



eunetha

EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Joint Action on HTA 2012-2015

Methodological Standards and Procedures (MSP) for Full core HTA content development

Date: 2015 Nov. 30th

Was developed by Work Package 4 -
WP 4 Lead Partner: Agenas (Italy)



V2.0 – November 2015

Disclaimer: EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 is supported by a grant from the European Commission. The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors and neither the European Commission nor EUnetHTA are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	4
Why produce guidance ?	5
Composition and Terms of Reference of writing team	6
Structure of the guidance	8
PART 1	9
1.1 The story so far.	9
1.2 JA2 WP4 aims and production outputs	10
1.3 Description of the content and use of the JA1 feed-back.....	10
1.4 Topic Notification and Selection procedure (WP4 only)	11
1.5 Project management and forming teams	12
1.6 Stakeholder (STK) involvement process and dealing with Conflict of interest and confidentiality of data.....	14
PART 2	20
2.1 Order of domain work	20
2.2 Handling the electronic environment.....	23
2.3 National report production.....	24
2.4 Carrying out evidence searches	27
2.5 Domain specific issues: Health problem and current use of technology (CUR).....	28
2.6 Domain specific issues: Description and technical characteristics of technology (TEC)	37
2.7 Domain specific issues: Safety of the technology (SAF)	40
2.8 Domain specific issues: Effectiveness of the technology (EFF)	58
2.9 Domain specific issues: Costs, economic evaluation of the technology (ECO).....	71
2.10 Ethical aspects of the technology (ETH).....	74
2.11 Domain specific issues: Organisational aspects of the technology (ORG).....	82
2.12 Domain specific issues: Social aspects of the technology (SOC).....	85
2.13 Domain specific issues: Legal aspects of the technology (LEG)	86
Appendix 1. Topic Notification and Selection Procedure Form.....	88

Appendix 2. Selection form for notified technologies	91
Appendix 3. Stakeholder Involvement Template (Project Leader overview).....	93
Appendix 4. Survey for Manufacturer; Survey for WP4 Partners.....	95
Appendix 5. Stakeholders Consultation Form; Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders comments ..	98
Appendix 6. Conflict of Interest Declaration Form	101
Appendix 7. Project Definition Template for Core HTA.....	106
Appendix 8 – Useful Sources and Databases	109

List of abbreviations

- COI – Conflict of Interest
- CUR – Current use of the technology (Domain)
- DOICU – Declaration of Interest and Confidentiality Undertaking
- ECO – Costs, economic evaluation of the technology (Domain)
- EFF – Effectiveness of the technology (Domain)
- ET – Editorial Team
- ETH –Ethical aspects of the technology (Domain)
- EUnetHTA – European Network for Health Technology Assessment
- GL - Guideline
- HTA – Health Technology Assessment
- I – Investigator
- JA1 – Joint Action 1
- JA2 – Joint Action 2
- LEG – Legal aspects of the technology (Domain)
- LP – Lead Partner
- MSP – Methodological Standards and Procedures
- ORG – Organisational aspects of the technology (Domain)
- PI – Primary Investigator
- POP Database – Planned and On-going Project database
- SAF – Safety of the technology (Domain)
- SAG – Stakeholder Advisory Group
- SOC - Social aspects of the technology (Domain)
- SOP – Standard Operating Procedure
- STK – Stakeholder
- TEC – Description and technical characteristics of technology (Domain)
- WP – Work Package

Why produce guidance ?

Aim

The aim of this document is to guide the production of full Core HTA information based on collaboration of different European organizations using the EUnetHTA available tools. Where guidance on specific issues is already available, the source is cited and in some cases extract of contents is reported.

Evidence base

The 3-Year work plan of Work Package 4 of EUnetHTA JA2.

Practical guidance

The most powerful rationale for the EUnetHTA network is sharing and collaboration to enhance efficiency and relevance of information for all users. As a consequence a common set of procedures and standards, based on experience applied to scientific knowledge, will aid and speed up homogeneous production.

This guidance, first produced at the same time as the first JA2 Core HTA, aims at providing practical help when it is most needed. The document is updated accordingly with ongoing experience and changes in collaborations process and models, as well as with possible scientific and methodological developments both in WP4 and in other WPs of EUnetHTA JA2 .

The document provides guidance which can be improved within the collaboration.

Composition and Terms of Reference of writing team

To write the first draft of this document an extended writing team was organized through a call for volunteers. This resulted in the Writing Teams line-up.

Chapter	Writing Team
<p>Why produce guidance now [rationale for producing guidance on how to do things]</p> <p>The story so far. [Background to the project with history, aims and evolution]</p> <p>JA2 WP4 aims and production outputs [summary of why and what WP4 will produce]</p> <p>Description of the content and use of the JA1 feed-back. [how the JA1 feed back was incorporated in the guidance]</p>	<p>Tom Jefferson (Agenas) Marina Cerbo (Agenas) Kristian Lampe (THL) Francesca Gillespie (Agenas)</p>
<p>Stakeholder (STK) involvement process and dealing with Conflict of interest and confidentiality of data in pilots [methods to involve stakeholders and carry out validation]</p>	<p>Mirjana Huic (AAZ) Francesca Gillespie (Agenas)</p>
<p>Project management and forming teams [how to form teams]</p> <p>Order of domain work [how to approach domain work and how to communicate across domains and with coordination]</p>	<p>Kristian Lampe (THL) Marina Cerbo (Agenas) Nicola Vicari (Agenas)</p>
<p>National production [how to promote the use of core HTA information]</p>	<p>Marina Cerbo (Agenas) Marco Marchetti (A. Gemelli-UCSC) WP4 Sub group 3</p>
<p>Carrying out evidence searches [how to construct, run, store and update searches]</p>	<p>Tom Jefferson (Agenas) Francesca Gillespie (Agenas)</p>
<p>Domain specific issues: Current use of the technology(CUR) [methods to develop domain content]</p>	<p>Luciana Ballini (ASSR – RER)</p>
<p>Domain specific issues: Description and technical characteristics of technology (TEC) [methods to develop domain content]</p>	<p>Antonio Migliore (Agenas) Daniela Pertl (GOG)</p>
<p>Domain specific issues: Safety of the technology (SAF) [methods to develop domain content]</p>	<p>Luciana Ballini (ASSR – RER)</p>
<p>Domain specific issues: Effectiveness of the technology</p>	<p>Luciana Ballini (ASSR – RER)</p>

(EFF) [methods to develop domain content]	Luca Vignatelli Leonor Varela (Avalia-t) Susanna Maltoni (ASSR-RER)
Domain specific issues: Costs, economic evaluation of the technology (ECO) [methods to develop domain content]	Elpida Pavi (NSPH) Eleftheria Karampli (NSPH)
Domain specific issues: Ethical aspects of the technology (ETH) [methods to develop domain content]	Dario Sacchini (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Pietro Refolo (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Roberta Minacori (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Marta Lopez de Argumedo (Osteba)
Domain specific issues: Organisational aspects of the technology (ORG) [methods to develop domain content]	Marco Marchetti (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Americo Cicchetti (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Giorgia Tedesco (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Angelica Carletto (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Daniela D'Angela (CEIS) Federico Spandonaro (CEIS) Barbara Polistena (CEIS)
Domain specific issues: Social aspects of the technology (SOC) [methods to develop domain content]	Alessandra Lo Scalzo (Agenas)
Domain specific issues: Legal aspects of the technology (LEG) [methods to develop domain content]	Marina Casini (A. Gemelli-UCSC) Emanuela Midolo (A. Gemelli-UCSC)
General review	Marina Cerbo (Agenas) Nicola Vicari (Agenas)

Structure of the guidance

The content of the guidance is primarily practical, relying on the experience gained during JA1 and JA2. For each domain or topic, brief initial guidance will allow researchers to follow at least a common thread. The aim of each chapter is NOT to provide an exhaustive treatise of description of the methods used in each domain or topic. Such sources represent the basis for the MSP but their inclusion in the MSP would introduce repetition and increase the size of the document.

The suggestions in this document are amenable to editing and change as increasing experience is gained. As such, the suggestions are not meant to be definitive and should be read in conjunction with the content of Appendix 1 of the 3-year work plan.

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the collaboration among researchers operating in different contexts and with different backgrounds. This cannot be achieved if communication is difficult or if information is scattered in different documents.

The content is divided in two Parts : **Part 1** addresses the general issues in joint assessments, **Part 2** addresses scientific issues relevant to domain work.

Each chapter consists of:

-Title

- *Aim* :a brief statement of the aim of the chapter

- *Evidence base* : a summary of the evidence base or applied methods at the basis of the guidance. If none exist, this is clearly stated.

- *Practical guidance* : “how to” description in which the authors explain the practical steps of the realization of the task. This is the part in which past-experience provides practical help to complete the task.

- *Bibliography*: a list of relevant sources used

The text has not been proof read or copy edited.

PART 1

1.1 The story so far.

The first project to establish a sustainable European Network on Health Technology Assessment (HTA) was set up in 2005 with funds from the European Commission and the Council of Ministers. The first project included a group of 35 organizations in 27 European countries with the coordination of the Danish Centre for Evaluation and HTA.

The main strategic objective of the network was to actively connect different HTA agencies and institutions, at national and/or regional level to enable an effective exchange of information and to support policy makers' decisions.

The first step was to set-up an organizational framework for a European Network on HTA and the development of practical enabling tools and services. After the successful completion of the EUnetHTA Project (2006-2008) the EUnetHTA Collaboration further developed the basis for a sustainable and permanent collaboration for HTA in Europe. In 2009 25 Founding Partners of EUnetHTA Collaboration joined forces with other partners and the European Commission to implement results of the previous projects through the first Joint Action (JA1) on HTA 2010-2012: a total of 55 organizations committed their resources to participate in the planned activities within the framework of the EUnetHTA JA1.

The overarching objective of the EUnetHTA JA1 was to put into practice an effective and sustainable HTA collaboration in Europe bringing added value at the European, national and regional level.

The second Joint Action (JA2) started in October 2012. JA2 could lead to the creation of a permanent and sustainable European Network for HTA through the development of a general strategy, principles and an implementation proposal, according to the requirements of Article 15 of the Directive for cross-border healthcare (2011/24/EU).

Within the JA2, Work Package 4 has the remit to:

- Test the capacity of national HTA bodies to produce structured core HTA information (full core/rapid HTAs) together and apply it in national context (including collection of data on costs and overall efficiency of the production in the network).
- Implement, pilot and further develop models and tools as well as production processes to support collaborative production of core HTA information with reinforced secretariat and coordination function.

1.2 JA2 WP4 aims and production outputs

Aim

“The aim of JA2 WP4 is to produce 3 core HTAs (they can be both pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions) and up to 20 linked national HTA reports, while further developing production methods in readiness for the creation of the permanent network.

Evidence base

EUnetHTA WP4 3-year Workplan.

Practical guidance

Producing core HTAs is a complex business, as it reflects the reality use of the intervention being assessed.

Such an undertaking has three main characteristics.

First, it must be a multidisciplinary effort reflecting the complex reality of the interventions and its uses.

Second, production must tread the tightrope of producing coherent and authoritative structured HTA information which is at the same time general, exhaustive, and usable as a basis for local use at national or subnational level.

Third, network production means avoidance of redundancy and duplication as all members of the network are free to propose and join and contribute to projects on topics of importance to their body or institution. Sharing of resources enhances efficiency and relevance.

1.3 Description of the content and use of the JA1 feed-back.

Aim

To explain how the JA 1 feedback was incorporated in the guidance. JA1 feedback is an important part of the baggage of experience in using the HTA Core Model.

Evidence base

The methodology applied was gathering relevant validation results of JA1 and delivering information on the use of the HTA Core Model and HTA Core Model On-line Tool to relevant working groups.

Practical guidance

We describe the process of making relevant JA1 validation information available to working groups.

The Validation of JA1 consisted of the following four Surveys:

- Core HTA Production Survey submitted to persons who participated in core HTA production
- Screening Model Survey submitted to member agencies of EUnetHTA and INAHTA
- Online Tool and Service Survey submitted to EUnetHTA Agencies + WP4 SAG
- Core HTA Content and Format Survey submitted to member agencies of EUnetHTA and INAHTA + WP4 SAG + Public Consultation

After a first analysis of results an official description of the validation process was made available in the Technical Report of Joint Action 1.

At the first e-meeting of JA2 the following critical issues about the validation results were presented along with considerations of how we can improve them:

- Roles and work load specifications (Reviewers, Primary Investigators, Investigators, Editorial team, Project Leader, Coordinator, etc.)
- Topic selection, Prioritization, Stakeholder involvement
- Collaborative model: mix?
- Lack of methodological guidance
- Conflicts of interest handling
- Problems with model applications
- Overlapping issues within and across domains
- Domain work cascade
- Standardization of evidence handling

Subsequently validation results were further analyzed by broad topics and textual comments were examined to identify similar and otherwise most relevant feedback.

Target working groups for receiving relevant information were identified and results were made available accordingly.

The first identified groups were the MSP working group and expert groups working on the update of the HTA Core Model within WP8. The following is a non-exhaustive list of the major topics of the grouped validation results received:

- Overall feasibility of the core HTA concept
- Key features of the HTA Core Model
- Core HTA content and format
- Experience in using the Screening Model, the Online Tool and Service, as well as the Collaborative Models and Final products.
- The experience acquired within the process
- Screening Core HTA model

Bibliography

At the end of JA1 users and researchers involved in the use of the CM were asked for their opinions and the results of this in-house survey form the basis for the comments.

1.4 Topic Notification and Selection procedure (WP4 only)

The first step in the production of any core HTA is a procedure for topic notification and selection.

The procedure adopted in JA2 is based on the experience of the JA1 and is divided into two parts:

1. Notification - identifying to the whole group interventions of interest (“technologies”).

Each EUnetHTA member and WP4 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) plus DG Sanco can notify and nominate as many technologies as they want using the form in **Appendix 1**. Notification is carried out on individual forms (i.e. one notification, one form). The form must be completed using the most up-to-date information available.

Completed forms are returned electronically to the project manager by a set date. Once the completed forms are received, the project manager carries out a face assessment to identify vague notifications (see the examples at page 1 of the form) and notifications which appear to contain

mistakes. These are returned to the originators for clarification. Incomplete forms are excluded and are not further processed.

The following rules apply:

- Multiple notifications of the same technology are counted as one.
- Unclear or incomplete notifications will be deleted
- Once there is a consolidated list, this is circulated to WP4 members and SAG members.

2. Selection - members are asked to select the technology which will be the topic of the core HTA.

- All WP4 partners and SAG members plus DG Sanco are asked to express a preference for no more than three technologies of interest to them. See Appendix 6 for specimen call to vote.
- Preferences are expressed by giving the scores 1, 2 and 3 in increasing order of importance, 3 being the most important and 1 the least important (each score can only be given once to one technology). "Important" means important to the agency or body at the time of notification and voting. If the voting body has a national remit, importance has a national perspective.
- The resulting scored consolidated list is then shared and:
 - If there is a clear "winner" (a technology which has scored more 3s than the others), this will be selected as a working topic with the runner up(s) as reserve(s). At present No SUMRANK is done (i.e. no aggregate scoring to define rank).
 - If there is no clear winner (there is more than one technology with the same 3 scores), the score sheet with the top scoring technologies will be circulated for a quick (3 days) further round of voting until a clear winner emerges.
- All lists of notified technologies will be made available for information, to facilitate collaboration amongst notifiers and to form the basis for further selection. See **Appendix 2** for specimen notification of selected technology.
- Form originators may want to notify the same technologies they have already listed in the Planned and Ongoing Projects (POP) database.

1.5 Project management and forming teams

Aim

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of how the overall management of a core HTA project and expert collaboration are organised.

Evidence base

The contents of this chapter are based on practical experience and participants' feedback from seven previous core HTA projects within the EUnetHTA Project (2006-2008) and EUnetHTA Joint Action 1 (2010-2012) and JA2 (2012-2015).

Practical guidance

Production of a core HTA is an extensive and challenging effort, bringing together many researchers with different scientific and geographical backgrounds. Consequently the project requires firm coordination by

dedicated persons acting as project leaders. The coordination should not rely on one person only. Preferably the task should be divided between 1-3 persons to ensure continuity in case of changes of employers as well as of planned and unexpected absences from work (sabbaticals, vacation periods, sick leave).

Following the choice of the technology the project Coordinator performs the recruitment of researchers' team accordingly with partners' availability (and) interest in assessing the topic.

Apart from the coordinators, people within a project group are divided into teams working on different domains. Each of these *domain teams* should have at least one person as *primary investigator (PI)*. The PI (or PIs) bears the primary responsibility within one domain for the core HTA production process - from project planning to delivering the final version of the core HTA information collection. The PIs write the majority of the core HTA contents, supported by one or more *investigators (I)*.

Each domain team should have one or more investigators that actively support the PI in his/her work. Investigators assist in writing and formulating the contents, and they can perform certain agreed-on tasks for the domain. The number of investigators depends on the available resources, but the project leaders should ensure that each domain has at least two persons actively participating as researchers, and that adequate expertise both on the topic and on the domain's typical research methodologies is available, as specified in the "*Policy for HTA Core Model and core HTA information*".

In addition to active researchers, each domain team should have a group of *internal reviewers (IR)* who support the investigators' work by providing ideas, reading and commenting drafts and ensuring adequate geographical and health system views. The aforementioned policy sets as minimum requirement that the reviewers must come from another organisation in another country than the investigators. Based on experience from earlier core HTA projects, however, an adequate number of reviewers per domain to ensure adequate distribution of views from different settings should be recruited. Reviewers should be regarded as active members of the domain team, not as external peer-reviewers.

The detailed working methods and order, as well as timelines, should be agreed on by the members of each domain team in collaboration with the project leaders. The PI has the primary responsibility from the domain team's side to keep contact with the project leaders and to bring the practical work forward within agreed-on timeline.

An *editorial team (ET)* should be set up for each core HTA project to support the project leaders. The ET discusses challenges and solutions for problems within various domains. Often similar challenges are identified within more than one domains and different domains should seek shared solutions to problems. One person from each domain should be assigned to the ET. The PI is the preferred choice as representative of his/her domain, but the task can also be allocated to any other investigator.

Practical experience has shown the convenience of forming teams with one PI coordinating more than one domain (sometimes called "domain clusters") perhaps with enlarged investigator teams preparing 2 or the domain in one cluster under the same PI:

Bibliography

"Policy for HTA Core Model and core HTA information"

1.6 Stakeholder (STK) involvement process and dealing with Conflict of interest and confidentiality of data

Aim

To explain guidance on who, how and when involve Stakeholders (STK) keeping track of results; to explain procedure on how to deal with Conflict of interest and confidentiality of data.

Evidence base

Literature on appropriate Stakeholder involvement are summarized here. According to these data there is no single standard way of implementing STK involvement. Therefore our guidance will be based on literature and past JA1 experience while working through relevant gaps relative to STK involvement and Conflict of interest and confidentiality issues. EUnetHTA policy and SOP on STK involvement define the rules applied in the Network.

Definition of STK

STKs are groups or organizations which will potentially be affected by, or have an interest in and may in a consultative role influence the actions or aims of an organization, project or policy directions (Nielsen 2009).

The major categories are: Consumer (general public, patient, and caregiver); Clinician (Health Professional); Policymaker; Researcher; Research Funder; Insurer/Payer; and Manufacturer (Table 1) (O'Haire 2011).

Table 1. Definitions of Stakeholder groups (original table from O'Haire 2011)

Stakeholder	Definition
Consumer (general public, patient, and caregiver)	<p>An individual or advocacy group representing individuals who use health care services (e.g., patients and their families) and/or who is a member of the community (e.g., patient, parent, neighbor)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General public • General public advocacy group • Individual patient with condition/disease • Individual patient without condition/disease • Patient advocacy group – condition/disease specific • Patient advocacy group – not condition/disease specific • A person acting as a proxy or providing care to a patient with condition/disease
Clinician (Health Professional)	<p>Health care provider (academic, rural/frontier, community)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition/disease specific • Not condition/disease specific • Practicing/nonpracticing <p>Medical organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition/disease specific • Not condition/disease specific
Policymaker	<p>An individual or organization who is involved in health care policy (e.g., local, state, provincial and Federal legislators and staff)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical organizations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governmental organizations (e.g., VA, AHRQ, government officials)
Researcher	<p>An individual who conducts and/or facilitates research activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic science • Translational science • Clinical science • Research methodology • Health service • Systematic review
Research Funder	<p>A public or private organization that funds research (e.g., National Institute of Health, Department of Defense, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Susan G. Komen Foundation, American Cancer Society)</p>
Insurer/Payer	<p>An organization or agency that pays for health-related goods and services (e.g., Blue Cross Blue Shield, Medicaid, Medicare) or a business group that pays for health insurance (e.g., employers and government)</p>
Manufacturer	<p>A business group that produces health-related items (e.g., pharmaceuticals and medical devices)</p>

The following four types of STK groups have been identified as particularly important for the EUnetHTA Joint Action: 1. Patient and healthcare consumer organizations; 2. Healthcare providers (professionals and hospitals); 3. Payers and 4. Industry, with clear standard operating procedures and stakeholder involvement policy described (<http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/eunetha-ja-stakeholder-involvement-standard-operating-procedures-sop>, <https://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/eunetha-ja-stakeholder-involvement-policy>).

Reasons and key components of STK involvement

A KCE report (Pierart J 2012) listed reasons to involve STKs: to provide legitimacy or credibility to the HTA institutions; to promote EBM practices and EBM culture; prevent disagreement or conflicts; improve acceptance of results and increase impact; enhance relevance of research and to reduce duplication.

STK involvement is seen as serving the principles of transparency, accountability, participation, objectivity, EB outcome, patient-oriented outcome, scientific work. Criteria of effective STK involvement are: to be involved at an early stage of the project; in transparency (to clarify confidentiality issues and publication rules, task to do and planning, amount of work needed (the number of meetings) and task to do); mutual learning; and satisfaction.

Key components of STK involvement written in this report are: STK identifications and analysis; communication at an early stage; STK consultation throughout the project development process; dialogue in case of controversies; management of STK comments; STK involvement in project monitoring; regular feedback to STK and skills to manage the process of STK involvement.

Different methods of STK involvement

There are different methods to involve STKs in the HTA process. The actual choice will depend on the precise set of circumstances and on the expected outcome (Table 2) (Pierart J 2012).

Table 2. Different methods of STK involvement

Methods of STK involvement
On-site visits
Individual interviews with typical STK
Focus groups
Discussion fora (meeting with 8-10 STK to discuss contentious points, project scoping groups, inventory group, rating groups)
Delphi methods
Consensus conferences
Online discussion groups
Surveys (web, telephone, paper self-administered)
Workshops
Use of social media

Practical guidance

This section represent a “how to” description on the practical steps of the realization of the task, with a description of the most common pitfalls. Maximum use of past experience is made here to give practical help to complete the task.

