	
	walking aids, special	cost	
	bedding, etc.		
Transport	- Travel to hospital, GP	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
	surgery, etc.	travel time	
Home	- Adaptation made to	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
adaptation	home. For example, ramp,	cost	
	stair-lift, etc.		
Time lost to	- Care arrangements, time	- Patient reported	- CRF, patient specific
illness	off work, etc.	time	
Accompanying	- Main activity done by	- Time spent	- CRF, patient specific
person time	accompanying person if		
spent in caring	not caring		

(HFNT – High Flow Nasal Therapy, FiO2 - fraction of inspired oxygen, CRF – Case Report Form, SOT – Standard Oxygen therapy, CPAP - Continuous positive airway pressure, ECG - Electrocardiogram, CT-Scan - Computed Tomography Scan, GP - General practitioner)

The amount of oxygen used with HFNT and SOT forms a relevant differential resource between the trial arms and hence is costed. As the central oxygen supply is common to both HFNT and SOT, the analysis measures only the variation in amount of oxygen supplied either by HFNT or SOT at a patient-specific level. For SOT, the CRF records oxygen flow rate titration in L/min and duration of use to give total quantity of oxygen used. For HFNT, the CRF records FiO2 and the gas flow rate (L/min). Using an indicative chart, patient-specific data on FiO2 and gas flow rate will be used to determine amount of oxygen used by HFNT (24). Consumables (e.g., oxygen interface, tubing, nasal prong) will be quantified using patient-specific

duration of oxygen therapy along with available duration of use guidance given by manufacturer or using clinical expert opinion (25).

The changes to the data collection instruments in AUS and NZ included contextual country-specific questions, responses and wording revisions for resource use data collection. This mainly included replacing country-specific questions on ethnicity, education, healthcare concession and out-of-pocket payments for ambulance travel, health professional visit and telephone consultations in AUS and NZ. Additionally, during the trial, amendments were made to data collection tools to improve data completion. Further details on data collection amendments are available in supplementary Table S2 (S1 Appendix).

c) Valuation of resource use

All health and social sector resources will be valued using national costs (for example, national cost collection in the UK) for the latest available year (26–32). Any unit cost not in the corresponding year will be adjusted using a health- or country-specific inflation index (for example, NHS cost inflation index published in Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU) cost manual) (31,33–36). If national unit costs are unavailable, published literature or local cost sources will be used. Capital costs will be annualised using country-specific discounting recommendations (3.5% UK, 5% AUS, 3.5% NZ) or using the 3.5% UK recommendation for pooled results, further assessed in sensitivity analysis (20,21,37). For example, in base-case, the HFNT device will be annualised using an average lifespan of 5 years, 3.5% discount rate and an annualised maintenance cost using available sources. Patient reported expenses will be used to value patient perspective costs. Time 'spent' by patients and caregivers will be valued using the human capital approach based on gross national average wages (38–40). Unpaid work will be valued using wage earned for similar work on a paid basis or using national average earnings if unavailable.

d) Computation of total costs

Total cost will be computed at a patient level by summing the components contributing to the cost of intervention delivery, initial admission and up to 90 days post-surgery relevant to health/social care sector and patient/family perspectives. For example, in base-case, per patient cost of HFNT arm in UK will include NHS/PSS perspective costs for HFNT delivery, initial admission and service utilisation until end of follow-up respectively. Total costs will be obtained by multiplying the quantity of resource use by unit cost across each subcomponent and then summing across. Some costs (for example, HFNT device) are expected to be shared between patients. In such cases, annualization, life-span and apportioning rules (for example, number of patients using the device) will be used as appropriate.

Outcomes: Identification, measurement, and valuation of health outcomes

a) Identification of patient reported outcomes

Days alive and at home after surgery (DAH90), a validated patient-reported metric, is the primary outcome endpoint for NOTACS trial (41). DAH90/DAH30 define home as a person's usual abode at 90 (and 30) days post-surgery. Escalation of care or time away from usual abode during follow-up period will be counted as a day away from home as per defined protocol. DAH is sensitive to changes in surgical risk and is considered a superior measure of quality of surgery and care than standard complication and mortality rates (42,43). The CRF records changes in the participant's overnight living location throughout follow-up. It includes details on whether stay was planned and if support for daily living activities was needed. The DAH measure will be used in cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) as it was identified as the most important primary outcome by patient and public representatives during development of the proposal.

For cost-utility analysis (CUA), a standardised generic health related quality of life measure, the EQ-5D-5L, relevant to the UK, AUS, and NZ is used (20–22,44). The EQ-5D-5L consists of two parts; the first asks respondents to categorise their health today on five dimensions (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression) and five response levels (no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, unable to) for each dimension, and the second part asks respondents to rate perception of their own overall health today on a scale of 0 (worst) to 100 (best) imaginable health.

b) Measurement and valuation of patient reported outcomes.

DAH90 and DAH30 are collected using a mix of CRFs completed by patients and research nurses from date of index surgery to 90 days after surgery. Patients are given the location diary on discharge and have the option of completing follow-up questionnaires on paper, online or via telephone. Patients not completing follow-up CRFs at 30 and 90 days are contacted regularly up to 30+30 and 90+90 days as per trial protocol. Information may be gathered from the patient's general practitioner (GP) surgery in case of non-response or to verify patient responses as per consent.

