



# Microsimulation Models for Malaria Cost Estimation & Generation of Evidence to Support Policy

**Titus Rotich** 

# Outline

- Introduction.
- Model structure.
- The algorithm.
- Calibration and validation.
- Example output.
- Results.
- Conclusion and recommendations.



## Introduction



# What is Microsimulation?

- Computer modelling technique that operates at the unit level.
- The individuals are a reflection of the population.
- Used to evaluate the impact of a proposed intervention or policy.
  - Generate base case.
  - Test different scenarios.
  - Compare the base case and the scenarios to evaluate the impact of the intervention.
- Policy recommendations.



# Why Microsimulation?

- Cost effectiveness.
- Time.
- Accuracy.
- Heterogeneity in population.



# What is Malaria?

- Disease by a *plasmodium* parasite, transmitted by infected female Anopheles mosquito.
- In 2021: 247m cases and an estimated 620k deaths, 77% of whom were children under 5.
  - Cf: covid19 claimed about 2000 lives of children under five each year.
- Treatment through Artemisinin-based Combination Therapy (ACT) for uncomplicated malaria.
  - Concerns about the emergence of ACT drug resistance.
- Accurate age-specific treatment cost is unavailable.
- Recent rollout of a malaria vaccine.



#### Goals

- Generate age-specific cost estimates.
- Quantify the evolution of antimalarial resistance.
- Evaluate the vaccination program.
- Evidence-based policy recommendations.



#### **Model Structure**



#### **Microsimulation Model Structure**



#### **Resistance Model Structure**



Koella and Anita (2004); Legros and Bonhoeffer (2016)

- λ Population increase rate.
- δ Annualised mortality rate.
- $\delta^{m-}$  Without malaria.
- $\delta^m$  With malaria.
- $\theta \& \kappa$  Recovery rates.
- $\gamma$  Loss of immunity.

 $\gamma(h) = \frac{(h+\delta)e^{-(h+\delta)\tau_1}}{1-e^{-(h+\delta)\tau_1}}$ 

• h - Inoculation rate.

$$h = \tilde{\alpha}^2 \beta_1 \beta_2 m e^{-\mu \tau} \frac{y}{\mu + \tilde{\alpha}^2 y}$$

- f Coverage.
- X Susceptibles.
- Y Infected.
- Z Immune.



# **The Algorithm**









Institute and Faculty of Actuaries

## **Calibration and Validation**



## **Calibration Example**







Institute and Faculty of Actuaries

#### **Example Calibration Results**







#### **Example Validation Results**



# **Example Output**



## **Example Individual Paths**



# The Case of Jane (and Jake)



- Currently aged 37, entered model at age 30.
- Gets sick twice, with malaria once.
- Gives birth to Jake, and exits the model with a neurological sequelae.



## The Case of Jane (and Jake) Cont'd

• On the week of April 08, 2013:



• Actual cost (to the patient):  $0.74 + 3.9 \times (1 - 0.37) \times (1 - 0.325) + 0.56 + 0.9212 \times 1.2 \times 1.25 = 4.34$ .



## **Results**



## **Age-Specific Costs**





#### **Treatment Cost Trends**



Uncomplicated malaria treatment costs



Uncomplicated malaria treatment costs (total)



#### **Treatment Cost Trends Cont'd**

case 📕 A 📕 B 📕 C

case 📕 A 📕 B 📕 C



Uncomplicated Malaria treatment failure, provider

- A: Failed first-line treatment but did not progress to severe malaria
- B: Failed first-line treatment that progressed to severe malaria
- C: Any severe malaria case.



Uncomplicated Malaria treatment failure, patient



#### **Treatment Cost Trends Cont'd**



## **Scenario Analysis & Vaccination Evaluation**

	DALYs Averted Per Cost Saving		
	Low Transmission	Moderate Transmission	High Transmission
RDT	0.00381	0.00732	0.00729
RDT + Vaccine	0.00390	0.00559	0.00910
ACT	(0.00293)	(0.00378)	(0.00719)
ACT + Vaccine	(0.00318)	(0.00411)	(0.00927)
CHWs	0.00517	0.00710	0.00892
CHWs + Vaccine	0.00719	0.01009	0.02018
Combined	0.00416	0.00582	0.00931
Combined + Vaccine	0.00398	0.00661	0.00926



#### **Conclusion and Recommendations**



# **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- Analysing malaria costs at the unit level presents an opportunity for targeted treatment options and funding.
  - Intermittent screening and treatment at schools (assuming no extra costs) resulted in a similar outcome as stocking RDTs in health centres.
- There's scope to enhance the utilisation of malaria treatment resources for better outcomes.
  - Based on the ACT and vaccination assumptions, reducing RDT stock-outs to 1 in 28 days in health centres results in the best health outcomes.
  - The vaccine performed poorly in low and moderate transmission settings at the current efficacy levels.
    - More research to be put into improving vaccine efficacy.
    - With an efficacy of above 85%, the vaccine becomes effective in most settings.
- Training CHWs could give the best results, but quantifying the cost of training CHWs is needed.







Expressions of individual views by members of the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries and its staff are encouraged.

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the presenter.

