

**Supplementary Material 29** Cost effectiveness scenario analysis – exponential 20% decay in efficacy per annum

|                       | <b>Costs</b>                           | <b>QALYs</b>                                | <b>ICER</b> | <b>Incremental net health benefit (95% CI)</b> |                                    |                                     |
|-----------------------|--|---|-------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                       | <b>(95% CI)</b>                        | <b>(95% CI)</b>                             |             | <b>k=£15,000</b>                               | <b>k=£20,000</b>                   | <b>k=£30,000</b>                    |
|                       | <b>[P(most costly)]</b>                | <b>[P(most effective)]</b>                  |             | <b>[Probability of being cost-effective]</b>   |                                    |                                     |
| <b>Control</b>        | £642.06<br>(507.14, 798.4)<br>[0.085]  | 17.79359<br>(17.77337, 17.81535)<br>[0.001] |             | -<br>-<br>[0.008]                              | -<br>-<br>[0.005]                  | -<br>-<br>[0.003]                   |
| <b>SWAL only</b>      | £691.19<br>(563.3, 846.93)<br>[0.216]  | 17.81400<br>(17.79118, 17.83704)<br>[0.097] | £2,406.63   | 0.017<br>(-0.011, 0.045)<br>[0.162]            | 0.018<br>(-0.01, 0.044)<br>[0.139] | 0.019<br>(-0.007, 0.045)<br>[0.121] |
| <b>SWAL plus desk</b> | £747.60<br>(641.42, 868.39)<br>[0.699] | 17.83461<br>(17.81298, 17.8545)<br>[0.902]  | £2,737.29   | 0.034<br>(0.001, 0.07)<br>[0.83]               | 0.036<br>(0.003, 0.071)<br>[0.856] | 0.038<br>(0.006, 0.071)<br>[0.876]  |