

OP49 Are Propensity-Score-Based Adjusted Indirect Comparisons Feasible For All European Joint Clinical Assessments Based On Non-Randomized Data?

Robert Krüger (robert.krueger@iqvia.com),
Chiara Cantoni and Anke Van Engen

Introduction: The EU HTA member state coordination group has finalized methodological guidance on indirect comparisons that states that propensity score (PS) methods should generally be used for indirect comparisons of non-randomized data in joint clinical assessments (JCAs). Half of new oncology approvals by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) between 2020 and 2023 were based on non-randomized data. This study aimed to identify how many of these were able to submit PS-based comparisons.

Methods: Using IQVIA's Market Access Insights (MAI) database of HTAs and regulatory approvals, we characterized evidence packages submitted to EMA and HTA agencies of EU member states according to the use of PS-based comparisons and access to individual patient data (IPD) from comparator studies.

Results: Of the 56 oncology approvals between 2020 and 2023, 30 (54%) were based on non-randomized data, of which 23 (23%) submitted PS-based indirect comparisons to EMA (15 therapies) or to HTA agencies (23 therapies). Electronic health record (EHR) or chart reviews were the most common source of comparative RWE, but agencies only took this evidence into account in fewer than half of HTAs where it was available. Use of PS-based methods also did not lead to more positive HTA outcomes than the alternative unanchored matching-adjusted indirect comparisons (MAICs) to aggregated data.

Conclusions: The prevalence of oncology approvals based on single-arm trials is expected to be a key challenge to the success of JCA. Unanchored comparisons will be required, but IPD was not necessarily shown to reduce uncertainty in HTAs analyzed in this research, and in about half of cases, comparisons to aggregate data were preferred due to applicability and heterogeneity concerns. Thus, the source of comparator data appears more relevant than the comparison method in HTAs, which contrasts with the available EU HTA coordination group guidance that focuses mainly on methodological aspects.

OP50 NICE Listens: Engaging The Public On How Environmental Sustainability Should Be Considered In Health Technology Assessment

Alice Murray (alice.murray@nice.org.uk) and Koonal Shah

Introduction: Involving the public is essential to building trust in health technology assessment (HTA) organizations. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) runs a deliberative public engagement program, NICE Listens. It was used to explore informed public opinion on how environmental sustainability should be taken into account in HTA.

Methods: Twenty-three general public participants from across England took part in three iterative online workshops (each lasting two or three hours, held three weeks apart in 2022). The workshops included trade-off exercises, role-play, group discussion, and video clips from interviews with sustainable healthcare experts.

Results: Strong support was found for NICE taking action to make healthcare more environmentally sustainable. Support increased as participants learned that sustainable healthcare offers co-benefits, such as reduced burden on the National Health Service through better self-management of conditions. Participants did not want health outcomes to be compromised in pursuit of sustainability. We identified some circumstances where they found it acceptable to consider the environmental impact of interventions in decision-making: when effective treatments already exist; when the condition is not severe; when the alternative is equally cost effective; and when greener options are marginally higher in cost but as clinically effective as the alternative.

Conclusions: The findings demonstrate that environmental sustainability is clearly considered a relevant element of value. They also offer insight into how the environmental impact of health interventions should be considered in HTA. Further research should focus on methods for consistent measurement of the environmental impacts of health interventions and the incorporation of those impacts into decision-making.

OP51 Strategies For Training Laypeople To Participate In Health Technology Assessment: A Scoping Review

Quenia Cristina Dias Morais (qcdias@gmail.com),
Alex Itaborahy, Leny Frossard, Iandy Mateus,
Bianca Leite and Marisa Santos

Introduction: This study aimed to map strategies for educating laypeople about health technology assessment (HTA). Although