OP116 Building Alignment Between Industry, Academia, And Patients On Health Technology Assessment Methods

Colman Taylor (colman.taylor@htanalysts.com.au)

Introduction: With the announcement of the health technology assessment (HTA) review in Australia, a HTA Summit was organized by ISPOR Australia in November 2022. The aim of the Summit was to provide a forum for industry, academia, and patients to share ideas and find common ground with respect to HTA policy, processes, and methods. Topics were determined by a Steering Committee and included: managing uncertainty; patient engagement; second order effects; genetics, genomics and precision medicines; conditional listing; and real-world evidence. Presentations on each topic were conducted by industry and non-industry experts. Breakout sessions led by facilitators were also held for each topic with members of the audience.
Methods: Discussions were recorded during the event and a thematic analysis was performed.
Results: The following themes were identified from the event.

- There was a strong sentiment that participants enjoyed the opportunity to discuss ideas and work toward solutions.
- There was a consistent theme that many of the issues arising in HTA were due to a lack of communication between sponsors, evaluators, patients, and decision makers.
- It was noted that HTA encompasses several technical terms that have different meanings among various stakeholders.
- There was a clear consensus that patients should be involved in HTA earlier and throughout the process.
- HTA reform can help drive better access to real-world evidence.
- To improve the efficiency of the process, uncertainty could be reframed as risk management, which incorporates the effect of uncertainty in the funding decision.
- HTA includes policies, processes, and methods and is used as a tool by decision makers to make informed funding decisions. It was noted on several occasions during the Summit that funding decisions have a political element that should be separated from the HTA process.

Conclusions: It is possible to achieve better collaboration between industry, academic, and patient groups with respect to HTA reform. To promote more collaborative work a consistent conflict of interest definition would be helpful.

OP119 Collectively Improving The Quality Use Of Highly Specialized Medicines: Starting With Biologics

Jonathan Dartnell (jdartnell@qumconnect.com.au), Sue Brown, Louise Hardy, Claire Barrett, Rachelle Buchbinder, Sam Whittle, Lisa Pulver, Nena Nikolic, Debra Rowett, Kylee Hayward and Catherine Hill

Introduction: In contrast to high-volume medicines prescribed by general practitioners, low-volume highly specialized medicines have not been supported by national quality use of medicine (QUM) programs in Australia. The first area addressed has focused on optimizing use of biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs).
Methods: The program was designed, developed and implemented in partnership with nine consortium member organizations and four affiliate organizations representing consumer and clinical audiences, program development expertize and implementation capability. The common agenda for the collective impact approach was to achieve better health outcomes for people with inflammatory arthritis, inflammatory bowel disease and plaque psoriasis. Multidisciplinary expert working groups reviewed formative QUM research and agreed on objectives, audiences, messages and interventions. Interventions were selected based on identified barriers, enablers and behavioral drivers, informed by the Theoretical Domains Framework. Interventions were co-designed and tested with end-users. Marketing and promotion activity supported implementation of all interventions through consortium channels and networks. Evaluation includes process, impact and outcome measures, and a realist evaluation of the academic detailing.
Results: Program objectives were to optimize: (i) first-line therapy before bDMARD use; (ii) first-choice bDMARDs; (iii) biosimilar prescribing and dispensing; (iv) bDMARD dosage; (v) glucocorticoid and analgesic use. Over 60 interventions supporting key messages for each objective were developed for audiences: consumers; rheumatologists, gastroenterologists, dermatologists; pharmacists; drug and therapeutic committees. Interventions implemented between September 2020 and September 2022 included: consumer decision aids, action plans, fact sheets, lived experience videos; living guidelines and evidence summaries; guidance/position statements for hospitals, podcasts, webinars, online learning; prescribing feedback reports; and academic detailing. Uptake of interventions has largely met targets and surveys have demonstrated shifts in specialist and consumer knowledge and behavior in line with key messages and objectives. Realist and outcome evaluation is ongoing.
Conclusions: Our experience demonstrates the value of a consortium of stakeholder organizations, with different expertise and interests but agreed goals and roles, working together to progress the quality use of highly specialized drugs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462323001241 Published online by Cambridge University Press