

Errata

Reference 35e Positron Emission Tomography (PET) for cervical cancer

Amendments to text and tables

Section and page	Current text	Revised text	Details
Page x of the Executive Summary last paragraph, third sentence	would result in an average cost offset of approximately <u>\$1838</u> per patient	would result in an average cost offset of approximately <u>\$2487</u> per patient	Error carried through from Table 21 p .60
Page 57 of the economic considerations section last paragraph, third sentence	then an average cost offset of approximately <u>\$1838</u> per patient would ensue	then an average cost offset of approximately <u>\$2487</u> per patient would ensue	Error carried through from Table 21 p. 60
Table 21 on page 60 fourth column (Proportion of patients) and fifth column (Cost/patient)	The Proportion of patients for curative treatment ' <u>0.675</u> ' with a cost per patient of '\$ <u>8768.80</u> '; total costs for PET ' <u>\$11 153</u> ' and Costs savings of PET vs no PET/patient ' <u>\$1838</u> '	The Proportion of patients for curative treatment ' <u>0.625</u> ' with a cost per patient of '\$ <u>8119.26</u> '; total costs for PET ' <u>\$10503</u> ' and Costs savings of PET vs no PET/patient ' <u>\$2487</u> '	Typographical error

Table 21 on page 60 revised:

Table 1 Estimated costs of using PET in patients with confirmed recurrence of cervical cancer.

Cost item	MBS/PBS	Unit cost \$	Proportion of patients*	Cost /patient	
PET	PET	n.a.	953	1	\$953
Curative treatment		\$12 990.82	0.625		\$8119.26
Palliative		\$3816.21	0.375		\$1431.08
Total costs for PET					\$10503
Costs savings of PET vs no PET*/patient					\$2487

- *Assuming that without PET all patients would have undergone curative treatment.