Investing in Clinical Guidelines to Enhance Health Technology Assessments and Reimbursement Decisions

Ruth Bartelli Grigolon, Vicky Nogueira Pileggi, Julia Lima, Renato Mantelli Picoli

Oracle Life Sciences, Brazil

Background

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) ensures evidence-based resource allocation for innovative health technologies. While clinical trials and real-world evidence (RWE) offer robust data, clinical consensus bridges evidence gaps by contextualizing data within local practice and addressing unmet needs.

This is critical in rare diseases and emerging technologies, where evidence may be limited. Regular updates and alignment with technology horizon scanning (THS) are essential to maintain relevance and prepare stakeholders for future innovations.

Objective

To highlight the **strategic value of clinical guidelines** projects in **Health Technology Assessments** (HTA), focusing on their role in reimbursement decisions, addressing evidence gaps, and guiding healthcare innovation.

Methods

A **systematic search** was conducted to explore **global HTA processes** and the integration of clinical guidelines in key systems, including NICE (UK), ICER (USA), G-BA (Germany), HAS (France), CDA (Canada), PBAC (Australia), and CONITEC (Brazil).

This analysis focused on understanding how clinical guidelines influence HTA outcomes, reimbursement decisions, and treatment pathways.

Results

Clinical guidelines support HTA processes by systematically synthesizing robust evidence and data related to the disease of interest. This evidence is translated into actionable recommendations that inform and guide clinical practice. Beyond its application in rare diseases—where limited patient populations and research constraints often result in immature literature—clinical consensus serves as a vital tool for synthesizing expert opinions to guide decision-making. Globally, HTA integration with clinical guidelines varies significantly.

For instance, NICE ensures alignment between guidelines and HTA outcomes, while G-BA relies on clinical guidelines to identify comparators for added-benefit assessments. HAS incorporates HTA recommendations directly into clinical guidelines, enhancing their utility for reimbursement decisions. These approaches underline the importance of harmonizing clinical guidelines with HTA to facilitate evidence-based decision-making. The inclusion of technology horizon scanning (THS) in clinical consensus projects ensures forward-looking relevance.

By anticipating the impact of emerging innovations, THS strengthens HTA frameworks and aligns the guidelines with future clinical and healthcare system needs, maintaining their credibility in guiding HTA decisions. This dynamic process fosters trust among stakeholders and ensures that reimbursement frameworks are responsive to evolving patient needs and technological advancements.

Table 1. The role of clinical guidelines on HTA by country and health system.

Country	System	Role of Clinical Guidelines
	NICE[1]	NICE develops both clinical guidelines and HTAs, ensuring alignment between the two.
	ICER/Payers[2]	Guidelines are developed independently by professional societies and referenced indirectly.
	G-BA/AMNOG[3]	Guidelines influence G-BA assessments by establishing therapeutic context and comparators.
	HAS[4]	HAS integrates clinical guidelines with HTA results to assess therapeutic value.
	CDA-AMC[5]	Guidelines operate independently but often align with CDA-AMC evaluations.
	PBS[6]	PBAC considers clinical guidelines to understand standards of care and unmet need.
	CONITEC[7]	Guidelines are directly influenced by HTA recommendations to align with public coverage.

Conclusion

Clinical guidelines **enhance HTA** by aligning reimbursement decisions with evolving **evidence and innovation**.

Integrating THS and maintaining dynamic **updates ensure relevance**, fostering collaboration among stakeholders to **optimize healthcare decision-making**.

References

1. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). NICE health technology evaluations: the manual (PMG36). Process Methods. 2022;(January). https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg36/chapter/introduction-to-health-technology-evaluation
2. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. Value Assessment Framework. Value Assess Framew. Published online 2023:51. https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/value-assessment-framework/#:~:text=The purpose of the value,value care for all patients.
3. Federal Joint Committee (G-BA). Methods for the Benefit Assessment of Pharmaceuticals. Accessed January 9, 2025. https://www.g-ba.de/ueber-den-gba/wer-wir-sind/
4. Haute Autorité de Santé. Methodological Guidance for Health Technology Assessment. Accessed January 9, 2025. https://www.has-sante.fr/
5. Canada's Drugs Agency. Health Technology Assessment Framework. Accessed January 9, 2025. https://www.cda-amc.ca/
6. Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. Guidelines for Preparing Submissions. Accessed January 9, 2025. https://www.pbs.gov.au/pbs/home
7. CONITEC - Brasil. Brazilian Guidelines for HTA Processes. Accessed January 9, 2025. https://www.gov.br/conitec/pt-br