

Development of the RELIANT (REveaLing Implicit fActors iN HTA) checklist to support the HTA deliberation

HTA265

C. Monleón <sup>1</sup>, M. Toumi <sup>2</sup>, HM Späth <sup>1</sup>, C. Dussart <sup>1</sup>, C. Crespo <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, University of Lyon, Faculty of Pharmacy, EA 4129 (P2S), Lyon  
<sup>2</sup> Aix Marseille University, Public Health Department, Marseille, <sup>3</sup> University of Barcelona, Statistics Department, Barcelona

Background:

**Deliberation in HTA** is the informed and critical examination of an issue and the weighing of arguments and evidence to guide a subsequent decision. Additionally, there are implicit factors impacting the HTA recommendations through this process. The authors defined **implicit factors in HTA as all non-explicitly collected or described factors in the HTA guidelines, that may influence the HTA deliberative process and any subsequent recommendation**. Since these factors are not acknowledged, they may jeopardize the legitimacy and transparency of HTA. To our knowledge, there is no checklist revealing these factors in a comprehensive manner.

Objectives:

The aim of our research project was to **develop a checklist accounting for the implicit factors influencing HTA deliberation in medicines**, by guiding the HTA practitioner to reflect prospectively and around the final recommendation on the implicit factors that may influence the latter. This in turn will improve the deliberation by making it more rationale, legitimate and transparent.

Methods:

To develop our checklist, we leveraged the findings from a SLR<sup>1</sup> previously published by our research group, from a mixed-methods study and from the assessment of the HTAi/ISPOR checklist<sup>2</sup> identified through a targeted literature review. A group of 8 experts from EU4+UK assessed the checklist through two rounds of review and their comments were incorporated into the final version.

Results:

We developed the **RELIANT (REveaLing Implicit fActors iN HTA) checklist** which is the first of its kind to support the HTA deliberative process.

RELIANT is a name that resonates with the objectives of this checklist since its implementation aims to address the potential implicit factors and biases that may compromise the legitimacy and trust of the HTA deliberation.

The checklist guides the HTA practitioner to reflect on the implicit factors that may influence the HTA process. The target audience of this tool are **HTA practitioners involved in the HTA deliberation**.

**It comprises 16 questions spread across 7 dimensions** covering perspectives, objective factors, meeting dynamics, personal interest, previous experience, context, and cognitive biases.

Table 1 presents a fragment from the checklist showcasing the cognitive biases dimension.

Table 1: Excerpt from the RELIANT checklist

f) Cognitive biases (individual and collective)	In an effort to be as objective as possible, do you consider any of these potential biases may impact your judgement?		
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Affect heuristic (decision influenced by subjective feelings)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Anchoring bias (focusing on the first picture you learn and staying with the first impression)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Attentional bias (paying disproportional attention to some things, over others)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Authority bias (having more confidence in a decision that was validated by an authority figure)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Automation bias (tendency to accept automated clinical decision advice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Availability bias (making judgments of likelihood based on ease of recall)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Confirmation bias (focusing on information confirming personal beliefs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Consistency tendency (difficulty in changing a point of view when the change is justified by the new evidence)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• False consensus effect (overestimation on how much other people are aligned with your appreciation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Framing effects (perception influenced by the way in which the evidence was presented)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Groupthink (situation in which the views of the decision-making group become homogeneous and contrary views are discouraged)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Halo effect (giving disproportionate weight in decision making to the beliefs of eminent individuals)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Hard/bandwagon effect (choosing based on other people choices)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• In-group conformity (having more confidence in a decision when it is in agreement with others)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Intellectual bias (becoming closed-minded about a belief)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Novelty (uncritical acceptance of a new technology)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Optimism bias (tendency to overestimate the likelihood of favorable outcomes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes
• Overconfidence bias (overestimation of personal ability or opinion)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Sometimes

Conclusions:

There is scarcity of tools accounting for the existence of implicit factors in the HTA deliberative process. The **RELIANT checklist fills a gap in this area since it is the first tool addressing the implicit factors in the HTA deliberative process**.

Our checklist could be used in light of the **European regulation on HTA** to further harmonize the appraisal. It could also be part of the **national transposition of this regulation**, contributing to its goals of harmonizing transparent HTA criteria. Hence, the RELIANT checklist has the potential to support the HTA deliberative processes at a national, regional, or local level prior to the HTA recommendation.

References: 1. Clara Monleón, Hans-Martin Späth, Carlos Crespo, Claude Dussart & Mondher Toumi (2022) Systematic literature review on implicit factors influencing the HTA deliberative processes in Europe, Journal of Market Access & Health Policy, 10:1, 2094047  
2. Oortwijn W. et al. Designing and implementing deliberative processes for health technology assessment: a Good practice report of a joint HTAi/ISPOR Task Force. VALUE HEALTH. 2022; 25(6):869–886