Past experience:

- Very little useful feedback (from scoping to comments on drafts) was provided in the JA1.
- The process of STK involvement was not clear enough and there was a need to improve transparency.

Suggested process:

STKs will be involved in different ways and at different times in WP4 activities, according to the EUnetHTA Stakeholder Involvement Policy (SOP), Methodological Standards and Procedure (MSP) and needs expressed by Domain teams. **Appendix 3** contains a supportive Template to be used by Project Leaders to track STK involvement.

The four different ways of STK involvement will be through:

1. Stakeholder advisory group (SAG)
2. Specific product assessments
3. Public consultations
4. Expert meetings

1) STK advisory group (SAG)

WP4 invites STK Forum participants to appoint representatives with specific expertise in the assessment of medical devices, procedures and diagnostics into the WP4 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG). Each person

participating in this group should have a clear mandate from the Forum participant. The mandate should be agreed upon between the Forum participant and the Secretariat and communicated to WP4 LP by the Secretariat. To ensure effective communication between the partners of WP4 and the SAG, the following feedback method should be used: if there is more than one representative from any given Forum participant, their feedback should be collated into one response, resulting in one response per Forum participant. The number of representatives per Forum participant is limited to three; it is however possible to change representatives between 2012 and 2015 based on the specific expertise that is needed. This policy applies to situations where major feedback is sought on preliminary WP4 documents and activities. SAG feedback was elicited for the following activities (including timing):

- WP4 Methodological Standards and Procedure Manual, draft and final text (for a period of 14 days);
- Each Topic proposal, prioritization and selection process, according the Topic Notification and Selection Procedure (for a period of 7 days);
- Each Core HTAs Project Protocol (for a period of 7 days);
- Each Core HTAs Drafts (the final pre-SAG draft) for a period of 14 days. This may be too short a period and in future 3 weeks may be considered

Comments and feedback are implemented if relevant.

Comments and feedback will be published in the Stakeholder Forum Area of the EUnethta.eu web site.

2) Specific product assessments (full Core HTAs)

Mandatory STK involvement includes:

- Contact with the respective manufacturer at the beginning of the assessment to elicit information (e.g. C/E mark, on-going studies, available evidence). Whenever possible, the EUnetHTA submission file for other technologies shall be used as developed. In addition, the draft Project Plan (Protocol) will be sent to the manufacturer for feedback (for a period of 7 days);
- An invitation to the SAG to comment on the draft Project Plans (Protocols);
- Commenting on the draft version of a full Core HTA (which will be made accessible on the EUnetHTA website);
- At least 1 clinical expert to review the second draft of the full Core HTA (for a period of 7 days).

Comments and feedback is implemented, if relevant.

If further clarification/details are required, further STKs who may be involved are:

- Contacts of respective providers/clinicians of technology (surgeons, etc.) in the scoping phase (for a period of 7 days) to have detailed information on the technology use;
- Contacts of the respective patient group (e.g. for support on patient-relevant endpoints) at the beginning of the assessment (for a period of 7 days).

Comments and feedback are implemented, if relevant.

Questionnaire *surveys* for retrieving more information on the use of a technology are planned separately for Manufacturers and EUnetHTA WP Partners and carried out by the Coordinator of WP4, Agenas, as Lead partner of WP4 EUnetHTA JA2. Questions for these Surveys should be prepared by each Domain Primary Investigator, in close cooperation with each Domain teams (for example, data on marketing authorization, CE mark, reimbursement status, national guidelines, clinical studies in progress, non-published data...), and sent to the Coordinator. The time frame for returning the answers by mail is 10 days. Upon receipt the Coordinator should send the answers to the Primary investigator of each Domain.

Templates for these Surveys are in **Appendix 4**.

3) Public consultation (including timing):

- Final version of the WP4 Methodological Standards and Procedure Manual (on the EUnetHTA website for a period of 30 days)
- Final version of each full Core HTA (on the EUnetHTA website for a period of 30 days)
- Individual Project plans (Protocols) for each pilot full Core HTA (will be available on the EUnetHTA website for a period of 10 days)

Comments and feedback should be implemented in the final deliverables (if relevant).

To increase transparency, authors of full Core HTA should reply to all STK comments using the Authors' Reply Template.

All **Templates** (WP4 EUnetHTA JA2 Stakeholders Consultation templates on the draft Core HTA Protocol, draft Core HTA Report, final Core HTA Report; WP4 EUnetHTA JA2 Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders Consultations) are in **Appendix 5**.

Comments and feedback will be published in the Stakeholder page of the EUnethta.eu website.

4) Expert meetings

Expert meetings with clinicians, experts, manufacturers, etc. can be organized by Core HTA Coordinator to discuss emerging issues from ongoing work and share the experience/lessons. Such meetings are useful at various stages of the work, but especially before finalisation of the protocol and to discuss findings. Experience has taught that efforts to engage STKs and maintain good communication throughout are seldom wasted. As well researchers these meetings may involve STKs.

Conflict of interest and confidentiality of data in pilots

Declaration of Interest and Confidentiality Undertaking (DOICU).

Conflicts of interest are handled according to EUnetHTA JA2 SOP. As conflict of interest may be topic-dependent, conflict of interest declarations will be collected from authors and reviewers involved in a specific assessment by the Lead Partner on the DOICU Form, see **Appendix 6**. Authors and reviewers who declare a conflict of interest will be excluded from parts of or the whole work under this specific topic by Lead Partner decision. However, they may still be included in other assessments.

If external experts are involved in WP4 conflict of interest declarations will be collected from them regarding the topic, by the Lead Partner using the COI Form. External experts who declare conflict of interest will be excluded from parts of, or the whole work under this specific topic, by Lead Partner decision. However, they may still be included in other assessments.

Handling of confidential data:

It is assumed that confidentiality agreements are standard practice for the WP4 organizations or institutions when hiring personnel. As a result, no separate confidentiality agreements will be drafted for participation in pilots. Individual WP4 partner organizations or institutions (not coordinating agencies or the EUnetHTA Secretariat) are responsible and accountable for the deliverance and maintenance of confidentiality agreements for participating in assessments.

Transparency of STK involvement will be increased by clear process, methods, template, and feedback description, as well as a clear process of dealing with conflict of interest statements.

Bibliography

Nielsen C, Kristensen F, Bistrup M, Cecchetti A, Turk E. Involving stakeholders and developing a policy for stakeholder involvement in the European network for Health Technology Assessment, EunetHTA. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2009;25 (Suppl 2):84-91.

O'Haire C, McPheeters M, Nakamoto EK, LaBrant L, Most C, Lee K, Graham E, Cottrell E, Guise J-M. Methods for Engaging Stakeholders To Identify and Prioritize Future Research Needs. *Methods Future Research Needs Report No. 4*. (Prepared by the Oregon Evidence-based Practice Center and the Vanderbilt Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-2007-10057-I.) AHRQ Publication No. 11-EHC044-EF. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. June 2011. Available at: www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/reports/final.cfm, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK62565/pdf/TOC.pdf>

Stakeholder Involvement Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). EUnetHTA JA2. Available at <http://www.eunethta.eu/outputs/eunethta-ja-stakeholder-involvement-standard-operating-procedures-sop> The Stakeholder Involvement Policy. EUnetHTA JA2. Available at <https://www.eunethta.eu/outputs/eunethta-ja-stakeholder-involvement-policy>

Pierart J, Leonard C, Chalon P, Daue F, Mertens R. Stakeholder Involvement in KCE working process. *Method*. Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre. (KCE). 2012. KCE reports 174C. D/2012/10.273/11., https://kce.fgov.be/sites/default/files/page_documents/KCE_174C_stakeholder%20involvement_in_KCE_working_processes.pdf

Gagnon MP, Desmartis M, Lepage-Savary D, Gagnon J, St-Pierre M, Rhainds M, et al. Introducing patients' and the public's perspectives to health technology assessment: A systematic review of international experiences. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2011;27(1):31-42.

Hansen HP, Lee A, van Randwijk CB. Patient aspects: A review of fifty-eight Danish HTA reports. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2011;27: 330–36.

Moran R, Davidson P. An uneven spread: A review of public involvement in the National Institute of Health Research's Health Technology Assessment program. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2011;27:343–47.

Danner M, Hummel JM, Volz F, van Manen JG, Wiegard B, Dintsios CM et al. Integrating patients' views into health technology assessment: Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) as a method to elicit patient preferences. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2011;27:369–75.

WP5 Procedure Manual draft, Version 2, 2013. Available at EUnetHTA JA2 Intranet.

Appendices

Appendix 3 Stakeholder Involvement Template (Project Leader overview)

Appendix 4 Survey for Manufacturer; Survey for WP4 Partners

Appendix 5 Stakeholders Consultation Form; Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders comments

Appendix 6 Conflict of Interest Declaration Form

1 **PART 2**

2 **2.1 Order of domain work**

3 **Aim**

4 The aim of this chapter is to provide guidance on planning and executing the practical research work of the
5 nine domain teams working on a core HTA.

6 **Evidence base**

7 The contents of this chapter is based on practical experience and participants' feedback from seven core
8 HTA projects within EUnetHTA Project (2006-2008) and EUnetHTA Joint Action 1 (2010-2012) and Joint
9 Action 2 (2013-2015) some of which are documented in respective technical reports.

10 **Practical guidance**

11 The guidance in this chapter presumes that the topic of the core HTA has been selected and the domain
12 teams have been set up according to the previous chapter. Consequently, the guidance focuses on the
13 period during which the domain teams perform the following activities:

- 14 1. design the project protocol for the HTA Core Model Online,
- 15 2. design the research protocols of different domain teams, and
- 16 3. find answers to the research questions.

17 The period ends in a finalized manuscript that is submitted for publication as a *collection of core HTA*
18 *information* within the HTA Core Model Online. Like topic selection, the publication approval process is
19 beyond the scope of this chapter.

20 There are two specific reasons for the need for good coordination between the domain teams. These deal
21 with information relations and possible control ("choke") points.

22 **Information relations across domains**

23 First, the domain teams inevitably need to deal with information that is related to the work of other domains.
24 Two main types of relations exist.

25 The relation can be *sequential*, meaning that the team working on domain A needs specific information from
26 the team working on domain B before it can answer certain research questions within domain A. For
27 example the ECO domain needs information on effectiveness from EFF domain to answer questions on
28 cost-effectiveness.

29 The relation can also be about (fully or partly) similar *content* of research, i.e. research questions that have
30 something in common. The assessment elements within various domains can sometimes be completely
31 similar or at least their content partly overlapping. In these cases the two domain teams should collaborate
32 when answering such questions. In these cases the domain teams should agree on which team provides the
33 initial answer that is then reviewed and amended by the other team(s) to cover their viewpoints and needs.
34 In the case of partial similarity, each domain team should work on their own research question(s) and share
35 information with the others. For example shared literature searches may make the work more efficient even if
36 the answers are kept separate.

37 **Control points**

38 Some events within the core HTA production process may make the continuation of the project meaningless.
39 Such a situation might, for example, arise if the research within the EFF domain concludes that the
40 effectiveness of the technology being assessed is clearly inferior or nil compared to the comparator
41 technology (i.e. there is strong "evidence of no effect"). In that case it might be more sensible to halt the
42 whole project and direct the research resources elsewhere rather than to continue studying all the research
43 questions yet waiting to be answered in some other domains.


44 While such a decision might be useful in practice, the criteria and procedures for making such decisions
 45 have not been discussed sufficiently to issue explicit advice on such choke points in core HTA projects within
 46 JA2. Some think that the issue might not be as simple as it first seems to be. The multi-disciplinary nature of
 47 the core HTA projects makes defining a simple sequence of research within various domains with all
 48 possible important choke points very difficult. Effectiveness - or lack thereof - is not the only characteristic of
 49 a technology that would define whether it is useful to continue a project or not. Safety may be a critical
 50 feature of a technology (as in the old principle of "*primum non nocere*"). Similarly important findings may be
 51 made in any domain of the HTA Core Model. While it may be possible to define explicit choke points in the
 52 future, these should be identified, analysed and discussed. Acceptance of such a viewpoint undermines the
 53 central function of HTA, that of helping decision makers choose the best possible intervention. In practice
 54 this means choosing those intervention which have the best cost-effectiveness profile relative to the others.
 55 Such a judgement is not possible initially on the basis of dimensions other than effectiveness (although all
 56 other dimensions contribute to the final assessment). In addition such reasoning would lead to a formulary
 57 full of ineffective or unproven interventions for which a harm profile is deemed satisfactory. This is a situation
 58 which is difficult to reconcile with the HTA perspective.

59 **Order of work**

60 Based on the information relations, the following table summarizes the recommended order of work within
 61 domains. To provide structure for the timeline the domain team work is divided into quarters. Considering
 62 that this phase typically would take anything between 6 and 12 months, the actual time allocated for each
 63 quarter would be between 1,5 to 3 months.

64 Preparatory work, including preparation of relevant protocols and reading other teams' drafts is marked in
 65 **Light green**.

66 An active phase of research within the domain is marked in **Dark green**.

Time 						
	Domain teams	Domain team work				
		1 st quarter	2 nd quarter	3 rd quarter	4 th quarter	
	Editorial team	Finalize scope and protocol	Coordination	Coordination	Prepare for final editorial work	
	CUR					Final editorial work 2-3 months Peer review and approval Process to be developed by WP4-5-8
	TEC					
Topic selection	SAF					
	EFF					
	ECO					
	ETH					
	ORG					
	SOC					
	LEG					

67
 68 This order of work takes into account the following key features of the process identified in previous
 69 projects:

- 70 • Results from the CUR, TEC and ORG domains are needed in several other domains.
- 71 • Work within CUR and TEC is closely related to scoping of the whole project.

- 72
- ECO domain needs input from EFF, CUR and ORG.
- 73
- ETH, SOC and LEG domains need input from several other domains.
- 74
- The Core HTA protocol needs to be agreed and locked for the subsequent phases to be functional
- 75
- within the HTA Core Model Online.

76 **Bibliography**

77 HTA Core Model Handbook (last version available)

78

79 **2.2 Handling the electronic environment**

80 **Aim**

81 The aim of this chapter is to provide guidance on the use of available EUnetHTA tools during the
82 development of the project.

83 **Evidence base**

84 Several tools have been developed to facilitate the collaboration on the basis of the EUnetHTA JA1
85 experience.

86 Resources are available and include the HTA Core Model, POP database, Evident database. Intranet
87 allows research teams to share documents and to exchange comments.

88 Training sessions are organised by Work package 2 and Work Package 8 to allow familiarization with
89 different tools.

90

91 **Practical guidance**

92 The guidance in this chapter is limited to the use of tools at different steps of HTA information production.

93 Step 1- Topic notification

94 Consult the POP database to know if other organisations are working on the topic of interest or have planned
95 to work on it to avoid duplication;

96 Step 2- Project planning

97 Project planning includes scoping, searching of information, formulating research questions, and planning
98 methodologies. The objective of this phase is to develop a final Project Plan, including timelines, a list of all
99 relevant questions to be answered and methodologies intended to be used in the assessment. The intranet
100 should be used to share relevant documents on the topic. These can be useful in the scoping process. A
101 Project Definition Template for core HTA is available in Appendix 7.

102 Instructions on the use of HTA Core Model Online can be found at
103 <http://mekat.hl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx>

104 Step 3- Assessment

105 The assessment involves finding answers to the questions of the protocol phase, the methodological
106 guidance outputs for the HTA Core Model applications and this guidance. The objective of this phase is to
107 produce HTA structured information to be included in result cards by each domain team.

108 To improve communication between teams draft documents should be shared in the intranet.

109 Step 4- Internal Review

110 Internal Review includes review of the assessment. The objective of this phase is to collect and address
111 comments and suggestions for changes from dedicated reviewers.

112 Step 5 -External Review and Consultation/validation

113

114 External Review and Consultation includes consultation of the assessment with WP4 members, at least 1
115 clinical expert, the manufacturer(s) and other potential STKs (e.g. physicians, patients). The objective of this
116 phase is to collect and address comments and opinions from all interested parties.

117

118 The Lead Partner (LP) will upload any useful documents on the intranet WP4 page to facilitate the
119 exchanges among domain teams. Documents to be submitted to SAG consultation and to public consultation

120 will be uploaded also respectively in the Stakeholder Forum area of the EUnetHTA website and announced
121 in the report page, in accordance with the EUnetHTA SOP.

122 **Bibliography**

123 HTA Core Model online: <http://www.corehta.info>

124 EVIDENT database: <https://evident.has-sante.fr/has/login.xhtml>

125 POP Database: <http://eunetha.dimdi.de/PopDB/>

126

127 **2.3 National report production**

128

129 **Aim**

130 The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the overall approaches that can be used to facilitate the
131 use of the core HTA information for national report production.

132 **Evidence base**

133 A list of general toolkit resources (with hyperlinks) that can be consulted if further information and guidance
134 is required on adaptation issues and transferability questions is at <https://mek.thl.fi/htacore/Adaptation.aspx>
135 .

136 **Practical guidance**

137 Piloting of local/national reports using and producing Core HTA information has taken place during the Joint
138 Action 2. Core HTA information is defined as “Any information on a technology that has been produced
139 through using the HTA Core Model and published through the HTA Core Model Online”. This information is
140 very likely to be useful in the European context (i.e. also in another country) due to its importance and/or
141 transferability.

142

143 There are three different approaches to national reporting activities:

- 144 1. To integrate Core HTAs information, already available from JA1/JA2, into national/local reports
145 (Adaptation);
- 146 2. To produce both Core HTA information and national/local information on collaboratively prioritized
147 topics (according to the procedure in par.1.4). The information is produced for joint and national
148 reporting using EUnetHTA tools;
- 149 3. To produce both Core HTA information and national/local information using EUnetHTA tools on
150 topics of national reporting interest.

151 The choice of an approach depends on the needs of each Organisation/Country and on the internal
152 organization of work.

153 The following EUnetHTA tools were identified for each of the already mentioned approaches to
154 facilitate national reporting.

Approaches	Basic Tools
1	Core HTAs, HTA collections <i>Adaptation (Toolkit & resources) available at</i> https://mek.thl.fi/htacore/Adaptation.aspx

2	HTA Core Model Application (for the selected topic) and Online Tool & Services (OT&S)
3	HTA Core Model Applications and Online Tool & Services (OT&S)

155

156 **Approach 1:**

157 The purpose of adaptation is to enable an HTA agency in one setting to make use of an HTA report (or Core
 158 HTAs and HTA collections) produced elsewhere, thus avoiding duplications and increase efficiency.
 159 (<https://mekat.hl.fi/htacore/Adaptation.aspx>). The extent to which this can be achieved depends on the
 160 generalizability of the topic under consideration and the different contexts in which it is to be considered.

161 The adaptation process could be undertaken in a wide range of ways, depending on the main purpose, and
 162 may range from simply translating the language in which the report is written, through to adapting the entire
 163 report:

- 164 1. Summarising: translate the summary and use this for background information.
- 165 2. Updating searches: using the original search strategy to identify any more recent evidence
 166 or adding to the search strategy and extending it.
- 167 3. Adapting: the systematic extraction of relevant HTA information from an existing report
 168 (from a whole report or from part of a report)
- 169 4. Adopting: making use of the report without making any changes at all (except perhaps
 170 translation into a destination language) (Chase et al., 2009; Turner et al., 2009)

171 Most safety and effectiveness evidence are context-independent for many health technologies and can be
 172 readily transferred to different contexts. However, specific attributes or acceptable trade-off levels may vary
 173 between contexts. Other heavily context dependent information, such as legal and ethical information, can't
 174 be readily adopted or easily adapted without significant appraisal in relation to the local context. (Chase et
 175 al., 2009)

176 A specific toolkit ("Adaptation Toolkit") was developed as part of Work Package 5 of the EUnetHTA 2006-
 177 2008 project. The final version is available on the EUnetHTA website
 178 (<https://mekat.hl.fi/htacore/Adaptation.aspx>). The toolkit is a collection of resources that helps the user
 179 assess whether data and information in existing HTA reports should and could be adapted for their own
 180 setting (Turner et al., 2010).

181 **Approach 2 and 3:**

182 Approaches 2 and 3 are based on the production of both Core HTA information in the European context and
 183 in a national/local context.

184 The production of national/local information should be done after:

- 185 • checking the relevance of each assessment element at national/local level,
- 186 • identifying the assessment elements which are most likely to be transferable to other
 187 settings.

188

189 The elements within the HTA Core Model have been evaluated for two key characteristics: importance and
 190 transferability. In this context importance indicates how essential the element is from the view point of
 191 decision-making at national/local level. Transferability indicates how easy it is to transfer the results from one
 192 setting to another. All the other assessment elements partially or not transferable to local setting should be
 193 assessed from different national/local perspectives. However importance and transferability should be
 194 estimated from case to case.

195 **Bibliography**

- 196 • Chase D, Rosten C, Turner S, Hicks N, Milne R. Development of a toolkit and glossary to aid in the
197 adaptation of health technology assessment (HTA) reports for use in different contexts. Health
198 Technol Assess. 2009 Nov;13(59):1-142, iii.
- 199 • Turner S, Adams N, Cook A, Price A, Milne R. Potential benefits of using a toolkit developed to aid in
200 the adaptation of HTA reports: a case study considering positron emission tomography (PET) and
201 Hodgkin's disease. Health Res Policy Syst. 2010 May 26;8:16.
- 202 • Turner S, Chase DL, Milne R, Cook A, Hicks NJ, Rosten C, Payne L, Coles S, Bell E; European
203 network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA). The adaptation of health technology
204 assessment reports: identification of the need for, and development of, a toolkit to aid the process.
205 Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2009 Dec;25 Suppl 2:28-36.
- 206

207 2.4 Carrying out evidence searches

208 **Aim**

209 To give guidance on how to construct, run, store and update searches

210 **Evidence base**

211 Readers should consult [EUnetHTA Guideline Process of information retrieval. Work on received comments
212 from internal review, version for SAG / Public Cons. elaborated, start in FEB 2015]

213 **Practical guidance**

214 Below are three major issues to be considered based on *past experience* followed by *possible solutions* and
215 at last a *suggested process*.

216 Past experience has shown that there is a need for a general evidence search using the standardized
217 methods indicated in the guideline, as overlapping evidence searches within and across domains may led to
218 duplication of work. Reference manager software should be used. To minimize duplications, the general
219 search should be conducted centrally by an information specialist for all domains following a well-defined
220 PICOD structure. Classic sources of information may however identify evidence for some domains (such as
221 EFF, SAF and ECO) and other domains may need to supplement with searches of specialised sources such
222 as books, specialist journals, government publications or surveys. Throughout the process the relevant
223 questions contained in Assessment Elements should be borne in mind.

