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Managed Entry Agreements / Risk Sharing / Accelerated Coverage

Regardless of the many names for risk sharing agreements (managed entry agreements), the purpose is still the same: payers, and providers need to ensure improved health outcomes with manageable costs, industry needs to have some certainty of revenue.

1. **Risk Assessment Criteria for CE Mark**
   - (No Comparator needed)
   - 1. Is the product **safe to use on patients**?
   - 2. Is the product **effective on patients**?

   The purpose of CE mark and reimbursement are different. CE mark (regulatory) determines **acceptability** while Reimbursement determines **value**.

2. **4 Post-CE Mark Criteria Guide Evidence Requirements for Reimbursement**:
   - 1. Are **comparator products** available?
   - 2. Are comparator products used in the same care setting?
   - 3. Is coverage and coding available for the products?
   - 4. Do the pricing strategy align to expectations

   If the answer to any of these questions is ‘no’, the payer engagement strategy is significantly more involved.

3. **Causes of Uncertainty on Improved Outcomes**
   
   **Diversity of the MedTech industry**:
   - Devices, diagnostics & Digital health
   - Diversity of care setting
   - Diversity of therapeutic area usage
   - Diversity of reimbursement pathways

   **Evidence requirements to demonstrate value**:
   - Ethical or practical challenges to RCT’s
   - Internal RCT validity vs External RWE validity of devices
   - Improved statistical methods & trial design

   **User Learning Curve**
   - User has to ‘learn’ how to use a device
   - Increased usage can lead to improved outcomes

   **Organisational Impact**
   - Impact on patient pathway
   - Impact on hospital flow
   - Impact on care pathway

   **Incremental Product Innovations**
   - Shorter/less applicable patent protection
   - Iterative nature of MedTech

   **Rapid Price Changes**
   - Older innovations depreciate as product evolves
   - Changes in ICER given comparator / SoC changes

---

Source: Alira Health Analysis, MedTech Europe, Bocconi University

---

For industry, the ‘risk’ being shared is certainty (timing) of revenue. For payers it is uncertainty of improved health outcomes versus costs. Given the 6 challenges in value articulation for MedTech, longer term innovative programmes are more suitable as opposed to individual contracts.
Identified Accelerated Coverage Pathways for Innovation (ACPI’s)

26 active pathways have been identified across Europe, each with their own scope, evidence requirements, stakeholders, access pathways and timelines.

Definition

Accelerated Coverage Pathways for Innovations (ACPI’s) are bilateral or multilateral agreements that enable patient access to a health technology subject to specific conditions outside the general reimbursement/funding frameworks

Identified Pathways

Austria
• Provisional/analogous MEL Procedure Codes

Belgium
• Limited Clinical Application

England
• Artificial Intelligence in Health and Care Award
• Innovation Technology Payment (ITP) programme
• MedTech Funding Mandate
• NHS Innovation Accelerator
• Rapid Uptake Products

France
• Article 51 of Social Security law (2018 & 2019)
• Health Economic Research Programme – PRME
• Hospital Clinical Research Program – PHRC
• Forfait Innovation
• Repository of Innovative Acts Outside the Nomenclature of Biology and Anatomical Pathology - RIHN
• ETAPES Program

Germany
• 137e - Trial Regulation
• 137h – Trial Regulation for Highly Invasive Medical Devices
• Digital Health Applications (DiGA)
• Innovation Fund
• NUB
• Selective Contracts

Netherlands
• Innovation for Small-scale Experiments
• Promising Care

Portugal
• Medical Device Reimbursement

Scotland
• IMTO Process by Health Technology Scotland

Spain
• Monitoring Studies
• Supervised Use

Wales
• NHS Wales

Notes: 1 Swiss pathways not included in the list 2 Part of the Accelerated Access Collaborative, the umbrella department overseeing different programmes, including 5 ACPI’s

Sources: Taxonomy of Value-Based Access Programmes MedTech Europe; Alira Health Analysis
Taxonomy of Accelerated Coverage Pathways for Innovations

**Builds on the second version of the taxonomy, newly added are the AI in Health and Care Award, the NHS Innovation Accelerator, the MedTech Funding Mandate, NHS Wales, Rapid Uptake Products, DiGa, Promising Care, IMTO Process, Monitoring Studies and the ETAPES Programme.**

### Traditional Reimbursement/funding
- **Goal:** Comparator products exist
- **Requirements:** Comparator products are in the same care setting
- **Success factor:** Comparator products are reimbursed/funded
- **Price of the technology fits within the tariff**

