



**Universiteit  
Leiden**  
The Netherlands

**Cost-utility of an internet-based intervention with or without therapist support in comparison with a waiting list for individuals with eating disorder symptoms: a randomized controlled trial**

Aardoom, J.J.; Dingemans, A.E.; Ginkel, J.R. van; Spinhoven, P.; Furth, E.F. van; Van den Akker-van Marle M.E.

**Citation**

Aardoom, J. J., Dingemans, A. E., Ginkel, J. R. van, Spinhoven, P., & Furth, E. F. van. (2016). Cost-utility of an internet-based intervention with or without therapist support in comparison with a waiting list for individuals with eating disorder symptoms: a randomized controlled trial. *International Journal Of Eating Disorders*, 49(12), 1068-1076. doi:10.1002/eat.22587

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3762520>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# Cost-Utility of an Internet-Based Intervention with or without Therapist Support in Comparison with a Waiting List for Individuals with Eating Disorder Symptoms: A Randomized Controlled Trial

J.J. Aardoom, MSc<sup>1\*</sup>  
 A.E. Dingemans, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
 J.R. van Ginkel, PhD<sup>2</sup>  
 P. Spinhoven, PhD<sup>3,4</sup>  
 E.F. Van Furth, PhD<sup>1,4</sup>  
 M.E. Van den Akker-van  
 Marle, PhD<sup>5</sup>

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To investigate the cost-utility of the internet-based intervention “Featback” provided with different levels of therapist support, in comparison to a waiting list.

**Method:** This economic evaluation was conducted from a societal perspective and was part of a randomized controlled trial in which participants ( $N = 354$ ) with self-reported ED symptoms were randomized to: (1) 8 weeks of Featback, consisting of psychoeducation and a fully automated monitoring- and feedback system, (2) Featback with low-intensity (weekly) therapist support, (3) Featback with high-intensity (three times a week) therapist support, and (4) a waiting list. Participants were assessed at baseline, postintervention, and 3-month follow-up. Cost-utility acceptability curves were constructed.

**Results:** No significant differences between the study conditions were found regarding quality-adjusted life-years ( $P = 0.55$ ) and societal costs ( $P = 0.45$ ), although the mean costs per participant were lowest in the Featback condition with low-intensity therapist support

(€1951), followed by Featback with high-intensity therapist support (€2032), Featback without therapist support (€2102), and the waiting list (€2582). Featback seemed to be cost-effective as compared to the waiting list. No clear preference was found for Featback with or without therapist support.

**Discussion:** A fully automated Internet-based intervention for ED symptoms with no, low-, or high-intensity therapist support represented good value for money when compared to a waiting list. This finding may have important implications for clinical practice, as both the unguided- and guided intervention could allow for more efficient care and widespread dissemination, potentially increasing the accessibility and availability of mental health care services for individuals with ED symptoms. © 2016 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

**Keywords:** eating disorders; E-health; Internet-based intervention; therapist support; cost-utility; quality of life; economic evaluation; randomized controlled trial

(*Int J Eat Disord* 2016; 49:1068–1076)

## Introduction

Eating disorder (ED) course and outcome vary depending on the type and severity of the ED, but, in general, can be regarded as rather unsatisfactory.

In terms of anorexia nervosa (AN) and bulimia nervosa (BN), approximately half of the patients show full recovery, whereas 30% show improvement and 20% display a chronic course.<sup>1–3</sup> Remission rates for binge ED seem to be more favorable than AN and BN, with most estimates varying between 55% and 80%.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, ED often cooccur with other psychiatric illnesses<sup>4</sup> and mortality rates are relatively high.<sup>5,6</sup>

The economic burden of ED is substantial. The societal costs of ED can be divided into healthcare costs, including pharmaceutical and healthcare utilization costs, as well as nonhealthcare costs, including costs related to absences due to illness or losses in productivity at work.<sup>7,8</sup> Numerous studies<sup>9–13</sup> have estimated the direct costs for patients with an ED, including healthcare costs and

Accepted 28 June 2016

\*Correspondence to: J.J. Aardoom; E-mail:

J.Aardoom@rivierduinen.nl

<sup>1</sup> Rivierduinen Eating Disorders Ursula, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup> Department of Medical Decision Making, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Published online 21 July 2016 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/eat.22587

© 2016 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

nonmedical costs such as transportation and social services. These costs varied substantially between the different studies and ED subtypes. The annual direct costs per patient with an ED were found to range from 127 USD to 8042 USD.<sup>7</sup> To our knowledge, only two studies have investigated the indirect costs, being costs related to productivity losses due to illness related absence, reduced productivity, and premature death. Krauth et al.<sup>11</sup> estimated the annual indirect costs for patients with AN at 4445 USD and for BN at 1528 USD, whereas another study<sup>14</sup> estimated the mean 3-month indirect costs of patients with AN to be €2492.