DAH90/DAH30 valuation accounts for any increase in care level from patient's previous residence. For example, hospital readmission or additional care requirement at 'home' within 90 days of surgery is subtracted from the total number of days at home. Staying away from 'home' for social reasons without any additional care or support is considered as home. The protocol for what counts as days away from home is predefined and available in the update of the published statistical analysis plan (submitted and under review). The location is based on where a patient spends the night. Patient records reporting baseline or follow-up abode as 'Other' will be reviewed for whether the 'other' should be classed as 'home' and agreed on a case-by-case basis by at least two blinded members. An additional blinded

member will be consulted if consensus is not reached. If a patient living at home is discharged from the hospital on day 6 after surgery but is subsequently readmitted for 4 days and then returns home until 90 days post-surgery, they would be assigned 80 DAH90.

The base case statistical analysis for the trial follows the approach used by Myles et al., to count days at home i.e. when a patient dies - a DAH value of 0 occurs for the whole period (18,41). For example, if a patient dies while still in the hospital or at home before 90 days, they are assigned 0 DAH90. This means no value is attributed whether a person lives for 1 or 89 days within the study period and no change can be seen if survival changes over time. The trial is not designed to capture change in survival and one reasoning to accept such a scoring is that it takes a more conservative view of benefit. However, for the economic evaluation there are two problems in using this approach. First there is evidence that costs and outcomes can be related and higher costs are particularly related to proximity to death (45–47). Through an increase in outliers, and potential miscasting of the relationship between costs and effects, assigning a zero value to all people dying could significantly bias regression results for cost-effectiveness. Second the cost-utility analysis, part of the suite of tools in economic evaluation used to support NICE's decision-making, does account for all days lived. Therefore, the base-case cost-effectiveness analysis will be conducted using all recorded days at home and dubbed 'DAH90(HE)' to represent a difference with calculation of the main trial outcome DAH90, which will be used in sensitivity analysis, to allow comparison with the main trial analysis.

Responses recorded on the EQ-5D-5L tool will be converted into a health state utility score using UK, AUS and NZ specific value sets (48–50). As recommended in the UK, the EQ-5D-5L data will be mapped onto the 3L value set (48,51), with QALYs calculated using the area under curve method (52). The study design

offers patients a tolerance window of 90 days for 90-day follow-up (and 30+30 days) to complete data collection. Because utility values may be expected to rise over time post-surgery, sensitivity analysis will explore the impact of using linear interpolations to obtain utility values at 90 days (53).

Analysis

a) Handling missing data

Before commencing analysis, data quality checks will be conducted and any duplicates, missing or extreme values will be identified and documented. Any missing data will be cross-checked against the CRF and, where necessary, patient records reviewed for procedural error. Clear outliers, such as those exceeding 4 standard deviations, will be investigated further and may be excluded or treated as missing values. However, if a series of potential outliers appears within a skewed distribution, they may be retained. In such cases, the data may be transformed (e.g., logarithmic or square root transformation) if necessary and assessed in sensitivity analysis.

The pattern and amount of missing data at each time point will be summarised using frequency and percentage plots, with pattern of missingness for resource use and outcomes assessed using Pearson Chi2 goodness of fit and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests at each data collection point (54). If data are missing completely at random (MCAR) and the percentage of missing data is below 5%, a complete case analysis (CCA) will be undertaken. This is unlikely to be the case due to the need to aggregate resource use and costs across many variables. Data missing at random (MAR) will be addressed using multiple imputation (MI) methods. Missing cost and outcome data will be estimated using joint chained equations with predictive mean matching, stratified by treatment arm and country. We will explore censoring as a special

case of missing data, particularly right censoring from loss to follow-up to judge the impact on estimating mean values for costs, DAH90 and QALYs using an inverse probability weighting approach (54). Imputation models will be determined during analysis as it is important that the model includes variables that are good predictors of missing variables. We will consider variables such as age, sex, baseline Barthel and/or EQ-5D-5L scores, baseline health service use, BMI, ethnicity, number of co-morbidities, whether surgery is elective, Euro Score II, ASA, and ARISCAT score. The number of imputed datasets required to achieve a stable imputation will be used (55). The distribution of imputed and observed values will be compared across both trial arms. Rubin's rule will be used to generate a complete single data set for analysis, encompassing the variation and uncertainty preserved in the multiple imputed data sets (56). Sensitivity analysis will assess the impact of different missingness assumptions (56). Total costs, DAH90(HE), utility index score at day 90 and total QALYs with CCA, pre-imputed and imputed dataset will be presented for HFNT versus SOT comparison.

b) Statistical analysis of differences in resource use, costs, and outcomes for cost-effectiveness and cost-utility analyses

The intention-to-treat principle will be followed for base-case analyses. Resource use, costs and outcomes will be summarised by trial arm; a) at discharge, 30- and 90-days, and b) by country at 90-days using descriptive statistics (frequency, mean (standard deviation), median, minimum (including % of zeros), maximum, IQR, 95% confidence interval around the mean, histograms and box plots) along with tests of normality. Significant differences at 5% level, using raw and imputed data, will be tested using two-sample t-tests of equality for normally distributed variables, and the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test and bootstrapped t-tests if skewed. This analysis will be repeated for a complete case analysis if feasible. Changes in the EQ-5D-5L health profile will be summarised using the Paretian Classification of Health

Change and by reporting the ten most frequently observed health states at baseline and day 90 for both trial arms (57). A Health Profile Grid will be developed for visual representation (57).

