**Supplementary Table 5: Net monetary benefits for the CUA base case and sensitivity analyses – Complete case analyses**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value of threshold** | **Base case:**  **% cost-effective** | **Base case:**  **mean net benefit**  **(95% CI)** | **Linear (U)\***  **% cost-effective** | **Linear (U):**  **mean net benefit**  **(95% CI)** | **Lower**  **(U)**¶  **% cost-effective** | **Lower (U):**  **mean net benefit**  **(95% CI)** | **Higher (U)**#  **% cost-effective** | **Higher (U):**  **mean net benefit**  **(95% CI)** | **Societal perspective:**  **% cost-effective** | **Societal perspective:**  **mean net benefit (95% CI)** |
| 0 | 69.1 | 71 (-215, 351) | 67.3 | 69 (-249,362) | 66.4 | 66 (-229, 377) | 69.6 | 79 (-218, 369) | 64.1 | 61 (-247, 360) |
| 10,000 | 68.2 | 67 (-217,342) | 53.8 | 17 (-292, 324) | 65.5 | 63 (-230, 372) | 69.0 | 76 (-222,367) | 63.8 | 57 (-248, 353) |
| 20,000 | 67.6 | 63 (-219, 334) | 40.6 | -36 (-354, 293) | 64.4 | 60 (-228, 365) | 68.2 | 73 (-226, 364) | 63.2 | 53 (-249, 347) |
| 30,000 | 66.2 | 59 (-219,327) | 30.9 | -89 (-441,266) | 63.8 | 57 (-231, 360) | 67.5 | 70 (-229, 361) | 62.9 | 49 (-250, 340) |
| 40,000 | 65.5 | 55 (-220,321) | 23.2 | -141 (-548, 250) | 63.3 | 53 (-228, 351) | 66.7 | 67 (-231, 356) | 61.9 | 45 (-251, 333) |
| 50,000 | 64.8 | 52 (-221,315) | 19.3 | -194 (-661, 248) | 62.6 | 50 (-225, 343) | 66.0 | 64 (-234, 351) | 61.1 | 41 (-252, 327) |
| 60,000 | 64.1 | 48 (-223, 309) | 16.2 | -246 (-771, 234) | 62.0 | 47 (-222, 337) | 64.9 | 61 (-235, 345) | 60.0 | 37 (-257, 323) |
| 70,000 | 63.6 | 44 (-224, 303) | 14.7 | -299 (-872, 233) | 61.3 | 44 (-222, 331) | 64.1 | 58 (-234, 342) | 59.3 | 33 (-257, 320) |
| 80,000 | 62.2 | 40 (-227, 299) | 12.9 | -352 (-978, 259) | 60.1 | 41 (-222, 325) | 63.0 | 55 (-233, 338) | 58.0 | 29 (-254, 317) |
| 90,000 | 60.9 | 36 (-232,296) | 11.4 | -404 (-1081, 260) | 59.8 | 37 (-222, 317) | 62.1 | 53 (-231, 333) | 56.8 | 25 (-255, 310) |
| 100,000 | 60.0 | 32 (-236, 291) | 10.8 | -457 (-1200, 269) | 59.1 | 34 ( -223, 309) | 61.4 | 50 (-232, 329) | 55.4 | 21 (-258, 303) |
| Complete case analysis included MgSO4 (n=111) and placebo (n=107).  \* Linear interpolation of health utilities over the entire follow-up period, rather than assuming that the health gain was achieved immediately following hospital discharge.  ¶ ‘Lower (U)’ denotes an assumption that baseline ASS scores mapped onto EQ-5D health states with lower utility scores than in the baseline analysis.  # ‘Higher U)’ denotes an assumption that baseline ASS scores mapped onto EQ-5D health states with higher utility scores than in the baseline analysis. | | | | | | | | | | |