Health economic evaluations can inform decision making regarding how to optimally allocate (scarce) health care resources. Unfortunately, economic analyses in the field of ED are scarce. A review by Stuhldreher et al.<sup>7</sup> identified only two studies that met inclusion criteria, which were that costs and effects of at least two treatments were compared, and that costs beyond those of the intervention being studied were included. One study<sup>15</sup> found that treatment as usual (i.e., help from a primary care provider or nutritionist, or self-referral to a specialty mental health organization), supplemented with a guided self-help intervention based on cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) principles, was more effective and less costly than treatment as usual alone in patients with recurrent binge eating episodes. Another study<sup>16</sup> investigated the cost-effectiveness of specialist outpatient treatment (i.e., manualized individual CBT, parental counseling with the individual, dietary therapy, and multimodal feedback) in comparison with inpatient treatment (i.e., multidisciplinary psychiatric approach with the aim of normalizing eating, restoring healthy weight, and facilitating psychological change) and treatment as usual (i.e., a multidisciplinary, individual- and family-based approach, including care from dietitians and pediatricians) for adolescents with AN. Specialist outpatient treatment was found to dominate the other two treatments. Most recently, Crow et al.<sup>17</sup> compared CBT to a stepped-care intervention for individuals with BN. Within the stepped-care intervention individuals could move from less intensive and expensive self-help, to the use of medication, and finally to high-intensity CBT consisting of eighteen 50-min sessions over the course of four months. This stepped-care intervention appeared cost-effective in comparison to directly starting with high-intensity CBT.

Until now, no economic evaluations have been conducted regarding E-health interventions for ED. In the field of mental health in general, Donker

et al.<sup>18</sup> recently reviewed the literature with respect to the economic evaluations of Internet-based mental health interventions, including interventions targeting symptoms of depression, anxiety, smoking cessation, suicidal ideation, and harmful alcohol use. Both guided and unguided Internet-based interventions were demonstrated cost-effective in comparison to control groups that included treatment as usual, waiting lists, or attention control groups. Nevertheless, the evidence was more robust for guided interventions as compared with unguided interventions.

The aim of the current study was to investigate the cost-utility of fully automated Internet-based intervention “Featback” with different levels of therapist support (i.e., none, once a week, and three times a week) in comparison to a waiting list for individuals with ED psychopathology.

## Method

### *Design and Participants*

This economic evaluation adopted a societal perspective, the preferred viewpoint for conducting a cost-effectiveness analysis which incorporates all costs and all health effects regardless of who incurs the costs and who obtains the effects.<sup>19</sup> The economic evaluation was part of a randomized controlled trial comparing: (1) Internet-based intervention Featback, comprising psychoeducation and a fully automated monitoring and feedback system, (2) Featback with low-intensity (weekly) therapist support, (3) Featback with high-intensity (three times a week) therapist support, and (4) a waiting list. Participants were recruited via the Featback website and the website of a Dutch pro-recovery-focused e-community (“Proud2Bme”) for young women with ED problems. The inclusion criteria were age  $\geq 16$ , access to the Internet, and self-reported ED symptoms as assessed by the Short Evaluation of EDs<sup>20</sup> and the Weight Concern Scale.<sup>21</sup> Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Leiden University Medical Center ethics committee. After screening and providing informed consent, 354 participants were randomized to the study conditions with a block size of 40 and a 1:1:1:1 allocation ratio. Detailed information on the study methods can be found in the published study protocol.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, the effectiveness results of this study have been reported elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> The current study included data that were collected at baseline, postintervention (i.e., after 8 weeks), and at 3-month follow-up (i.e., 3 months after the postintervention assessment), resulting in a time horizon for the economic evaluation of 5 months.

### Interventions

**Featback.** Featback consisted of psychoeducation as well as a fully automated monitoring and feedback system. Participants received a weekly invitation by e-mail asking them to complete a monitoring questionnaire consisting of eight 4-point Likert items assessing four dimensions: body dissatisfaction, excessive concern with body weight and shape, unbalanced nutrition and dieting, and binge eating and compensatory behaviors. After completion, a supportive feedback message was automatically generated according to a predefined algorithm taking into account their reported status (healthy range or unhealthy range) of each of the above-mentioned dimensions, as well as patterns of change (improved, deteriorated, or unchanged). The feedback messages contained social support by expressing interest in, and concerns about the participants' well-being. Positive reinforcement techniques such as encouragement were used to stimulate and/or maintain healthy behaviors and attitudes. Furthermore, the messages included tips and advice on how to counteract negative developments in reported ED-related symptoms. See Bauer et al.<sup>24</sup> and our published study protocol<sup>22</sup> for more detailed information.

**Featback Supplemented with Low-Intensity Support.** Participants received Featback supplemented with low-intensity (weekly) therapist support by means of e-mail, chat, and/or teleconference. An e-mail support session included one e-mail reply from the therapist to the participant, whereas a chat or teleconference support session consisted of a 20-min conversation. For each support session, participants could choose their preferred medium of support.

**Featback Supplemented with High-Intensity Support.** Participants received Featback supplemented with high-intensity (three times a week) therapist support by means of e-mail, chat, and/or teleconference.

**Waiting list control condition (WLC).** Participants in the WLC waited 5 months before receiving Featback with low-intensity therapist support.

Participants in all study conditions were free to undergo any other type of intervention or treatment (i.e., usual care).

### Measures

**Health-Related Quality of Life.** Health-related quality of life was measured by the EuroQol (EQ-5D-3 L).<sup>25</sup> This self-report questionnaire consists of five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression. Each dimension can be rated on three levels: no problems, some problems, and extreme problems. Someone's health state can be expressed by a five-digit number using the answer digits for each of the

five dimensions. Thus, a total of 243 (3<sup>5</sup>) distinct health states can be defined. Each health state was translated into a utility score ranging from 0 (death) to 1 (perfect health) using the Dutch tariff.<sup>26</sup> Quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) were calculated over the course of five months using the area-under-the-curve method. In addition to the EQ-5D-3 L, QALYs were also calculated using the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) ranging from 0 (worst imaginable health) to 100 (perfect health).