Regression models will be fitted for mean costs and QALYs, with and without imputed values. Models will include intervention arm and variables to adjust for baseline patient characteristics (age, sex, Barthel, EQ-5D score, health service use, BMI, ethnicity, number of co-morbidities and whether surgery is elective, Euro Score II risk score, ASA and ARISCAT score). We will however be unable to control for baseline differences such as patient/family borne costs. We will examine data prior to selecting a regression model but will consider generalised linear or mixed models given their ability to handle large numbers of zeros and will test log-link and more flexible forms to examine goodness of fit. We will assess the relationship between baseline covariates for collinearity in the decision for covariate inclusion in the final model. We will also examine the impact of accounting for the correlation between costs and QALYs, by using seemingly unrelated regression analysis with and without correcting for confounding at baseline (58).

The difference in costs between the trial arms will be divided by the difference in outcomes between the trial arms, to give incremental cost-effectiveness/utility ratios. Incremental cost-utility ratios (ICURs) will be compared with country-specific costs-effectiveness thresholds (CET) used in the UK (£20,000/QALY), AUS (AU\$ 28,033/QALY) and NZ (NZ\$ 40,000/QALY) (20,45,46). Fully pooled results will be reported in the UK currency (country-specific unit cost applied to resource use followed by summing of all costs to UK currency using purchasing power parity (PPP)) and assessed against the CET value for UK. Country-specific incremental net monetary benefit (NMB) statistics, (INMB = incremental benefit * CET – incremental cost) will be presented with 95% CI limits. As no CETs are available for DAH outcome, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) will be used to support wider decision making for any clearly dominant or

dominated strategies. We will follow the recommended framework to present cost-effectiveness and cost-utility estimates for this multinational trial (61,62) and present following; a) country-specific ICUR estimates using country-specific data on cost and QALY respectively b) country-specific ICUR estimates using trial-wide resource use valued against country-specific unit costs and trial-wide EQ-5D responses valued against domain level EQ-5D value set for chosen country) and, depending on evidence of heterogeneity, c) pooled trial-wide ICUR estimate by applying country-specific unit costs to resource use followed by summing costs to the common UK currency using PPP and summing country-specific QALYs using country-specific value sets into a pooled QALY value. The Likelihood ratio test and range test of qualitative interaction will be used to examine if the direction of cost-effectiveness varies between the countries (63,64). The likelihood ratio and standardised range test statistic will be compared against respective critical values at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ for the three groups to indicate heterogeneity (63,65). We will explore the use of shrinkage estimates as an alternative to trial-wide pooling of cost-effectiveness results (66). Table 2 provides the methods and perspective considered in presenting the range of cost-effectiveness results.

Table 2. Methods and perspective for presenting the cost-effectiveness results for multinational NOTACS trial.

Analy	Primary	Method	Secondary	Method			
sis	(perspective)		(perspective)				
a)	a) Country specific						
UK	NHS and PSS	Only UK specific data	NHS and PSS	Only UK specific data			

			+ Individual (OOPE)	
			+ value of time use	
AUS	Health care system	Only AUS specific data	Health care system	Only AUS specific data
	(includes		(includes public/private)	
	public/private)		+ value of time use	
NZ	Health sector	Only NZ specific data	Health sector	Only NZ specific data
	+ Individual (OOPE)		+ Individual (OOPE)	
			+ value of time use	
b)	Country specific - tria	l pooled		
UK	NHS and PSS	Resource use – UK, AUS,	NHS and PSS	Resource use – UK, AUS,
		NZ combined	+ Individual (OOPE)	NZ combined
		Unit costs – UK	+ value of time use	Unit costs – UK
		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ
		combined and valued		combined and valued
		using UK tariff		using UK tariff
AUS	Health care system	Resource use – UK, AUS,	Health care system	Resource use – UK, AUS,
	(includes	NZ combined	(includes public/private)	NZ combined
	public/private)	Unit costs – AUS	+ value of time use	Unit costs – AUS

		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ
		combined and valued		combined and valued
		using AUS tariff		using AUS tariff
NZ	Health sector	Resource use – UK, AUS,	Health sector	Resource use – UK, AUS,
	+ Individual (OOPE)	NZ combined	+ Individual (OOPE)	NZ combined
		Unit costs – NZ	+ value of time use	Unit costs – NZ
		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ
		combined and valued		combined and valued
		using NZ tariff		using NZ tariff
(c)	Fully pooled			
Trial	Health and social care	Resource use – UK, AUS,	Health and social care	Resource use – UK, AUS,
	sector	NZ	+ Individual (OOPE)	NZ
		Unit costs – UK, AUS, NZ	+ value of time use	Unit costs – UK, AUS, NZ
		Total cost – UK, AUS, NZ		Total cost – UK, AUS, NZ
		combined to UK		combined to UK
		currency using PPP		currency using PPP
		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ		Outcomes – UK, AUS, NZ
		tariffs used on		tariffs used on
		respective data for single		respective data for single
		combined QALY measure		combined QALY measure