224 There is no agreed standard methodology for supplementary specialized searches. Primary
225 Investigators (PIs) and Investigators (Is) of each domain should agree on a scope and methods to
226 carry these out within a domain, if necessary (this includes analyzing, synthesizing and using
227 critical appraisal tools). Any quality assessment of literature must be done by two independent
228 researchers For detailed methodological support please refer also to updated HTA Core Model of
229 WP 8 doc. using specific content suggestions where available.

230 Although several attempts have been made to eliminate duplication of specific evidence search due to
231 overlaps of Assessment Elements (AE) within and across domains, there is no agreed methodology. One
232 possible way to achieve this is for PIs of related overlapping domain questions to make contact and
233 coordinate efforts along with the Project leader (PL) to avoid duplication of work. Please refer also to
234 updated HTA Core Model applications on the EUnetHTA website .

235 Despite its practical importance (risk of reference loss, ease of communication, standardization, storage)
236 there is no agreed reference manager software, although it would be strongly advisable to enable a uniform
237 data management. We therefore suggest if available the use of a reference manager software compatible
238 with other systems. As lack of coordination leading to duplication of searches is the most common practical
239 pitfall so far identified, access to a standard process with clearly laid out rules and software aid is the best
240 possible antidote to duplicate searches.

241

242 **Bibliography**

243 [EUnetHTA Guideline Process of information retrieval. Work on received comments from internal review,
244 version for SAG / Public Cons. elaborated, start in FEB 2015]

245 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]

246

247 Note for the next chapters: domain content may change over time, so readers are invited to check the latest
248 version of the HTA core model.

249

250 **2.5 Domain specific issues: Health problem and current use of technology (CUR)**

251 **Aim**

252 The aim of this chapter is to describe the necessary information and the practical steps for the description of
253 the “Health problem and Current Use of the Technology” for diagnostic technology (DT), screening
254 technology (ST) and medical and surgical intervention (MST).

255 **Evidence base**

256 The following documents were used to define the practical guidance:

- 257 • EUnetHTA HTA Core Model Handbook (2012);
- 258 • EUNEHTA HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2012)
- 259 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2012)
- 260 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2012)
- 261 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2012)
- 262 • EUnetHTA Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013);
- 263 • Bossuyt et al. (2006);
- 264 • Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (Wells et al. 2008);
- 265 • STROBE checklist (von Elm et al. 2007)
- 266 • AGREE II instrument (Brouwers et al. 2010)

267

268 The guidance is structured as a table containing:

- 269 1. in the first column, labelled as “*Standard procedure\|Data Source*”, an assertive sentence for the
270 action requested and sources for data retrieval are provided. If needed, details, suggestions and
271 description of the most common pitfalls are provided.
- 272 2. a second column, labelled as “*References*”, specifies the reference(s) at the basis of the action,
273 where more details for accomplishing the procedure can be found.
- 274 3. a third column, labelled as “*Done*”, to check if the action is done or not and why.

275 When different approaches and methodologies are needed, procedural steps are distinguished for each of
276 the following type of technology: (1) Medical and Surgical Interventions (MST), (2) Diagnostic Technologies
277 (DT), (3) Screening Technologies (ST). Unless otherwise specified, the procedural step is to be considered
278 applicable for all three types of technology.

279

280 **Practical guidance**

281 The operational steps for compiling the “Health problem and current use of technology” are:

- 282 1. select the topics from the EUnetHTA HTA Core Model (8 Apr 2014 version)
- 283 2. search the information in the data sources
- 284 3. assess the quality of the information retrieved
- 285 4. apply the instruments for the analysis and synthesis
- 286 5. report the results

287

288 Readers should be aware that earlier versions of the HTA Core Model Handbook contained links to the
289 actual guidance within the Model. The links were removed and in some cases it was difficult for users
290 to identify the actual source of guidance. Please consult individual model applications for the actual
291 guidance, available at www.corehta.info.

292

293 **1.1. Selection of the topics/issue and search of information**

294

Standard procedure and Data sources	References	Done (Yes, No, because...)
<p>Select the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements</p> <p>The topics related to Health problem and Current Use of the Technology are in the EUnetHTA Assessment Element with Identification number from A0001 to A0022</p>	<p>EUnetHTA HTA Core Model Handbook (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and</p>	
<p>Describe the target condition: <i>disease mechanisms , natural course of condition, burden, prevalence and incidence of the condition, risk factors and consequences, diagnosis and prognosis, target population</i></p> <p>Search this information in published medical literature, clinical practice guidelines, reviews on mechanism of disease, risk factors, course and prognosis, epidemiological studies such as Cross-Sectional Studies (Prevalence), Cohort-Studies (Incidence)</p> <p>Data source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>HTAs, systematic reviews and original research can be found in Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and Cochrane CENTRAL, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD), Medline, Embase, Cinahl, PsycINFO.</i> - <i>Evidence-based guidelines can be found in reference databases, guidelines producers' websites and in Guidelines International Network's (GIN) website.</i> - <i>Websites of health technology assessment agencies</i> - <i>Registers and statistics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Disease registers</i> <i>Administrative Databases (discharge databases, reimbursement claims</i> 	<p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)</p> <p>Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. Table 1. Health problem and current use of technology Domain specific sources</p>	

<p>Describe the Current Management of the Condition: <i>how is the disease/health condition currently being diagnosed or screened, how is the disease/health condition currently being managed, how should the condition be diagnosed according to published algorithms/guidelines, how should the condition be managed according to published algorithms/guidelines, what are the differences in the management for different stages of disease and what are the other evidence-based alternatives to the current technology.</i></p> <p>Data source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence-based guidelines can be found in reference databases, guidelines producers' websites and in Guidelines International Network's (GIN) website - Specialists or experts consultation - Expert surveys or interviews 	<p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)</p> <p>Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. Table 1.(HPCU) Domain specific sources</p>	
<p>Describe the utilization of the technology: <i>how much is the technology being used and the variations in use across countries/regions/settings.</i></p> <p>For Screening Technologies (ST) describe the current rate of screening adherence</p> <p>Data source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disease Registers - Technology Registers - Procedure Registers - Device registers - Administrative Databases (discharge databases, reimbursement claims databases) 	<p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)</p> <p>Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. Table 1.(HPCU) Domain specific sources</p>	
<p>Describe the Life-Cycle of the technology: <i>in which phase is the development of the technology (experimental,emerging, routine use, obsolete)</i></p> <p>Data source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Horizon scanning databases and websites - Ongoing research databases - Technology developers and manufacturers websites - ECRI database(www.mdsr.ecri.org) 	<p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)</p> <p>Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. Table 1.(HPCU) Domain specific</p>	

<p>Describe the regulatory status of the technology: which approval status has the technology in other countries (e.g. USA) or international authorities and how is the coverage of the technology across counties</p> <p><i>N.B.: European Directives differentiate between In Vitro Diagnostic Medical Device (Directive 98\79\EC), active implantable medical devices (Directive 90\385 EEC) and (other) medical devices (Directive 93\42\EEC)</i></p> <p><i>The Directive 2007\47\EC introduced the obligation for the Commission to implement Eudamed, which at present is still in progress.</i></p> <p>Data source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Manufacturers</i> - <i>Marketing authorisation and other regulatory institutions' websites e.g. (Europe: EMA; US: FDA; Canada: Health Canada; New Zealand: MedSafe; Australia: TGA)</i> - <i>National health services' websites</i> - <i>Regional/local governments' health departments' websites</i> 	<p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)</p> <p>Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. Table 1.(HPCU) Domain specific sources</p>	
--	--	--

295
296
297
298
299

1.2. Quality assessment tools or criteria

In the second column of the table are reported the characteristics of studies and data sources for the description of the different elements.

Standard procedure	Study type/data sources	References	Done (Yes, No because)
<p>To evaluate the quality of studies on disease mechanisms, no tools are provided</p>	<p><i>Descriptive</i></p>	<p>HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)</p>	
<p>To evaluate the quality of Natural course of condition studies the STROBE checklist or Newcastle-Ottawa Scale can be used</p>	<p><i>Observational</i></p>	<p>HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>STROBE checklist (von Elm et al. 2007)</p>	
<p>To evaluate the quality of Burden of disease, prevalence and incidence of the condition studies the STROBE checklist or Newcastle-Ottawa Scale can be used</p>	<p><i>Observational</i></p>	<p>HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)</p> <p>STROBE checklist (von Elm et al. 2007)</p>	

<p>To evaluate the quality of Risk factors and consequences studies the STROBE checklist or Newcastle-Ottawa Scale can be used</p>	<p><i>Observational</i></p>	<p>HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014) STROBE checklist (von Elm et al. 2007) Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (Wells et al. 2008)</p>	
<p>To evaluate the quality of Target population studies, no tools are provided</p> <p>To evaluate the quality of data for Target population you have to distinguish:</p> <p>for Registers - quality should be appraised carefully considering the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How representative is the register? (European, National, Regional, Local?) • What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria? • What is the quality of information? • How complete is the coverage? • What kind of information is coded? <p>• for Routine collected statistics and administrative data you must take into account that the use of routinely collected statistics has several limitations. The reliability of the diagnosis varies and usually it is not possible to differentiate between different stages of the disease. Even the validity of the coding of causes of death may be variable, and in some countries is known to be very limited.</p>	<p><i>Narrative review, scientific associations guidelines recommendations</i></p> <p><i>Register analysis, routine collected statistics and administrative data</i></p>	<p><i>Not needed</i></p>	
<p>To evaluate the quality of data for Utilization of technology considerations made in the above paragraph apply.</p>	<p><i>Narrative reviews, surveys, observational and</i></p>		

	<i>qualitative research, register analysis, routine collected statistics and administrative data</i>		
<i>To evaluate the quality of guidelines for Current Management of the Condition AGREE II tools will be used</i>	<i>Clinical guidelines</i>		
<i>The evaluation of the quality of data sources for Current Management of the Condition is not provided</i>	<i>Information from websites of relevant associations of health care professionals or disease-specific societies</i>		
<i>To evaluate the quality of data for Life-Cycle of the technology you must take into account that potential bias in the information provided by manufacturers needs to be carefully assessed</i>	<i>Manufacturers</i>		
<i>To evaluate the quality of data for regulatory status (approval status) you must take into account that potential bias in the information provided by manufacturers needs to be carefully assessed</i>	<i>Marketing authorisation and other regulatory institutions' websites e.g. Manufacturers</i>		

300 **1.3. Analysis and synthesis**

301 The type of synthesis suggested is reported in the second column

302

Standard procedure	Type of Synthesis	References	Done (Yes, No because)
<i>Synthesis of information on Disease mechanisms</i>	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
<i>Synthesis of information on Natural course of condition</i>	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
<i>Synthesis of information on burden, prevalence and incidence of the condition</i>	Data may be meta-analysed, but often there is no opportunity to do that	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	

Synthesis of information on Risk factors and consequences	Meta-analysis per subgroups if possible	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
Synthesis of information on Target population	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
Synthesis of information on Utilization of technology	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
Synthesis of information on Current Management of the Condition	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
Synthesis of information on Life-Cycle of the technology	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
Synthesis of information on regulatory status of the technology	Narrative	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	

303

304

1.4. Reporting

305

Standard procedure	Reference	Done (Yes, No because)
For all topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check relations to other domains to ensure coherence • Define important terms in a glossary • Check that the sources of information used explicitly be documented 	HTA Core Model Handbook (2014)	
For the target condition Check that the Disease mechanisms, natural course of condition, Burden, prevalence and incidence of the condition, Risk factors and consequences and target population are analysed		

<i>and syntheses as 3.3</i>		
For the utilization of technology <i>Check that European level and national data with abundant numerical information through tables, graphs and figures are reported</i>	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)	
For the Current Management of the Condition <i>Check that an illustrative synthesis is reported. Flowchart of current management pathway is particularly illustrative in diagnostic technology and helps the reader to understand the intended role of the new technology (replace, add-on ,triage).</i>	HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014) Bossuyt et al. (2006);	
For the Life-Cycle of the technology check <i>that illustrative synthesis is reported</i>		
For the regulatory status <i>Check that the regulatory status are reported</i>		

306

307 **Bibliography**

308 Bossuyt PM, Irwig L, Craig J, Glasziou P. Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing
309 diagnostic pathways. *BMJ* 2006 6;332:1089-92.

310 Brouwers M, Kho ME, Browman GP, Burgers JS, Cluzeau F, Feder G, Fervers B, Graham ID, Grimshaw J,
311 Hanna S, Littlejohns P, Makarski J, Zitzelsberger L for the AGREE Next Steps Consortium. AGREE II:
312 Advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in healthcare. *Can Med Assoc J.* 2010. Dec
313 2010; 182:E839-842; doi:10.1503/090449

314 Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals. EUnetHTA 2013. Available at <http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-effectiveness-assessment-pharma>; last access
315 May 10th 2013.
316

317 HTA Core Model Handbook (1.5, 8 Apr 2014: Updated to match current features of the Online Tool).
318 EUnetHTA 2014. Available at <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx>; last access February 13th 2015.

319 HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (1.5, 8 Apr 2014: Updated to match current features of the
320 Online Tool) . Available at <http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/final-hta-core-model-screening-technologies> ; last
321 access February 13th 2015.

322

323 Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies . (1.5, 8 Apr 2014: Updated to match current features of
324 the Online Tool). Available at <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access
325 February 13th 2015
326 Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (1.5, 8 Apr 2014: Updated to match
327 current features of the Online Tool) Available at <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6>
; last access February 13th 2015.

328 Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (1.5, 8 Apr 2014: Updated to match current
329 features of the Online Tool). Available at <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last
330 access February 13th 2015

331 von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative.

332 The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)statement: guidelines
333 for reporting observational studies. *Lancet.* 2007 Oct 20;370(9596):1453-7. PMID: 18064739

334 Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
335 (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Available from
336 www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm; last access May 10th 2013.

337

338

339 **2.6 Domain specific issues: Description and technical characteristics of technology (TEC)**

340 **Aim**

341 The aim of the methodological guidance for the TEC domain is to provide HTA Core Model users with a brief
 342 list of issues on the description and technical characteristics of the technology which have to be taken into
 343 account when answering the relevant assessment elements, and, thus, guide them through a step-by-step
 344 procedure which will facilitate quality.

345 **Evidence base**

346 The evidence base, applied methods, and information sources are described under chapter 2 Practical
 347 guidance.

348 **Practical guidance**

349 **Information sources**

350 **A. Systematic search**

<p>Did you check published literature including reviews, introduction sections of research articles, conference proceedings, textbooks or handbooks about the history and characteristics of the technology?</p> <p><u>Examples of sources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Medline/Pubmed http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed ➤ Embase ➤ Cochrane Library http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/view/0/index.html ➤ EBSCO http://www.ebsco.com/index.asp ➤ Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/ ➤ BIOSIS (life sciences database including patents, journals, conferences, books, review articles (http://science.thomsonreuters.com/training/biosis)) 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, because ...</p>
<p>Did you check the reference lists of key papers?</p>		

351 **B. Hand search**

<p>Did you search for national guidelines concerning the application of the technology?</p> <p><u>Examples of sources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Guidelines International Network (GIN) http://www.g-i-n.net/ ➤ National Clinical Guideline Center http://www.ncgc.ac.uk/ ➤ National Guideline Clearinghouse http://guideline.gov/index.aspx 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, because ...</p>
<p>Did you search for grey literature to find out more about the technology (e.g. technical reports from government agencies or scientific research groups, working papers from research groups or committees, white papers, or preprints)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, because ...</p>
<p>Did you contact manufacturers or search for information about the technology on manufacturers' websites?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, because ...</p>
<p>Did you search for information on the websites of HTA and related agencies or professional associations to find out about the technology?</p> <p><u>Examples of sources:</u> _____</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, because ...</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Websites from EUnetHTA members ➤ HTAi (http://www.htai.org) ➤ Health technology assessment on the net' report (http://www.ahfmr.ab.ca) ➤ International network of agencies for HTA http://www.inahta.net/ 		
<p>Did you check if the technology has obtained regulatory approval and did you list it in the Core HTA?</p> <p><u>Examples of sources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ EU or US regulatory bodies ➤ regulatory bodies in those countries where the technology has been approved for use 		

352

C. Survey or Interviews

Did you use a questionnaire to get information about technical aspects of the technology?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you interview specialists or experts concerning the technology (e.g. clinicians, nurses, paramedics, patients)?	Yes	No, because ...

353

D. Quality assessment tools or criteria

Did you use peer reviewed literature when possible?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you describe how you assessed the quality of the included information?	Yes	No, because ...

354

E. Analysis and synthesis

Are the findings referred to sources explained clearly in order to enhance the transparency of the Core HTA?	Yes	No, because ...
--	-----	-----------------

355

356

F. Reporting

Did you check relations of TEC to other domains (CUR, ORG, LEG) to avoid double work?	Yes	No, because ...
Are the approaches and sources of information used explicitly documented in the Core HTA?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you describe the design and function of the technology sufficiently for the users of HTA to understand the technology's mode of action, its technical requirements and possible problems and alternatives, its staffing requirements, its applicability range, its variants, and its possible direct risks?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you describe the issues in this domain detailed enough in order to separate the technology in question from related technologies?	Yes	No, because ...
For medical devices: Did you include drawings or schematics for the technology that illustrate the components, dimensions and materials of construction of the device?	Yes	No, because ...
For diagnostic and monitoring technologies (laboratory tests, imaging, questionnaires etc): Did you include sufficient information about the technical precision of the technology?	Yes	No, because ...

For management processes (such as screening programs): Did you describe the position and interaction of the technology within the broader healthcare sequence and did you list alternative technologies?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you list the product names of the technology?	Yes	No, because ...
Did you define important terms in a glossary?	Yes	No, because ...

357

358 **Bibliography**

359

360

361

362 **2.7 Domain specific issues: Safety of the technology (SAF)**

363 **Aim**

364 The aim of this guidance is to describe the necessary information and practical procedures and steps for the
365 production of the Assessment Elements for the Core HTA's Safety domain.

366 **Evidence base**

367

368 The following procedural framework was applied: firstly, methodological deliverables by EUnetHTA were
369 included and consulted in order to design the structure for a comprehensive review on the safety of the
370 technology in object. Then, handbooks or manuals for producing systematic reviews from institutions
371 contributing to the methodology of systematic reviews were non-systematically consulted from specific
372 websites and included. Finally, tools and methods for single specific procedural steps were non-
373 systematically searched and included. The documents included were compared for consistency.

374 The following documents were used in order to define the general design for the practical guidance of
375 procedures:

- 376 • Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011);
- 377 • CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination
378 2009);
- 379 • HTA Core Model Handbook (2012);
- 380 • HTA Core Model Update 1.5, 8 Apr 2014
- 381 • EUnetHTA Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013);
- 382 • EUnetHTA Guideline: Endpoints used for REA of pharmaceuticals – Safety (2013)
- 383 • EUnetHTA Guideline: Methodological guideline for REA of pharmaceuticals: Internal validity (2013)

384

385 In addition to the above documents, the followings were used to define single procedural steps:

- 386 • AHRQ Methods Guide for Medical Test Reviews (2012);
- 387 • AHRQ User's guide - Registries for evaluating patient's outcomes (Gliklich et al .2010)
- 388 • AMSTAR instrument (Shea et al. 2007);
- 389 • CONSORT Statement (Ioannidis et al. 2004);
- 390 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2012);
- 391 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2012);
- 392 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2012);
- 393 • HTA Core Model on Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening (Jefferson et al. 2013a);
- 394 • HTA Core Model on Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (uPA/PAI-1 [FEMTELLE],
395 MammaPrint, Oncotype DX) (Jefferson et al. 2013b);

- 396 • GRADE method (Balshem et al. 2011, Guyatt et al. 2011a, Guyatt et al. 2011b, Guyatt et al. 2011c,
397 Guyatt et al. 2011d, Guyatt et al. 2011e, Guyatt et al. 2011f, Guyatt et al. 2011g, Guyatt et al. 2013,
398 Schünemann et al. 2008);
- 399 • Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (Wells et al. 2008);
- 400 • PRISMA Statement (Moher et al. 2009);
- 401 • STROBE Statement (von Elm et al. 2007)
- 402 • GL Internal validity of non-randomised studies (NRS) on interventions: internal consultation of draft
403 guideline finalised (16th of JAN 2015) , work on comments and preparation of version for SAG / Public
404 Cons.

405

406 The guidance is structured as a table containing:

- 407 1. a first column with an assertive sentence for the action requested, labelled as “*Standard procedure*”.
408 If needed, details, suggestions and description of the most common pitfalls are provided.
- 409 2. a second column, labelled as “*References*”, specifying the reference(s) at the basis of the action,
410 where more details for accomplishing the procedure can be found.
- 411 3. a third column, labelled as “*Done*”, to check if each action has been completed or not and why.

412 If different approaches and methodologies are needed, every procedural step is distinguished for each of the
413 following types of technology: (1) Medical and Surgical Interventions, (2) Diagnostic Technologies, (3)
414 Screening Technologies, (4) Prognostic Technologies. Unless otherwise specified, the procedural step is to
415 be considered applicable for all four types of technology.

416

417 **Practical guidance**

418 In this chapter the procedural steps needed to produce the Assessment Elements for the Safety domain are
419 reported.

420 According to the HTA Core Model Handbook (2012), in order to assess the safety of a technology a
421 systematic approach is required. However it is also recognised that the definitions and the terminology of
422 safety used in HTA have not been standardised so far and a multiplicity of terms are used, such as side-
423 effects, adverse events, adverse effects, complications, harms, risks and hazards, safety, tolerability and
424 toxicity (Ioannidis 2004).

425 The wide scope of identifying and assessing all possible harms caused through the use of a technology,
426 requires a focus on three different sub-categories of safety:

427 1. risks or possible injuries, accidents and losses patients may be exposed to, due to the use of the
428 technology; for instance excessive radiation, technology or system failure. These outcomes are usually
429 investigated in Phase I and II trials, when evaluating drugs, or in feasibility studies or studies on technical
430 performance, when evaluating medical devices;

431

432 2. adverse events and adverse side effects related to the use of the technology, taken into consideration to
433 counterbalance the evaluation of the technology’s benefits. These outcomes are best investigated through
434 Phase III or comparative effectiveness clinical trials;

435

436 3. long-term adverse events and rare adverse effects related to the prolonged and wide use of a technology,
 437 which presents a favourable balance between evaluated benefits and harms. These outcomes are best
 438 investigated with Phase IV trials, surveillance and large observational long-term studies.