### Utilization Caps
- **Goal:** Limit total incremental budget impact
- **Requirements:** Defined cost-drivers and clinical outcomes
- **Success factor:** Effectiveness, neutral or negative budget impact

### Fixed Cost per Patient
- **Goal:** Limit incremental cost per patient/procedure
- **Requirements:** Patient costing for technology
- **Success factor:** Effectiveness, cost-neutrality/savings

### Conditional Treatment Continuation
- **Goal:** Evaluate part of patients in a clinical trial
- **Requirements:** Follow study protocol design and/or registry
- **Success factor:** Demonstrate effectiveness as soon as possible

### Pay-For-Performance
- **Goal:** Quantify value of MedTech beyond a certain point in care
- **Requirements:** Outcomes and measurement systems
- **Success factor:** Outcomes selection

### Higher
- **Uncertainty about Clinical Outcomes**
- **Uncertainty about Economic Outcomes**

Sources: Taxonomy of Value-Based Access Programs MedTech Europe; Alira Health Analysis
**Taxonomy of Accelerated Coverage Pathways for Innovations**

*Builds on the second version of the taxonomy, newly added are the AI in Health and Care Award, NHS Innovation accelerator, the MedTech Funding Mandate, Rapid Uptake Products, DiGa, Promising Care, IMTO Process, Monitoring Studies and the ETAPES Programme.*

---

**Main goal**

- Innovation Technology Payment
- NUB
- Medical Device Reimbursement

**Economic Uncertainty Addressed**

- Limited Clinical Application
- AI in Health and Care Award
- MedTech Funding Mandate
- NHS Innovation Accelerator
- Rapid Uptake Products
- Article 51 of Social Security Law
- Health Economical Research Programme – PRME
- Forfait Innovation
- RIHN
- ETAPES Programme

**Not the goal**

- Digital Health Applications (DiGa)
- Selective Contracts
- Innovation for Small-scale Experiments
- Promising Care
- IMTO Process
- Monitoring Studies
- Supervised Use
- NHS Wales

**Traditional Reimbursement/Funding**

1. Comparator products exist
2. Comparator products are in the same care setting
3. Comparator products are reimbursed/funded
4. Price of the technology fits within the tariff

---

Notes: 1 Part of the Accelerated Access Collaborative, the umbrella department overseeing different programs, including 5 ACPI’s 2 Swiss pathways not included in the list

Source: Alira Health & ValueConnected analysis
Industry can develop a structured approach to collaborative dialogue

**7 enablers support stakeholder engagement.**

### How Industry Can Support Product Adoption

1. **Patient Centric Therapeutic Areas**
   Identify the primary therapeutic areas for your MedTech solution. A PICO framework can support this and define your core value proposition.

2. **Develop patient cohorts with risk adjusted criteria and protocols**
   This ensures similar patients to drive comparability of outcomes in the clinical trial. This also helps to identify exactly where the value for a solution is derived from.

3. **Define clear outcome measures for cohorts patients**
   The outcomes become the measurements for success, which define value, and set the foundation of pricing a MedTech solution.

4. **Define a clear timeframe to achieving optimal outcomes**
   Timeframes for patient outcomes, must align to economic savings to resonate with payer budgets.

5. **Quantify baseline outcomes & costs for each patient cohort**
   A baseline is critical for cost benefit analysis for payers outlining why this may be better than the Standard of Care.

6. **Determine prospective outcomes and cost improvement**
   This defines the quantifiable benefit that will drive pricing, volume and access discussions.

7. **Develop a simple business model.**
   A business model serves two purposes:
   1. Internal and resourcing
   2. Viability of payer investment

---

**Value Based Procurement: Collaborative Dialogue**

- Patients
- Providers & Hospital Management
- Payers
- Payment Policymakers
- Physicians
- Patients
Value Based Procurement

Value based procurement in of itself is not the end goal. It is a stepping-stone to a more holistic and patient-centric buying process in healthcare. The MedTech companies that adapt the fastest will have a significant competitive advantage.

- Increasing Potential for Improved Total Costs to System & Patient Outcomes
  - Price-Focused
    - Procurement based NOT only on price, but outcomes & costs
    - Unilateral decisions made with Price only contracts

- Increasing Time, Complexity & # of Stakeholders
  - Value Based Healthcare
    - Value & outcomes quantified, contracted, with risk sharing
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POLICY PERSPECTIVES

Coverage with Evidence Development, Only in Research, Risk Sharing, or Patient Access Scheme? A Framework for Coverage Decisions
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Different forms of PBRSAs

Reductions in expected price

- Outcome
- Non-outcome

Evidence generation

- Only in research
- Approval with research
Uncertainty evaluation – why does uncertainty matter?