372

373

374

375376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

(PPP – Purchasing power parity, NHS and PSS – National Health Services and Personal and Social Services, OOPE – Out-of-pocket expenditure, AUS - Australia, NZ - New Zealand, UK - United Kingdom) c) Handling uncertainty Parameter uncertainty will be handled using one-way sensitivity analysis (OWSA) and scenario analysis to assess the impact of following changes: i) Costs HFNT intervention setup costs, including assumptions about length of life, device use and price. Oxygen therapy cost, any variation in oxygen consumption calculation. Any significant assumption in measurement or valuation methods for costs, including outliers (for example, methods for follow-up/intravenous medication data collection, discount rate, etc). Cost at 30 days. Perspective (impact of including patient/family costs) ii) Outcomes DAH90 to assess the impact of assigning a DAH value of zero for those dying between zero to 90 days post-surgery. Using linear interpolate and 90+90th day value as a proxy for 90th day utility value in QALY calculation. Outcomes at 30 days.

Sampling uncertainty will be characterised using 95% CI limits for ICUR/ICER values based on non-parametric bootstrapping along with cost-effectiveness plane (CEP) and cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEAC) to inform decisions (20).

Heterogeneity will be assessed using sub-group analysis to improve robustness of our findings. The potential subgroups to be explored are:

- Patients requiring escalation of oxygen therapy.
- Time on treatment (at least 8 or 24 hours)

Discussion

The NOTACS trial is the first international evidence comparing HFNT versus SOT in adult patients at high risk of developing PPC undergoing cardiac surgery. The trial addresses clinical and economic evidence gaps regarding the use of HFNT (10,11). A recent pilot study in this same population subgroup saw a reduction in length of hospital stay by 29% and re-admission to ICU dropped from 14% to 2% with HFNT compared to SOT (67). HFNT can potentially lead to significant cost-savings and offer good value for investment. The NOTACS trial aims to inform policy recommendations in the UK, AUS, and NZ.

Strengths

This study has several strengths. First, this is the first study to measure and account for the cost of oxygen therapy with HFNT or SOT following cardiac surgery using prospective, patient-level data. Second, the analysis takes a multinational approach, incorporating methods and guidance relevant to decision-making in three diverse healthcare systems. Our analysis aims at maximising the balance between using available data from the trial with the perspective and methods most relevant to each country. Third, data collection

was influenced by inputs from patients and the public, is country-specific, and records both patient and family costs, and time loss at a patient-level. This yields a potentially valuable source of evidence for broader understanding of the economic implications of HFNT intervention. Fourth, the range of estimates planned for, along with a wide range of sensitivity analyses will give a good indication of the robustness of findings. Finally, the findings can indicate resource utilisation patterns and health benefits in other subpopulations (e.g. following abdominal surgery) where HFNT can be used.

Limitations

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424 425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

There are limitations to the planned analyses. Firstly, in presenting the pooled cost-effectiveness results. the study adopts a health and social care sector perspective. This includes the costs of community-based services and home or continuing care, as recommended in the UK, AUS and NZ (20,68,69). However, this pooled analysis will not include patient perspective costs, which form an important consideration in AUS and NZ. This exclusion may limit the applicability of the pooled trial wide results to these countries. The decision on perspective for pooled analysis was made because the trial was initially designed for, and predominantly recruits from the UK. The analysis however does account for patient perspective costs across all three countries and the cost-utility findings are presented ranging from country-specific to pooled trial wide results, presenting relevant economic evidence for decisions. Secondly, the costeffectiveness analysis findings using DAH outcome measure relies on participation diaries completed by patients to record any changes in location. Despite efforts to follow-up with patients' GP practice for incomplete records, there still may be instances where this information is unavailable, potentially influencing the cost-effectiveness findings. Thirdly, the analysis focuses on the cost-effectiveness of HFNT for patients included in controlled trial settings which may differ from the broader population or more real-world clinical settings. Finally, results are limited to 90 days of follow up and cost-effectiveness over a longer period may differ.

Ethics and dissemination:

The study received ethics approval in the United Kingdom from Yorkshire & The Humber- Leeds West Research Ethics Committee, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK on 2nd April 2020 (REC ref: 20/YH/0133). In Australia, the approval was obtained from South Metropolitan Health Service Human Research Ethics Committee, MURDOCH, Western Australia on 3rd September 2021 (ref: RGS0000004935) and 19th May 2022 (Ref: RGS0000005326), from St John of God Health Care Human Research Ethics Committee (ref: 1870) on 13th October 2021, and West Australian Aboriginal Health Ethics Committee (ref: HREC1146) on 29th April 2022. In New Zealand, the approval was obtained from Health and Disability Ethics Committees, Wellington, New Zealand on 12 October 2021 (ref: 21/STH/213). Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants. The results will be published in peer reviewed journals and presented at scientific conferences to inform stakeholders. Study newsletters and lay summaries on webpages will be used to disseminate the findings to patients.

