

support mechanisms. Priority-setting guidelines were also helpful.

Conclusion By including all medical specialties, nurses and physicians, and various institutions, the study provides information on how the COVID-19 mitigation also influenced those not directly involved in the COVID-19 treatment of patients. In the next stages of the pandemic response, support for healthcare professionals directly involved in outbreak-affected patients, those redeployed or those most impacted by mitigation strategies must be a priority.

159:oral **SCALING UP NEUROLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS IN EAST AFRICA: A HEALTH ECONOMIC EVALUATION**

¹J Hubbers*, ²Seid Ali Gugssa, ³Tiwonge Elisa Khonje Phiri, ⁴Omar Mwalim Omar, ⁵Ayalew Moges Beyene, ⁶Kigocha Okeng'o, ⁷Mieraf Tadesse Tolla, ⁸M Tessema Memirie S, ⁹Oystein Haaland, ¹⁰Kjell Arne Johansson. ¹Bergen Center for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway; Helse Fonna, Haugesund, Norway; ²Addis Ababa University, College of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Department of Neurology, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; ³Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital, Department of Neurology, Blantyre, Malawi; ⁴Bergen Center for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), University of Bergen, Bergen; ⁵Addis Ababa university, Department of pediatrics, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; ⁶Muhimbili National Hospital, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; ⁷Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA; ⁸Bergen Center for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), University of Bergen, Bergen; ⁹Bergen Center for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway; ¹⁰Bergen Center for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.49

Neurological disorders are currently among the top causes of disability adjusted life-years (DALYs) and deaths globally. A vast increase in disease burden is projected, particularly in low- and lower middle-income countries (LLMIC). Paradoxically, in LLMIC settings, neurological disorders are often neglected, underdiagnosed, receive insufficient funding, and limited research. To combat the growing burden of disease, increasing focus must be placed on management of neurological disorders. Cost-effectiveness analyses of epilepsy (acute and long-term management), migraine (first-line treatment, prophylaxis), Parkinson's disease (drug treatment, physical therapy), and dementia (diagnosis and follow up, drug treatment, caregivers interventions) were performed to inform policy makers in Ethiopia, Malawi, and Tanzania. Health system costs were collected through a top-down microcosting method. Costing and coverage data were collected with expertise of East African neurologists and medical experts. Efficacy estimates were gathered by estimating the mortality or disability reduction, based on meta-analyses or systematic reviews. The cost-effectiveness analyses, calculating the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), were conducted with FairChoices: DCP Analytics Tool. The health benefits of the interventions were estimated in DALYs averted. Cost-effectiveness analyses identified the long-term management of epilepsy (ICER: 0.35), self-managed treatment of migraine (ICER: 45.93), and support for dementia caregivers (ICER: 0.0004) as the best-buy interventions. Parkinson's disease and the other dementia interventions were not deemed cost-effective in resource-constrained settings, because of its high costs or limited individual benefits. However, these interventions can be significantly impactful for patient's families, indicating the need for further exploration of the non-health benefits using alternate methodology. The current findings support that an impact in managing neurological conditions can be made by scaling-up the

identified cost-effective interventions in resource-constrained settings. By including these considerations carefully, a revision of the essential health benefit package can initiate a prime step forward in pursuit of poverty reduction and health equity.

199:oral **SHOULD THE NETHERLANDS ALLOW VOLUNTARY ADDITIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE FOR EXPENSIVE CANCER TREATMENTS? A JUSTICE PERSPECTIVE**

Jilles Smids*, Eline Bunnik. *Erasmus Medical Center, department of Medical Ethics, History, and Philosophy of Medicine, Rotterdam, The Netherlands*

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.50

Objective In the Netherlands, an increasing number of effective but extremely expensive cancer treatments are (temporarily) not reimbursed through mandatory basic health insurance. It seems that access to such treatments is currently limited: patients are often not allowed to pay out of pocket, and health insurers do not offer voluntary additional health insurance (VAHI) to cover such cases (Calcoen et al., 2017). However, patient might benefit from and prefer such insurance. Why is this not provided?

Methods In this paper, we provide a normative analysis, specifically from the perspective of social justice, of the question whether the Netherlands (and countries with similar healthcare systems) should change this policy and allow VAHI.

Results While the Dutch healthcare system has a strong egalitarian ethos, and allowing VAHI will lead to unequal access to potentially beneficial treatments, we argue that there are no in-principle justice-based objections against the provision of additional insurance. As long as mandatory basic health insurance covers all medically necessary treatments that societies owe their members on the basis of justice, denying citizens access to additional treatments based on considerations of equality would invoke the raising-up objection (Eyal, 2013), and may not be just.

We then consider how the introduction of VAHI to cover expensive cancer treatments in practice might lead to objectionable changes to the healthcare system. We suggest that it should be possible to maintain the current Dutch full population coverage, extensive service coverage, and relatively moderate cost sharing. Yet, whereas only an affluent clear minority of citizens has the ability to pay for top-up payments, a considerable majority may be able to afford VAHI. This might lead to a problematic two-tiered healthcare system, that reinforces existing class differences and undermines equal social standing of citizens with low income that cannot afford VAHI (Cf. Fourie, 2016).