- Evidential uncertainty
- Decision uncertainty
- Net reduction in population health

Further research to reduce costs of uncertainty

- Including learning curves, incremental innovation
- Risk of wrong funding decision
- Funding non-cost-effective or failure to fund cost-effective
- Is research of value? How can research be incentivized? What are the costs of changing decisions?
Expanding the decision options

- Rejection vs Adoption

- Based on existing evidence, is health gained > health forgone?

- Approval with research vs Only in research

- Is the value of additional research greater than its cost?
- Can research be conducted if device is approved?
- Are there significant irrecoverable costs?
- What else do we expect to happen in the future (e.g. prices)?
- Are there issues regarding who should pay for research?
Summary

- Important distinction between PBRSAs that generate evidence versus those that reduce the effective price
- Analytically, key to understand the
  - Importance and cost of uncertainty
  - The potential value of research
  - The actual value of research
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Health Challenges
Rising Demands
Limited Budget

Value-driven access to medical innovations
Medical innovations into the HC system

• Patients to be better
• The entire society to be better-off
• Premium/tax payers remain in solidarity with one another
Value-driven entry of innovative Medtech
Value in ‘value-based healthcare’

(European Commission, EXPH, 2019)
Advantages of MEAs

• Adoption largely via local procurement: national positive list infeasible
• Clinical value uncertain: (high-level) evidence not available or insufficient in the early stages
• Economic value uncertain: missing outcome data, uncoordinated evaluations, impact on public resources difficult to trace
• Short PLC, rapid incremental change, SME-dominant
• Implementation challenges: upscaling beyond pilot, soft skills, culture, data reuse, etc.
Adapting to the dynamics & pace of Medtech/Digitech

(MedTech Europe Taxonomy of Value-Based Access Programmes, 2019)
MEAs: flexible access schemes

Flexible
≠ lenient, arbitrary, exceptionalism
= agile, fit-for-purpose, proportional to value proposition & scale metrics

Optimising (post-market) value over time
• Ongoing evaluation, know-how learning, stepwise upscaling
• Attention to patients’ engagement and de-implementing obsolete care

→ Balance between innovation and regulation
• Value delivery to the end-user without reducing time-to-market
The Dutch case

Regulated competition, decentralised development and uptake

‘Open’ entry into the statutory basic package (# pharma)
• Health professionals and insurers decide

National Health Care Institute (ZIN) stimulates evidence generation and appropriate entry
• Implementing the MEA program ‘Potentially Promising Care’
• Stakeholder dialogue through case study (Medtech/AI)
• Information provision on innovation pathways (ZvI)
• Limited (risk-based) explicit assessments

Dutch government to consider a ‘sluice’ for Medtech!
Thank you!

Pabrishami@zinl.nl

Payam Abrishami

@Payabri

Kinderdijk, The Netherlands
Virtual ISPOR 2021
Can PBRSAs for Medtech Address Procurement and Market Access Challenges?
Scanning the Current Horizon and a View to the Future
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OVERVIEW OF EUROPEAN CED PROGRAMS FOR MDs

• **Methods:**
  – Structured interviews with 25 decision-makers from 23 jurisdictions to explore:
    ▪ Characteristics of existing CED programmes for MDs
    ▪ Perceptions regarding 13 pre-identified challenges associated with initiating and operating CED schemes for devices
  – Data collection on individual schemes initiated or still ongoing in 2015-2020.

WP7 Coverage with Evidence Development for Medical Devices

Challenges with CED schemes for medical devices
1. Deciding which medical devices are candidates for CED schemes
2. Obtaining stakeholder agreement on the scheme
3. Securing funding for the scheme
4. Determining the appropriate study design for data collection
5. Determining the relevant outcome measure(s) on which data are collected
6. Dealing with data collection and monitoring
7. Dealing with data analysis
8. Ex-ante definition of decision rule, based on possible outcomes of the scheme
9. Reaching an agreement on price, reimbursement or use of the device at the end of the scheme
10. Withdrawing a device from the market when evidence indicates the device is not (cost-) effective
11. Obtaining agreements about the duration of the scheme and the stopping rule
12. Adapting the scheme to account for product modifications or a learning curve
13. Dealing with the market entry of similar devices

Source: Reckers-Droog et al (2020)

OVERVIEW OF EUROPEAN CED PROGRAMS FOR MDs

- **Results:**
  - 7 countries with CED programmes for MDs
    - Belgium, England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and Switzerland
  - 71 ongoing schemes in 2015-2020*

* The dataset of CED schemes for MDs implemented in Europe in 2015-2020 can be downloaded from this [COMED outputs homepage](http://example.com).