**Costs.** Healthcare costs included costs related to the intervention, health care utilization and medication. Intervention costs included the time investment of psychologists when an alarm signal was received in case participants showed severe deteriorations in symptoms (i.e., 10 min for each alarm signal in order to send a standardized e-mail<sup>22</sup>) multiplied by their hourly pay rate (€44.05). Costs related to the amount of therapist support were estimated by multiplying the amount of therapist investment (i.e., 25 min for one support session: 5 min for preparation and 20 min for support session) by their hourly pay rate (€21.50). Supervision costs were based on multiplying time investments (i.e., four 2-h group supervision sessions and two individual half-an-hour supervision sessions) by the hourly pay rate of all therapists (€21.50) and one supervisor (€44.05). To calculate the supervision costs per participant, the total amount of supervision costs was divided by the number of participants who received therapist support.

The utilization of health care services was assessed with the Trimbos/iMTA questionnaire for Costs associated with Psychiatric Illness (TiC-P).<sup>27</sup> The recall period included 2 months (pre to postintervention) and 3 months (postintervention to 3-month follow-up). The costs were calculated by multiplying health care use (i.e., the number of contacts with the health care provider) with their standard cost prices using the Dutch guidelines for cost research in health care.<sup>28</sup> Medication costs were obtained from the National Healthcare Institute.<sup>29</sup>

Nonhealthcare costs were assessed with the Health and Labor Questionnaire (SF-HLQ).<sup>30</sup> These costs were related to productivity losses at work, including absence from paid work (i.e., absenteeism), production losses due to reduced efficiency (i.e., presenteeism), and difficulties in performing unpaid work such as domestic tasks. The recall period for nonhealthcare costs was 1 month. Costs were extrapolated by multiplying the reported costs by the number of months in-between the corresponding assessment periods. Costs related to absenteeism were calculated according to the friction cost method. More specifically, the number of hours that participants were absent from their paid job was multiplied by the average gross hourly wage per paid working individual in the Netherlands, based on age and gender.<sup>28</sup> Presenteeism costs were calculated based on the

HLQ method, in which participants had to indicate how many hours of work they would need to catch up for all the work they were unable to perform because of health problems. These hours of work were then multiplied by the average gross hourly wage per paid working individual in the Netherlands, based on age and gender.<sup>28</sup> Finally, costs related to difficulties in performing unpaid work were calculated by multiplying the number of hours that others had to take over for participants in performing usual household tasks by the average gross hourly wage earned by a domestic worker.<sup>28</sup> All costs were adjusted to the year 2015 according to the Dutch consumer price index.<sup>31</sup>

### Analyses

Statistical analyses were performed according to the intent-to-treat approach, including all participants who underwent randomization. The majority of missing data were handled by conducting multiple imputation using predictive mean matching for numerical variables, and using (multinomial) logistic regression for categorical variables. However, variables concerning the number of appointments with a dietician, or homeopath or acupuncturist, were imputed using regression-based imputation. These variables showed very little variance and included only a few values that were higher than the minimum value of 0, which made it difficult to find matching cases. Health care utilization costs of the following health care providers were combined given their highly skewed data which would have led to an unreliable imputation process: (1) general practitioner and company physician, (2) physiotherapist and occupational therapist, (3) social worker, psychologist/psychiatrist, consultation office for alcohol and drug addiction, and self-help groups, (4) outpatient hospital services and emergency care services, and (5) admission/stay at psychiatric institutions, sheltered housing, and accompanied housing. Multiple imputations were conducted in statistical software program R version 3.02, taking into account interactions in the data.<sup>32</sup> For each variable with missing data, the number of predictor variables was determined by the rule of thumb of 15 cases per potential predictor.<sup>33</sup> The variables that were most strongly associated with the outcome variable were chosen as predictors for the missing data on the outcome variable. To this end, the following measures of association were used: (1) correlation, if both the outcome variable and the predictor variable were numerical, (2) the square root of partial  $\eta^2$  if one of the variables was categorical and the other one was numerical, and (3) Cramér's V if both the outcome and predictor variable were categorical. A total of 100 imputed datasets were generated, of which the results were pooled according to Rubin's rules.<sup>34</sup>

Cost-utility analyses were conducted with the QALYs as derived from the EQ-5D-3 L scores and the societal costs. The uncertainty regarding mean costs and effects per participant was estimated using bootstrapping in Microsoft Excel, simulating 1000 bootstrap samples per imputed dataset. The results of the bootstrapping were represented in cost-utility acceptability curves. These curves illustrate the probability that an intervention is cost-effective in comparison with the alternative for a range of ceiling ratios, which are the maximum amount of societal costs decision makers are willing to pay for one unit change in outcome. An intervention is cost-effective as compared with the alternative if it has a higher net benefit, with the net benefit being defined as willingness to pay \* effects (i.e., QALYs) – societal costs.

Two sensitivity analyses were conducted by repeating the cost-utility analyses (1) using the VAS as a utility measure, and (2) using the change in utilities as assessed by the EQ-5D from baseline, in order to account for baseline difference in utility scores.

## Results

### Sample Characteristics

A total of 354 participants were assessed at baseline: 87 participants in the Feedback condition without a therapist, 88 and 89 participants in the Feedback conditions with low- and high-intensity therapist support, respectively, and 90 participants in the WLC. Two hundred seventy-three participants (77%) were assessed at postintervention, and 202 (57%) at 3-month follow-up. Study dropout rates did not significantly differ between the conditions at postintervention ( $\chi^2(3) = 4.35$ ,  $P = 0.23$ ), although at 3-month follow-up the WLC participants dropped out of the study less often than participants who received Feedback without or with low-intensity therapist support ( $\chi^2(3) = 15.69$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ).