Acknowledgements

- We wish to thank all patients, family members, and staff members from all the participating sites for
- 457 their involvement in this study.

References:

1. NICOR | Adult Cardiac Surgery (Surgery Audit) [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 13]. Available from: https://www.nicor.org.uk/adult-cardiac-surgery-surgery-audit/

463 2. About The Database | ANZSCTS [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 13]. Available from: https://anzscts.org/database/about/

3. Ball L, Costantino F, Pelosi P. Postoperative complications of patients undergoing cardiac surgery.

Curr Opin Crit Care [Internet]. 2016 Aug 1 [cited 2023 Dec 13];22(4):386–92. Available from:

467 https://journals.lww.com/co-

- 468 criticalcare/fulltext/2016/08000/postoperative_complications_of_patients_undergoing.18.aspx
- 4. Snowdon D, Haines TP, Skinner EH. Preoperative intervention reduces postoperative pulmonary complications but not length of stay in cardiac surgical patients: a systematic review. J

 471 Physiother. 2014 Jun 1;60(2):66–77.
- Westerlind A, Nilsson F, Ricksten SE. The use of continuous positive airway pressure by face mask and thoracic epidural analgesia after lung transplantation. Gothenburg Lung Transplant Group. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth [Internet]. 1999 [cited 2022 May 4];13(3):249–52. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10392672/
- Gümüş F, Polat A, Yektaş A, Erentuğ V, Alagöl A. Readmission To Intensive Care Unit After
 Coronary Bypass Operations in the Short Term. Turk J Anaesthesiol Reanim [Internet]. 2014 [cited
 2022 May 4];42(4):162. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4894143/
- Bardell T, Legare JF, Buth KJ, Hirsch GM, Ali IS. ICU readmission after cardiac surgery. European
 Journal of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery [Internet]. 2003 Mar 1 [cited 2023 Dec 13];23(3):354–9.
 Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1010-7940(02)00767-4
- 482 8. Jabbari A, Alijanpour E, Tabasi S. Clinical Usage of High-flow Oxygenation in Postcardiac Surgery
 483 Patients. Ann Card Anaesth [Internet]. 2019 Jan 1 [cited 2023 Dec 13];22(1):107. Available from:
 484 /pmc/articles/PMC6350429/
- 485 9. Maggiore SM, Battilana M, Serano L, Petrini F. Ventilatory support after extubation in critically ill patients. Lancet Respir Med. 2018 Dec 1;6(12):948–62.
- 10. Lu Z, Chang W, Meng S, Xue M, Xie J, Xu J, et al. The Effect of High-Flow Nasal Oxygen Therapy on Postoperative Pulmonary Complications and Hospital Length of Stay in Postoperative Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Intensive Care Med [Internet]. 2020 Oct 1 [cited 2022 Sep 4];35(10):1129–40. Available from:
- 491 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0885066618817718
- 492 11. Wu X, Cao W, Zhang B, Wang S. Effect of high-flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy vs conventional
 493 oxygen therapy on adult postcardiothoracic operation: A meta-analysis. Medicine [Internet].
 494 2018 Oct 1 [cited 2022 Sep 4];97(41). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6203525/
- Eaton Turner E, Jenks M. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the use of high-flow oxygen through nasal cannula in intensive care units in NHS England. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res
 [Internet]. 2017 Dec 5 [cited 2022 Sep 5];18(3):331–7. Available from:
 https://europepmc.org/article/med/29187008
- 499 13. Groessl EJ, Tally SR, Hillery N. Cost-Effectiveness of Humidified High-Flow Therapy (HHFT) for
 500 COPD Patients on Long-Term Oxygen Therapy. ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research