- Heterogeneity of CED programmes characteristics (eligibility criteria, roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, funding arrangements, type of decisions being contemplated at the outset of each scheme)
- High variability in how decision-makers perceived CED-related challenges possibly reflecting country-specific arrangements and different experiences with CED.
- One general finding: relatively little attention paid to the evaluation of schemes, both during and at their completion

Source Federici et al (2021, forthcoming)
THE ITALIAN NATIONAL HTA PROGRAMME FOR MEDICAL DEVICES (PNHTADM)

1. Potential impact of technology on care pathway
2. Ethical or social implications
3. Organizational impact
4. Economic impact
5. Technical relevance
6. Uncertainty regarding comparative effectiveness
7. Clinical condition epidemiological profile

1. The technology does not provide the elements to support its introduction into clinical practice
2. The introduction of the technology in the clinical pathway would provide benefit
3. The technology is recommended only for use in research programs for the purpose of producing additional scientific evidence
4. The introduction of the technology is conditional on the collection of contextual evidence of demonstrated efficacy and cost data

- Emerging, non-CE marked
- Innovative
- Mature
- Obsolete
- Single
- Non-fungible

- EUnetHTA Core Model® domains and methods plus aspects related to the Italian NHS

1. Coverage policy through LEA Commission
2. Purchasing policy through procurement tenders
3. Reimbursement policy through Tariff Commission

Source Adapted from Tarricone et al (2021)
GOVERNANCE AND METHODOLOGY OF PNHTADM

Source Adapted from Tarricone et al (2021)
THE PROPOSED PATHWAY OF INTEGRATION BETWEEN HTA AND PROCUREMENT

A priority for PNHTADM? NO

Regional recommendation NO

Existing contract? NO

Send Forms A and B to the regional level NO

Compliance w/ PNHTADM prioritization criteria? NO

Regional evaluation on the basis of Form A and B

Earmark technology for PNHTADM

Purchase denied

Purchase authorized

Purchase subject to development of further evidence

Purchase authorized only for research purposes

Send Form A to the Purchase Requests Evaluation Center

PNHTADM recommendation YES

NO

YES

Purchase denied

Purchase authorized

Purchase subject to development of further evidence

Purchase authorized only for research purposes

YES

Send Form A to the Purchase Requests Evaluation Center

Source Adapted from Cabina di Regia del Programma Nazionale HTA (2019)
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED MODEL BY ITALIAN REGIONS: VENETO

Bur n. 100 del 07/07/2020

DELIBERAZIONE DELLA GIUNTA REGIONALE n. 811 del 23 giugno 2020

Rinnovo della rete regionale per la governance dei dispositivi medici: istituzione del Tavolo tecnico regionale sui dispositivi medici e attivazione delle Unità di valutazione aziendali delle richieste di acquisto di dispositivi medici.

[Sanità e igiene pubblica]

Note per la trasparenza:

A seguito del recepimento del Programma Nazionale di HTA Dispositivi Medici avvenuto con DGR n. 967 del 6 luglio 2018, si approvano l'istituzione di un tavolo tecnico, denominato Tavolo regionale sui dispositivi medici e, a livello aziendale, l'attivazione di Unità di valutazione delle richieste di acquisto di dispositivi medici.

https://bur.regione.veneto.it/BurvServices/pubblica/DettaglioDgr.aspx?id=422931
1. Biological meshes for repair of inguinal hernias (awarded in 2019)

2. Cryoablation (awarded in 2020)

3. Carotid artery stents (awarded 2021)
• Date of publication: December 2018
• Date of award: November 2019
• Duration: 48 months
  – (January 2020 – December 2023)
• Lots: 2
• Award criteria
  – Most Advantageous Economic Tender
  – Quality criterion: **Net Monetary Benefit**
    - Outcome measures
      - Rate of infections after 30 days
      - Rate of recurrences after 24 months
    - WTP threshold: 60,000€/QALY
  – Quality-weighting: 70

• Outcome monitoring and pay-back
  1. Establishment of a regional **registry**
  2. **Monitoring** of RW outcomes after 12 months:
    - Rate of infections after 30 days
    - Rate of recurrences after 24 months
  3. **Payback**:
    - In case the rates of infections and recurrences exceed 20% or more the figures declared in the technical offer, ESTAR will meet the Economic Operator to assess the causes.
    - If the device ineffectiveness will be verified, the Economic Operator will pay back 50% of the purchase price.

