

Guidelines for the Economic Evaluation of Health Technologies: Canada (4th Edition)

What's New

Section	Key Changes
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical foundations for the guidance provided Role of economic evaluation within health care decision-making highlighted Reference-case analysis introduced
Decision problem	<p><i>Previously referred to as Study Question</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlights role of economic evaluations to inform decisions A discrete decision problem should be specified for each perspective and subgroup of interest
Types of evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost-utility analysis is the recommended form of analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes comparability Allows for full assessment of uncertainty
Target population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stratified analyses of subgroups should be conducted when factors that may lead to different estimates in costs or outcomes are identified
Comparators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All currently used and potentially displaced interventions should be considered — comprehensive approach to selecting comparators
Perspective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The perspective should directly relate to the decision problem
Time horizon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The time horizon should be long enough to capture all the costs and outcomes associated with the intervention
Discounting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended reference-case rate for costs and outcomes is 1.5% Change to rate based on theoretical foundations of the <i>Guidelines</i>, grounded in the principles of a social decision-making viewpoint on social choice
Modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model choice should be based on the decision problem and what is known about the natural course of the disease Researchers should consider existing well-constructed and validated models to help inform the appropriate model structure Additional guidance on: expert elicitation; model calibration; model validation; and incorporation of future outcomes and costs is discussed
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased detail provided The assessment of the evidence should be based on fitness for purpose, credibility, and consistency. Trade-offs among these criteria should be noted.
Measurement and valuation of health	<p><i>Previously referred to as Valuing Outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifies guidance on: combining health utilities and valuing non-health effects
Resource use and costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects updated CADTH <i>Guidance Document for the Costing of Health Care Resources in the Canadian Setting: Second Edition</i> The relationship between resource identification, measurement and valuation, and the decision problem highlighted Additional guidance on: the use of administrative data and the inclusion of patient and informal caregiver time

Section	Key Changes
Analysis	<p><i>New section added</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlights the importance of conducting probabilistic analyses
Uncertainty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focuses on the three categories of uncertainty to be addressed: parameter, methodological, structural <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parameter: addressed by the use of probabilistic analyses (no longer referred to as probabilistic sensitivity analyses) Methodological: where the results of a reference-case analysis are compared with a non-reference-case analysis Structural: addressed by the use of scenario analyses Provides more detailed guidance on the use of value of information analysis methods Deterministic analysis of parameter uncertainty is not recommended Variability now addressed through consideration of heterogeneity within target population
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All outcomes should be weighted equally regardless of the characteristics of those receiving the health effect Analyses should be presented in a disaggregate format with descriptions of relevant patient populations to allow for the consideration of any equity related policy issues
Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No major changes
Generalizability	<p><i>Section removed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details on issues of generalizability included in individual sections, where relevant

Note: All sections have been reviewed and revised accordingly to ensure alignment.