OP97 Stakeholders' Involvement In Brazilian Health Technology Assessment Incorporation In 2021: A Statistical Description Of Demands To The Brazilian National Committee For Health Technology Incorporation

Denis Satoshi Komoda (deniskomoda@gmail.com), Carlos Roberto Silveira Correa, Marilia Berlofa Visacri and Daniela Santos

Introduction. The demands for incorporating or excluding health technologies within the Brazilian Public Health System (SUS) can be requested by different stakeholders, including public administration, pharmaceutical companies, specialists' and patients' organizations/associations. The Brazilian National Committee for Health Technology Incorporation (CONITEC), part of the Ministry of Health, is the responsible organ to evaluate these demands and emit recommendations. The aim of this study is to show an overview of stakeholders according to the type of technology under request.
Methods. On 26 November 2021, a search was performed at CONITEC website. Health Technology Assessment (HTA) incorporation reports from 1 January to 26 November 2021 were extracted. From these reports, data regarding the demanded technology (e.g., medications, diagnostic tests, etc.), demand (technology incorporation, exclusion, or alteration), pharmacological classification according with the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC), and requester' categorization (e.g., pharmaceutical companies, official administration organs, etc.).
Results. Preliminary results showed a total of 77 health technologies, in 63 HTA incorporation submissions, of which 87 percent (n = 67) were medications, and 9 percent (n = 6) were new medical procedures. Only one medical device, one vaccine and two diagnostic tests were requested. Technology incorporation accounted for 94.8 percent of the demands (73), and 4 demands of exclusion. Seventy-one percent of the requested medications were classified, according to first ATC coding level, within groups L (Antineoplastic and immunomodulating agents), N group (Nervous system), A group (Alimentary tract and metabolism), and R group (Respiratory system), accounting 28.3, 17.9, 8.9 and 8.9 percent, respectively. Regarding stakeholders, the Brazilian Ministry of Health and its associated departments were responsible for 57.1 percent of the demands, while pharmaceutical companies requested 37.6 percent of incorporations. Other requesters included the Federal Justice Department, patients', and specialists' organizations, summing up with only four demands.
Conclusions. These results present the numerical weight of stakeholders in the Brazilian HTA incorporation system, with special attention to Brazilian bureaucracy and pharmaceutical companies. Further analysis regarding association between demand and other variables such as budgetary impact, costs, and ICD-10, shall deepen our understanding of different stakeholders' role in Brazilian HTAi.

OP99 Participatory Approaches Used In Research And Development Of Medical Devices: A Comparison Of Focus groups, Interviews And Surveys

Kas Woudstra (kas.woudstra@radboudumc.nl), Marcia Tummers, Catharina Klijn, Lotte Sondag, Floris Schreuder, Rob Reuzel and Maroeska Rovers

Introduction. Multi-stakeholder engagement in the development and evaluation of medical devices is crucial for aligning devices with stakeholders' views, needs, and values. Focus groups, interviews, and surveys are often used to involve stakeholders, but these methods have rarely been compared to analyse their relative merits. Therefore, we systematically compared these three methods in terms of themes, interaction, and feasibility.
Methods. The methods were compared in a case-study on surgery with a new endoscopic device for patients with intracerebral haemorrhage. We asked patients, relatives, healthcare professionals and decision-makers about their perspective on this device, and about their perceived quality of hospital care. We conducted the focus groups and interviews in one explorative and one interactive round. The comparison was made in terms of number and content of themes, who and how participants interact, and in terms of hours that needed to be worked by researchers to apply a method.
Results. We enrolled 18 participants in the focus groups, 17 in the interviews and 43 in the survey. Focus groups generated 31 and 19 themes, and interviews 58 and 40 themes in the explorative and interactive round. Surveys generated 42 themes. Interviews produced various themes about the device that did not occur in the other methods. In the two rounds of the focus group, 13 and 42 percent of the interactions were directly between participants. In interview round one, 98 percent of the interactions were between the interviewer and participant, whereas 80 percent of the interactions in round two were discussions of other participants' opinions. In focus groups participants were inclined to emphasise agreement, whereas the interviews generated more in-depth discussions. Interviews took three times as many hours as the focus groups and survey.
Conclusions. Methods for multi-stakeholder involvement in device development vary considerably. These methodological differences should be taken into account when selecting a method for engaging stakeholders in the early stages of the lifecycle of a medical device.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462322001441 Published online by Cambridge University Press