

dichotomous responses and/or Likert scales) for the evaluation and the format and dimension's weights of the final design of the tool.

## PP502 AQuAS Learnings From Implementing GRADE Approach, Especially The Evidence To Decision Framework And Multidisciplinary Final Consensus

Emmanuel Giménez, Maria-Dolors Estrada, Xavier Garcia ([xavier.garciausco@gencat.cat](mailto:xavier.garciausco@gencat.cat)), Maria Auxiliadora Castillo, Leonor Varela and Mireia Espallargues

**Introduction.** In recent years, the GRADE system has been adopted internationally to make judgments about evidence and/or recommendations. Recently, the Spanish Network of HTA (RedETS) has promoted among its members the use of the GRADE system, especially the "Evidence to Decision" tool (EtD) where a multidisciplinary panel is involved. The objective is to describe the methodological approach with the first AQuAS experience using this methodology in HTA, focused on inclusion/exclusion of these technologies in the Spanish National Health Service (NHS) portfolio.

**Methods.** The standard EtD tool was used for clinical and financial decisions. Four multidisciplinary panels were constituted by relevant professionals in clinical practice and, where possible, patients. The four panels discussed on the following four interventions: in two cases, AQuAS prepared preliminary recommendations and participants provided feedback, while in the other two cases, experts received the evidence review and were asked to formulate recommendations. These recommendations were voted on and, in the case of disagreement, adapted and then voted on for a second time. Finally, any discrepancies were noted in the report. Evaluated interventions were: maxillofacial 3D-reconstruction, cataract surgery equipment, non-invasive surgery in obesity and pharmacological treatment in secondary fracture prevention.

**Results.** Especially when more than one evaluative question was addressed in the HTA report the EtD and the consensus results required discussion. Consensus was fast but not immediate. Meeting length depended on the number of HTA questions and the amount of original disagreement in the recommendations. The nuances on how to write recommendations also affected the panel duration. All panels were successful in formulating the final recommendations.

**Conclusions.** Standardizing methodologies increased the homogeneity across HTA reports. The GRADE system is a feasible and useful tool because it favors transparency and rigor in drawing up recommendations on the inclusion/exclusion of technologies in the NHS portfolio. The EtD framework complements GRADE tables, which display the relevant evidence in a way that can be used by multidisciplinary groups to reach a consensual recommendation. Although all participants received a short training video, more experience in the use of these methodologies might shorten the duration of the process and facilitate reaching

consensus. Some considerations on how to overcome the difficulties and complexity of this methodological approach are discussed.

## PP506 Health Technology Reassessment (HTR) Of A Non-Drug Technology: Methods Used By A Regional HTA Unit

Marie-Belle Poirier ([marie-belle.poirier.ciussse-chus@sss.gouv.qc.ca](mailto:marie-belle.poirier.ciussse-chus@sss.gouv.qc.ca)), Maria Benkhalti, Jérémy Joncas, Ouifak El Warrari, Aghiles Addad, Sonia Cheng, Frédéric Mior, Anne Méziat-Burdin and Pierre Dagenais

**Introduction.** An environmental scan conducted by the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies (CADTH-March-2019) revealed that several health technology assessment (HTA) organisations are currently developing standard health technology reassessment (HTR) processes. Here we present methods used to conduct an HTR of a prioritization programme for non-immediate life-threatening urgent surgeries implemented in 2017 at a tertiary referral hospital in (Quebec-Canada). This HTR initiative was conducted by a regional HTA unit to optimize the programme efficiency and resources utilization as well as to motivate change in the clinical community of other hospitals within its healthcare network. Patient and healthcare personnel satisfaction levels towards the programme were also considered.

**Methods.** In this case study, HTR methods and outputs were elaborated using elements presented in the CADTH environmental scan and relevant publications identified through PubMed and in the grey literature. Documents in English and French, published between January 2002 and March 2019 were considered. Key stakeholders were consulted to identify barriers of the programme implementation to other hospitals in regards to aspects related either to the local medical practice or organizational factors.

**Results.** The prioritization process was conducted using the same tool applied for HTA appraisal with the additional criterion that the HTR could facilitate the programme implementation. The research processes used in this HTR included: i) systematic review of the literature, ii) hospital database search (efficacy and resource utilization), iii) perceptions of healthcare teams and patients. HTR outputs consist of specific recommendations on implementation barriers and methods to monitor the impacts of the programme.

**Conclusions.** In this evolving field, sharing lessons from HTR methods provides information to develop standard adaptable processes to different contexts. Hence, this work applies HTR to a healthcare programme while most of the literature focuses on the HTR processes on drug and interventional medicine disinvestment. These elements represented HTR methods used from prioritization appraisal, research processes for evaluation and outputs used to plan the implementation and finally monitoring from a regional HTA unit. It also showcases that HTR being conducted as a structured evidence-based assessment adds value to a healthcare programme and could also facilitate its implementation.