**Table 1** presents the baseline characteristics of study participants. Significant differences between the conditions were found regarding age, duration of ED psychopathology, marital status, and utility scores as measured by the VAS. There were no significant baseline differences regarding the other demographic variables or the utility scores as measured by the EQ-5D. Participants demonstrated high levels of ED psychopathology, as reflected in their mean EDE-Q score (4.2,  $SD = 0.9$ ) that is comparable to the norm for treatment-seeking patients with an ED in our specialized clinical program.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, approximately 97% of the study participants scored above the clinical significance cut-off point of 2.2.<sup>36</sup>

**TABLE 1.** Baseline characteristics of the study population. Data (nonimputed) are provided in means (SD) or numbers (percentages)

	Waiting List Control (n = 90)	Featback (n = 87)	Featback + Low-Intensity Therapist Support (n = 88)	Featback + High-Intensity Therapist Support (n = 89)	Statistics
Gender					$\chi^2(3) = 2.02, P = 0.57$
Male	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)	
Female	90 (100.0%)	86 (98.9%)	87 (98.9%)	87 (97.8%)	
Marital status					$\chi^2(6) = 13.22, P = 0.04$
Married/living together	11 (12.2%) <sup>A</sup>	28 (32.2%) <sup>A,B</sup>	17 (19.3%) <sup>A,B</sup>	21 (23.6%) <sup>B</sup>	
Single/living alone	79 (78.8%)	58 (66.7%)	71 (80.7%)	67 (75.3%)	
Divorced	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	
Education level					$\chi^2(6) = 7.69, P = 0.26$
Low	10 (11.1%)	4 (4.6%)	4 (4.5%)	7 (7.9%)	
Intermediate	17 (18.9%)	16 (18.4%)	26 (29.5%)	19 (21.3%)	
High	63 (70.0%)	67 (77.0%)	58 (65.9%)	63 (70.8%)	
Use of psychotropic medication					$\chi^2(3) = 3.35, P = 0.34$
Yes	25 (28.4%)	21 (24.7%)	17 (19.5%)	16 (18.2%)	
No	63 (71.6%)	64 (75.3%)	70 (80.5%)	72 (81.8%)	
Paid job					$\chi^2(3) = 0.27, P = 0.97$
Yes	49 (55.7%)	46 (54.1%)	49 (56.3%)	49 (56.3%)	
No	39 (44.3%)	39 (45.9%)	38 (43.7%)	38 (43.7%)	
Age (years)	22.8 (6.6) <sup>A</sup>	24.7 (7.1) <sup>A,B</sup>	23.0 (7.0) <sup>A</sup>	26.3 (9.2) <sup>B</sup>	$F(3,350) = 4.17, P = 0.01$
Duration ED problems (years)	5.7 (5.6) <sup>A</sup>	8.1 (6.9) <sup>A,B</sup>	6.5 (5.8) <sup>A,B</sup>	8.2 (7.7) <sup>B</sup>	$F(3,346) = 3.05, P = 0.03$
Global ED psychopathology (EDE-Q)	4.1 (1.1)	4.2 (0.8)	4.4 (0.9)	4.0 (0.8)	$F(3,113) = 1.54, P = 0.21$
Global AN psychopathology (SEED-AN)	1.1 (0.4)	1.1 (0.4)	1.1 (0.4)	1.1 (0.4)	$F(3,347) = 0.24, P = 0.87$
Global BN psychopathology (SEED-BN)	1.5 (0.7)	1.4 (0.7)	1.5 (0.7)	1.5 (0.6)	$F(3,349) = 0.30, P = 0.82$
Utility score EQ-5D	0.65 (0.28)	0.63 (0.27)	0.60 (0.28)	0.63 (0.28)	$F(3,258) = 0.39, P = 0.76$
Utility score Visual Analog Scale	0.63 (0.17)	0.60 (0.17)	0.55 (0.16)	0.57 (0.17)	$F(3,258) = 3.03, P = 0.03$

Notes: ED=Eating disorder; EDE-Q=Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire; SEED=Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders; AN=Anorexia nervosa; BN=Bulimia nervosa; EQ-5D=3-level version of the EuroQol.

Significant group differences were further investigated using Bonferonni posthoc comparisons: different superscript letters indicate significant differences between the conditions.

**Outcomes: utilities.** The mean utility scores and QALYs over the course of 5 months for the different study conditions are presented in **Table 2**. The utility scores as measured by the EQ-5D increased over time in all conditions, however, the QALYs were not significantly different across study conditions.

**Outcomes: societal costs.** The societal costs for the different study conditions over the course of five months are presented in **Table 3**. As shown in **Table 3**, the study conditions showed significant differences regarding intervention costs, homeopath, and acupuncturist costs, mental health care costs, costs related to admission/stay at psychiatric institutions, sheltered housing, and accompanied housing, and finally, costs due to substitution of unpaid work. However, the total societal costs including all healthcare and nonhealth care costs were not significantly different between the conditions. Nevertheless, the societal costs were highest in the WLC (see **Table 3**).

**Cost-utility.** **Figure 1** presents the cost-utility acceptability curve. For a willingness to pay between €0 and €20,000, the three Featback conditions demonstrate higher probabilities (22–47%) of achieving the highest net benefit in comparison to

the WLC (1–5%). Thus, for this range of willingness to pay, Featback could be considered a preferred strategy in comparison to a waiting list, although no clear preference for Featback with or without support was apparent. When society is willing to pay €20,000 or more per QALY gained, Featback without therapist support has the highest probability (42–54%) of achieving the highest net benefit, closely followed by Featback with high-intensity therapist support (30–38%), and Featback with low-intensity therapist support (1–17%) and the WLC (5–15%).