*For details on the application of NMB see Messori et al, 2020.
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MODULO DI RICHIESTA DI ACQUISTO
DI DISPOSITIVI MEDICI E TECNOLOGIE

Parte A

(a cura del personale sanitario richiedente)

1. Dati del richiedente

Data della richiesta

Nome e cognome del richiedente

Telefano

E-mail

Unità Operativa (UO)

Responsabile UO richiedente

Il richiedente ha un conflitto di interessi rispetto al DM o alla tecnologia richiesti?
SI □ NO □

In caso affermativo, specificare quale
2. Dati tecnici

La richiesta di acquisto è urgente?
SI ☐ NO ☐

Il DM/tecnologia è esclusivo o infungibile?
SI ☐ NO ☐

In caso affermativo, specificare la motivazione dell’esclusività o di infungibilità

Tipologia di richiesta: ☐ Singolo prodotto
☐ Categoria di prodotti omogenei

Classe di rischio del DM o della categoria di DM richiesti:
I ☐ IIa ☐ IIb ☐ III ☐

Dati del prodotto o della categoria di prodotti richiesti
Nome/i commerciale/i .................................................. (facoltativo se si richiede l’acquisto di una classe di prodotti)
Produttore/i .................................................................
Fornitore/i .................................................................
Data/e marchio CE .....................................................
Classificazione Nazionale dei DM (CND) ........................................... (obbligatoria se si richiede l’acquisto di una classe di prodotti)
Numero/i di repertorio .................................................(non obbligatorio)

Destinazione d’uso riportata nelle Istruzioni per l’Uso .................................................................

Descrivere la popolazione target beneficiaria della tecnologia proposta e la condizione morbosa oggetto di cura

Come viene trattata attualmente la popolazione target?

Esiste un percorso diagnostico terapeutico assistenziale (PDTA) di riferimento?
SI ☐ NO ☐

In caso affermativo, descrivelo:

Il DM o la categoria di prodotti richiesti va in affiancamento o sostituzione di un dispositivo analogo già in uso?
SI ☐ NO ☐

In caso affermativo, indicare:
Nome commerciale del/i dispositivo/i .............................................
CND .................................................................
% di sostituzione ..................................................

Specificare la motivazione della richiesta di acquisto (es. caratteristiche del prodotto attualmente utilizzato per quella indicazione, vantaggi della tecnologia proposta, motivo per cui il prodotto attualmente utilizzato non va più bene)

3. Stima dei quantitativi richiesti

Indicare il numero stimato di casi da trattare all’anno nell’unità operativa ..................

Indicare il fabbisogno stimato annuo della tecnologia (numero di pezzi) ..................

Indicare il prezzo di acquisto indicativo o un range di prezzo del DM/tecnologia (in €) ..........................................

Indicare il prezzo di acquisto (indicativo) dell’attuale DM/tecnologia (in €) ..................

4. Documentazione da allegare

Se la richiesta è relativa ad un singolo prodotto, inviare:
- Scheda tecnica del prodotto
- Istruzioni per l’Uso

Se la richiesta è relativa ad una classe di prodotti, inviare:
- Una scheda tecnica per ogni prodotto
- Le Istruzioni per l’Uso di ogni prodotto

IL RESPONSABILE di UOC/UOSD

IL DIRETTORE di DIPARTIMENTO
MODULO INTEGRATIVO DI RICHIESTA DI ACQUISTO
DI DISPOSITIVI MEDICI E TECNOLOGIE

Parte B

(a cura del Centro di Valutazione delle Richieste di Acquisto)

Il Modulo B deve essere compilato solo per prodotti senza raccomandazioni - nazionali o regionali - e senza convenzioni/contratti in essere. Qualora esista una raccomandazione o la tecnologia richiesta sia riconducibile a convenzione/contratto in essere, l’esito della richiesta di acquisto sarà coerente le indicazioni regionali e non è richiesta la compilazione del Modulo B.