439

440 In HTA “the aim is not necessarily to cover all known and previously unrecognised harms of a technology
 441 (...) rather, Core HTA preparers should focus their review and predefine the safety issues and outcome
 442 measures they wish to work in their assessment”.

443

444 Every aspect has different safety objectives, endpoints and different methodology and tools to assess them.
 445 In order to harmonize the HTA Core Model work among different domains (namely TEC, SAF, EFF) we
 446 recognize that the safety assessment could be either entirely completed in this SAF domain or split among
 447 the TEC, SAF, and EFF domains.

448

449 In particular issues related to the risks carried by the developmental phase of a technology need to be
 450 incorporated in the TEC domain; adverse events and side effects determining the overall “clinical impact” of
 451 the technology should be part of the EFF domain, while long term/rare and unknown adverse events of a
 452 technology which has passed the scrutiny of effectiveness, i.e data from the “vigilance phase”, should be
 453 specifically addressed in the SAF domain.

454 It is reviewers’ responsibility to choose the best approach for accomplishing the goal.

455

456 To complete the Assessment Elements for the Safety domain, comprehensive reviews or systematic
 457 reviews, answering each selected issue, need to be carried out. To accomplish these goals the following
 458 steps are considered (CRD’s Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare 2009, Higgins et al. 2011,
 459 HTA Core Model Handbook ver 1.5, 8 Apr 2014, HTA Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013, Moher
 460 et al. 2009):

461

3.1 Definition of the relationship of the SAF domain with TEC and EFF domains

462

3.2 Selection of the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements

463

3.3 Definition of research questions

464

3.4. Definition of inclusion criteria for considering studies

465

3.5 Systematic search of evidence

466

3.6 Selection of the studies

467

3.7. Data extraction

468

3.8. Methodological quality assessment

469

3.9. Data synthesis

470

3.10 Grading of quality of evidence

471

3.11 Reporting

472

473

474 **3.1 Definition of the relationship of the SAF domain with TEC and EFF domains**

Standard procedure	References	Done
--------------------	------------	------

<p>Establish whether the whole aspects of safety will be assessed in the SAF domain or split between TECH, EFF and SAF domains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2013 (draft version 27th June, 2013) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

475

476

3.2 Selection of the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Select the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.2.2 Phase 2: Protocol design, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) • Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014) • Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014) • Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014) • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>Core HTA authors, who are not aware of any specific safety problem, could start with a broad overview of the whole range of adverse effects associated with the use of the technology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>If you have to assess a prognostic technology refer to guidance for diagnostic technologies</p> <p><i>N.B.: Methods specific to conduct a systematic review of a prognostic test are not well established. Currently there are only three applications of the HTA Core Model: medical and surgical interventions, diagnostic technologies, and screening technologies. While awaiting for specific methodological guidance on prognostic technologies, refer to guidance for diagnostic technologies. However, there are fundamental differences in the assessment of diagnostic and prognostic tests, thus consider that HTA Core assessment element questions for diagnostic technologies are thus not suited for prognostic technologies.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical Effectiveness, Methodology Description Chapter, in HTA Core Model on Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (Jefferson et al. 2013b) • Chapter 12. Systematic Review of Prognostic Tests, in Methods Guide for Medical Test Reviews (AHRQ 2012) 	

477

478

3.3 Definition of research questions

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define research question(s) according to the PICOD system</p> <p>PICOD stands for participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.2.4, Phase 4: Protocol design, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) • Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. • PRISMA Statement (Moher et al. 2009) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>
<p>Anticipate and choose if it is necessary or not to cover all known and unrecognised harms of a technology</p> <p><i>N.B.:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Systematic assessment of all safety issues of a technology can be time consuming. It might be reasonable for authors of a Core HTA to select the safety issues that are significant for patients, or most likely to be important in guiding the decision of health care providers and policy makers. Thus the aim is not necessarily to cover all known and previously unrecognised harms of a technology. Rather, Core HTA preparers should focus their review and predefine the safety issues and outcome measures they wish to work in their assessment.</i> 2. <i>Core HTA authors may choose to narrow down into some of the following areas:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>the five to ten most frequent adverse effects</i> b. <i>all adverse effects that either the patient or the clinician considers to be serious</i> c. <i>the most common adverse effects that lead the patient to stop using the intervention</i> d. <i>by category (for example: diagnosed by clinician, diagnosed by lab results, patient-reported symptoms, biomarkers that may be early indicators of possible adverse effects</i> e. <i>consider also patients' exclusion criteria in effectiveness trials, which might reveal/mask expected adverse events.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>
<p>Be aware that several harm categories may help identifying and classifying research questions for the safety domain and relations to other domains.</p> <p>Harms should classified according to intensity, frequency, on set timing, seriousness and severity. Seriousness is classified as mild, moderate and serious. Serious refers to adverse effects that have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (ver 1.5, 8 Apr 2014) • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2014 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

<p>significant medical consequences (e.g. lead to death, permanent disability or prolonged hospitalisation). Severity refers to the intensity of a particular adverse effect. For example, a non-serious adverse effect, such as headache, may be severe in intensity (as opposed to mild or moderate).</p> <p>The following categories, can be considered in relation to the TEC domain as they describe the direct harms of the use and the administration of the technology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct harm (due to e.g. radiation, toxicity or invasiveness) or indirect harm (due to e.g. insufficient training, experience, maintenance, diagnostic error) • operator or setting dependent harms (e.g. they can be modified by changing practices or affecting users' knowledge, skills and behaviour) or patient dependent harms (e.g. which means that there are vulnerable patient groups in whom protection is especially required) • occupational harms and environment harms • possible variations in the safety profile between different generations/versions of the technology • besides patients, the use of a technology may cause harm to their family and close ones, health care professionals, public, and the environment. <p>The following categories, can be considered in relation to the EFF domain as they describe adverse effects / events directly or indirectly attributable to the use of the technology and which must be considered when evaluating balance between benefits and harms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intended or unintended harms • dose-related harms or time-relatedness harms, tolerability, toxicity • negative consequences of false test's results and of further testing and treatments/delay in treatment in patients with false test's results <p>The following categories, can be considered specific to the SAF domain as they relate to late and rare adverse events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unexpected harms and late adverse reactions • misuse and abuse of the technology 		
<p>Adopt standardised definitions and terminology of harms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) 	<p>Yes</p>

<p><i>N.B.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The definitions and the terminology of safety used in HTA have not been standardised. A number of initiatives aim to harmonise safety terms. Examples include the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, the WHO Adverse Reaction Terminology, the Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA) Terminology.</i> ○ <i>Core HTA authors can use any terms they find proper. However the Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) recommends the use of MedDRA for describing adverse reactions.</i> ○ <i>Be aware that the standard 'preferred terms' in some cases can distort descriptions in the original reports of adverse events and blur distinctions between them.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2014 (version 1.5, 8 Apr 2014) • Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. • Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTEP, National Cancer Institute) • WHO Adverse Reaction Terminology (WHO-ART, Uppsala Monitoring Center) • Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities Terminology (MedDRA, MSSO) 	<p>No (explain)</p>
---	--	---------------------

479

480

3.4 Definition of inclusion criteria for considering studies

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define “Criteria for considering studies for inclusion” according to elements of PICOD.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5, Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>The inclusion criteria must be established for the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population/patient characteristics - Types of interventions - Types of comparators - Relevant safety outcomes - Study design - Publication type - Publication date - Language <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Depending on the novelty of the technology you should evaluate whether you include only studies published in peer-review studies or if you will also take into account information from conference abstracts, unpublished data.</i> 2) <i>Inclusion/Exclusion criteria should be clearly</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 14, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 2, Methods, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Chapter 13, Including non-randomized studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

<i>presented in the report</i>		
<p>You may need to consider a broad range of study designs for the systematic assessment of Safety</p> <p><i>N.B.: although safety data from RCTs are considered most reliable, the inclusion of data from sources with higher risk of bias may be necessary when RCTS are scarce, harms are unknown, rare, or occurring only during long follow-up. These may include observational studies, country registers and published case reports.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.5.1, Appropriate study types, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2012) • Chapter 14, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

481

482

3.5 Systematic search of evidence

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>To identify evidence on harms you need to search several and diverse/different sources. Thus conduct a comprehensive systematic search of evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General medical databases <p><i>N.B.: Be aware that for general medical databases there is no optimal search strategy to specifically identify reports of adverse effects. Combination of different approaches in Medline and Embase is needed. New, previously unrecognised remain easily undetected and several study types should be considered for inclusion in the search.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematic review databases/HTA databases - Primary sources of unpublished information or data, such as: manufacturers product data sheets or application for a product license; national or international safety monitoring systems/databases of adverse events; disease or technologies registries; pharmacovigilance systems or spontaneous adverse events databases; routine statistics from hospital, primary care, health system founders; specific enquiries to manufacturers, regulators or professional bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EUnetHTA Guideline: Methodological guidelines for rapid relative effectiveness assessment (REA) of Pharmaceuticals developed in WP5 of EUnetHTA JA: Safety (2013) • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2013 (version 1.5, 8 Apr 2014) • Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. • Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. • Chapter 4, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

	2011)	
<p>For each search draft a sufficiently detailed report of searches and databases should be provided to allow the search to be reproduced.</p> <p>The process should be explicitly defined including search strategy. A flow chart with number of studies retrieved, studies included and excluded and reasons for exclusion is recommended.</p> <p>You should update the search at the end of the review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [EUnetHTA Guideline Process of information retrieval. Work on received comments from internal review, version for SAG / Public Cons. elaborated, start in FEB 2015] • Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 6, Searching for studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>
Use bibliographic software to manage references.		<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

483

484

3.6 Selection of the studies

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Perform the selection of studies through the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of potentially relevant titles and /or abstracts and retrieval of full-texts - assessment of full papers considered as potentially relevant - inclusion of the final set of studies <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <p>1) <i>Assessment of eligibility of studies, and extraction of data from study reports, should be done by at least two people, independently</i></p> <p><i>Studies, rather than publications, are the unit of interest of the review, therefore multiple publications of the same study need to be linked together. Duplicated studies should be eliminated.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 7, Selecting studies and collecting data, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Chapter 1, Core principles and methods for conducting a systematic review of health interventions, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

485

486

3.7 Data extraction

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define all data you have to collect and design a standardized data collection form.</p> <p>Data extraction should include frequency,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2012) • Chapter 4, Systematic reviews of 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

<p>severity, seriousness of the event and withdrawals from treatment because of adverse events and for unknown reasons.</p>	<p>adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7, Selecting studies and collecting data, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Template 5, Table for reporting results from clinical trials, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) 	
<p>Describe how the data extraction process is to be performed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the data categories and information requirements that are to be collected - how verification of extracted data from each report will be verified (e.g. extraction by two review authors, independently) - piloting, training and existence of coding instructions for the data collection form; - how data are extracted from multiple reports of the same study - how disagreements are handled if more than one author extracts data from each report <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that when you design the data extraction form you should take into account the aim of the report, research questions but also the information that will be relevant for quality assessment and analysis of results</i></p>		<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

487

488

3.8 Methodological quality assessment

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Assess both the risk of bias of sources of information and the quality of data on adverse reactions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. 	
<p>Assess the risk of bias considering the specificity of each study design and source of data, and, if appropriate, using validated frameworks and tools for the methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity.</p> <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>there is a lack of a relevant quality assessment tool to appraise evidence on harms. Any available tool should be used cautiously. Comparing evidence from randomised trials and observational studies is useful</i> 2) <i>you must apply different tools for</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2012) • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2013 (draft version 27th June, 2013) • Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. • Chapter 4, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 8, Assessing risk of bias in included studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Chapter 13, Including non-randomized studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

<p><i>different study scope</i></p> <p>3) <i>there is currently no consensus on how to incorporate information about quality from a range of study designs within a systematic review</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	
<p>However relevant questions in order to assess the quality of adverse effects data are suggested by some institutions.</p> <p>CRD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an adequate explanation of how adverse effects were identified? • Was a standardised or validated measurement instrument used? • How was the adverse effect(s) attributed to the intervention? • Are the terms clearly explained? <p>EUnetHTA (HTA Core Model 2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How rigorous were the methods used to detect adverse effects? Were the methods used for monitoring reported? • Was follow up sufficiently long to assess the risk for serious longer term safety issues? • How complete is the reporting? Did the investigators report all important or serious harms? Did the report give numerical data by group? • How were data collected: prospective/routine monitoring, spontaneous reporting, patient checklist/questionnaire/diary; systematic survey of patients? • Were any patients excluded from the harms analysis? <p>EUnetHTA (HTA Core Model Update 2014, draft)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the methods used for detecting adverse effects reported: prospective or routine monitoring, spontaneous reporting, or patient checklists/questionnaires/diaries ? • How rigorous were these methods? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 4, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 3.3. Safety, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) • Safety domain, HTA Core Model Update 2013 (draft version 8 April 2014) • Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the follow-up sufficiently long to assess the risk for serious longer term safety issues? • How complete is the reporting? Did the investigators report all serious or common harms? • Did the report give numerical data by group? • Were any patients excluded from the harms analysis? <p>EUnetHTA (REA 2013)</p> <p>Useful questions to assess how the adverse reactions are collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were definitions given of reported adverse effects? • How were adverse effects data collected: prospective/routine monitoring, spontaneous reporting, patient checklist/questionnaire/diary; systematic survey of patients? <p>Useful questions to assess how the adverse effects are reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were any patients excluded from the adverse effects analysis? • Did the report give numerical data by intervention group? • Which categories of adverse effects did the investigators report? • Did investigators report on all important or serious adverse effects, and how were these defined? • Were methods used for monitoring adverse effects reported? • Was an independent data safety monitoring board established? 		
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of systematic reviews you could refer to the AMSTAR instrument or to the NOKC checklist for systematic reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shea et al. 2007 • Appendix EFF-1 Section 4, in Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening (Jefferson et al. 2013a) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of RCTs you could</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No</p>

<p>refer to the risk of bias system proposed by the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions or to the extension of the CONSORT statement: for better reporting in randomised trials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 8, Assessing risk of bias in included studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • CONSORT statement (Ioannidis 2004) 	<p>(explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of cohort studies you could refer to the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale or to the STROBE Statement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 2011. Chapter 13: Including non-randomized studies • Wells et al. 2008 • von Elm et al. 2007 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of case reports you could refer to issues proposed by the Cochrane Collaboration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 14, Adverse effects, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To evaluate the quality of Registers you must take into account that the quality of registers should be appraised carefully considering the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How representative is the register? (European, National, Regional, Local?) • What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria? • What is the quality of information?(e.g. data entry) • How complete is the coverage? • What kind of information is coded? <p>for Routine collected statistics and administrative data you must take into account that :</p> <p>The use of routinely collected statistics has several limitations. The reliability of the diagnosis varies and usually it is not possible to differentiate between different stages of the disease. Even the validity of the coding of causes of death may be variable, and in some countries it is known to be very limited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014) • AHRQ User's guide - Registries for evaluating patient's outcomes (Gliklich et al .2010) 	

3.9 Data synthesis

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define a clear plan to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> construct a descriptive summary of the included studies <p><i>N.B.: you can do it by tabulating details about study type, interventions, numbers of participants, a summary of participant characteristics, outcomes, method to collect adverse events. An indication of study quality or risk of bias may also be given in this or a separate table. Data synthesis should include text and tables to provide an initial descriptive summary and explanation of the characteristics and findings of the included studies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> decide whether and how to perform a narrative synthesis and or a quantitative synthesis of results of studies (table / forest plot / range of estimates / meta-analysis). <p><i>N.B.: a narrative synthesis of studies may be undertaken where studies are too heterogeneous (either clinically or methodologically) to combine in a meta-analysis, but even where a meta-analysis is possible, aspects of narrative synthesis will usually be required in order to fully interpret the collected evidence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize characteristics of single included studies according to recommendations from the Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals <p>Data Synthesis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a preliminary synthesis of findings of included studies Report results by each study design / source of data Summarize in a table the results by group of included studies/data according to recommendations from the Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals Summarize in a table the results by group of included studies/data according to recommendations from the Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals Describe the safety profile of the technology versus the comparator(s), 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) Chapter 4, Systematic reviews of adverse effects, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) Safety domain, HTA Core Model ver 1.5 April 2014 Chapter 2.7, Methods: Interpreting evidence, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) Appendix 5, Recommendations of guidelines on methodological issues, Safety, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

<p>with special regard to the most frequent, serious and severe adverse reactions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A table is preferable for the comparison of the safety profile of the new pharmaceutical and the comparator(s). • Variation in results across studies should be investigated and explore relationships within and between studies • Quantitative results should be expressed as point estimates together with associated confidence intervals and exact p-values. <p><i>N.B.: simply describing the studies is not sufficient for a synthesis. The defining characteristic of narrative synthesis is the adoption of a textual approach that provides an analysis of the relationships within and between studies and an overall assessment of the robustness of the evidence.</i></p>		
---	--	--

491

492

3.10 Grading of quality of evidence

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>If appropriate and possible, assess and report quality of evidence (grading):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for single studies - for single important outcomes/adverse events across studies <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>for overall rating of the quality of evidence for each outcome you could apply the GRADE method</i> 2) <i>for overall rating of the quality of evidence according to the GRADE method you have to prepare Summary of Findings tables. In this case the GRADE method considers – in addition to risk of bias/limitations - also publication bias, imprecision of results, inconsistency of results, indirectness of results</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRADE method <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guyatt et al. 2011a - Balshem et al. 2011 - Guyatt et al. 2011b - Guyatt et al. 2011c - Guyatt et al. 2011d - Guyatt et al. 2011e - Guyatt et al. 2011f - Guyatt et al. 2011g - Guyatt et al. 2013 - Schunemann et al. 2008 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

493

494

3.11 Reporting

Standard procedure	References	Done
--------------------	------------	------

<p>Define important terms in a glossary</p> <p>Reporting is performed in three phases: the result cards, the domain reports and the full report</p> <p>In the result cards the authors report the detailed methods and results for each research question separately. The cards are compiled in a domain report amended with chapters for domain specific methods, summary of main results, and discussion. Finally, all domain reports are taken together, and amended with the benefit-harm analysis and overall summary and discussion.</p> <p>Enter the results according to the instructions from the HTA Core Model Online 2012. Chapter 2.2.4 Phase 4: Entering the results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.8, Methods: Reporting, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 2.2.4, Phase 4: Entering the results, in HTA Core Model Online (2014) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

495

496

497 **Bibliography**

498 Adverse Reaction Terminology WHO-ART. The Uppsala Monitoring Centre. Available from [http://www.umc-](http://www.umc-products.com/DynPage.aspx?id=4918)
499 [products.com/DynPage.aspx?id=4918](http://www.umc-products.com/DynPage.aspx?id=4918); last access May 22nd 2013

500 Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
501 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013

502 Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
503 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013

504 Assessment Element for Screening Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
505 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013

506 Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Meerpohl J,
507 Norris S, Guyatt GH. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;
508 64:401-6.

509 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Systematic Reviews: CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in
510 Healthcare. Jan 2009. Available from www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/index_guidance.htm; last access May
511 10th 2013.

512 Gliklich RE, Dreyer NA, eds. Registries for evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide. 2nd ed. AHRQ
513 Publication No. 10-EHC049. Rockville, MD:agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
514 September 2010

515 Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Glasziou P, DeBeer H,
516 Jaeschke R, Rind D, Meerpohl J, Dahm P, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-
517 GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol 2011a; 64:383-94.

518 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, Devereaux PJ, Montori VM,
519 Freyschuss B, Vist G, Jaeschke R, Williams JW Jr, Murad MH, Sinclair D, Falck-Ytter Y, Meerpohl
520 J, Whittington C, Thorlund K, Andrews J, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality
521 of evidence--imprecision. J Clin Epidemiol 2011d; 64:1283-93.

522 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Glasziou P, Jaeschke
523 R, Akl EA, Norris S, Vist G, Dahm P, Shukla VK, Higgins J, Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann HJ; GRADE

- 524 Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *J Clin*
525 *Epidemiol* 2011e; 64:1294-302.
- 526 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Falck-Ytter Y,
527 Jaeschke R, Vist G, Akl EA, Post PN, Norris S, Meerpohl J, Shukla VK, Nasser M, Schünemann HJ;
528 GRADE Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence--indirectness. *J Clin*
529 *Epidemiol* 2011f; 64: 1303-10.
- 530 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Djulbegovic B, Atkins D,
531 Falck-Ytter Y, Williams JW Jr, Meerpohl J, Norris SL, Akl EA, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines:
532 5. Rating the quality of evidence--publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011c; 64:1277-82.
- 533 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Norris S, Meerpohl J,
534 Djulbegovic B, Alonso-Coello P, Post PN, Busse JW, Glasziou P, Christensen R, Schünemann HJ.
535 GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*
536 2013; 66:158-72.
- 537 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Atkins D, Kunz R, Brozek J, Montori
538 V, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Dahm P, Meerpohl J, Vist G, Berliner E, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Murad MH,
539 Schünemann HJ; GRADE Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence.
540 *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011g; 64:1311-6
- 541 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Montori V, Akl EA, Djulbegovic B, Falck-
542 Ytter Y, Norris SL, Williams JW Jr, Atkins D, Meerpohl J, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines: 4.
543 Rating the quality of evidence—study limitations (risk of bias). *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011b; 64:407-15
- 544 Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0*
545 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from [www.cochrane-](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org)
546 [handbook.org](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org). Chapter 5: Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies;
547 last access May 10th 2013.
- 548 HTA Core Model Handbook 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
549 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx>; last access May 10th 2013.
- 550 HTA Core Model Update 2014. EUnetHTA 2014 (draft version 1.5). Available at
551 <http://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/review2013/>; last access June 30th 2013.
- 552 Ioannidis JP, Evans SJ, Gøtzsche PC, O'Neill RT, Altman DG, Schulz K, Moher D; CONSORT Group.
553 Better reporting of harms in randomized trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. *Ann Intern*
554 *Med*. 2004 16; 141:781-8.
- 555 Jefferson T, Vicari N, Frønsdal KB (eds). *Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening*. EUnetHTA 2013a.
- 556 Jefferson T, Vicari N, Raatz H (eds). *Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (uPA/PAI-1 [FEMTELLE],*
557 *MammaPrint, Oncotype DX)*. EUnetHTA 2013b.
- 558 *Methods Guide for Medical Test Reviews*. AHRQ Publication No. 12-EC017. Rockville, MD: Agency for
559 Healthcare Research and Quality; June 2012. Available from
560 www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/reports/final.cfm; last access May 10th 2013.
- 561 *Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals*. EUnetHTA 2013. Available at
562 [http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-](http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-effectiveness-assessment-pharma)
563 [effectiveness-assessment-pharma](http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-effectiveness-assessment-pharma); last access May 10th 2013.
- 564 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
565 Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2009; 6:e1000097.
- 566 National Cancer Institute. *Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE)*. Cancer Therapy
567 Evaluation Program (CTEP). Available from
568 http://ctep.cancer.gov/protocolDevelopment/electronic_applications/ctc.htm; last access May 22nd
569 2013

- 570 Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, Williams JW Jr, Kunz R, Craig J,
571 Montori VM, Bossuyt P, Guyatt GH; GRADE Working Group. BMJ 2008; 336:1106-10.
- 572 Shea BJ, Bouter LM, Peterson J, Boers M, Andersson N, Ortiz Z, Ramsay T, Bai A, Shukla VK, Grimshaw
573 JM. External Validation of a Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR). PLoS
574 ONE. 2007; 2(12): e1350. Available also from <http://www.amstar.ca/>; last access May 10th 2013.
- 575 The Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA). Available from <http://www.meddrasso.com/>;
576 last access May 22nd 2013
- 577 von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative.
578 The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
579 guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet 2007; 370:1453-7.
- 580 Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
581 (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Available from
582 www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm; last access May 10th 2013.
- 583
- 584
- 585

586 2.8 Domain specific issues: Effectiveness of the technology (EFF)

587 Aim

588 The aim of this guidance is to describe the necessary information and practical procedures/steps for the
589 production of the information (result cards) corresponding to Assessment Elements for the Core HTA's
590 Effectiveness domain.