As can be seen in the upper part of **Figure 2**, comparable results were found in the first sensitivity analyses when using the VAS as utility measure. The results of the second sensitivity analyses using the change in utilities from baseline as assessed by the EQ-5D are presented in the bottom of **Figure 2**. Overall, the results show that for all willingness to pay values (€0–€100,000) Featback with different levels of therapist support are cost-effective strategies in comparison to a waiting list, with no clear preference for one of the three Featback conditions.

**TABLE 2.** Mean utility scores and corresponding quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) for Internet-based intervention “Featback” provided with different levels of therapist support. Data are based on the pooled results of 100 multiple imputed datasets

	Waiting List Control (n = 90)	Featback (n = 87)	Featback + Low-Intensity Therapist Support (n = 88)	Featback + High-Intensity Therapist Support (n = 89)	Statistics
<i>Utility Score EQ-5D</i>					
Baseline	0.65	0.64	0.60	0.63	
Postintervention	0.67	0.69	0.65	0.67	
Three-month follow-up	0.68	0.71	0.64	0.69	
QALYs	0.27	0.28	0.26	0.27	$F(3,350) = 0.71, P = 0.55$
<i>Utility Score Visual Analog Scale</i>					
Baseline	0.63	0.60	0.54	0.57	
Postintervention	0.62	0.62	0.59	0.61	
Three-month follow-up	0.62	0.66	0.60	0.66	
QALYs	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.25	$F(3,350) = 0.78, P = 0.51$

**TABLE 3.** Societal costs for the different study conditions over the course of 5 months (2015, in €). Data are based on the pooled results of 100 multiple imputed datasets

	Mean Costs Per Participant (% of Individuals Who Incurred Costs)				Statistics
	Waiting List Control (n = 90)	Featback (FB) (n = 87)	Featback + Low-Intensity Therapist Support (FBL) (n = 88)	Featback + High-Intensity Therapist Support (FBH) (n = 89)	
<i>Total health care costs</i>	1964 (96.5%)	1676 (94.8%)	1412 (100.0%)	1524 (100.0%)	$F(3,350) = 0.68$
<i>Total intervention costs</i>	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.3%)	53 (100.0%)	107 (100.0%)	$F(3,350) = 183.60^{***a}$
<i>Total health care utilization costs</i>	1964 (96.5%)	1673 (94.8%)	1359 (97.4%)	1417 (91.2%)	$F(3,350) = 1.00$
General practitioner and company physician	90 (74.3%)	92 (75.9%)	91 (71.7%)	90 (72.4%)	$F(3,350) = 0.29$
Dietician	1 (38.2%)	2 (59.5%)	2 (56.2%)	1 (44.2%)	$F(3,350) = 3.80^{*b}$
Homeopath and acupuncturist	0 (27.0%)	0 (36.3%)	0 (31.9%)	0 (27.1%)	$F(3,350) = 2.17$
Physiotherapist and occupational therapist	18 (11.1%)	78 (24.3%)	68 (17.5%)	99 (29.3%)	$F(3,350) = 1.82$
Mental health care <sup>1</sup>	920 (77.9%)	1115 (79.2%)	1043 (78.0%)	995 (71.7%)	$F(3,350) = 3.57^{*b}$
Outpatient hospital services and emergency care services	47 (11.7%)	44 (17.9%)	109 (24.9%)	56 (41.8%)	$F(3,350) = 2.56$
Admission/stay at psychiatric institutions, sheltered housing, and accompanied housing	856 (12.3%)	324 (4.6%)	29 (1.4%)	166 (44.2%)	$F(3,350) = 3.67^{*c}$
Medication <sup>2</sup>	32 (44.9%)	18 (50.5%)	17 (52.2%)	10 (39.9%)	$F(3,350) = 0.95$
<i>Total nonhealthcare costs</i>	618 (70.1%)	426 (76.3%)	539 (62.4%)	508 (66.7%)	$F(3,350) = 1.00$
Absenteeism	85 (47.8%)	153 (50.2%)	94 (28.4%)	47 (34.4%)	$F(3,350) = 2.39$
Presenteeism	448 (43.1%)	246 (46.1%)	233 (38.1%)	298 (42.2%)	$F(3,350) = 1.39$
Substitution of unpaid work	85 (10.7%)	27 (10.7%)	212 (20.1%)	163 (16.2%)	$F(3,350) = 5.21^{**d}$
<i>Total societal costs</i>	2582 (98.7%)	2102 (97.9%)	1951 (100.0%)	2032 (100%)	$F(3,350) = 0.45$

\* $P \leq 0.05$ , \*\* $P \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\* $P \leq 0.001$ .

Statistics: significant group differences were further investigated using posthoc comparisons: a = WLC and FB < FBL < FBH, b = WLC < FB, c = WLC > FBL, d = WLC and FB < FBL.

<sup>1</sup>Including appointments with a social worker, psychologist, psychiatrist, consultation office for alcohol and drug addiction, and participation in self-help groups.

<sup>2</sup>Including tranquilizers (ADHD, anxiety, sleep problems), antidepressants, antipsychotics, as well as drugs for epilepsy, osteoporosis, and intestines and stomach.