1. Evidenze cliniche a supporto della tecnologia

Il compilatore deve fornire la lista delle evidenze cliniche a supporto della sicurezza e dell’efficacia della tecnologia compilando le tabelle seguenti, che si basano sul GRADEpro.\(^{37}\) Il compilatore deve elencare tutti i possibili endpoint relativi a sicurezza (Tabella 12) ed efficacia (Tabella 13), ed almeno uno studio per ciascun endpoint rilevante. Si raccomanda l’utilizzo di endpoint rilevanti per i pazienti. Gli endpoint surrogati possono essere riportati solo se esiste una correlazione con l’endpoint principale. Possono essere utilizzati quali fonti non solo studi primari, ma anche revisioni sistematiche e report di HTA.

Il compilatore, inoltre, deve rispondere alle seguenti domande.

Sono presenti Linee guida cliniche di riferimento regionali/nazionali/internazionali (ad esempio società scientifiche o autorità sanitarie)?  SI ☐ NO ☐

In caso affermativo, specificare quali .................................................................
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabella 12 Sintesi evidenze cliniche a supporto della sicurezza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riferimenti studio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popolazione</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disegno dello studio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endpoint</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definizione endpoint</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metodo di misurazione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempistica di misurazione</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tipo di variabile</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N° pazienti del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N° pazienti del gruppo di controllo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risultato/effetto:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Se l'endpoint è dicotomico:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N° eventi del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N° eventi del gruppo di controllo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Se l'endpoint è continuo:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deviazione standard del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Errore standard della media del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervallo di confidenza al 95% del gruppo dei trattati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media del gruppo di controlli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deviazione standard del gruppo di controllo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Errore standard della media del gruppo di controllo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervallo di confidenza al 95% del gruppo di controllo</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Evidenze economiche a supporto della tecnologia

Esistono valutazioni economiche (es. analisi di costo-efficacia, analisi di costo-utilità, analisi di impatto sul budget) all’interno di report di HTA o pubblicate come articolo scientifico?
Si ☐ No ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riferimento bibliografico</th>
<th>Tipologia studio*</th>
<th>Sintesi delle evidenze disponibili</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Costi legati alla tecnologia

Il DM/tecnologia necessita di altri dispositivi accessori per l’utilizzo?  Si ☐ No ☐
Il DM/tecnologia viene utilizzato con un’apparecchiatura? Si ☐ No ☐
In caso affermativo, l’apparecchiatura è già disponibile? Si ☐ No ☐
L’uso del DM/tecnologia richiede investimenti infrastrutturali? Si ☐ No ☐
In caso affermativo, specificare quali ..................................................
Servono competenze specifiche per poter utilizzare la nuova tecnologia? Si ☐ No ☐
In caso affermativo, specificare quali ..................................................

Sono già disponibili nella struttura le competenze per sfruttare appieno la tecnologia proposta?
Si ☐ No ☐

4. Rimborso della tecnologia

Codice ICD-9-CM di diagnosi.................................................................
Codice ICD-9-CM di intervento..............................................................
Codice DRG..........................................................................................
Tariffo regionale ricovero (tariffa DRG in €)..........................................
Tariffa regionale prestazione ambulatoriale (in €).................................
Tariffa regionale prestazione territoriale (in €).....................................

5. Aspetti organizzativi legati all’uso della tecnologia

La nuova tecnologia comporta un cambiamento nel PDPA del paziente?
Si ☐ No ☐

In caso affermativo, specificare quale .................................................

La nuova tecnologia può comportare il cambiamento di procedure organizzative?
Si ☐ No ☐

In caso affermativo, specificare quale (ad es., impatto sulla durata della degenza, sugli accessi ambulatoriali, sulle liste di attesa, sulle infezioni intrespedaliere,...) .................................................................

Quali sono i tempi di introduzione del DM/tecnologia previsti sulla base delle valutazioni organizzative e operative?

6. Documentazione da allegare

Segnalazioni relative alla sicurezza (obbligatorio)
Dati non ancora pubblicati e autocertificazioni di pregresse esperienze applicative sperimentali e/o cliniche (se disponibili)
Budget Impact Analysis fatta secondo standard internazionali (facoltativo)
Analisi di costo-efficacia o di costo-utilità ad hoc fatta secondo standard internazionali (facoltativo)

IL CENTRO DI VALUTAZIONE DELLE RICHIESTE DI ACQUISTO

IL DIRETTORE GENERALE