501 [Internet]. 2023 Apr 5 [cited 2023 Jun 29];15:239–50. Available from: 502 https://www.dovepress.com/cost-effectiveness-of-humidified-high-flow-therapy-hhft-for-copd-503 patie-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-CEOR 504 14. Sørensen SS, Storgaard LH, Weinreich UM. Cost-Effectiveness of Domiciliary High Flow Nasal 505 Cannula Treatment in COPD Patients with Chronic Respiratory Failure. Clinicoecon Outcomes Res [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 5];13:553–64. Available from: 506 507 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34168472/ 508 15. Fleeman N, Mahon J, Bates V, Dickson R, Dundar Y, Dwan K, et al. The clinical effectiveness and 509 cost-effectiveness of heated humidified high-flow nasal cannula compared with usual care for 510 preterm infants: systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technol Assess (Rockv). 2016 Apr 25;20(30):1-68. 511 512 16. Buendía JA, Acuña-Cordero R, Rodriguez-Martinez CE. The cost-utility of early use of high-flow 513 nasal cannula in bronchiolitis. Health Econ Rev [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Oct 514 29];11(1):1-8. Available from: 515 https://healtheconomicsreview.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13561-021-00339-7 516 17. Earwaker M, Villar S, Fox-Rushby J, Duckworth M, Dawson S, Steele J, et al. Effect of high-flow 517 nasal therapy on patient-centred outcomes in patients at high risk of postoperative pulmonary complications after cardiac surgery: a study protocol for a multicentre adaptive randomised 518 519 controlled trial. Trials [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Dec 14];23(1):1–18. Available from: 520 https://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-022-06180-5 521 18. Dawson SN, Chiu Y Da, Klein AA, Earwaker M, Villar SS. Effect of high-flow nasal therapy on patient-centred outcomes in patients at high risk of postoperative pulmonary complications after 522 cardiac surgery: a statistical analysis plan for NOTACS, a multicentre adaptive randomised 523 controlled trial. Trials [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Dec 14];23(1):1-8. Available from: 524 525 https://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-022-06607-z 526 Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gøtzsche PC, Krleža-Jerić K, et al. SPIRIT 2013 19. 527 statement: Defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern Med [Internet]. 2013 528 Feb 5 [cited 2024 Sep 18];158(3):200-7. Available from: www.annals.org 529 20. 4 Economic evaluation | NICE health technology evaluations: the manual | Guidance | NICE. 530 PBAC Guidelines | 3A.1 Overview and rationale of the economic evaluation [Internet]. [cited 21. 531 2023 Dec 15]. Available from: https://pbac.pbs.gov.au/section-3a/3a-1-overview-and-rationale-532 of-economic-evaluation.html 533 22. Economic analysis - Pharmac | New Zealand Government [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 15]. Available from: https://pharmac.govt.nz/medicine-funding-and-supply/the-funding-534 535 process/policies-manuals-and-processes/economic-analysis 536 23. Ramsey SD, Willke RJ, Glick H, Reed SD, Augustovski F, Jonsson B, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Alongside Clinical Trials II—An ISPOR Good Research Practices Task Force Report. Value 537 in Health [Internet]. 2015 Mar 1 [cited 2023 Dec 21];18(2):161–72. Available from: 538 http://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098301515000169/fulltext 539

540 24. AIRVO 2 High--Flow Standard Operating Procedure Paediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) Royal 541 Hospital for Children Glasgow. 542 25. Airvo[™] 2 Nasal High Flow/HFNC System [2 - 60 L/min] | Fisher & Paykel Healthcare [Internet]. 543 [cited 2023 Dec 15]. Available from: https://www.fphcare.com/en-gb/hospital/adultrespiratory/optiflow/airvo-2-system/ 544 545 26. NHS England » National Cost Collection for the NHS [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 3]. Available from: 546 https://www.england.nhs.uk/costing-in-the-nhs/national-cost-collection/ Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) | Home [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 28]. Available from: 547 27. 548 https://www.pbs.gov.au/pbs/home 549 28. National Hospital Cost Data Collection | IHACPA [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 28]. Available from: 550 https://www.ihacpa.gov.au/health-care/costing/national-hospital-cost-data-collection 551 Cost Resource Manual - Pharmac | Te Pātaka Whaioranga | NZ Government [Internet]. [cited 29. 552 2024 Jun 28]. Available from: https://pharmac.govt.nz/medicine-funding-and-supply/the-553 funding-process/policies-manuals-and-processes/economic-analysis/cost-resource-manual 554 30. Average weekly earnings in Great Britain - Office for National Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 555 28]. Available from: 556 https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemploye 557 etypes/bulletins/averageweeklyearningsingreatbritain/april2024 558 Unit Costs of Health and Social Care programme (2022 – 2027) | The new home for the Unit 31. Costs of Health and Social Care report [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 17]. Available from: 559 560 https://www.pssru.ac.uk/unitcostsreport/ 561 32. MBS Online - MBS Online [Internet]. [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: 562 https://www.mbsonline.gov.au/ 563 33. nhs cost inflation index - Google Search [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 29]. Available from: 564 https://www.google.com/search?q=nhs+cost+inflation+index&rlz=1C1GCEV enGB992GB993&oq 565 =NHS+cost+inflation+&ags=chrome.0.0i512l2j69i57j0i512j0i390.3778j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie= 566 UTF-8 567 34. Appendix A: Use of GDP deflator - NHS Digital [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 29]. Available from: 568 https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/adult-social-care-activity-569 and-finance-report/2020-21/appendix-a 570 35. Consumers price index (CPI) | Stats NZ [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 28]. Available from: 571 https://www.stats.govt.nz/indicators/consumers-price-index-cpi/ 572 36. Consumer Price Index, Australia, March Quarter 2024 | Australian Bureau of Statistics [Internet]. 573 [cited 2024 Jun 28]. Available from: https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/economy/price-indexes-574 and-inflation/consumer-price-index-australia/latest-release

8 Discounting - Pharmac | New Zealand Government [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 24]. Available

from: https://pharmac.govt.nz/medicine-funding-and-supply/the-funding-process/policies-

37.