## Discussion

This study investigated the cost-utility of fully automated Internet-based intervention “Featback” provided along with different levels of therapist support (i.e., none, once a week, three times a week) in comparison to a WLC for individuals with ED symptoms. The results demonstrated no significant differences between the costs and effects for the four conditions. Nevertheless, cost-utility analyses as conducted from a societal perspective demonstrated that for willingness to pay values between €0 and €100,000 per

QALY, Featback with no, low-, and high-intensity therapist support seemed to be cost-effective strategies as compared to a waiting list. From an economic viewpoint, no clear preference was found for Featback with or without therapist support.

Given that good quality economic evaluations in the field of ED are scarce,<sup>7</sup> our study findings will also be compared to those of studies that economically evaluated Internet-based interventions for mental health conditions other than ED. The finding that both Featback with and without

**FIGURE 1.** Cost-utility acceptability curve for Internet-based intervention “Featback” provided with different levels of therapist support as compared to a waiting list control condition. [Color figure can be viewed at [wileyonlinelibrary.com](http://wileyonlinelibrary.com)]




QALY = Quality-Adjusted Life-Year as assessed by the EQ-5D


therapist support were cost-effective strategies as compared to a waiting list, is in line with several previous studies that have compared either a guided or unguided Internet-based intervention to a control group. More specifically, unguided Internet-based interventions have been found to be cost-effective in comparison to usual care for depression,<sup>37</sup> and in comparison to a waiting list for suicidal ideation.<sup>38</sup> Regarding the comparison of guided Internet-based interventions with control conditions, our findings are in line with findings by Lynch et al.<sup>15</sup> who demonstrated that treatment as usual supplemented with a face-to-face guided self-help intervention based on CBT principles, was cost-effective as compared to treatment as usual alone in patients with recurrent binge eating episodes. Also, our results are comparable to that of a study<sup>39</sup> in which a therapist-guided Internet-based intervention was found to be cost-effective as compared to usual care in the treatment of depression. Thus, preliminary evidence suggests that both unguided and guided Internet-based interventions for mental health problems represent good value for money when compared to usual care or a waiting list. If confirmed in future studies, this could have important implications for everyday practice. Both unguided and guided Internet-based interventions could allow for more efficient care and widespread dissemination, potentially increasing the accessibility and availability of mental health care services for individuals with ED symptoms.

Our finding that, from an economic viewpoint, no clear preference was found for the Internet-based intervention with or without therapist support, is in contrast with findings from a study that directly compared a guided and unguided Internet-based intervention for harmful alcohol use<sup>40</sup> and partly in

**FIGURE 2.** Results of two sensitivity analyses presenting the cost-utility acceptability curve for Internet-based intervention “Featback” provided with different levels of therapist support as compared to a waiting list control condition. [Color figure can be viewed at [wileyonlinelibrary.com](http://wileyonlinelibrary.com)]



QALY = Quality-Adjusted Life-Year as assessed by a Visual Analog Scale



QALY = Quality-Adjusted Life-Year as assessed by the EQ-5D and calculated by the change in utilities from baseline

line with a study investigating smoking cessation.<sup>41</sup> Regarding harmful alcohol use, Blankers et al.<sup>40</sup> demonstrated that guided Internet-based therapy was cost-effective in comparison to a similar therapy without therapist guidance. With respect to smoking cessation, Smit et al.<sup>41</sup> economically evaluated an Internet-based intervention with counseling from a practice nurse, the same intervention without counseling, and usual care. The unguided intervention had the highest chance of being the most cost-effective treatment option when smoking abstinence was used as the outcome measure, whereas results were in favor of usual care when quality of life was used as the outcome measure in the analyses. In sum, the literature provides mixed results when directly comparing guided and unguided interventions. More studies are needed that directly compare Internet-based interventions with and without guidance, not only in the field of ED, but in the field of mental health in general as well. It is possible that the cost-effectiveness of unguided versus guided interventions may vary as a result of the target population (i.e., mild vs. severe mental health problems) and the content and intensity of the

Internet-based intervention being studied (i.e., from low-intensity programs including psychoeducation and self-monitoring tools, for example, vs. high-intensity CBT).

A previous study by Crow et al.<sup>17</sup> demonstrated that a stepped-care intervention, in which individuals could move from self-help, to medication, to CBT if necessary, was cost-effective in comparison to directly providing CBT. They discuss the potential value of a stepped-care approach in treating symptoms of BN, given that such approaches can be easily disseminated and can help to allocate the limited health care resources in a more efficient manner. Relating this to the current study findings, fully automated Internet-based interventions, such as Featback, have potential to provide cost-effective care as (one of) the first step(s) in a stepped-care model for the treatment of ED. After Featback, more intensive treatment options, such as outpatient treatment, could be offered, and subsequently inpatient treatment, if needed. Hence, an interesting future study would be to investigate the cost-effectiveness of a stepped-care approach in comparison to treatment as usual. Especially since stepped-care interventions have also demonstrated promising results in terms of being a cost-effective alternative to usual care for older individuals with subthreshold levels of anxiety and depression,<sup>42</sup> generalized anxiety- or panic disorders in primary care,<sup>43</sup> and obsessive-compulsive disorders.<sup>44</sup>

The results of the cost-utility analyses have been presented for willingness to pay values between €0 and €100,000. Although the threshold for the societal willingness to pay for one QALY gained is arbitrary, values between €0 and €100,000 could be regarded within the realistic range of amounts to pay per QALY gained. For example, in the Netherlands specifically, a maximum amount of €80,000 has been established as acceptable by the Council for Public and Health Care (RVZ).<sup>45</sup>