591 Evidence base

592 The following conceptual framework was applied: first, methodological deliverables by EUnetHTA were
593 included and consulted to design the structure for a systematic review of effectiveness. Then, handbooks or
594 manuals for producing systematic reviews from institutions contributing to the methodology of systematic
595 reviews were non-systematically consulted from specific websites and included. Finally, tools and methods
596 for single specific procedural steps were non-systematically searched and included. The documents included
597 were compared for consistency.

598 The following documents were used in order to define the general design for the practical guidance of
599 procedures:

- 600 • Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011);
- 601 • CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination
602 2009).
- 603 • HTA Core Model Handbook (2014);
- 604 • EUnetHTA Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013);
- 605 • PRISMA Statement (Moher et al. 2009);
- 606 • In addition to the above documents, the followings were used to define single procedural steps:
- 607 • AMSTAR instrument (Shea et al. 2007);
- 608 • Bossuyt et al. (2006);
- 609 • Cochrane Handbook for DTA Reviews (Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group 2011);
- 610 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)
- 611 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)
- 612 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)
- 613 • EUnetHTA Methodological guidelines for rapid relative effectiveness assessment (REA) of
614 Pharmaceuticals developed in WP5 (2013)
- 615 • HTA Core Model on Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening (Jefferson et al. 2013a)
- 616 • HTA Core Model on Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (uPA/PAI-1 [FEMTELLE],
617 MammaPrint, Oncotype DX) (Jefferson et al. 2013b)
- 618 • GRADE method (Balshem et al. 2011, Guyatt et al. 2011a, Guyatt et al. 2011b, Guyatt et al. 2011c,
619 Guyatt et al. 2011d, Guyatt et al. 2011e, Guyatt et al. 2011f, Guyatt et al. 2011g, Guyatt et al. 2013,
620 Schünemann et al. 2008);
- 621 • Methods guides on medical test reviews (AHRQ 2012).
- 622 • Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (Wells et al. 2008);
- 623 • QUADAS 2 tool (Whiting et al. 2011);
- 624 • QUIPS tool (Hayden et al. 2013)
- 625 • STARD Checklist (Bossuyt et al. 2003);

626

627 The guidance is structured as a table containing:

- 628 1. a first column with an assertive sentence for the action requested, labelled as "*Standard procedure*".
629 If needed, details, suggestions and description of the most common pitfalls are provided.
- 630 2. a second column, labelled as "*References*", specifying the reference(s) at the basis of the action,
631 where more details for accomplishing the procedure can be found.

632 3. a third column, labelled as “Done”, to check if each action is done or not and why.

633 If different approaches and methodologies are needed, every procedural step is distinguished for each of the
 634 following types of technology: (1) Medical and Surgical Interventions, (2) Diagnostic Technologies, (3)
 635 Screening Technologies, (4) Prognostic technologies. Unless otherwise specified, the procedural step is to
 636 be considered applicable for all four types of technology.

637

638 **Practical guidance**

639 In this chapter the procedural steps needed to produce the result cards corresponding to Assessment
 640 Elements for the Effectiveness domain are reported.

641 To complete the Assessment Elements for the Effectiveness domain one or more Systematic Reviews,
 642 answering each selected issue, need to be carried out. There are pre-defined steps in producing a
 643 systematic review (CRD’s Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare 2009, Higgins et al. 2011, HTA
 644 Core Model Handbook 2012, HTA Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013, Moher et al. 2009):

- 645 3.1. Selection of the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements
- 646 3.2. Definition of research questions
- 647 3.3. Definition of inclusion criteria for considering studies
- 648 3.4. Systematic search of evidence
- 649 3.5. Selection of the studies
- 650 3.6. Data extraction
- 651 3.7. Methodological quality assessment
- 652 3.8. Data synthesis
- 653 3.9. Grading of quality of evidence
- 654 3.10. Reporting

655

656 **3.1 Selection of the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements**

Standard procedure	References	Done
Select the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment Elements <i>N.B.: Methods specific to conduct a systematic review of a prognostic test are not well established. Currently there are only three applications of the HTA Core Model: medical and surgical interventions, diagnostic technologies, and screening technologies. While awaiting for specific methodological guidance on prognostic technologies, refer to guidance for diagnostic technologies. However, there are fundamental differences in the assessment of diagnostic and prognostic tests, thus consider that HTA Core assessment element questions for diagnostic technologies are thus not suited for prognostic</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.2.2 Phase 2: Protocol design, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) • Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014) • Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014) • Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014) • Clinical Effectiveness, Methodology Description Chapter, in HTA core model on Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (Jefferson et al. 2013b) 	Yes No (explain)

<i>technologies.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 12. Systematic Review of Prognostic Tests, in Methods Guide for Medical Test Reviews (AHRQ 2012) 	
----------------------	--	--

657

658 **3.2 Definition of research questions**

Standard procedure	References	Done
Define research question(s) according to the PICOD system PICOD stands for participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2.2.2, Phase 2: Protocol design, in HTA Core Model Handbook (2014) Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals 2013. PRISMA Statement (Moher et al. 2009) 	Yes No (explain)
Outcomes relevant to the technology should be listed and differentiated in Primary, Secondary and Surrogate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 5, Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) Chapter 2, Methods, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) 	Yes No (explain)

659

660 **3.3 Definition of inclusion criteria for considering studies**

Standard procedure	References	Done
Define “Criteria for considering studies for inclusion” according to elements of PICOD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 5, Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	Yes No (explain)
Relevant to all “ Topics” from Assessment Elements (i.e. all outcomes, including harms and adverse effects) of Medical and Surgical Interventions: the inclusion criteria must be established for the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population/patient characteristics - Types of interventions - Types of comparators - Relevant outcomes - Study design - Publication type 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) Chapter 5, Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) Chapter 2, Methods, in Model 	Yes No (explain)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publication date - Language <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) <i>If systematic reviews or HTA reports are available you should value if they could be adapted or updated</i> 4) <i>The best evidence is based on RCTs and SR(s) of RCTs, so you have to consider inclusion/exclusion criteria for both study designs.</i> 5) <i>If you anticipate few RCTs, you should consider whether to include non RCTs studies and which types of non RCTs studies</i> 6) <i>If cohort studies or case series are included, specify if studies with a retrospective design are suitable for inclusion</i> 7) <i>If case series are included, define a minimum number of study's participants as inclusion criterion</i> 8) <i>Ideally all relevant studies should be included but if this is not feasible they should be identified and you should specify the reason for exclusion recorded</i> 9) <i>Depending on the novelty of the technology you should value if you include only studies published in peer-review studies or if you will also take into account information from conference abstracts, unpublished data.</i> 10) <i>You should value if you include all studies or only those published in the last years</i> 11) <i>Inclusion/Exclusion criteria should be clearly presented in the report</i> 	<p>for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness Chapter. HTA Core Model for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2.0) 	
<p>Relevant to all " topics" from Assessment Elements (i.e. all outcomes including harms and adverse effects) of Diagnostic Technologies, Screening Technologies and Prognostic Technologies</p> <p>the inclusion criteria should clearly define the following elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - population/patient characteristics (health care setting, stage of the disease, severity, age, etc) - types of index tests <p><i>N.B.: For some tests you must take into account that there will be studies analysing only the index test without considering the comparator test. In this case you have to specify whether studies without</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6, Developing criteria for including studies, in Cochrane Handbook for DTA Reviews (Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group 2011) • Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • STARD Checklist (Bossuyt et al. 2003) • Bossuyt et al. (2006) • EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (in development) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

<p><i>head-to-head comparisons are to be included or excluded.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - types of comparator tests <p><i>N.B.: If data on comparator are not available from head to head comparison, you will have to decide whether to include indirect evidence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - types of target conditions <p><i>N.B.: The authors should define clearly the target condition/s that will be considered (i.e. diagnosis of specific condition, disease stage, treatment response, etc.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reference standards - types of outcome (diagnostic accuracy and clinical outcomes) - types of studies <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>the best evidence for diagnostic accuracy is based on diagnostic test accuracy studies and SR(s) of diagnostic test accuracy studies, so you have to consider inclusion/exclusion criteria for both study designs.</i> 2) <i>it could be important - for the transferability and interpretation of results – to establish “a priori” the role of test and its position in the diagnostic pathway according to the following labels: Triage, Replacement, Add-on</i> 3) <i>issues of intra and inter-observer reliability of the tests refer to the Description and technical characteristics of technology.</i> 		
--	--	--

661

662 **3.4 Systematic search of evidence**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Conduct a comprehensive systematic search of evidence for each research question searching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General medical databases - Topic specific databases - Systematic review databases/HTA databases - Trial registers - Grey literature through hand searching if appropriate - Unpublished studies (seek additional information from manufacturers, and EMA clinical study report request procedure or agencies?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 6, Searching for studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Chapter 7, Searching for studies, in Cochrane Handbook for DTA Reviews (Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

<p>For each search draft a sufficiently detailed report of searches and databases should be provided to allow search to be reproduced.</p> <p>The search process should be explicitly defined including search strategy. A flow chart with number of studies retrieved, studies included and excluded and reasons for exclusion is recommended.</p> <p>You should update the search at the end of the review</p>	<p>2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Methods guide for effectiveness and comparative effectiveness reviews http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/60/318/CER-Methods-Guide-140109.pdf PDF pp.103, 125, 136-8, 166. January 2014. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>
<p>Use bibliographic software to manage references.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EUnetHTA GL Process of information retrieval (in development) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

663

664 **3.5 Selection of the studies**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Perform the selection of studies through the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of potentially relevant titles and /or abstracts and retrieval of full-texts - assessment of full papers considered as potentially relevant - inclusion of the final set of studies <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <p>2) <i>Assessment of eligibility of studies, and extraction of data from study reports, should be done by at least two people, independently</i></p> <p><i>Studies, rather than publications, are the unit of interest of the review, therefore multiple publications of the same study need to be linked together. Duplicated studies should be eliminated.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 3, Systematic review of the literature, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) Chapter 7, Selecting studies and collecting data, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) Chapter 1, Core principles and methods for conducting a systematic review of health interventions, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

665

666 **3.6 Data extraction**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define all data you have to collect and design a standardized data collection form</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Template 5, Table for reporting results from clinical trials, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) Chapter 7, Selecting studies 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

<p>Describe how the data extraction process is to be performed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the data categories and information requirements that are to be collected - how verification of extracted data from each report will be verified (e.g. extraction by two review authors, independently) - piloting, training and existence of coding instructions for the data collection form; - how data are extracted from multiple reports of the same study - how disagreements are handled if more than one author extracts data from each report <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>When you design the data extraction form you should take into account the aim of the report, research questions but also the information that will be relevant for quality assessment and analysis of results</i> 2) <i>if appropriate, you need to consider separately how to manage data from primary studies and data from SRs</i> 3) <i>for diagnostic accuracy studies you should consider also specific data to be extracted (i.e. raw data to calculate pre-test probability/prevalence of disease, raw number of true and false positive, true and false negative, ecc.)</i> 	<p>and collecting data, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 1, Core principles and methods for conducting a systematic review of health intervention, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (2014) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

667

668 **3.7 Methodological quality assessment**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Use validated frameworks and tools for the methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity assessment of included studies</p> <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) <i>you must apply different tools for different study scope and design (i.e. primary studies vs SRs, effectiveness studies vs diagnostic accuracy studies, RCTs vs non-RCTs)</i> 5) <i>you must take into account that simply grading studies is not sufficient and that you should also assess the appropriateness of the study to resolve the research question</i> 6) <i>you should refer to risk of bias specific for</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline 8, Levels of evidence: Internal validity (of randomized controlled trials, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Guideline 9, Levels of evidence: Applicability of evidence in the context of a relative effectiveness assessment of pharmaceuticals, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 8, Assessing risk of bias in included studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>

<p><i>each type of technology (MST, DT, ST) and purpose (effectiveness, diagnostic accuracy)</i></p> <p>7) <i>when you include a SR you should distinguish the quality of the SR itself from the quality of results obtained from the primary studies included into the SRs</i></p>	<p>Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 13, Including non-randomized studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) • Chapter 9, Assessing Methodological Quality, in Cochrane Handbook for DTA Reviews (Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group 2011) • Chapter 1, Core principles and methods for conducting a systematic review of health interventions, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) • EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (2014) 	
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of systematic reviews you could refer to the AMSTAR instrument or to the NOKC checklist for systematic reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shea et al. 2007 • Appendix EFF-1 Section 4, in Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening (Jefferson et al. 2013a) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of RCTs refer to the risk of bias system proposed by the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 8, Assessing risk of bias in included studies, in Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins et al. 2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of cohort studies refer to the Cochrane Acrobat-NRSI tool. www.riskofbias.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 2011. Chapter 13: Including non-randomized studies • Wells et al. 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of diagnostic accuracy studies refer to the QUADAS 2 tool</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 9, Assessing Methodological Quality, in Cochrane Handbook for DTA Reviews (Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group 2011) • Whiting et al. (2011) 	<p>Yes No (explain)</p>
<p>To assess methodological quality/risk of bias/internal validity of prognostic studies you could</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hayden et al. (2013) 	<p>Yes No</p>

refer to the QUIPS tool	(explain)
-------------------------	-----------

669

670 **3.8 Data synthesis**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Define a clear plan to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> construct a descriptive summary of the included studies <p><i>N.B.: you can do it by tabulating details about study type, interventions, numbers of participants, a summary of participant characteristics, outcomes and outcome measures. An indication of study quality or risk of bias may also be given in this or a separate table. Data synthesis should include text and tables to provide an initial descriptive summary and explanation of the characteristics and findings of the included studies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> decide whether and how to perform a narrative synthesis and or a quantitative synthesis of results of studies (table / forest plot / range of estimates / meta-analysis). <p><i>N.B.: a narrative synthesis of studies may be undertaken where studies are too heterogeneous (either clinically or methodologically) to combine in a meta-analysis, but even where a meta-analysis is possible, aspects of narrative synthesis will usually be required in order to fully interpret the collected evidence.</i></p> <p>Data Synthesis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a preliminary synthesis of findings of included studies Report results by each outcome Quantitative results should be expressed as point estimates together with associated confidence intervals and exact p-values. Variation in results across studies should be investigated Explore relationships within and between studies Propose an interpretation of how the intervention works, why and for whom <p><i>N.B.: simply describing the studies is not sufficient for a synthesis. The defining characteristic of narrative synthesis is the adoption of a textual approach that provides an analysis of the relationships within and between studies and an overall assessment of the robustness of the evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1, Core principles and methods for conducting a systematic review of health interventions, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) Chapter 2, Systematic reviews of clinical tests, in CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (2009) Chapter 2.7, Methods: Interpreting evidence, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (2014) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

671

672 **3.9 Grading of quality of evidence**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>If appropriate and possible, assess and report quality of evidence (grading):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for single studies - for single important outcomes across studies <p><i>N.B.: for this procedure you must take into account that</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) <i>for overall rating of the quality of evidence for each outcome you could apply the GRADE method</i> 4) <i>for overall rating of the quality of evidence according to the GRADE method you have to prepare Summary of Findings tables. In this case you should consider – in addition to risk of bias/limitations - also publication bias, imprecision of results, inconsistency of results, indirectness of results</i> 5) <i>for Diagnostic Technologies and Prognostic Technologies studies publication bias, imprecision of results, inconsistency of results have not consolidated methods to be assessed with</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRADE method <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guyatt et al. 2011a - Balshem et al. 2011 - Guyatt et al. 2011b - Guyatt et al. 2011c - Guyatt et al. 2011d - Guyatt et al. 2011e - Guyatt et al. 2011f - Guyatt et al. 2011g - Guyatt et al. 2013 • EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (2014) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

673

674 **3.10 Reporting**

Standard procedure	References	Done
<p>Check relations to other domains (SAF) to avoid double work</p> <p>Define important terms in a glossary</p> <p>Reporting is performed in three phases: the result cards, the domain reports and the full report</p> <p>In the result cards the authors report the detailed methods and results for each research question separately. The cards are compiled in a domain report amended with chapters for domain specific methods, summary of main results, and discussion. Finally, all domain reports are taken together, and amended with the benefit-harm analysis and overall summary and discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enter the results according to the instructions from the HTA Core Model Online 2014. Chapter 2.2.4 Phase 4: Entering the results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2.8, Methods: Reporting, in Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals (2013) • Chapter 2.2.4, Phase 4: Entering the results, in HTA Core Model Online (2014) 	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (explain)</p>

675

676 **Bibliography**

- 677 Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
678 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013
- 679 Assessment Element for Screening Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
680 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013
- 681 Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
682 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6> ; last access May 10th 2013
- 683 Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Meerpohl J,
684 Norris S, Guyatt GH. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;
685 64:401-6.
- 686 Bossuyt PM, Irwig L, Craig J, Glasziou P. Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing
687 diagnostic pathways. BMJ 2006 6;332:1089-92.
- 688 Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, Lijmer JG, Moher D, Rennie D,
689 de Vet HC; Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy. Towards complete and accurate
690 reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. BMJ 2003; 326:41-4.
- 691 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Systematic Reviews: CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in
692 Healthcare. Jan 2009. Available from www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/index_guidance.htm; last access May
693 10th 2013.
- 694 Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group. Handbook for DTA Reviews. 2011. Available from
695 <http://srdta.cochrane.org/handbook-dta-reviews>; last access May 10th 2013.
- 696 EUnetHTA. Endpoints used for REA of pharmaceuticals: composite endpoints. February 2013.
- 697 EUnetHTA. Comparators and comparisons – Direct and Indirect Comparisons. February 2013
- 698 EUnetHTA. Health-Related Quality Of Life and Utility Measures. February 2013
- 699 EUnetHTA. Levels of evidence: Internal validity (of randomized controlled trials). February 2013
- 700 EUnetHTA. Endpoints used for REA of pharmaceuticals – Safety. February 2013
- 701 EUnetHTA. Endpoints used in REA of pharmaceuticals: surrogate endpoints. February 2013
- 702 EUnetHTA. Levels of evidence: applicability of evidence in the context of a relative effectiveness
703 assessment of pharmaceuticals February 2013
- 704 EUnetHTA. Comparators & comparisons: criteria for the choice of the most appropriate comparator(s)
705 February 2013
- 706 EUnetHTA. Endpoints used for REA of pharmaceuticals – Clinical endpoints February 2013
- 707 **to be updated with new references when available**
- 708 Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Glasziou P, DeBeer H,
709 Jaeschke R, Rind D, Meerpohl J, Dahm P, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-
710 GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol 2011a; 64:383-94.
- 711 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, Devreux PJ, Montori VM,
712 Freyschuss B, Vist G, Jaeschke R, Williams JW Jr, Murad MH, Sinclair D, Falck-Ytter Y, Meerpohl
713 J, Whittington C, Thorlund K, Andrews J, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality
714 of evidence--imprecision. J Clin Epidemiol 2011d; 64:1283-93.
- 715 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Glasziou P, Jaeschke
716 R, Akl EA, Norris S, Vist G, Dahm P, Shukla VK, Higgins J, Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann HJ; GRADE
717 Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. J Clin
718 Epidemiol 2011e; 64:1294-302.

- 719 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Falck-Ytter Y,
720 Jaeschke R, Vist G, Akl EA, Post PN, Norris S, Meerpohl J, Shukla VK, Nasser M, Schünemann HJ;
721 GRADE Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence--indirectness. *J Clin*
722 *Epidemiol* 2011f; 64: 1303-10.
- 723 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Djulbegovic B, Atkins D,
724 Falck-Ytter Y, Williams JW Jr, Meerpohl J, Norris SL, Akl EA, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines:
725 5. Rating the quality of evidence--publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011c; 64:1277-82.
- 726 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, Helfand M, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Norris S, Meerpohl J,
727 Djulbegovic B, Alonso-Coello P, Post PN, Busse JW, Glasziou P, Christensen R, Schünemann HJ.
728 GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*
729 2013; 66:158-72.
- 730 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Atkins D, Kunz R, Brozek J, Montori
731 V, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Dahm P, Meerpohl J, Vist G, Berliner E, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Murad MH,
732 Schünemann HJ; GRADE Working Group. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence.
733 *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011g; 64:1311-6
- 734 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Montori V, Akl EA, Djulbegovic B, Falck-
735 Ytter Y, Norris SL, Williams JW Jr, Atkins D, Meerpohl J, Schünemann HJ. GRADE guidelines: 4.
736 Rating the quality of evidence—study limitations (risk of bias). *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011b; 64:407-15
- 737 Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic
738 factors. *Ann Intern Med* 2013; 158:280-6.
- 739 Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0*
740 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from [www.cochrane-](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org)
741 [handbook.org](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org). Chapter 5: Defining the review question and developing criteria for including studies;
742 last access May 10th 2013.
- 743 HTA Core Model Handbook 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
744 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx>; last access May 10th 2013.
- 745 Jefferson T, Vicari N, Frønsdal KB (eds). *Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening*. EUnetHTA 2013a.
- 746 Jefferson T, Vicari N, Raatz H (eds). *Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (uPA/PAI-1 [FEMTELLE],*
747 *MammaPrint, Oncotype DX)*. EUnetHTA 2013b.
- 748 *Methods Guide for Medical Test Reviews*. AHRQ Publication No. 12-EC017. Rockville, MD: Agency for
749 Healthcare Research and Quality; June 2012. Available from
750 www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/reports/final.cfm; last access May 10th 2013.
- 751 *Model for Rapid REA of pharmaceuticals*. EUnetHTA 2013. Available at
752 [http://www.eunethta.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-](http://www.eunethta.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-effectiveness-assessment-pharma)
753 [effectiveness-assessment-pharma](http://www.eunethta.eu/outputs/new-application-hta-core-model-hta-core-model-rapid-relative-effectiveness-assessment-pharma); last access May 10th 2013.
- 754 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
755 Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2009; 6:e1000097.
- 756 Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, Williams JW Jr, Kunz R, Craig J,
757 Montori VM, Bossuyt P, Guyatt GH; GRADE Working Group. *BMJ* 2008; 336:1106-10.
- 758 Shea BJ, Bouter LM, Peterson J, Boers M, Andersson N, Ortiz Z, Ramsay T, Bai A, Shukla VK, Grimshaw
759 JM. External Validation of a Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR). *PLoS*
760 *ONE*. 2007; 2(12): e1350. Available also from <http://www.amstar.ca/>; last access May 10th 2013.
- 761 Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
762 (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Available from
763 www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm; last access May 10th 2013.

