

(JA3) offers a new early dialogue process involving a higher number of European HTABs. The present analysis aims to describe if the JA3 process modified the level of agreement across HTABs.

METHODS:

A descriptive analysis of the written recommendations provided during every JA3 early dialogues coordinated by the French National Authority for Health (HAS) until November 2017 was conducted. The level of commonality for each HTAB position identified was assessed globally and by domain (population, comparator, outcomes, study design and health economics) and classified as follows: “full agreement” if all HTABs had the same position, “partial agreement” if more than half HTABs had the same position and “disagreement” in all other cases.

RESULTS:

Four JA3 early dialogues were performed until November 2017: two in oncology, one in neurology and one in metabolic disorders. Between five and nine HTABs from eleven European countries participated. A total of forty-six positions were identified in these four early dialogues: ten on population, five on comparator, fifteen on outcomes, four on study design and twelve on health economics. Of the forty-six positions, full agreement was reached for twenty-eight positions, partial agreement for seventeen positions and only one disagreement was observed. The level of full agreements was highest for questions on comparators (five out of five) and population (nine out of ten) and lower for questions on health economics (six out of 12).

CONCLUSIONS:

Although the JA3 process substantially increased the number of HTABs participating in the early dialogues, this descriptive analysis suggests that the level of agreement remains very high. This may be facilitated by the high level of dialogue and coordination between HTAB ensured by the EUnetHTA process.

.....

OP154 Industry And Clinician Views Of Medtech Innovation Briefings

AUTHORS:

Alexia Campbell Burton (alexia.campbell-burton@nice.org.uk), Harriet Unsworth

INTRODUCTION:

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence Medtech Innovation Briefings (MIBs) are commissioned by the National Health Service (NHS) England and designed to support NHS and social care commissioners and staff who are considering using new medical devices and other medical, digital or diagnostic technologies. MIBs are fast flexible summaries of single technologies that are intended to be responsive to commissioners needs for information about innovative technologies. MIBs include a description of the technology, how it is used and its potential role in the treatment pathway. They also include a review of relevant published evidence and likely costs. As a relatively new product, the format of MIBs continues to evolve and in 2016 a more streamlined evaluation template was introduced. To ensure MIBs continue to meet users’ needs, a study was conducted to understand the opinions and requirements of core stakeholders and to identify key areas for future development.

METHODS:

An initial cross-sectional online survey with NHS staff who were potential users of MIBs was carried out in December 2015. A second round of online and mail-out surveys were circulated between November 2016 and May 2017 to medical technology manufactures and an additional group of NHS staff. Descriptive analysis was used for all quantitative data and qualitative data was summarized using thematic analysis.

RESULTS:

Thirty-nine medical professionals and forty-two manufacturer representatives participated in the surveys. More than half of clinicians were aware of MIBs and thought that raising awareness and visibility should be a future priority. Manufactures regarded MIBs as having a positive or mixed impact on innovation, access, or uptake by the healthcare system.

CONCLUSIONS:

Stakeholders are using MIBs in a variety of ways and there was and a range of suggestions for their future development particularly regarding moving from single technology evaluation to simultaneous assessment of similar technologies.

.....