

The EU JCA scoping process: a health technology developer perspective

James Ryan, Director, Global HTA Policy, HTA & Modelling Science

AstraZeneca

The PICO simulations were used to predict the scoping process outcome, and its implications on evidence generation & analysis

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIOS	1L NSCLC
Country specific PICO	6+1
PICO ¹ (direct comparison)	14 (6)
Unique population	11
Comparators	9
Outcomes	28
Proportion of analysis requiring indirect evidence ²	57%
Includes NICE, as a proxy of remaining MS Based on base case scenario (no additional outcome measure, subgroup or inclusion of	

² Based on base case scenario (no additional outcome measure, subgroup or inclusion of safety analyses required in Germany). Requested analyses does not imply feasibility

What was learned from the simulations and case studies?

What are the implications of the process on HTDs and HTA bodies?

How could the process be built upon to increase the quality, efficiency and usage of the JCA?



The proposed process, high number of PICOs and significant analysis burden has implications for HTDs and HTA bodies



For HTDs...



Additive PICOs will not change trial and evidence development



Lack of evidence-based guidance and engagement reduces predictability, transparency and inclusivity



Redundant and exponentiallygrowing analyses requests



Majority of PICOs require more complex indirect analyses

For EU HTA assessors...



Significantly higher PICO count than was predicted by EUnetHTA



Significant resource required to assess large & complex dossier



Large proportion of ITCs will require substantial time for assessment and write-up vs direct comparisons

For local HTA bodies...



MS have different approaches to PICOs – no guidance creates increased variation



Many safety & subgroups analyses not usable or not used by most Member States



Size & complexity compromises utility at a local level





Ensuring a high quality, inclusive and transparent JCA relevant to Member States





Increase HTD engagement

- Early engagement whilst retaining independence of final PICOs
- Use evidence HTDs have on the disease, clinical practice and endpoints to inform PICOs
- HTD to propose a base case PICO





Guidance for assessors and Member States on comparator selection

- Usage data to determine the "best available alternative"
- Robustness of effectiveness evidence supporting its use
- Requirement to treat a minimum proportion of the selected European (sub)population?





Selection and prioritization of subpopulations

- Subpopulations (and subgroups) should be clinically relevant and actionable at a national MS decision-level
- Priority to pre-specified and clinical consensus





Not all PICOs or analyses should have the same weight

- PICOs informed by evidence-based principles should have more weight
- Complementary clinical analyses were anticipated - and improve efficiencies
- MS PICOs are needed to ensure timely submissions at a national level