The current study has several limitations and strengths. Limitations include the retrospective assessment of the utilization of health care services and use of medication. The corresponding recall periods of two and three months could have introduced recall bias, which in turn could have led to an over- or underestimation of costs. Another limitation pertains to the missing data at postintervention and 3-month follow-up. Furthermore, interventions costs are estimated based on the average salary of psychologists and MSc students in psychology. If in everyday practice, the supervision and therapist support is provided by other

types of therapists, this may lead to slightly different costs. A final limitation of this study is related to the relatively short study duration of approximately 5 months. It would have been interesting to see whether the obtained results hold for a follow-up period of at least 1 year. Strengths of this study include the use of broad eligibility criteria, by which we aimed to resemble daily clinical practice as much as possible. Another strength is the use of a broad societal perspective and subsequently the inclusion of indirect costs such as absenteeism and presenteeism, as these were often lacking in previous studies<sup>7</sup> although these costs can be substantial.<sup>14,46</sup> A final strength is that two sensitivity analyses have been conducted in order to assess the robustness of the findings from the primary analysis.

In conclusion, fully automated Internet-based interventions such as Featback have potential to provide cost-effective care: a fully automated Internet-based intervention for ED symptoms provided with no-, low-intensity-, or high-intensity therapist support seemed to be cost-effective in comparison to a waiting list. If future research confirms this finding, this could have important implications for everyday practice. That is, both the unguided- and guided intervention could allow for more efficient care and widespread dissemination, thereby potentially increasing the accessibility and availability of mental health care services for individuals with ED symptoms.

This study was part of a randomized controlled trial that was supported by a grant from the European Commission's Executive Agency for Health and Consumers in the Health Program (Contract No: 20101209).

## References

- Steinhausen HC. The outcome of anorexia nervosa in the 20th century. *Am J Psychiatry* 2002;159:1284–1293.
- Steinhausen HC, Weber S. The outcome of bulimia nervosa: Findings from one-quarter century of research. *Am J Psychiatry* 2009;166:1331–1341.
- Keel PK, Brown TA. Update on course and outcome in eating disorders. *Int J Eat Disord* 2010;43:195–204.
- Hudson JI, Hiripi E, Pope J, Kessler RC. The Prevalence and correlates of eating disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Biol Psychiatry* 2007;61:348–358.
- Arcelus J, Mitchell AJ, Wales J, Nielsen S. Mortality rates in patients with anorexia nervosa and other eating disorders. A meta-analysis of 36 studies. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2011;68:724–731.
- Harris EC, Barraclough B. Excess mortality of mental disorder. *Br J Psychiatry* 1998;173:11–53.
- Stuhldreher N, Konnopka A, Wild B, Herzog W, Zipfel S, Löwe B, et al. Cost-of-illness studies and cost-effectiveness analyses in eating disorders: A systematic review. *Int J Eat Disord* 2012;45:476–491.
- Simon J, Schmidt U, Pilling S. The health service use and cost of eating disorders. *Psychol Med* 2005;35:1543–1551.