764 Whiting PF, Rutjes AWS, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, Leeflang MM, Sterne JAC, and
765 Bossuyt PMM. QUADAS-2: A Revised Tool for the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy
766 Studies. *Ann Intern Med* 155 (8):529-536, 2011. Available also from <http://www.bris.ac.uk/quadas/>;
767 last access May 10th 2013.

768 EUnetHTA GL Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (2014)

769

770

771

772 2.9 Domain specific issues: Costs, economic evaluation of the technology (ECO)

773

774 Aim

775 The aim of this guidance for the ECO domain is to provide HTA Core Model domain team members with
776 practical guidance on a list of issues which have to be taken into account when developing the domain
777 content.

778 Evidence base

779 The contents of this chapter were developed on the basis of methodological deliverables by EUnetHTA, as
780 well as from practical experience from previous core HTA projects within EUnetHTA Project (2006-2008) and
781 EUnetHTA Joint Action 1 (2010-2012) and during the development of the 1st Core HTA in the framework of
782 EUnetHTA JA2 WP4 activities. The following documents have been consulted:

- 783 • HTA Core Model for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2.0)
- 784 • HTA Core Model for Diagnostic Technologies (2.0)
- 785 • HTA Core Model for Screening Technologies (2.0)
- 786 • HTA Core Model Handbook v.1.5.
- 787 • EUnetHTA WP5 JA2, Relative effectiveness of pharmaceuticals, Procedure manual for
788 piloting REAs, V3
- 789 • EUnetHTA WP5 JA2, Rapid assessments of other health technologies, Procedure manual
790 for piloting rapid assessments, V3
- 791 • EUnetHTA core HTA on Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm Screening (Jefferson et al. 2013a)
- 792 • EUnetHTA core HTA on Prognostic tests for breast cancer recurrence (uPA/PAI-1 [FEMTELLE],
793 MammaPrint, Oncotype DX) (Jefferson et al. 2013b)

794

795 Practical guidance

796 Readers should consult [\[EUnetHTA Guideline on Economic evaluations: SAG / Public consultation finalised
797 \(DEC 2014\), work on 212 received comments and preparation of final version to be published in MAR 2015\]](#)

798 *Preparing for the writing phase*

799 The roles of authors/co-authors/reviewers as well as suggested ways of the division of tasks are discussed in
800 the current document (Chapter: 1.5 *Project management and forming teams*). Domain team members
801 could consider familiarizing themselves with the relevant HTA Core Model (pharmaceuticals, diagnostics,
802 surgical procedures etc.) already developed by EUnetHTA and available on the EUnetHTA website as well
803 as the guidance on handling the electronic environment (Chapter: *General issues: handling the electronic
804 environment* in the current document). Relevant documents include:

- 805 • HTA Core Model for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2.0)
- 806 • HTA Core Model for Diagnostic Technologies (2.0)
- 807 • HTA Core Model for Screening Technologies (2.0)
- 808 • HTA Core Model Handbook V 1.5

809 Domain team members complete the Conflicts of Interest Declaration Form (COI Form, Appendix 4)
810 prepared by EUnetHTA and submit it to the WP LP, so that potential problems will be addressed.

811

812 *Scoping phase*

813 The primary investigator (PI) collaborates with other Domains' PIs for the development of the PICO
814 questions so that economic evaluation papers are identified during the centralized initial literature search.

815

816 The operational steps for developing the content for the "COSTS, ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF THE
817 TECHNOLOGY" domain are:

- 818 1. Selection of the most relevant topics from the relevant HTA Core Model
- 819 2. Search for information in the data sources
- 820 3. Assessment of the quality of the information
- 821 4. Analysing and synthesis
- 822 5. Reporting of results

823

824 **1. Selection of the most relevant topics from the relevant HTA Core Model**

825

826 Selection of Assessment elements of the respective HTA Core Model applications. which are also research
827 questions relevant to the scope of the project. **Search for information in the data sources**

828

829 Topic issues included in the ECO domain are:

- 830 - Resource utilization (identification, measurement, valuation of resources)
- 831 - Measurement and estimation of outcome(s)
- 832 - Examination of costs and outcomes
- 833 - Characterising uncertainty
- 834 - Characterising heterogeneity
- 835 - Validity of the model(s)

836 At this point, investigators will have access to text already developed by the CUR, TEC, SAF, EFF, ORG
837 domains . Relations with other domains need to be taken into consideration. At this stage, domain team
838 members can discuss the approach to be adopted i.e. whether the domain will provide a review of existing
839 economic evidence or an economic model will be developed and populated or both. This would facilitate
840 information gathering, as information sources vary depending on the approach. Justification of the approach
841 adopted should be provided.

842 Data to be used in the ECO domain may be located as part of the *overall search* conducted for the whole
843 project during the scoping phase. However, it is highly likely that additional literature searches will be
844 necessary.

845

846 In addition to the guidance included in the guideline "Methods for health economic evaluations – A guideline
847 based on current practices in Europe", to be published in April 2015, a collection of literature that provides a
848 solid scientific basis covering all the methodological aspects of economic evaluation is provided under
849 Bibliography.

850 *Reporting of results*

851 It is suggested that authors work on domain result templates that can be downloaded from the Online HTA
852 Model Tool (Research Tab of the respective project). Domain result templates include the research
853 questions in the domain. On the same tab, a reference manager guide and the EUnetHTA citation style for
854 Endnote are available, as well as a draft template of a study card (its use is optional). Authors work mostly
855 on text documents. Changes they make on the text should be marked either by using the Track Changes

856 tool in Word or by using different font colors. Authors can also decide on who will be responsible for
857 accepting/rejecting changes and finalizing the text.

858 In the reporting, use of summary tables, graphs, schematic patient flows, model representations is
859 encouraged as they facilitate communication and understanding of findings.

860

861 *Internal Review*

862 It is recommended that *internal reviewers (IR)* are given enough time to familiarize themselves with the
863 domain text, as previous experience has shown. It was also suggested that IRs have access to the whole
864 Core HTA draft text and not just the domain text.

865 IRs should provide their comments through a comments table.

866 PIs and Is reply to the comments by IRs using the “Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders Consultations”
867 document. Template is available in the Appendix 5.

868

869 *Comments by SAG*

870 PIs and Investigators reply to the comments by SAG using the “Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders
871 Consultations” document. Template is available in the Appendix 5.

872 **Bibliography**

- 873 • ISPOR. Country specific pharmacoeconomic guidelines. Dublin: ISPOR; 2006.
- 874 • Briggs A, Claxton K, Sculpher M, Decision modeling for health economic evaluation, Oxford University
875 Press, UK, 2008.
- 876 • Ades AE, Sculpher M, Sutton A, Abrams K, Cooper N, Welton N et al. Bayesian methods for evidence
877 synthesis in cost effectiveness analysis, *Pharmacoeconomics* 2006, 24:1-19.
- 878 • Polacheck SW, Occupational self-selection: a human capital approach to sex differences in
879 occupational structure. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 1981, 63 (1): 60-69.
- 880 • Culyer AJ. NICE’s use of cost-effectiveness as an example of deliberative process. *Health Econ Policy
881 Law* 2006; 1: 299-318.
- 882 • Garber AM, Phelps CE. Economic foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis. *J Health Econ* 1997; 16:
883 1-31.
- 884 • Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, Carswell C, Moher D, Greenberg D, Augustovski F, Briggs AH,
885 Mauskopf J, Loder E, and on behalf of the CHEERS Task Force, Consolidated health economic
886 evaluation reporting standards (CHEERS) statement, *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation*,
887 2013; 11: 6.
- 888 • Drummond MF, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*,
889 Oxford University Press, 2005
- 890 • Weinstein MC, O'Brien B, Hornberger J, Jackson J, Johannesson M, McCabe C, Luce BR; ISPOR Task
891 Force on Good Research Practices--Modeling Studies. Principles of good practice for decision analytic
892 modeling in health-care evaluation: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Good Research Practices--
893 Modeling Studies. *Value Health*. 2003 Jan-Feb;6(1):9-17.
- 894 • Sonnenberg FA, Beck JR. Markov models in medical decision making: a practical guide. *Med Decis
895 Making*. 1993 Oct-Dec;13(4):322-38.
- 896 • *Methods for health economic evaluations – A guideline based on current practices in Europe*, to be
897 published in April 2015

898

899 **2.10 Ethical aspects of the technology (ETH)**

900

901 **Aim**

902 To provide HTA Core Model users with a synthetic list of specific issues, tools, and methods to be taken into
903 account to carry out the ethical analysis in the Core HTA process.

904

905 **Evidence base**

906 Methodological deliverables by *European Network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA) HTA*
907 *Core Model* (2014) for Medical and Surgical Interventions (1.0R, 1.1, 2.0), for Diagnostic Technologies
908 (1.0R, 1.1, 2.0), for Screening Technologies (1.0, 2.0), for Pharmaceuticals (2.0) were consulted and used in
909 this chapter to collect all available evidence to design the structure for a systematic analysis on ethical
910 aspects of a certain health technology. Current literature on methodological aspects related to HTA Ethical
911 domain was considered.

912

913 **Practical guidance**

914 The operational steps for assessing ethical aspects of a health technology are:

- 915 - Defining the focus of the overall assessment
- 916 - Collecting ethically relevant information and assessing the quality of the information;
- 917 - Processing of available literature and extraction of ethically relevant aspects;
- 918 - Producing the core of ethical analysis;
- 919 - Methods for addressing HTA ethical analysis;
- 920 - Synthesizing, reporting and interpreting the ethical analysis and evidence;
- 921 - Transferability of ethical analysis;
- 922 - Overlap with other domains (e.g. legal and social)

923

924 *Defining the focus of the overall health technology assessment*

925 The entire HTA working group defines the focus within the topic, the specific questions to be
926 answered, the study inclusion criteria, the primary outcome points for the analysis of the
927 consequences of implementing/not implementing/disinvesting an health technology (e. g.: efficacy,
928 safety, effectiveness, cost implications). These choices are “value-laden” and they need to be
929 considered carefully before proceeding to literature review as they can have a major impact on the
930 content and conclusions of the assessment.

931

932

933 *Collecting ethically relevant information and assessing the quality of the information*

934 The ethical domain information sources for its specific analysis are the following:

- 935 • *Ethics literature* linked to the object of the analysis, from (general and HTA dedicated)
 936 bibliographic sources. If these are not available, literature on issues analogous to the matter
 937 under discussion should be considered;
- 938 • *Ethically relevant documentation from factual databases* that provide information in the form of
 939 guidelines for diagnosis and treatment, patient indications/contraindications, and other
 940 authoritative information, like professional standards/guidelines/reports, Codes of ethics by
 941 Colleges of healthcare professionals, statements of Scientific Societies, industry and
 942 government monographs, regulatory documents, market research reports, policy and research
 943 institute studies, publications of special panels and commissions, conference proceedings
 944 (e.g.: World Medical Association; Italian College of Physicians) and HTA reports from national,
 945 federal, regional bodies (e.g.: INAHTA, European Network for Health technology Assessment
 946 (EUnetHTA); UK National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE); Canadian Agency for Drugs
 947 and Technologies in Health (CADTH), etc.).
- 948 • Results produced by other domains involved should be analyzed for their possible ethical relevance,
 949 especially in the case of very scarce or lacking specific ethics literature.
- 950 • *Stakeholder opinion* (e.g.: experts, public, patients, service users, industry, organizational and healthcare
 951 professionals, etc.) through meetings/hearings or by primary studies, might consent to get
 952 information/inputs – to be analysed from the qualitative point of view – on aspects that could not be
 953 identified by the content or methodological expert group or from the literature review. Experts' opinions
 954 are considered the lowest level of evidence.
- 955 • *Discussions within the HTA working group*. Debate among researchers involved in the
 956 assessment process is an effective resource in identifying ethical aspects related to the
 957 technology in discussion.
 958
- 959 No baseline quality criteria are of available in literature on the assessment of the ethical impact
 960 of the technology in question, but a possible checklist could be:
- 961 a. the inclusion of the publications in peer-reviewed journals in international databases
 962 (e.g.: PubMed, Embase, etc);
- 963 b. the inclusion of the retrieved general and specific documentation/literature in
 964 recognized highly qualified institutional bodies: for “general” documentation an example
 965 could be professional standards/guidelines, Codes of ethics by Colleges of healthcare
 966 professionals/Scientific Societies; while for “specific” documentation, among others:
 967 INAHTA, NICE; CADTH. Although this literature can be timely and cover aspects of
 968 technologies that are not addressed in mainstream sources, it is usually not subject to
 969 peer review, and must be scrutinized accordingly.
- 970 - For literature from other HTA domains of possible ethical interest, the current standard quality
 971 criteria adopted for different domains are assumed (e.g.: GRADE and PICO methodologies for
 972 EFF domain).

973

974 *Processing of available literature and extraction of ethically relevant aspects*

975 The first task of an ethical analysis in an HTA process is the *processing of literature*. In fact, as the
 976 *HTA Core Model* suggests literature search focused only on the technology in question may
 977 seldom give access to articles relevant to the ethical evaluation. A natural starting point could be:

- 978 - to include keywords related to ethics to the literature search needed to cover the other areas of
979 the HTA process;
- 980 - to hand-search published HTA reports (ethical considerations are often integrated in the
981 reports), and perform an Internet search for reports, proceedings and books, etc;
- 982 - to perform a systematic literature review that will cover all the ethical and moral issues
983 identified during the process is challenging. Ethically relevant issues are identified during the
984 entire HTA process, and the literature searches thus commonly repeated when new ethically
985 relevant issues are identified. The extended literature search should not be focused only on the
986 technology in question, but cover other related technologies with similar ethical challenges. The
987 detailed literature search should include all relevant sources on ethical aspects of the
988 technology in question. A suggestion for databases and potentially useful MeSH terms was
989 identified by Droste (cf. Droste et al 2003, 2010);
- 990 - Finally, ethical analysis in HTA needs to consult a wider range of sources of literature than
991 would normally be considered for scientific evidence on clinical effectiveness.

992

993 *Producing the core of ethical analysis in an HTA process*

994 An ethicist should be *responsible for drafting, facilitating and reporting the ethical analysis*. Preferably, ethical
995 considerations should be introduced as early as possible in the HTA process. The responsible person for the
996 ethical analysis should ensure that the moral issues are considered by the whole group during the entire
997 process.

998 A successful ethical analysis should always be carried out together with the content experts and not seen as
999 an add-on that can be conducted by separate ethicists alone. Ethical analysis is an ongoing process that
1000 lasts throughout the HTA project. Ethical and moral issues should be considered early on while analyzing
1001 other aspects of the technology and, vice versa, the ethical analysis is dependent on the results and insights
1002 gathered for the other domains. However, if the only alternative is to do an “add-on” ethical analysis this is
1003 most likely better than no ethical analysis at all.

1004 Considerations on ethical aspects relate to two areas: 1. questions related to the HTA process (selection of
1005 topic, outcomes, methods, evaluating the importance of ethical analysis and planning it); 2. questions related
1006 to implementing/not implementing or disinvesting the technology in a health care service.

1007

1008 *Methods for addressing HTA ethical analysis*

1009 The choice of methods to perform an ethical analysis in an HTA process depends on a number of
1010 interacting factors: a. the type of technology being assessed; b. the role and authority of the HTA
1011 organization in the national decision-making procedure; c. the time and resources available for the
1012 assessment; d. the methodological expertise and experience with ethical analysis that are
1013 available within the organization; e. the socio-cultural context.

1014 There are many possible approaches, ranging from deontological to teleological perspectives (casuistry;
1015 coherence analysis; interactive, participatory HTA approach; principlism; social shaping of technology; wide
1016 reflective equilibrium, the “triangular model” based on the human person - centred approach;
1017 axiological (Socratic) approach). The debate about them highlighted that each approach has strengths and
1018 weaknesses in HTA context; consequently, no single approach is probably sufficient when it is applied alone.
1019 Moreover, since the moral issues of a technology are closely linked to the context of its development,
1020 uptake, and use, approaches for HTA ethical domain should be context-sensitive. (Burls et al, 2011).

1021 After a clear declaration of the approached assumed to conduct the ethical analysis, it is useful to set up a
1022 list of possible research questions to systematize the fundamental issues of ethical interests

1023 (beneficence/non maleficence, autonomy, respect for persons, justice and equity, ethical relevance of
1024 legislation, ethical consequences of the HTA). *HTA Core Model Assessment Elements List* is a useful tool for
1025 this purpose (EUnetHTA, 2014).

1026 Some issues deal with direct consequences of the implementation/not implementation/disinvesting (simple
1027 facts, e.g. can the technology harm the patient). Many issues deal with questions that need careful
1028 consideration that will provide a thorough overview of the value-laden aspects that need to be taken into
1029 account when deciding on implementation (e.g. balance between benefit and harm). A minority of issues
1030 cover areas that lead to clear conclusions (e.g. whether legislation is fair and adequate).

1031 *Synthesizing, reporting and interpreting the ethical analysis and evidence*

1032 Once ethical values at stake or in conflict for the health technology in question have been identified
1033 and analyzed through a particular ethical approach and methodology, the results have to be
1034 synthesized and reported transparently so that they can be considered when deciding whether to
1035 implement/not implement/disinvest a technology.

1036 No single solution to every ethical problem exists, nor is it possible to list ethical issues according
1037 to a commonly agreed weighted value. Answers to the core set of issues may also reflect the wide
1038 variety in personal morals and values within the society. The synthesis of ethical analysis has to be
1039 performed in an open way. Either the interests of various stakeholders are kept as "unweighted" as
1040 possible, or the weighing is done transparently i.e. describing the procedure and participants of the
1041 analysis.

1042 Ideally, the decision on "whose values are to be weighted" need to be in the hands of the decision
1043 makers. There can be different decision makers for different types of technologies within the same
1044 country and between countries. The ideal way to present the synthesis of the analysis may vary
1045 accordingly.

1046 It is important to identify also those areas where values may differ significantly between the various
1047 stakeholders (e.g. attitude towards the care of patients with non-treatable diseases, extremely
1048 costly interventions or conditions perceived as 'self-inflicted'). The main areas of ethical
1049 controversy should be clearly stated in the final document.

1050 The results of the ethical analysis will usually be reported as a separate chapter within the HTA report, to
1051 guarantee transparent reporting of value issues.

1052 The ethical implications of implementing or refraining from the implementation of technology need,
1053 however, to be discussed in a balanced way so that the health policy makers have a wider view on
1054 all possible consequences of their decision.

1055 The decision to implement/not implement/disinvest a new technology requires careful decision on
1056 the balance between benefit and harm, cost-effectiveness, reallocation of resources, etc.
1057 Discussing the context-specific moral issues within the respective chapter (e.g.: effectiveness,
1058 safety, and costs) may thus also help the decision makers to identify various scenarios and find the
1059 best for the common good.

1060

1061 *Transferability of ethical analysis*

1062 The ethical analysis and its outcome have to be described so that their transferability across
1063 different national or local settings could be evaluated.

1064 Many of the ethical implications are common to various nations, but some value-laden issues are
1065 likely to be *country- or community –specific*, and will crucially relate to factors such as the 'social

1066 contract', the country's healthcare financing system and the country's economic growth prospects,
1067 relying on local values, stakeholder attitudes and available health care resources.

1068

1069 *Overlap with HTA legal and social domains*

1070 Ethical analysis cannot be "separated" from the assessment of legal and social aspects related to a
1071 particular health technology. Sometimes, these domains overlap with the ethical analysis, though
1072 the angle of evaluation may differ (e.g.: the legal framework forms one of the fundamentals for
1073 professional ethics).

1074 The societal consequences of implementing/not implementing/disinvesting an health technology may differ
1075 from those of primary outcomes at patient level (f.i.: avoidance of death at patient level, avoidance of
1076 impaired working ability at societal level). The implementation/not implementation/disinvestment of an health
1077 technology will not only have an effect on health, functional abilities and psychosocial well-being, but also on
1078 social networks and need of support.

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083 **Bibliography**

1084 Andersen S, Caron L, Langavant GC, Dondorp W, Hagenfelt K, Hofmann B, Lopez-Argumedo M,
1085 Noorani H. INAHTA's Working Group on Handling Moral issues. INAHTA Report, June 2005.

1086 Autti-Rämö I, Mäkelä M: Ethical evaluation in health technology assessment reports: An eclectic
1087 approach. IJTAHC 2007;23:1-8.

1088 Beauchamp T, Childress J. Principles of Biomedical Ethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2012
1089 (7th ed.).

1090 Burls A; Caron L; de Langavant GC; Dondorp W; Harstall C; Pathak-Sen E, Hofmann B. Tackling
1091 ethical issues in health technology assessment: A proposed framework. International Journal of
1092 Technology Assessment in Health Care 2011;27(3):230-7.

1093 Capron AM. Law and bioethics. In: Post SG (ed.): Encyclopedia of Bioethics, 3rd edition, p. 1369-1375.
1094 Macmillan Reference USA, New York, NY 2004.

1095 Clausen C, Yoshinaka Y. Social shaping of technology in TA and HTA. Poiesis Prax 2004,
1096 2(2,3):221-46.

1097 Daniels N. Wide reflective Equilibrium and Theory Acceptance in Ethics. Journal of Philosophy
1098 1976, 76, 5:256-82.

1099 Daniels, N. Wide reflective Equilibrium in Practice, in Sumner L, Boyle J (ed.), Philosophical
1100 Perspectives on Bioethics, Toronto, Buffalo, London 1996, pp. 96-114.

1101 DeJean D, Giacomini M, Schwartz L, Miller FA. Ethics in Canadian health technology assessment:
1102 A descriptive review. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care 2009, 25:4:
1103 463-9.