138:oral **RESPONSIBILITY IN A PANDEMIC: SHOULD VACCINATION STATUS BE USED TO DISTRIBUTE SCARCE MEDICAL RESOURCES?**

^{1,2}Jin K Park. ¹Department of Politics and International Relations; ²Harvard Medical School

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.51

Should the unvaccinated be deprioritized for scarce medical resources when resources are scarce and when hospitals become overwhelmed? This, among others, has surprisingly been entertained in several contexts during the COVID-19

pandemic. In the face of a seemingly never-ending waves of variants that cause hospitalization rates to skyrocket each time, and as numerous observational studies have demonstrated that being unvaccinated is significantly associated with increased mortality and hospitalizations, it is tempting to 'attribute personal responsibility to the unvaccinated' and deprioritize these individuals for scarce medical resources, or, as President Emmanuel Macron argues, 'making life as difficult as possible.' At first blush, there are at least two separate questions: (1) are the unvaccinated squarely responsible for the continuing spread of the virus and (2) are the unvaccinated squarely responsible for the continuing burden on the healthcare system? The focus in this paper is on the second question, and I will interrogate the underlying values at stake in such a question.

I will argue that using vaccination status as a factor in scarce resource allocation is not defensible, though other ways of using responsibility may be. I argue that given the diversity of reasons for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy, using vaccination status alone for scarce resource allocation may in some scenarios contravene widely accepted allocation principles. Recognizing objections to vaccines is critical to the first-order task of working out the relationship between vaccination and responsibility for burdening health systems in the pandemic. It may be defensible, however, to collectivize responsibility for vaccination through other mechanisms, through collective taxation for all unvaccinated individuals, for example. Increasing vaccine uptake will be central to the future of the pandemic, and policymakers must seek to understand the nature of vaccine hesitancy in their respective societies, as many have already sought to do.

198:poster

USING THE BENEFIT-OF-DOUBT APPROACH FOR HEALTH SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS: A GLOBAL CASE STUDY ON AMENABLE MORTALITY

^{1,2,3}João Vasco Santos*, ⁴Giovanna D'Inverno, ⁵Ana Camanho. ¹Public Health Unit, ACES Grande Porto VIII – Espinho/Gaia, ARS Norte, Portugal; ²MEDCIDS, Department of Community Medicine, Information and Health Decision Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal; ³CINTESIS, Centre for Health Technology and Services Research, Porto, Portugal; ⁴Faculty of Business and Economics (FEB), KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; ⁵Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.52

Introduction Many different indicators can be used for health system effectiveness. Therefore, using composite indicators is a good way to summarize them all. One example of such efforts is the Healthcare Access and Quality Index (HAQI) from the Global Burden of Diseases study, for which different causes of mortality amenable to health care are summarized in this index through principal component analysis and exploratory factor analysis. While these approaches use the variance of the indicators, they do not consider room for improvement, i.e. distance to the frontier. Thus, in this study we present the Benefit-of-Doubt (BoD) approach as a solution for combining frontier analysis and composite indicators, using amenable mortality estimates for 189 countries.

Methods We performed a retrospective observational and methodological study, using data on 32 causes of mortality amenable to health care for 189 countries in 2015. As these indicators can be summed up (they all have the same units), there is a gold-standard to compare with. However, this is not the case for most of the health system effectiveness

indicators or other analyses. For analyzing effectiveness through the BoD approach, countries were divided by regions, either by WHO regions and by socio-demographic index (SDI).

Results We have found important differences, highlighting those causes of death that contributed more to effectiveness by WHO and SDI region. There were wide heterogeneities across causes of death. Additionally, overall analysis showed that the composite indicators were correlated but with some specific important differences.

Discussion We show that the BoD approach is a good option for computing composite indicators, also when using information on 'room for improvement', i.e. distance to the frontier. The use of BoD in health systems performance assessment, specifically in effectiveness and efficiency dimensions, can be an interesting step towards priority setting.

185:poster

THE IDEAS BEHIND CHARGING FOR NON-ATTENDANCE IN HEALTHCARE: AN ANALYSIS OF KEY POLICY DOCUMENTS IN DENMARK AND NORWAY

Joar Røkke Fystro*, Eli Feiring. Department of Health Management and Health Economics, University of Oslo

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.53

Objective Patients who miss their appointments without giving notice burden healthcare systems. Longer waiting lists and unused resources, which could have benefited other patients, are the ramifications. To amend this problem of non-attendance, a charge—sometimes called a fee or fine—has been considered and in some places implemented. While Denmark declines, so far, charging for non-attendance, in public hospitals, Norway charges patients. Moreover, the charge in Norway has increased the latter years, amounting to three times the user fee for outpatient services. We desired to investigate the underlying ideas of such charging. There are different conceivable justifications for charging for non-attendance and these justifications are treated differently, in as much as the two countries have reached different conclusions.

Methods We conducted a qualitative document analysis. A conceptual framework was constructed and key policy documents from the two countries were deductively analysed. The framework consisted of ideal type justifications for utilising non-attendance charges: from being an inducement, that the charge should compensate losses incurred, to being a punishment.

Results There is considerable attention towards the problem of non-attendance in both Denmark and Norway, because non-attendance negatively affects efficient healthcare delivery. Nonetheless, we found conflicting ideas behind using a non-attendance charge between the countries and, interestingly, within the policy documents themselves. While the charge is above all understood in a purely utilitarian sense in the Norwegian documents, there are more considerations about charging as a retributive stance in the Danish documents.

Discussion Use of non-attendance charges challenges the role of law and formal sanctions in healthcare, as well as—some critics allege—threaten universal access to healthcare. There is an important distinction, with ethical implications, whether a charge is an incentive, utilised to motivate patients to attend, or