9. Dickerson JF, DeBar L, Perrin NA, Lynch F, Wilson GT, Rosselli F, et al. Health-service use in women with binge eating disorders. *Int J Eat Disord* 2011;44:524–530.
10. Grenon R, Tasca GA, Cwinn E, Coyle D, Sumner A, Gick M, et al. Depressive symptoms are associated with medication use and lower health-related quality of life in overweight women with binge eating disorder. *Womens Health Issues* 2010;20:435–440.
11. Krauth C, Buser K, Vogel H. How high are the costs of eating disorders - anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa – for German society? *Eur J Health Econ* 2002;3:244–250.
12. Mitchell JE, Myers T, Crosby R, O'Neill G, Carlisle J, Gerlach S. Health care utilization in patients with eating disorders. *Int J Eat Disord* 2009;42:571–574.
13. Striegel-Moore RH, Leslie D, Petrelli SA, Garvin V, Rosenheck RA. One-year use and cost of inpatient and outpatient services among female and male patients with an eating disorder: Evidence from a national database of health insurance claims. *Int J Eat Disord* 2000;27:381–389.
14. Stuhldreher N, Wild B, Konig HH, Konnopka A, Zipfel S, Herzog W. Determinants of direct and indirect costs in anorexia nervosa. *Int J Eat Disord* 2015; 48:139–146.
15. Lynch FL, Striegel-Moore RH, Dickerson JF, Perrin N, DeBar L, Wilson GT, et al. Cost-effectiveness of guided self-help treatment for recurrent binge eating. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2010;78:322–333.
16. Byford S, Barrett B, Roberts C, Clark A, Edwards V, Smethurst N, et al. Economic evaluation of a randomised controlled trial for anorexia nervosa in adolescents. *Br J Psychiat* 2007;191:436–440.
17. Crow SJ, Agras WS, Halmi KA, Fairburn CG, Mitchell JE, Nyman JA. A cost effectiveness analysis of stepped care treatment for bulimia nervosa. *Int J Eat Disord* 2013;46:302–307.
18. Donker T, Blankers M, Hedman E, Ljotsson B, Petrie K, Christensen H. Economic evaluations of Internet interventions for mental health: A systematic review. *Psychol Med* 2015;45:3357–3376.
19. Gold M, Siegel J, Russell L, Weinstein M. *Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
20. Bauer S, Winn S, Schmidt U, Kordy H. Construction, scoring and validation of the Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders (SEED). *Eur Eat Disord Rev* 2005; 13:191–200.
21. Killen JD, Taylor CB, Hammer LD, Litt I, Wilson DM, Rich T, et al. An attempt to modify unhealthful eating attitudes and weight regulation practices of young adolescent girls. *Int J Eat Disord* 1993;13:369–384.
22. Aardoom JJ, Dingemans AE, Spinhoven P, Roijen LH, van Furth EF. An Internet-based intervention for eating disorders consisting of automated computer-tailored feedback with or without supplemented frequent or infrequent support from a coach: Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2013;14:340.
23. Aardoom J, Dingemans A, Spinhoven P, van Ginkel J, de Rooij M, van Furth E. Web-based fully automated self-help with different levels of therapist support for individuals with eating disorder symptoms: A randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2016;18:e159.
24. Bauer S, Moessner M, Wolf M, Haug S, Kordy H. ES[S]PRIT – An Internet-based programme for the prevention and early intervention of eating disorders in college students. *Br J Guid Couns* 2009;37:327–336.
25. EuroQol Group, EuroQol - A new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy* 1990;16:199–208.
26. Lamers LM, Stalmeier PFMMJ, Krabbe PFMBJJ. Measuring the quality of life in economic evaluations: The Dutch EQ-5D tariff. *Dutch J Med [Nederlands Tijdschrift Voor Geneeskunde]* 2005;149:1574–1578.
27. Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Donker M, Tiemens B. *Handleiding Trimbos/iMTA Questionnaire for Costs Associated with Psychiatric Illness (TiC-P)*. Erasmus MC, Rotterdam: Instituut voor Medische Technology Assessment, 2002.
28. Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Tan SS, Bouwmans CAM. *Handleiding voor kostenonderzoek: Methoden en standaard kostprijzen voor economische evaluaties in de gezondheidszorg*. Rotterdam: College voor zorgverzekeringen, 2010.
29. National Healthcare Institute (2015). *Medicine prices [Medicijnkosten]*. Retrieved from <https://www.medicijnkosten.nl/>.
30. van Roijen L, Essink-Bot ML, Koopmanschap MA, Bonsel G, Rutten FF. Labor and health status in economic evaluation of health care. *The Health and Labor Questionnaire*. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 1996;12:405–415.
31. Statistics Netherlands. *Netherlands Consumer Price Index*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=71311ned&D1=0-1,4-5&D2=0&D3=a&HD=080521-1622&HDR=G1,T&STB=G>.
32. Doove LL, Van Buuren S, Dusseldorp E. Recursive partitioning for missing data imputation in the presence of interaction effects. *Comput Stat Data Anal* 2014;72:92–104.
33. Stevens J. *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates Inc., 2009.
34. Rubin DB. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1987.
35. Aardoom JJ, Dingemans AE, Slof Op't Landt MC, van Furth EF. Norms and discriminative validity of the Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire (EDE-Q). *Eat Behav* 2012;13:305–309.
36. Dingemans A, van Son G, Aardoom J, Bruidemegon K, Slof-Op't Landt M, van Furth E. Predictors of psychological outcome in patients with eating disorders: A routine outcome monitoring study. *Int J Eat Disord* 2016; in press.
37. Gerhards SA, de Graaf LE, Jacobs LE, Severens JL, Huijbers MJ, Arntz A, et al. Economic evaluation of online computerised cognitive-behavioural therapy without support for depression in primary care: Randomised trial. *Br J Psychiatry* 2010;196:310–318.
38. van Spijker BA, Majo mC, Smit F, van SA, Kerkhof AJ. Reducing suicidal ideation: Cost-effectiveness analysis of a randomized controlled trial of unguided web-based self-help. *J Med Internet Res* 2012;14:e141.
39. Hollinghurst S, Peters TJ, Kaur S, Wiles N, Lewis G, Kessler D. Cost-effectiveness of therapist-delivered online cognitive behavioural therapy for depression: Randomised controlled trial. *Brit J Psychiat* 2010;197:297–304.
40. Blankers M, Nabitz U, Smit F, Koeter MW, Schippers GM. Economic evaluation of internet-based interventions for harmful alcohol use alongside a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2012;14:e134.
41. Smit ES, Evers SM, VH, de Hoving C. Cost-effectiveness and cost-utility of Internet-based computer tailoring for smoking cessation. *J Med Internet Res* 2013;15:e57.
42. Veer-Tazelaar P, Smit F, van HH, van OP, van der Horst H, Beekman A, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a stepped care intervention to prevent depression and anxiety in late life: Randomised trial. *Br J Psychiatry* 2010;196:319–325.
43. Goorden M, Muntingh A, van MH, Spinhoven P, Ader H, van BA, et al. Cost utility analysis of a collaborative stepped care intervention for panic and generalized anxiety disorders in primary care. *J Psychosom Res* 2014;77:57–63.
44. Tolin DF, Diefenbach GJ, Gilliam CM. Stepped care versus standard cognitive-behavioral therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder: A preliminary study of efficacy and costs. *Depress Anxiety* 2011;28:314–323.
45. Council for Public and Health Care. *Sensible and sustainable healthcare [Zinnige en duurzame zorg]*. Retrieved from [https://www.raadrns.nl/uploads/docs/Advies\\_-\\_Zinnige\\_en\\_duurzame\\_zorg.pdf](https://www.raadrns.nl/uploads/docs/Advies_-_Zinnige_en_duurzame_zorg.pdf).
46. Stewart WF, Ricci JA, Chee E, Hahn SR, Morganstein D. Cost of lost productive work time among US workers with depression. *JAMA* 2003;289:3135–3144.