1104 Droste S, Gerhardus A, Kollek R. Methoden zur Erfassung ethischer Aspekte und
1105 gesellschaftlicher Wertvorstellungen in Kurz-HTA-Berichten – eine internationale
1106 Bestandsaufnahme. DAHTA@DIMDI Köln: DIMDI, 2003.

- 1107 Droste S, Dintsios CM, Gerber A. Information on ethical issues in health technology assessment:
1108 how and where to find them. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2010; 26(4): 441-449. Additional
1109 supplemental material publishers web page.
- 1110 Duthie K, Bond, K. Improving ethics analysis in health technology assessment. *International
1111 Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 2011, 27:1: 64-70.
- 1112 European Network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA). HTA Core Model. Available at:
1113 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/Default.aspx> (last access: Dec 30, 2013).
- 1114 Giacomini M. One of these things is not like the others: The idea of Precedence in Health Technology
1115 Assessment and Coverage Decisions. *The Milbank Quarterly* 2005;83(2): 193-223.
- 1116 Grunwald A. The normative basis of (health) technology assessment and the role of ethical
1117 expertise. *Poiesis Prax* 2004; 2: 175-93.
- 1118 Habermas J. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns. Band 1, Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche
1119 Rationalisierung / Band 2 Zur Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft.* Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a.M. 1981.
- 1120 Håheim LL, Dalen K, Eide R, Karlsson S, Lygre GB, Lyngstadaas SP, Nordmo AM. Health effects from
1121 removing amalgam fillings with suspicion of or health related injuries from amalgam. Oslo: Norwegian
1122 Knowledge Centre for the Health Services, 2006. In Norwegian with English summary.
- 1123 Heiberg, Arvid; Frydenberg, Karin; Grønvik, Oddrun; Hofmann, Bjørn; Klingenberg, Claus Andreas;
1124 Markestad, Trond; Martiniussen, Marit; Pettersen, Folf Dagfinn; Rogne, Sissel. Recommendations
1125 on extension of newborn screening. Oslo: Directorate of Health, 2009. In Norwegian.
- 1126 Hofmann B. Toward a procedure for integrating moral issues in health technology assessment. *Int
1127 J Technol Assess Health Care* 2005; 21:312-8.
- 1128 Hofmann B. Ethics in the assessment of health technology [In Norwegian with an English summary:]. Oslo:
1129 Norwegian Knowledge Center for the Health Services, 2008.
- 1130 Hofmann B. Why ethics should be part of health technology assessment. *Int J Techn Assess Health Care*
1131 2008;24:423-9.
- 1132 Hofmann B. On value-judgments and ethics in health technology assessment. *Poiesis & Praxis:
1133 International Journal of Technology Assessment and Ethics of Science* 2005; 3(4): 277-95.
- 1134 Hofmann B. Complexity of the concept of disease as shown through rival theoretical frameworks.
1135 *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 2001; 22(3): 211-37.
- 1136 Hofmann B. Why ethics should be part of health technology assessment. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*
1137 2008;24: 423-9.
- 1138 Hofmann B. Ethical Challenges with Welfare Technology: A Review of the Literature. *Science and
1139 Engineering Ethics* 2012. URL: <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s11948-011-9348-1>.
- 1140 Holte TO, Hofmann B, Li RT, Norderhaug IN, Romundstad P, Sæterdal I Ørstavik KH, Tanbo To. Male
1141 infertility: intracytoplasmic sperm injection. Oslo: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services,
1142 2007. [In Norwegian with English summary.]
- 1143 Jonsen A, Siegler M, Winslade W. *Clinical Ethics*, 5th ed. New York, McGraw-Hill 2001.
- 1144 McGee, G. *Pragmatic Bioethics*. Nashville, London 1999.
- 1145 Movik, Espen; Ringerike, Tove; Linnestad, Kristin Kamilla; Hofmann, Bjørn; Harboe, Ingrid;
1146 Gjertsen, Marianne Klemp. Assessment of metylantrexon on obstipation in cancer treatment. Oslo:
1147 Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services, 2009. In Norwegian with an English
1148 summary.
- 1149 Musschenga AM. Empirical Ethics, Context –Sensitivity, and Contextualism. *J Med Philos* 2005;30: 467-90.

- 1150 Neitzke G. Was ist der Fall? Argumente für eine Zuspitzung der kasuistischen Methodik. In: Düwell M,
1151 Neumann JN (eds.) *Wieviel Ethik verträgt die Medizin?* 1st ed. Mentis-Verlag, PaderbornMeth: 211-4.
- 1152 Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1971.
- 1153 Rip A, Misa TJ, Schot J (eds). *Managing technology in society: the approach of constructive*
1154 *technology assessment*. Pinter, London 1995.
- 1155 Saarni S, Autti-Rämö I, Lühman D, Hofmann B, Velasco-Garrido M, Lopez de Argumedo M,
1156 Marchetti M. Ethical analysis, in: EUnetHTA WP4. HTA Core Model for Medical and Surgical
1157 Interventions – Version 1.0r 31 Dec 2008, available at
1158 <https://fio.stakes.fi/htacore/BrowseModel.aspx> (accessed: May 27, 2013).
- 1159 Sacchini D., Spagnolo A.G., Minacori R., Carrasco de Paula I., HTA and ethics: the framework of
1160 ethical positions and the proposal of a person-centred model, *Italian Journal of Public Health* 2005,
1161 2 (2): 304.
- 1162 Sacchini D., Refolo P., L'Health Technology Assessment (HTA) e i suoi aspetti etici, *Medicina e Morale*
1163 2007, 1: 101-39.
- 1164 Sacchini D., Analisi etica nell'HTA riferita al lapatinib, *Italian Journal of Public Health*, 2009, 6 (1), Suppl. 1:
1165 68-76.
- 1166 Sacchini D., Analisi etica nell'HTA report su ranimizumab (Lucentis®). *Italian Journal of Public Health*, 2009,
1167 6(2), suppl.: 58-63.
- 1168 Sacchini D., Analisi etica nell'HTA sulla vaccinazione antipneumococcica con Synflorix™ (PHiD-CV), *Italian*
1169 *Journal of Public Health*, 2009, 6(4), Suppl. 5: 61-8.
- 1170 Sacchini D., Viridis A., Refolo P., Pennacchini M., and Carrasco de Paula I., *Health Technology*
1171 *Assessment (HTA): Ethical Aspects, Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 2009, 12 (4): 453-7.
- 1172 Sacchini D., Refolo P., Spagnolo A.G., La valutazione della dimensione etica, in Cicchetti A., Marchetti M. (a
1173 cura di), *Manuale di Health Technology Assessment*, Roma: Il Pensiero Scientifico Editore, 2010: 173-90.
- 1174 Sgreccia E., *Manuale di Bioetica. I. Fondamenti ed etica biomedica*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2007 (4.a ed.).
- 1175 Skorupinski, B, Ott, K. *Technikfolgenabschätzung und Ethik*. ETH-Hochschulverlag, Zürich 2000.
- 1176 Strech et al. Value judgements in the analysis and synthesis of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008,
1177 61 521-4.
- 1178 Ten Have H. Ethical perspectives on health technology assessment. *Intl J Technology Assessment*
1179 *in Health Care*, 2004; 20(1): 71-6.
- 1180 The Danish Council of Ethics. *Screening - a report.*: 1-188. Copenhagen 2001.
- 1181 Van derWildt GJ, Reutzel R, Banta HJ. The ethics of assessing health technologies. *Theor Med Bioeth*
1182 2000;21: 101-13.
- 1183 Van Willigenburg T. *Casistry in Medical Ethics*. In: Düwell M, Neumann JN: *Wieviel Ethik verträgt*
1184 *die Medizin?* mentis, PaderbornMeth 2005: 165-78.
- 1185 Vieth, A. Defending Principlism well understood. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 2002, 27:623-
1186 51.
- 1187 Vist GE, Frønsdal KB, Johansen M, Hofmann B, Fretheim A. Health effects of screening for
1188 metabolic diseases in newborn. Rapport nr 22-2007. Oslo: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the
1189 Health Services, 2007. In Norwegian with English summary.
- 1190 Wilson JMG, Jungner G. *Principles and practice of screening for disease*. WHO. Geneve 1968
- 1191
- 1192

1193

1194

1195

1196 **2.11 Domain specific issues: Organisational aspects of the technology (ORG)**

1197 **Aim**

1198 This chapter provides guidance for assessing the organizational impact of new technologies.

1199 **Evidence base**

1200 The following documents were consulted to collect all available evidence at the basis of the guidance:

- 1201 • HTA Core Model Handbook (2014);
- 1202 • HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies (2014)
- 1203 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Screening Technologies (2014)
- 1204 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies (2014)
- 1205 • EUnetHTA Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions (2014)

1206 **Practical guidance**

1207 The organizational domain of a healthcare process represents one of the most complex aspects of the work.
1208 This is because the relationship between many variables acting in an organizational context and the final
1209 results are not foreseeable.

1210 The search for evidence for the evaluation of the organizational impact of a technology can follow two
1211 methods: an evidence-based literature analysis and a specific collection of data (quantitative and qualitative
1212 evidence).

1213 The relevant operational steps are:

- 1214 1. to select the most relevant topics from one of the HTA Core Models
- 1215 2. (Diagnostic Technologies (2008), Screening Technologies and Medical and Surgical Interventions) and
1216 search for information in the data sources
- 1217 3. to data extract
- 1218 4. to assess the quality of the information gained
- 1219 5. to produce analysis and synthesis
- 1220 6. to report the results

1221

1222 **1. Selection of the most relevant topics/issue and search of information**

1223

1224 The organizational domain is based on four possible topics: “process”, “structure”, “management” and
1225 “culture”.

1226 The first step consists of the selection of the topics and issues from the HTA Core Model Assessment.

1227 Describe the information about the “process”:

- 1228 • Process description
- 1229 • Personnel, training and resources
- 1230 • Interaction and communication

1231 This information is linked to the workflow and patient processes. Furthermore, the patient flow and changes
1232 required in patient path should be taken into account when implementing a new technology. It has to be
1233 explained what kind of staff is needed, and whether the existing staff can be trained. The use of technology
1234 could be monitored in order to clarify if the new technology modifies the quality of patient flow.

1235 Describe the features of “structure” topic:

- 1236 • Decentralization or centralization of technology (e.g. the location of the use of the
1237 technology that could be vary between different countries);
- 1238 • Costs (e.g. budget impact of the implementation of the technology for the payers or
1239 analysis of additional costs). In particular, this aspect will be done with economic domain.

1240 Describe the “management topic”:

- 1241 • Management of the problems and the options attached to a specific technology (e.g.
1242 resources management, co-ordination, definition of objectives, monitoring and control,
1243 analysis of the activity and results)
- 1244 • Criteria for the assessment of management tools related to a specific technology (e.g.
1245 check of the increase appropriateness level produced by new technology).

1246 The “Culture” topic consists of the options and standard for organization, personnel and patients (e.g
1247 analysis of the positive and negative interpretations of the new technology by different professional groups).

1248

1249 The second step consists of an identification of the research problems and questions for the technology to
1250 be assessed: the organizational analysis should deal with the overall policy question and the organisational
1251 set-up.

1252 The research strategy should collect the relevant studies focusing on the organisational aspects in order to
1253 make a systematic search of the evidence; if there are no systematic reviews or meta-analysis, primary
1254 studies should be used.

1255 To reduce publication bias, the research strategy should be steered to obtain all available evidence, a
1256 systematic classification of available evidence, its objective assessment and a summary analysis (e.g. meta-
1257 analysis). An appropriate research strategy includes the following methodological questions:

- 1258 • clear definition of the objectives;
- 1259 • clear description of the strategy used;
- 1260 • clear description of the inclusion and exclusion criteria used;
- 1261 • brief summary of the characteristics of all included and excluded studies;
- 1262 • methodological quality evaluation of primary studies and description of the criteria used;
- 1263 • clear result presentation of the included studies (with statistical figures).

1264 It is difficult to find organizational scientific evidence produced from systematic reviews or meta-analysis and
1265 to identify relevant data sources. For this reason, incomplete and partial revisions are often produced.

1266 To reduce these risks, the published literature, the grey literature, hand searching of journals, contacting
1267 experts and scanning reference lists of relevant papers should be included.

1268 The literature search can be performed in different database as listed in Appendix 8. The database of GIN
1269 recommendations, the registers and international, national and regional routine collected statistics are also
1270 the important sources of information. Conference proceedings and manufacturers’ reports can also provide
1271 answers to some organizational points.

1272 From experience gained in Joint Action 1, we observed that these databases are often unsuitable to collect
1273 all available evidence. To complement the low level of data available in the literature, other methods of
1274 gathering information are recommended, such as the “individual methods” (questionnaires, face-to-face
1275 interviews, case-study analysis, Delphi method, failure analysis) and the “Group-based method” (focus
1276 groups, concept mapping, consensus panels, nominal group techniques). The questions could be posed
1277 verbally or by using standard interview forms (e.g. telephone interviews) or in written form as postal
1278 questionnaires. It would be reasonable to administer the questionnaires to all Eunetha partners in order to
1279 receive evidence focusing on the organizational aspects by each country.

1280 **2. Data extraction**

1281 Data extraction should take into account the strength of the study design, the performed analyses, the target
1282 population, the interventions and outcomes measured.

1283 The data from the literature review results could be structured and directly related to the research questions
1284 posed. In particular, the data (especially of quantitative studies) that should always be extracted are: data
1285 that identify the types of the studies (such as title, authors, journal, publication details), population
1286 characteristics and care setting, methodological quality, interventions, outcomes, length of follow-up, drops-
1287 outs, missing data, data of the results, effect measures and notes.

1288 In this phase, the use of tables (such as the following table), might aid the collection of information.

Authors (year)	Types of study	Interventions	Outcomes	Notes

1289

1290 To facilitate the information pool, data extraction could be shared among several authors.

1291 For the selection of articles, the following inclusion criteria could be considered:

- 1292
- To include all HTA reports
 - To include all economic studies (in case they contain information about work flow, patient flow, investment needed, etc)
 - To include articles where the abstract refers to organizational issues
 - To include studies which carry out to detect the acceptability of the technology among professionals.
- 1293
1294
1295
1296
1297

1298 **3. Quality assessment of the studies**

1299 We are not aware of quality criteria for articles which consider the organization of health care. In general, it
1300 has been desirable to evaluate the technology transferability. The organizational impact assessments are
1301 linked to the organizational context in which the technology works. The literature results are not completely
1302 transferable. In this case, the study's conclusions can be considered as the assumptions to be confirmed in
1303 your organization.

1304 **4. Analysis and synthesis**

1305 The other step of the process is the narrative synthesis of the results. Quantitative data synthesis could be
1306 obtained by meta-analysis that combines the results of the included studies. Qualitative evidence synthesis
1307 may be carried out through the tabulation of study characteristics and their results.

1308 **5. Results**

1309 It would be desirable to:

- describe the interpretation of the findings in all the result cards of the domain;
 - discuss the significance of methodological issues that may affect the interpretation of results, e.g. access to information, quality of information, conduct of studies, biases;
 - write the indications for further researches;
 - expose the related questions;
 - not provide recommendations.
- 1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316

1317 **6. Internal review among different authors**

1318 It might be necessary to carry out an internal review process in order to harmonize the result cards and
1319 ensure coherence of the results in the domain. In this phase, the Primary Investigator plays an important role
1320 of coordination between authors and should be responsible for the final editing (if necessary). In the past

1321 experience of the Joint Action 1, the PI of the organizational domain had to make some final changes, such
1322 as:

- 1323 • re-ordering some text for consistency between answers
- 1324 • editing throughout to remove words and phrasing which imply a recommendation
- 1325 • editing throughout to remove statements which are not substantiated either by the literature
1326 or other data sources
- 1327 • editing for improving clarity.

1328 At the end, it would be useful to write a brief summary of the main results of the organizational domain,
1329 keeping them clean from all interpretation and judgment.

1330 **Bibliography**

1331 HTA Core Model Handbook 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
1332 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx>. Last access May 22nd 2013.

1333 HTA Core Model For Screening Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
1334 <http://www.eunetha.eu/outputs/final-hta-core-model-screening-technologies>. Last access May 22nd 2013

1335 Assessment Element for Screening Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
1336 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6>. Last access May 22nd 2013

1337 Assessment Element for Diagnostic Technologies 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
1338 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6>. Last access May 22nd 2013

1339 Assessment Element for Medical and Surgical Interventions 2012. EUnetHTA 2012. Available at
1340 <https://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/ViewHandbook.aspx?full=1&id=6>. Last access May 22nd 2013

1341

1342 **2.12 Domain specific issues: Social aspects of the technology (SOC)**

1343 The SOC domain focuses on the patients' and others' considerations, worries and experiences before,
1344 during and after the implementation of the technology. The domain describes how the technology moulds
1345 diverse social arenas and is moulded by these arenas where the patients use it (hospitals, general
1346 practitioner, everyday life, homes, schools, and workplace), and what specific meanings people give to the
1347 technology.

1348 **Aim**

1349 The aim of chapter is to provide HTA Core Model domain team members with practical guidance on a list of
1350 issues which have to be taken into account when developing the domain content.

1351

1352 **Evidence base**

1353 HTA Core Model Handbook (last version available)

1354

1355 **Practical guidance**

1356 The assessment process may differ with respect to each technology. The following phases may need to be
1357 gone through in the following order and to the extent that is necessary to find answers to the relevant issues:

- 1358 1. Take your literature selection and screen for the Assessment Element(s)

- 1359 ○ Search for literature reviews, or if no literature reviews are available
- 1360 ○ Consult health care professionals and content experts (proxy informants) for their opinions
- 1361 ○ Document methods followed

1362 The literature research can be performed in different databases as listed in Appendix 8.

- 1363 2. Provide results (even descriptive) that can answer the AE(s)
- 1364 3. If there is no answer, state it
- 1365 4. If you miss some major social aspects and no study reported them, state it in the discussion
- 1366 (generally or in the AE comments sector)

1367 Quality assessments should evaluate:

- 1368 - the purpose of the study and relevance to study question,
- 1369 - context (population/setting/values),
- 1370 - appropriateness of methods and theoretical framework,
- 1371 - transparency of data generation, analysis and interpretation (avoidance of bias),
- 1372 - connection between research question and conclusions (internal consistency in relation to the
- 1373 theoretical framework of the study) and
- 1374 - the account of the knowledge generated given the methods (relevance for practice)

1375

1376

1377 **Bibliography**

1378 EUnetHTA WP8 – HTA Core Model 2.0 – www.corehta.info (access January 30 2015)

1379 **2.13 Domain specific issues: Legal aspects of the technology (LEG)**

1380 [methods to develop domain content]

1381 **Aim**

1382 The aim of the methodological guidance for the LEG domain is to provide HTA Core Model users with a brief
 1383 list of issues on legal evaluation which have to be taken into account when answering the relevant
 1384 assessment elements and, guide users through a step-by step procedure which will facilitate respect of legal
 1385 normative and human rights.

1386 **Evidence base**

1387 The evidence sources for the legal domain differ from those of biomedical evidence .

1388 As the highest level of evidence written law is seen as a fact. There are several levels of written law, like

- 1389 - EU legislation
- 1390 - National legislation
- 1391 - EU recommendations
- 1392 - Federal national law

1393 The second level of evidence can be seen as the interpretation of the existing regulations

- 1394 - Detect differences between different legislation levels
- 1395 - Search for legal literature

1396 Further sources of evidence

1397 - Medico-legal literature: search for legal aspects in medical databases

1398 - Use the commonly developed literature search of the HTA to detect legal issues

1399 - Interpret existing (local) legislation (i.e. in terms of supporting or hindering the implementation of the
1400 intervention)

1401

1402 **Practical guidance**

1403 Contributors chosen to develop this domain should have a legal background or experience in the subject
1404 matter. The process includes three steps:

1405 1. Recognize relevant legal questions 2. Identify the needs of national adaptation 3. State the level of
1406 transferability of the results in the conclusions

1407

1408 **Bibliography**

1409 EUnetHTA WP8 – HTA Core Model 2.1 – www.corehta.info Legal aspects

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1415 **Appendix 1. Topic Notification and Selection Procedure Form**1416 **Core HTA Topic Notification Form**1417 **Introduction**

1418 The purpose of this form is to collect notifications (i.e. identification and transmission) information for
 1419 interventions to be selected for assessment in a full Core HTA as part of the JA2 WP4 process.

1420 **Topic Selection Procedure**

1421 This procedure is based on the experience from JA1 and the first two core HTAs of JA2.

1422 Each participant can submit one or more proposals using the Topic Notification Form (one for each
 1423 technology notified), sent by Agenas to all EUnetHTA members and to the Stakeholder Forum members.

1424 A list of notified technologies from the previous Topic Selection Procedures (JA2 Core HTA 1 and Core HTA
 1425 2) is also available so that some technologies can be notified again.

1426 If you are not sure on some requested data, please write NA (not applicable).

1427 Proposals will be collected by Agenas team, deadline no later than **August 15th**

1428 Once Agenas has received proposals:

1429 1. A consolidated list of technologies will be made available after a face assessment to identify vague
 1430 notifications and notifications which appear to contain mistakes.

1431 2. Each WP4 Partner will express their preferences for 3 technologies of interest to them, giving them a
 1432 scores from 3 (the most important) to 1 (the least important)

1433 (The significance of the term “importance” will be left to individual originators of the form).

1434 3. The resulting scored consolidate list will be shared and

1435 a. If there is a clear “winner” (a technology which has scored more 3s that the others), this will
 1436 be selected as a working topic with the runner up(s) as reserve(s);

1437 b. If there is no clear winner (there is more than one technology with the same 3 scores), the
 1438 scored sheet with the top scoring technologies will be circulated for a quick (3 days) further
 1439 round of voting until a clear winner emerges

1440 **Source of topic proposal:**

1441

Country	
Institution	
Name of respondent	
e-mail	
Date of proposal	

1442

1443 **Please identify one candidate technology for assessment with the HTA Core model On-line (generic**
 1444 **and commercial name if applicable):**

1445

1446

1447 **N.B.** Only specific technologies will be considered. Notifications of broad categories of technologies
 1448 (e.g. genetic tests for cancer, in vitro diagnostics of infection etc) will not be considered and the form
 1449 will be returned to the originator with a request for more specific information.

