

involvement procedure, as some important POs were not initially represented by the umbrella organization.

OP83 Value Assessment Framework: Evidence-Informed Deliberative Processes

AUTHORS:

Marcia Tummers (Marcia.Tummers@radboudumc.nl), Rob Baltussen, Maarten Jansen, Leon Bijlmakers, Janneke Grutters, Anouck Kluytmans, Rob Reuzel, Gert Jan van der Wilt

INTRODUCTION:

Priority setting in health care has been long recognized as an intrinsically complex and value-laden process. Yet, Health Technology Assessment (HTA) agencies presently employ value assessment frameworks that are ill-fitted to capture the range and diversity of stakeholder values, and thereby risk to compromise the legitimacy of their recommendations. We propose 'evidence-informed deliberative processes' as an alternative framework with the aim to enhance this legitimacy.

METHODS:

The framework is based on an integration of two increasingly popular and complementary frameworks for priority setting: multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) and accountability for reasonableness (A4R). Evidence-informed deliberative processes are, on the one hand, based on early, continued stakeholder deliberation to learn about the importance of relevant social values. On the other hand, they are based on rational decision-making – through evidence-informed evaluation of the identified values.

RESULTS:

The framework has important implications for how HTA agencies should ideally organize their processes. Firstly, HTA agencies should take the responsibility to organize stakeholder involvement. Second, agencies are advised to integrate their assessment and appraisal phase,

allowing for the timely collection of evidence on values that are considered relevant. Third, HTA agencies should subject their specification of decision-making criteria to public scrutiny. Fourth, agencies are advised to use a checklist of potentially relevant criteria, and to provide argumentation how each criterion affected the recommendation. Fifth, HTA agencies must publish their argumentation and install options for appeal.

CONCLUSIONS:

Adopting 'evidence-informed deliberative processes' as a value assessment framework could be an important step forward for HTA agencies to optimize the legitimacy of their priority setting decisions. Agencies can incorporate elements according to their needs and affordances.

OP85 Value To Society Of A Nationwide Patient Blood Management Program

AUTHORS:

Dialina Brillhante, António Robalo Nunes, Cândida Fonseca, João Mairos, Jorge Félix (jorge.felix@exigoconsultores.com), Mafalda Gonçalves, Melina Mota, Diana Ferreira, César Ferreira, Valeska Andreozzi, Björn Vandewalle, Sara Rabiais

INTRODUCTION:

Patient Blood Management (PBM) describes a multidisciplinary approach that strives to optimize patients own blood and has been reported to reduce blood components utilization while achieving improved patient outcomes and reduced healthcare costs. The aim of this study was to evaluate the public health and economic impact related to the implementation of a nationwide PBM program in Portugal.

METHODS:

A decision-model comparing two scenarios ("current clinical practice" and "with PBM implementation") was used to estimate the PBM impact including