

current frameworks lack mentioning of any explicit political/ethical deliberation and an evaluation on the potential impact of the HTAs (1).

METHODS:

During a topic prioritization for HTA, Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) as destination therapy for adults with end-stage heart failure was submitted. The prioritization criteria used were largely in line with those described above. We also included criteria on ethical/equity consideration and the potential impact of an HTA on decision making. A literature search was conducted to gather clinical and economic evidence on LVAD for the target population, supplemented by local data on potential need for and budget impact of providing a LVAD service.

RESULTS:

LVAD was scored high on clinical, economic and budget impact with a moderately high need, which would generally subject it to an HTA in order to inform a policy decision. However LVAD was also considered as a technology with a high impact on ethical and political grounds, given that it is a technology offering survival and quality-of-life benefits for a small group of patients for whom effective treatment is otherwise lacking. Through deliberation, the prioritization panel concluded that the impact of an HTA would be low, as a policy decision on whether a LVAD program should be funded would go beyond evidence. Therefore an HTA was not recommended for LVAD.

CONCLUSIONS:

To inform decision making, an evaluation on the potential impact of the HTA itself taking into account of the ethical/political consideration of funding a technology is of equal importance as the evidence alone. Subsequently, limited HTA resources can be reserved for technologies where an HTA can truly make a difference.

REFERENCES:

1. Noorani HZ, Husereau DR, Boudreau R, Skidmore B. Priority setting for health technology assessments: a

systematic review of current practical approaches. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2007;23(3):310–315.

2. EVIDEM. Evidence and Value: Impact on DecisionMaking (v3.1). Canada: EVIDEM Collaboration; 2014. Available at <https://www.evidem.org/docs/2016/EVIDEM-v3-1-Decision-criteria-conceptual-background-definitions-instructions-Oct-2015.pdf> [Accessed May 2016].

PP021 Peer Review Innovations For Grant Applications: Efficient And Effective?

AUTHORS:

Geoff Frampton (g.k.frampton@soton.ac.uk), Jonathan Shepherd, Karen Pickett, Jeremy Wyatt

INTRODUCTION:

Peer review of grant applications is employed routinely by health research funding bodies to determine which research proposals should be funded. Peer review faces a number of criticisms, however, especially that it is time consuming, financially expensive, and may not select the best proposals. Various modifications to peer review have been examined in research studies but these have not been systematically reviewed to guide Health Technology Assessment (HTA) funding agencies.

METHODS:

We developed a systematic map based on a logic model to summarize the characteristics of empirical studies that have investigated peer review of health research grant applications. Consultation with stakeholders from a major health research funder (the United Kingdom National Institute for Health Research, NIHR) helped to identify topic areas within the map of particular interest. Innovations that could improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of peer review were agreed as being a priority for more detailed analysis. Studies of these innovations were identified using pre-specified eligibility criteria and were subjected to a full systematic review.

RESULTS:

The systematic map includes eighty-one studies, most published since 2005, indicating an increasing area of investigation. Studies were mostly observational and retrospective in design, and a large proportion have been conducted in the United States, with many conducted by the National Institutes of Health. An example of an innovation is video training to improve reviewer reliability. Although research councils in the United Kingdom have conducted several relevant studies, these have mainly examined existing practices rather than testing peer review innovations. Full results of the systematic review will be provided in the presentation, and we will assess which innovations could improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of peer review for selecting health research proposals.

CONCLUSIONS:

Despite considerable interest in, and criticism of, peer review for helping to select health research proposals, there have been few detailed systematic examinations of the primary research evidence in this area. Our evidence synthesis provides the most up-to-date overview of evidence in this important developing area, with recommendations for health research funders in their decision making.

PP022 New Models Are Needed To Optimize The Management Of New Medicines

AUTHORS:

Brian Godman (brian.godman@ki.se), Eduardo Diogene, Jurij Fürst, Kristina Garuoliene, Augusto Guerra, Roberta Joppi, Rickard Malmström, Wija Oortwijn, Gisbert Selke, Angela Timoney, Björn Wettermark

INTRODUCTION:

Countries are struggling to fund new premium priced medicines with ever increasing prices. In addition, there are substantial savings as medicines lose their patents. This requires coordinated approaches. Models are being

developed centering on three pillars: pre-launch including horizon scanning; peri-launch including pricing and reimbursement (P & R)/ risk sharing; and post-launch including assessing effectiveness (1,2). This will continue to enable access to safe, effective and affordable medicines.

METHODS:

Desk research of regulatory and other relevant policy documents as well as a thorough and extensive literature search in peer-reviewed databases were conducted.

RESULTS:

Models to optimize the use of new medicines are being developed. These center on three pillars: pre-launch activities including horizon scanning with a specific focus on unmet needs, drugs expected place in therapy, drugs preliminary budget impact and forecasting (including medicines likely to lose their patents); peri-launch activities including P & R assessment and assessments of risk sharing arrangements; and post-launch activities include assessing the effectiveness and safety of new medicines in routine clinical care (1,2). Pre-launch activities to agree the number of potential patients for new cancer medicines resulted in hospitals staying within budget (3); and health authorities that had instigated activities pre-launch saw limited excess bleeding with dabigatran (3). Risk-sharing arrangements have increased access to new medicines; however, concerns with their confidential nature and administrative burden (2,3). Qualitative and/or quantitative approaches are also being developed to better value (new) medicines. There is also growing use of patient level data post launch, for example, studies highlighted concerns with dabigatran prescribing in Spain and anti-obesity medicines in Sweden. Long-term follow-up studies have shown greater effectiveness of ciclosporin versus tacrolimus for transplants despite the rhetoric.

CONCLUSIONS:

Stakeholders in the healthcare field are working together and developing methods to increase funding for new valued medicines whilst restricting their use