1450

1451 **Please indicate the type of technology ¹**

1452 **Diagnostics** **Medical or surgical intervention** **Screening**

1453 **Pharmaceutical**

1454

1455 **Please provide the Title of the proposed assessment topic:**

1456

1457

1458

1459 **Proposed Topic is presented as “alert” in POP database Yes/No**

1460 **Please indicate why there is need to assess this healthcare technology (select all that**
 1461 **apply):**

- Potential clinical benefits
(e.g., reduced number of heart attacks, strokes, or emergency room visits)
- Potential non-clinical benefits
(e.g., improved patient satisfaction, shorter hospital length of stay)
- Utilization pattern
(e.g., current use is a deviation from recommended use, inconsistent use)
- Budget impact on health care system
- Potential harm issues
- Ethical issues
- Other. Please specify _____

1462

1463 **Which overall assessment question (s) should be answered by the Core HTA in order to**
 1464 **contribute to the solution of the problem that you are describing? Please limit to 100**

¹ Limited to Core Model ® applications available

1465 words per question and define the questions as clearly as possible. Ideally questions should be
1466 structured as a PICO question.

1467

1468 **What is the specific illness/condition/public health issue that is being targeted by this**
1469 **healthcare technology? Please limit to 100 words.**

1470

1471

1472 **Describe the burden of the illness/condition/public health issue for patients AND the**
1473 **healthcare system. Please think of the burden in terms of (1) morbidity rates; (2)**
1474 **mortality rates; (3) sickness episodes; (4) number of healthcare providers involved, (5)**
1475 **costs for the Health Insurance or the public sector; etc. Please limit to 500 words.**

1476

1477 **Describe whether there is inappropriate variation in practice in dealing with this**
1478 **illness/condition/public health issue across your country or Europe. Please limit to 100**
1479 **words.**

1480

1481 **Describe the type of the population affected** (gender, age, subgroups of patients being
1482 **targeted). Please limit to 100 words.**

1483

1484 **Describe any other stakeholder who may be affected by any policy change about the**
1485 **specific technology. Please limit to 100 words.**

1486

1487 **Describe the COMPARATOR (s): current standard of care of this illness/condition/public**
1488 **health issue or current practice. Please limit to 100 words.**

1489

1490 **Describe the current funding policy of this intervention and the comparator. Please limit**
1491 **to 100 words.**

1492

1493 **Indicate whether there is already evidence with regard to the proposed research topic.**
1494 **Please limit to 100 words and include references.**

1495

1496 **Indicate which data are necessary for this assessment** (if the data exists, please indicate
 1497 the extent to which the data is exploitable; if data not available, indicate how it would best be
 1498 collected). *Please limit to 100 words.*

1499

1500

1501 **Please, describe any other factors important in the process of refining your topic**
 1502 **proposal.** *Please limit to 100 words.*

1503

1504

1505

1506 **Place and date****Signature**

1507

1508

1509

1510 **Appendix 2. Selection form for notified technologies**

1511 **Introduction**

1512 The purpose of this form is to collect preferences for interventions to be selected for assessment in a full
 1513 Core HTA as part of the JA2 WP4 process.

1514

1515 **Topic Selection Procedure – The story so far**

1516 This procedure is based on experience from JA2 Core HTA 1 & 2 topic selection process and the former
 1517 JA1.

1518 Agenas sent the *Core HTA Topic Notification Form* on **DATE** to all EUnetHTA members and
 1519 partners, including WP4 SAG and DG Sanco, with a comeback deadline on **DATE**. An electronic
 1520 procedure was used through a specific webform in the EUnetHTA intranet (for EUnetHTA
 1521 members) while a doc form was used for WP4 SAG and DG Sanco).

1522 Once the completed forms were received, Agenas carried out a face assessment and deleted vague
 1523 notifications and notifications which appeared with insufficient information.

1524 The consolidated list of technologies is at "**WP4 Core HTA XX Consolidated List of Proposed**
 1525 **Technologies.xls**".

1526

1527 **Next Steps:**

1528 1. The consolidated list will be shared with WP4 Partners and WP4 SAG.

1529 2. Each WP4 Partner and WP4 SAG should express their preferences for 3 technologies of interest to
 1530 them, giving them a scores from 3 (the most important) to 1 (the least important).
 1531 "*Important*" means *important to your agency or body at the time of notification and voting. If your*
 1532 *agency has a national remit, then it's national importance.*

1533 3. The resulting scored consolidated list will BE shared, and:

- 1534 a. If there is a clear "winner" (a technology which has scored more 3s than the others), this will
 1535 be selected as a working topic with the runner up(s) as reserve(s). No SUMRANK will be
 1536 done (i.e. no aggregate scoring to define rank).
- 1537 b. If there is no clear winner (there is more than one technology with the same 3 scores), the
 1538 scored sheet with the top scoring technologies will be circulated for a quick (3 days) further
 1539 round of voting until a clear winner emerges.

1540 *All lists of notified technologies will be available for information, to facilitate collaboration amongst notifiers*
 1541 *and to form the basis for further selection.*

1542

1543

Instructions:

1544

- 1545 1. Identify your choice of the 3 interesting technology in the file

WP4 Core HTA ~~XX~~ Consolidated List of Proposed Technologies.xls

1547

- 1548 2. Rank them in order of importance* (3 is the most important) in the table below:

1549

Score	Technology (see column B on the excel sheet)
3 (most important)	
2 (important)	
1 (least important)	

1550

- 1551 3. Return this sheet with your choices and scores to:

1552 **PROJECT MANAGER NAME (EMAIL)**

1553 by **DATE** and no later. Late arrivals will be discarded.

1554

1555 **"Important" means important to your agency or body at the time of notification and voting. If your agency*
 1556 *has a national remit, then it's national importance.*

1557

1558

1559

Appendix 3. Stakeholder Involvement Template (Project Leader overview)

WP4 JA2 Date: Project Leader:							
Responsible of communications between stakeholders and working group :							
Stakeholder	C.O.I.*	Purpose of STK involvement <i>(please specify Project Phase)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Topic Selection ➤ Prioritization ➤ Scoping ➤ Core Protocol validation ➤ Core Draft validation ➤ Final report 	Methods of STK involvement	Comments received/ Answer received, but no comments/Date	Action taken (Author reply)/Date	Stakeholders Involvements Satisfaction End <i>(to be filled at the end of the project)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Excellent 2 Good 3 Poor 	Stakeholders' Comments <i>(to be filled at the end of the project)</i>
Patient and healthcare consumer organisations <i>Name/Contact:</i>							
Healthcare providers (professionals and hospitals) <i>Name/Contact:</i>							

Payers <i>Name/Contact:</i>							
Industry <i>Name/Contact:</i>							
Others <i>Name/Contact:</i>							
Stakeholders not considered (<i>specify name</i>)				Why			
Working Group Satisfaction of Stakeholder involvement process (<i>to be filled at the end of the project, report only total figures</i>)							
1 Excellent							
2 Good							
3 Poor							
Final Working groups Comments on Stakeholder involvement process (<i>if any</i>)							

1560 *All Stakeholders involved must sign a Conflict of Interest Declaration (C.O.I.)

Appendix 4. Survey for Manufacturer; Survey for WP4 Partners

SURVEY FOR RETRIEVING INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGY IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

EUnetHTA JA2 WP4 Editorial Team developed this questionnaire for a European collaborative health technology assessment of _____.

The questionnaire only asks about some aspects of the health technology and comparators under assessment.

Answer to all questions is not required by the survey but PLEASE provide as much information as possible.

If you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact WP4 Lead Partner official contact (Nicola Vicari vicari@agenas.it)

Thank you!

Personal Information

1. Country *This question is required.

2. Institution *This question is required.

3. Name of respondent *This question is required.

4. e-mail *This question is required.

Survey for Manufacturer

CUR and TEC Domains

Example:

- 1. In which EU countries, and when, do you market your health technology (according the scope of this assessment)?**
- 2. In which EU countries your health technology is reimbursed by the National Health Service? Please include information on co-payments or other information regarding reimbursement, if applicable.**
- 3. In which EU countries your health technology is used as primary screening or diagnostic or therapeutics method?**
- 4. What qualification, training and quality assurance needed for staff and laboratory used your health technology?**
- 5. What kind of equipment and supplies required?**
- 6. How much time has to be allowed for shipping the samples (in case of medical tests for screening)?**

We need medical test instructions for use, patients' information leaflet and CE mark document, please send us scanned by e-mail, thank you.

EFF and SAF Domains

ECO Domain

Example

Are there price lists for health technology (e.g. from some manufacturer/countries) available? If yes can we have them, thank you?

SOC Domain

Example

- 1. Do you have any Data - Qualitative study – Report about patients' acceptability, satisfaction/compliance, opinions on uptake and use of health technology?**
- 2. Do you have any Data - Qualitative study – Report about differences in perceptions/satisfaction/compliance with health technology due to:**
 - Gender
 - Ethnicity
 - Geographic areas (e.g. Northern European countries, Mediterranean etc.)

Socio-Economical status

ETH Domain

LEG Domain

Example

- 1. Where is the market authorisation for the health technology available?**

THANK YOU!

Survey for WP4 Partners

CUR and TEC Domains

Example

- 1. What types of screening programmes (population based or opportunistic) exist in your country, if any?**
- 2. What is the target population and screening interval of the screening?**
- 3. How many people are estimated to belong to the target population in your country?**
- 4. What is the primary screening method for disease assessed here?**
- 5. What is the current rate of screening adherence?**
- 6. If specific medical test is the primary screening method for disease under assessment, please specify which test is used (the name and Manufacturer), thank you.**
- 7. Does national guideline exist on screening in your country?**
- 8. How is screening illness is currently diagnosed in your country?**

9. **How is screening illness is currently managed in your country? Please provide any algorithms or guidelines, thank you.**
10. **Which market authorization status (CE mark) has health technology in your country?**
11. **What is the reimbursement status of specific screening under assessment in your country?**

EFF and SAF Domains

ECO Domain

SOC Domain

ETH Domain

LEG Domain

Appendix 5. Stakeholders Consultation Form; Authors Reply Form on Stakeholders comments

European network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA) Joint Action 2 (2012-2015)

WP4 SAG CONSULTATION FORM

PUBLIC CONSULTATION FORM

MANUFACTURER CONSULTATION FORM

EUnetHTA REVIEWERs CONSULTATION FORM ON THE DRAFT PROJECT PLAN, DRAFT REPORT, and FINAL REPORT ON CORE HTA

Core HTA Title, ID

Name	Organization	Date

Please provide your comments in Table below, thank you.

Comment #	Page	Section number	Comment

References

European network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA) Joint Action 2 (2012-2015)

WP4

AUTHORS REPLY FORM on SAG CONSULTATION, PUBLIC CONSULTATION, MANUFACTURER CONSULTATION and EUnetHTA REVIEWERS CONSULTATION OF THE DRAFT PROJECT PLAN, DRAFT REPORT, and FINAL REPORT ON CORE HTA

Core HTA Title, ID

SAG Comments received from:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
-

Answer received, but no comments:

- 1.
- 2.
-

Public consultation received from:

- 1.
- 2.
-

Manufacturer comments received from:

- 1.
- 2.
-

EUnetHTA reviewer comments received from:

- 1.
- 2.
-

Answer received, but no comments:

- 1.
- 2.
-

Comment #	Page	Section number	Comment	Author's reply

SAG comments	Public comments	consultation	Manufacturer comments	EUnetHTA comments	reviewer
--------------	--------------------	--------------	-----------------------	----------------------	----------

References

Appendix 6. Conflict of Interest Declaration Form



STATEMENT ON TERMS OF PARTICIPATION AND EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES OF EXPERTS (potential conflict of interest and confidentiality undertaking) WHO ARE INVOLVED IN EUnetHTA Joint Action 2

STATEMENT YEAR:

The undersigned,

Name:

Address Street:

Postal code:

Town/city:

Employee of EUnetHTA WP [NUMBER(s)] Partner/Associate organisation: Yes/ No

accepts to participate during years 2012-2015 in the work plan of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 which I've read

and

provides the following information² on his/her honour and to the best of his/her knowledge.

Section 1. Declaration of Interests

1a. Main professional activity

Name of the organisation³:

Description⁴of the activity:

Period of time (years of start-end)

1b. I carried out salaried employment for / received remuneration from the following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisation(s):

² Please provide details on your affiliations as far as 3 years back (and up until now) from the time of filling the form

³ Enter 'none' if you feel this point does not apply. This also applies to subsequent items.

⁴ Please provide a brief description. This also applies to subsequent items.

Name of the organisation:

Description of the activities:

Period of time (years of start-end)

1c. I acted in an advisory capacity for the following organisation(s)⁵ (i.e. patient, HTA, public or private research organisations,...):

Name of the organisation⁶:

Description⁷ of the advisory capacity:

Honorarium: Yes/ No

Period of time (years of start-end):

Name of the organisation:

Description of the advisory capacity:

Honorarium, Yes/ No

Period of time (years of start-end):

2. I carried out clinical studies in relation to the development of a medicine/medical device/diagnostic / procedure for the following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisation(s):

Name of the organisation:

Name of the medicine:

Period of time (years of start-end):

Name of the organisation:

Name of the medicine:

Period of time (years of start-end):

3. I sat on a committee or similar advisory body for the following medical research on behalf of a pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisation:

Details of the research:

Name of the organisation:

Name of the medicine:

Description of the duties:

⁵ Where necessary, additional entries can be made. This also applied to subsequent items.

⁶ Enter 'none' if you feel this point does not apply. This also applies to subsequent items.

⁷ Please provide a brief description. This also applies to subsequent items.

Honorarium: Yes/ No

Period of time (years of start-end):

4a. I received a personal research, study or travel allowance from the following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisation(s):

Name of the organisation:

Description of the allowance:

Period of time (years of start-end)

4b. The following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisation(s) paid for my congress expenses:

Name of the organisation:

Description of the congress:

Period of time (years of start-end):

5. I gave a presentation at meetings organised by the following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisations and received remuneration for my input:

Name of the organisation:

Description of the meeting:

Period of time (years of start-end):

6. I carried out activities or drew up advice for the following pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisations in exchange for personal payment:

Name of the organisation:

Description of the activities:

Period of time (years of start-end):

7. I held a managerial position in the following institutes, where medicinal research is carried out that was funded by pharmaceutical/medical device/other health-technology developing and/or producing/distributing organisations:

Name of the institute:

Description of the duties:

Period of time (years of start-end):

8. I have financial interests in an organisation involved in the field of medicines/medical device/other health-technology

Name of the organisation:

Description of the financial interests:

Period of time (years of start-end):

9. A member of my household⁸ has been engaged in activities as described in items 1b-8 above

Yes/No:

If Yes, description⁹:

10. I have another interest to declare:

Yes/No:

If Yes, description:

Should there be any change to the above due to the fact that the undersigned acquires additional interests, s/he shall promptly notify the EUnetHTA Secretariat and Lead Partner of the relevant Work Package where s/he participates and complete a new declaration of interest detailing the changes. This declaration does not discharge the undersigned from an obligation to declare any potential conflicting interest(s) at the start of and throughout the whole duration of any EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 Activity activity in which s/he participates.

Furthermore, by signing this statement, I accept and agree to the following:

- Collected declarations are for information of the EUnetHTA Secretariat and EUnetHTA JA2 WP Lead and Co-Lead Partners of WP only and it is the responsibility of the EUnetHTA Secretariat and Lead and Co-Lead Partners to keep the information confidential.
- Signed declarations will be stored in electronic form, protected by password access only.
- In case of the conflict of interest being identified, the issue of handling this conflict of interest will be between the individual and the EUnetHTA Secretariat or (as relevant) the Lead Partner or Co-Lead Partner of a relevant WP. Accuracy of the conclusion is the responsibility of the individual (providing correct information) and the Lead Partner or Co-Lead Partner (as relevant). Details of such conclusions and their consequences will not be made known to any third parties other than the members of the working group/team of the respective project. The process of assessing the conflict of interest and its general outcome will be described in the final report from the project to ensure transparency of the procedures while respecting the privacy rights of any individuals concerned.

⁸ Household member is a spouse, partner, or child living at the same address as the individual who signs the conflict of interest declaration.

⁹ Please provide a description following the format of Items 1b-8 of the declaration. Individuals from countries where information on the 3rd persons are legally not allowed to be provided may omit this item – indication of the legal reason of omitting this information need to be explicitly indicated.

Section 2. Confidentiality undertaking

In view of the following definitions:

“EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 Activities” encompass any meeting (including meeting preparation and follow-up), associated discussion or any other related activity of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 committees and governance bodies, its Work Packages, expert groups, stakeholder groups, or any other such meeting, work as an expert on assessments, and work as an expert on guidance development.

“Confidential Information” means all information, facts, data and any other matters which are indicated as confidential and of which I acquire knowledge, either directly or indirectly, as a result of my EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 Activities.

“Confidential Documents” mean all drafts, preparatory information, documents and any other material, together with any information contained therein, which is indicated as confidential and to which I have access, either directly or indirectly, as a result of my participation in EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 Activities. Furthermore, any records or notes made by me relating to Confidential Information or Confidential Documents shall be treated as Confidential Documents.

I understand that I may be invited to participate either directly or indirectly in certain EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 Activities and hereby undertake:

1. to treat all Confidential Information and Confidential Documents under conditions of strict confidentiality.
2. not to disclose (or authorise any other person to disclose) in any way to any third party¹⁰ any Confidential Information or Confidential Document.
3. not to use (or authorise any other person to use) any Confidential Information or Confidential Document other than for the purposes of my work in connection with EUnetHTA Joint Action Work Package activities.
4. to dispose of Confidential Documents as confidential material as soon as I have no further use for them.

This undertaking shall not be limited in time, but shall not apply to any document or information that I can reasonably prove was known to me before the date of this undertaking or which becomes public knowledge otherwise than as a result of a breach of any of the above undertakings.

Place:

Date:

Signature:

¹⁰ Third party does not include employees of the National Competent Authorities who either have employment contracts that provide confidentiality obligations or are encompassed by confidentiality obligations under national legislation on professional secrecy.

Appendix 7. Project Definition Template for Core HTA

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the collaborative definition of the general information requested for the creation of a new project (Core HTA) in the EUnetHTA On-line Tool and Service (www.corehta.info).

The information in this document originates from the HTA Core Model Online (on March 18th 2013).

*Note: indications for fields are in **blue** text*

Project name (title): Required	
Model version Required	Short demo application HTA Core Model Application for Medical and Surgical Interventions (1.1) HTA Core Model Application for Diagnostic Technologies (1.1) HTA Core Model Application for Screening Technologies
Project type Required	Core HTA Some information on the technology (free selection of topics) Testing / Pilot 2 / Validation 2012

Project scope

Please define the scope of the project which will guide work within all domains. Additionally, the structured information you provide here will enable the system to automatically suggest research questions in the next phase.

Scope elements:

- Technology and its intended use
- Target condition (the disease or health condition that is the target of the technology)
- Target population (usually a subgroup of those who have or may have the target condition)
- Comparison
- Main outcomes for each domain

Short name fields are used for automatic research questions. *Free definition* fields allow you to provide more details in plain text.

Technology

Technology short name Required	<i>Give a short name for the technology. Add an optional abbreviation or acronym inside parenthesis. If multiple technologies are assessed, separate the names with a semicolon ; An example with two technologies: Acetylsalicylic acid (ASA); Ibuprofen</i>
Technology free definition	<i>Define the technology briefly and clearly enough to distinguish it from other related technologies</i>

Intended use of the technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> Screening <input type="checkbox"/> Diagnostics <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation
Intended use of technology free definition	<i>Please fill in the sentence: This technology is used for...</i>

Target Condition

Target condition short name	<i>Give a short name for the disease or health condition (of certain grade or severity) that is the target of the technology. Add an optional abbreviation or acronym inside parenthesis. If multiple conditions are targeted, separate the names with a semicolon ; An example with two conditions: Idiopathic headache (Headache); Neck pain</i>
Target condition free definition	<i>Define briefly the target condition (disease or other health condition) of this assessment</i>

Target population

Target population group	<input type="checkbox"/> Patients who have the target condition <input type="checkbox"/> Suspected health condition <input type="checkbox"/> Possible future health condition <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy and/or asymptomatic people
Target population sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Any <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Target population age	<input type="checkbox"/> Fetuses <input type="checkbox"/> Any age except fetuses <input type="checkbox"/> Specific ages (please specify)
Target population further details	<i>Give a further refinement of the target population (if necessary). Examples: 'in office work', 'of oriental origin' or 'with myopia' (where myopia is a co-morbidity, not the target condition)</i>
Target population free definition	

Comparison

Comparison	<input type="checkbox"/> Placebo <input type="checkbox"/> Not doing anything (e.g. waiting list) <input type="checkbox"/> Specified other technology / usual care (please specify)
Comparison free definition	<i>Define briefly the technology or strategy to which you want to compare the technology under assessment</i>

Outcomes

Outcomes free definition	<i>Provide here an overview of the main outcomes or areas of interest for this project, in order to ensure overall clarity of the project scope. You are encouraged to consider each domain separately, but also to avoid too many details, as those can be further defined in subsequent phases of protocol design.</i>
--------------------------	--

Project Metadata

Metadata helps to classify your project and its results and makes it easier to find it when searching the database. Filling in the metadata is only required when moving from phase 2 to phase 3, so you can skip this part if you are in the early phases of your project.

You can use e.g. NCBO BioPortal to search for suitable terms, codes and keywords. The system won't verify the correctness of the terms, codes or keywords you enter.

Technology

Technology MeSH terms	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Technology ATC codes (for pharmaceuticals)	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Technology free keywords	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>

Target condition

Target condition MeSH terms	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Target condition ICD-10 codes	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Target condition free keywords	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>

Comparison

Comparison MeSH terms	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Comparison ATC codes (for pharmaceuticals)	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>
Comparison free keywords	<i>Separate terms with a semicolon;</i>

Appendix 8 – Useful Sources and Databases

- Pubmed,
- Embase,
- Cochrane Library all databases,
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)
- Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures
- Technologies in Health (CADTH)
- Health Canada
- NIHR-HTA Database (INAHTA)
- Medical Services Advisory Committee (MSAC)
- National Coordinating Centre for Health Technology Assessment (NCCHTA)
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)
- NHS Quality Improvement Scotland (NHS QIS)
- Trip Database
- CINAHL
- Database of Dissertational Abstract
- Scirus database
- Emerald Library,
- Science Direct,
- Education Resources Information Center
- OAlster Catalogue

Psychological/sociological databases such as

- Psychinfo,
- ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts),
- Sociological Abstracts and
- ISI Web of Science
- Social Services Abstracts,
- Social Care on line / Caredata
- SocINDEX

Euroethics (European Database Network on Ethics in Medicine, including:

- Biogea (Italy),
- Cendibem (Spanish),
- CRIB (Belgium),
- ETHINSERM (France),
- ETHMED (Austria, Germany, Switzerland),
- EUROETHIK (Germany),
- MIKS (Sweden).