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Health Technology Assessment (HTA)

“Multi-disciplinary process ... summarises information about the medical, social, economic and ethical issues related to the use of a health technology...to inform the formulation of safe and effective health policies” (Garrido et al, 2006)

HTA can enter into the following policy-processes:

- Agenda setting
- Policy formulation
- Decision making (e.g. reimbursement)

**Figure 1:** Four principal stages to HTA

- **Identify Topic**
  - May include prioritization

- **Conduct Assessment**

- **Disseminate Findings**

- **Evaluate Impact of HTA on Health Policy**

---

5 Elements to Topic Identification and Prioritization

1. Identify problems of relevance
2. Identify possible types of assessment to help address these decision problems,
3. Judge potential relative benefits - costs to help set priorities b/t topics,
4. Communicate priorities to those responsible for undertaking assessments,
5. Monitor and review assessments and priorities

Objectives of Study

➢ To describe and to evaluate the current approaches for:

(i) topic identification, and

(ii) prioritization

for the HTA assessment of **non-pharmaceutical technologies** across four Canadian and eight international HTA organizations
Methods

- **Systematic literature review:**
  - Database searched: Medline, EMBASE, Cochrane, HEED, PubMed, BIOSIS
  - Grey literature: agency websites, policy documents, commissioned report, working papers
  - Literature published up to September 4, 2012

- **Interviews**
  - Canadian HTA representatives to ensure accuracy in data collection
List of HTA Agencies Studied

- 12 quasi-governmental agencies across nine countries
  - Australia- Medical Services Advisory Committee (MSAC)
  - Belgium- Health Care Knowledge Center (KCE)
  - Canada- Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH)
    - Health Quality Ontario, formerly: Medical Advisory Secretariat (MAS)/Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee (OHTAC)
    - Institut National D’Excellence en Santé et en Services Sociaux (INESSS)
  - Alberta Health and Wellness (AHW)
  - Denmark- Danish Centre for Health Technology Assessment (DACEHTA)
  - England- National institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)
  - Finland- Finnish Office for Health Technology Assessment (FinOHTA)
  - Germany- Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen (iQWiG)/ Federal Joint Committee (G-BA)
  - Sweden- Statens beredning för medicinsk utvärdering (SBU)
  - USA- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)/Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)
RESULTS
Figure 2: PRISMA Diagram of Systematic Literature Review

- **Records identified through database searching** (n = 1986)
- **Additional records identified through other sources** (n = 39)

**Records after duplicates removed** (n = 1722)

**Records screened** (n = 1722)

**Full-text articles assessed for eligibility** (n = 88)

**Studies included in narrative synthesis** (n = 51)

**Records excluded** (n = 1634)

- Focus no in HTA-agencies of interest (n = 9)
- Does not discuss currently practices processes for topic nomination/prioritization within an HTA setting (n = 17)
- Not primary literature (n = 11)
Of the 51 studies included:

- 23 studies on topic nomination
- 7 studies on prioritization
- 16 studies in total

**Figure 3:** Breakdown of study by topic

**Figure 4:** Number of studies published by jurisdiction
### Table 1: Types of Non-pharmaceutical Technologies Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medical devices</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Diagnostic Tests</th>
<th>Public-health interventions (e.g. screening/prevention)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia (MSAC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (KCE)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CADTH)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (AWH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (OHTAC; MAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (INESSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (DACEHTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (NICE; MTAC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (FinOHTA)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (JDC; IQWiG)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (SBU)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (CMS; AHRQ)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All agencies studied currently assess a wide variety of non-pharmaceutical health technologies.
Topic Identification

- **Goal:** Identify topics that are of most relevance to decision-makers

- Process categorized as either:

  (i) Open Process: Topics proposed by wide group of internal and external stakeholders
  - May involve additional strategies (e.g. horizon-scanning)

  (ii) Focused Process: Topics proposed internally
### Table 2: Who can Nominate HTA Topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Referrals received from:</th>
<th>Horizon Scanning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>SHI Payer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAC</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADTH</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHW</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHTA</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACEHTA</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE; MTAC</td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinOHTA</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-BA; iQWiG</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS; AHRQ</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of organizations have adopted an open process in nominating non-pharmaceutical HTA topics.
Requirements for Topic Identification

- Few agencies have clear eligibility requirements

- Of those with explicit requirements, it ensures:
  1. Relevance and appropriateness of topics
  2. Temporal proximity
Prioritization and Selection of HTA:

- **Goal:** To develop set of criteria to evaluate and rate potential topics against others, while considering additional quantitative and qualitative information relevant to each assessment.

- Criteria can be classified as either:
  1. Disease attributes
  2. Attributes of the technology
  3. Organization/ system-related concerns
  4. Technical issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical impact</td>
<td>Claimed therapeutic benefit of the proposed technology in comparison to current care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial impact</td>
<td>Potential total costs and incremental budgetary impact from a policy changes with this technology in comparison to current care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>Prevalence or incidence of the condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease burden</td>
<td>Disease burden of the population affected by this technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation in existing clinical practice</td>
<td>Variation in utilization rates of this technology for the given clinical condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current technology access/use</td>
<td>Pattern of access and utilization impact of the technology in the current healthcare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Availability of evidence and ability of this HTA to be readily conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on health policies</td>
<td>Health policy implications associated from the policy changes with this technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAC</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADTH</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHW</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHTAC; MAS</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESSS</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACEHTA</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE; MTAC</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinOHTA</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-BA; iQWiG</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS; AHRQ</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritization and Selection of HTA:

- A proactive approach to prioritization observed in all organizations

- Heterogeneity in the prioritization criteria exist although, the most commonly-cited criteria are:
  1. Clinical impact (n=11/12)
  2. Financial impact (n=10/12)
  3. Feasibility = Number of patients = Disease burden (n= 8/12)

Despite significant heterogeneity, most priority-setting considers the available evidence and the likely outcomes of assessment
Prioritization and Selection of HTA:

- Overall, process lacks transparency with the exception of:
  - CADTH: weighted rankings of quantitative scores
  - NICE: ordinal rating scale

Although both agencies have an explicit rating/ranking system, they also allow consideration of additional contextual factors

2. NICE (2012) Updated priorisation criteria for referral of technology appraisal to NICE
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
General Recommendations to Priority Setting

- HTA is adaptive to a jurisdiction’s health care values and political environment
  - Process must be flexible given that it exists in a world of constant flux

- Flexibility must be balanced with a systematic approach
  - Consistent membership vs. weighting criteria

- Transparency:
  - Can be improved with increased interaction and dialogue
  - But, has cost and time implications
Conclusions

- Approach should reflect the program’s goals, resources available and the preferred working methodology of those involved.

- Most common criteria: clinical impact, financial impact, number of patients, disease burden and feasibility. Others may be included that are specific to organization’s and jurisdiction’s needs.

- Tradeoffs exist in developing a priority-setting approach:
  - Clarity/transparency vs. timeliness
  - Flexibility vs. systematic
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