575

576

30

577 manuals-and-processes/economic-analysis/prescription-for-pharmacoeconomic-analysis-578 methods-for-cost-utility-analysis/8-discounting/ 579 38. Home - Office for National Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 23]. Available from: 580 https://www.ons.gov.uk/ 581 39. Australian Bureau of Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 23]. Available from: 582 https://www.abs.gov.au/ Home | Stats NZ [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 23]. Available from: https://www.stats.govt.nz/ 583 40. 584 Myles PS, Shulman MA, Heritier S, Wallace S, McIlroy DR, McCluskey S, et al. Validation of days at 41. 585 home as an outcome measure after surgery: a prospective cohort study in Australia. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2017 Aug 1 [cited 2023 Jul 1];7(8). Available from: 586 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28821518/ 587 588 42. Bell M, Eriksson LI, Svensson T, Hallqvist L, Granath F, Reilly J, et al. Days at Home after Surgery: 589 An Integrated and Efficient Outcome Measure for Clinical Trials and Quality Assurance. 590 EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2019 May 1 [cited 2023 Jul 1];11:18-26. Available from: 591 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31317130/ 592 43. Snowden C, Swart M. Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine GIRFT Programme National 593 Specialty Report. 2021; 594 44. FAQs – EQ-5D [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 16]. Available from: https://euroqol.org/eq-5d-595 instruments/eq-5d-5l-about/faqs/ O'Hagan A, Stevens JW. A framework for cost-effectiveness analysis from clinical trial data. 596 45. 597 Health Econ [Internet]. 2001 Jun 1 [cited 2024 Jul 19];10(4):303-15. Available from: 598 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hec.617 599 46. Howdon D, Rice N. Health care expenditures, age, proximity to death and morbidity: Implications 600 for an ageing population. J Health Econ. 2018 Jan 1;57:60-74. 601 47. Hazra NC, Rudisill C, Gulliford MC. Determinants of health care costs in the senior elderly: age, 602 comorbidity, impairment, or proximity to death? European Journal of Health Economics 603 [Internet]. 2018 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Jul 19];19(6):831–42. Available from: 604 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10198-017-0926-2 605 Van Hout B, Janssen MF, Feng YS, Kohlmann T, Busschbach J, Golicki D, et al. Interim scoring for 48. 606 the EQ-5D-5L: Mapping the EQ-5D-5L to EQ-5D-3L value sets. Value in Health [Internet]. 2012 Jul 607 1 [cited 2022 Oct 29];15(5):708–15. Available from: 608 http://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098301512000587/fulltext 609 49. Norman R, Mulhern B, Lancsar E, Lorgelly P, Ratcliffe J, Street D, et al. The Use of a Discrete Choice Experiment Including Both Duration and Dead for the Development of an EQ-5D-5L Value 610 Set for Australia. Pharmacoeconomics [Internet]. 2023 Apr 1 [cited 2023 Aug 23];41(4):427–38. 611 Available from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40273-023-01243-0 612

50. Sullivan T, Hansen P, Ombler F, Derrett S, Devlin N. A new tool for creating personal and social EQ-5D-5L value sets, including valuing 'dead.' Soc Sci Med. 2020 Feb 1;246:112707.

- 615 51. Position statement on use of the EQ-5D-5L value set for England (updated October 2019) |
- Technology appraisal guidance | NICE guidance | Our programmes | What we do | About | NICE.
- [cited 2022 Oct 29]; Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-
- programmes/nice-guidance/technology-appraisal-guidance/eq-5d-5l
- 619 52. Whitehead SJ, Ali S. Health outcomes in economic evaluation: the QALY and utilities. Br Med Bull
- 620 [Internet]. 2010 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Jun 18];96(1):5–21. Available from:
- 621 https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldq033
- 53. Linear interpolation Wikipedia [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 18]. Available from:
- 623 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linear_interpolation#Linear_interpolation_between_two_known_
- 624 points
- 54. Faria R, Gomes M, Epstein D, White IR. A Guide to Handling Missing Data in Cost-Effectiveness
- Analysis Conducted Within Randomised Controlled Trials. Pharmacoeconomics [Internet]. 2014
- 627 Nov 26 [cited 2023 Jul 2];32(12):1157–70. Available from:
- 628 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40273-014-0193-3
- 629 55. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and
- guidance for practice. Stat Med [Internet]. 2011 Feb 20 [cited 2023 Jul 2];30(4):377–99. Available
- from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21225900/
- 632 56. Leurent B, Gomes M, Cro S, Wiles N, Carpenter JR. Reference-based multiple imputation for
- 633 missing data sensitivity analyses in trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis. Health Econ [Internet].
- 634 2020 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Jul 19];29(2):171–84. Available from:
- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hec.3963
- 636 57. Devlin N, Parkin D, Janssen B. Methods for Analysing and Reporting EQ-5D Data. Methods for
- Analysing and Reporting EQ-5D Data. 2020;
- 638 58. Willan AR, Lin DY, Manca A. Regression methods for cost-effectiveness analysis with censored
- data. Stat Med [Internet]. 2005 Jan 15 [cited 2023 Jul 3];24(1):131–45. Available from:
- https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15515137/
- 641 59. Edney LC, Haji Ali Afzali H, Cheng TC, Karnon J. Estimating the Reference Incremental Cost-
- 642 Effectiveness Ratio for the Australian Health System. Pharmacoeconomics [Internet]. 2018 Feb 1
- 643 [cited 2023 Aug 23];36(2):239–52. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29273843/
- 644 60. Kvizhinadze G, Wilson N, Nair N, McLeod M, Blakely T. How much might a society spend on life-
- saving interventions at different ages while remaining cost-effective? A case study in a country
- with detailed data. Popul Health Metr [Internet]. 2015 Jul 8 [cited 2023 Aug 23];13(1):1–5.
- 647 Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4493819/
- 61. Drummond M, Barbieri M, Cook J, Glick HA, Lis J, Malik F, et al. Transferability of Economic
- 649 Evaluations Across Jurisdictions: ISPOR Good Research Practices Task Force Report. Value in
- 650 Health. 2009 Jun 1;12(4):409–18.

