

RESULTS:

We present a novel, flexible framework that combines evidence of efficacy with published results on other outcomes that matter to patients. Menus and outputs are designed to facilitate dialogue between advocates, clinicians, and HTA professionals. By allowing the user to adjust settings based on known heterogeneity among subpopulations, the tool's output can be used to inform discussions about the value of new interventions for defined patient segments.

CONCLUSIONS:

Patient representatives must frequently identify knowledge gaps in the literature before their HTA engagements and leverage this information to conduct surveys among their constituents. Our new patient advocate decision aid can support this process and facilitate a better understanding of the value of new innovations for diverse subgroups. A better definition of target populations will help to achieve balance between patient access and budget impact of new treatments. We seek feedback on our prototype from all stakeholders to further improve and maximize utility of this tool.

.....

PP29 Evaluating Supplementary Search Methods: Outcomes To Measure And Why

AUTHORS:

Juan Talens-Bou (j_talens@hotmail.com), Chris Cooper, Jo Varley-Campbell

INTRODUCTION:

In a recently published review of supplementary search methods, we proposed that researchers could usefully record time taken to search and present outcome values in similar way to existing studies, to facilitate generalisability of outcomes, where appropriate. We also discuss the idea of linking literature search effectiveness to study value. In this vignette, we discuss which outcomes we believe are important to measure and why. We discuss this in the context of the review of supplementary search methods and using a recently submitted evaluation of contacting study authors for context.

METHODS:

In a recently completed systematic review, we contacted eighty-two study authors to ask three questions. We aimed to measure the following outcomes when contacting study authors: Effectiveness - determined as number of contacts compared to number of replies; Efficiency - i) time to make contact and ii) time between contact and reply. We determined this in hours, minutes and seconds, in line with other studies; Cost - determined by comparing the efficiency of contacting authors with the effectiveness; and Value - determined by reading and comparing the published studies with the replies received to see if any unique data were identified.

RESULTS:

Effectiveness: thirty-eight answers were received from eighty-two possible contacts. Efficiency: In total, author contact took six hours, fifty-four minutes and twenty-five seconds across thirty-nine weeks. Replies were received across zero to thirty-nine days (median fourteen days). Cost: Cost for staff time was GBP 80.33 (EUR 91.20) or GBP 2.11 (EUR 2.40) per e-mail reply received. Value: We were able to identify value in author replies for each of the questions asked.

CONCLUSIONS:

In a recently published review of supplementary search methods, and a linked evaluation of the effectiveness of contacting study authors, we suggest outcomes that should be measured to determine effectiveness of literature search methods. We conclude that measuring these outcomes demonstrate both effectiveness and value.

.....

PP32 Protocol For Evaluation Of Pharmaceutical Assistance Governance

AUTHORS:

Emilia Faraco (emiliabaiarle@gmail.com), Marina Rover, Mareni Farias, Silvana Contezini

INTRODUCTION:

In Brazil, the National Pharmaceutical Assistance Policy was published in 2004. Pharmaceutical assistance at the primary health care level in Brazil is understood as a