651 62. Manca A, Willan AR. "Lost in translation": Accounting for between-country differences in the 652 analysis of multinational cost-effectiveness data. Pharmacoeconomics [Internet]. 2006 Nov 25 653 [cited 2023 Jun 26];24(11):1101–19. Available from: 654 https://link.springer.com/article/10.2165/00019053-200624110-00007 63. Gail M, Simon R. Testing for Qualitative Interactions between Treatment Effects and Patient 655 Subsets. Biometrics. 1985 Jun;41(2):361. 656 657 64. Cook JR, Drummond M, Glick H, Heyse JF. Assessing the appropriateness of combining economic 658 data from multinational clinical trials. Stat Med. 2003 Jun 30;22(12):1955–76. 659 65. Piantadosi S, Gail MH. A comparison of the power of two tests for qualitative interactions. Stat Med [Internet]. 1993 Jan 1 [cited 2023 Jul 3];12(13):1239-48. Available from: 660 661 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.4780121305 662 66. Manca A, Lambert PC, Sculpher M, Rice N. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Using Data from 663 Multinational Trials: The Use of Bivariate Hierarchical Modeling. 664 http://dx.doi.org/101177/0272989X07302132 [Internet]. 2007 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Aug 665 14];27(4):471-90. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X07302132 666 667 67. Zochios V, Collier T, Blaudszun G, Butchart A, Earwaker M, Jones N, et al. The effect of high-flow 668 nasal oxygen on hospital length of stay in cardiac surgical patients at high risk for respiratory complications: a randomised controlled trial. Anaesthesia [Internet]. 2018 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Oct 669 670 3];73(12):1478-88. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30019747/ 671 68. Prescription for Pharmacoeconomic Analysis - Pharmac | New Zealand Government [Internet]. 672 [cited 2024 May 25]. Available from: https://pharmac.govt.nz/medicine-funding-and-supply/thefunding-process/policies-manuals-and-processes/economic-analysis/prescription-for-673 674 pharmacoeconomic-analysis-methods-for-cost-utility-analysis 675 69. PBAC Guidelines | Section 3A Cost-effectiveness analysis [Internet]. [cited 2024 May 25]. Available from: https://pbac.pbs.gov.au/section-3a-cost-effectiveness-analysis.html 676 677

Supporting information

679 **S1 file. S1 Appendix**

678

680 **S2 file. S2 Appendix**

	Study Period					
	Enrolment Allocation Post-allocation		location	Close-out		
	Screening	Baseline	Randomization	Discharge	30 Days (+30 days) post-op	90 Days (+90 days) post-op
Timepoint**	Prior to Surgical Admission (or after admission if in-house urgent)	Surgery Admissio n	During or After surgery & prior to extubation	Day of Discharge	30 days (+30 days) post-op	90 days (+90 days) post-op
<u>Enrolment</u>						
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	Х					
Informed Consent		Х				
Demographics		Х				
Past Medical History		Х				
EuroSCORE II & ARISCAT RighdRAvpenia compente i.org/10.1101 preprint (which was not certified by peer revi	1/2024.09.29.24314569; this version postriew) is the author/funder, who has grante	X ed September 30, 2024. The medRxiv a license to dis	he copyright holder for this splay the preprint in perpetuity.			
1 . 1	nade available under a CC-BY 4.0 Internati		P(A) 4.0 P(-)-1.0.		-	-
Initiation of high flow nasal therapy			х			
Initiation of standard oxygen therapy			х			
<u>Assessments</u>						
EQ-5D-5L & Barthel Questionnaires		X		X	X	X
Participant & Family Resource Use Questionnaires		х		х	х	х
Adverse & Serious Adverse Events Assessed (from the point of extubation			X			X
Inpatient Medication Log (to start from the point of extubation)			X	Х		
Inpatient Location Log (to start from the point of extubation)			Х	Х		
Inpatient Oxygen Therapy Log (to start from the point of extubation)			X	Х		
Participant Location and Medication Diary				X		Х
ROX Index			X	Х		
Record of Respiratory Support Escalation			X	Х		
Record of Post-operative Complications			X	Х		
Record of Intensive care Length of stay and Re- admissions				X		
Record of Hospital Discharge Destination				х		
Record of Hospital Length of Stay				Х		
Figure 1						