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Background and objectives

- Workshops Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Chile
  - 2016
  - Aimed at key stakeholders
  - Four-hour intensive trainings
  - Guest lecturer Prof. Michael Drummond

- ISPOR Latin America
  - 2017
  - Compact presentation focusing on the country-specific learnings
  - Ample room for discussion WITH ALL OF YOU

- White Paper and Scientific article
  - 2017-2018
  - Broad dissemination going wide and deep
  - Foster the dialogue
  - Register to receive it
Why is it so important to count on RWE as well?

- **RCTs**
  - Restrictive inclusion/exclusion criteria that may lead to selection
  - Controlled design, often blinded and/or vs. placebo
  - Protocol-driven compliance
  - Protocol-driven follow-up
  - Fewer comorbidities and restrictive concomitant medications
  - Reflects ideal financial conditions

- **Reality**
  - No restricting inclusion/exclusion criteria
  - Naturalistic open design with real-life comparators
  - Real adherence (patient decision)
  - Real follow-up by physicians discretion
  - All common comorbidities and routine concomitant medications
  - Reflects impact of access problems, copayments, limited coverage, etc.

**Uses of RWE**

- **Regulators**
  - EA & CUPS
  - Adaptive Pathways/Licensing
  - Pharmacovigilance
  - 21st Century Cures Act (and 2012 HC Reform Act)

- **Physicians**
  - Locally relevant clinical guidelines
  - Personalized medicine
  - Professional Associations to feed their value frameworks

- **HTA and Payers**
  - Inputs for CEA & BIM
  - Conditional Reimbursement
  - VBP & Performance-Based Risk Sharing Agreements
  - Test/validate value arguments in reassessments

- **Patients**
  - Increased inclusion of PRO endpoints
  - Trend towards involvement of Patient Advocacy Groups in RWD collection

**Pharma & Biotech**

- Improve R&D investment strategies
- Increasing trial efficiency
- Improve treatment adherence
- Risk management
- Identify subpopulation and extensions
**Uses of RWE**

No use by regulators

Limited use in HTA (until recently non-binding) → SUR & SUR & Sistema de Tutelaje de Tecnologías Sanitarias Emergentes

Limited use in coverage decisions but this is rapidly changing

Main promoter of RWE use are the pharmaceutical industry and academia

No use by regulators

Used in HTAs but results are not always binding

Multiple users (government, insurance, pharma) in price negotiations

Superintendence of Health uses RWE to support auditing

Limited use in HTAs (clinical and economic)

Main promoter is academia

No use by regulators

Used in health decision making, especially pertaining to coverage (DANE)

Multiple national or large scale surveys and national statistics

---

**Challenges**

Normative barriers: Difficulties with information security and data integrity

Technical barriers: few databases not regularly updated, non-harmonized codification and no longitudinal follow-up of patients across levels of care

Trust issues and fragmentation

Available RWD not centralized. Fragmented system generate fragmented data

Absence of common indicators’ definitions and harmonized coding

Variation in data quality and no longitudinal follow-up of patients’

Still insufficient experienced scientist to analyze the data

Hurdles to set SIDRA project

Scarce resources allocated to fund RWE research lack of good quality sources of information in relevant areas

Lack of stewardship of the MoH to drive the production of relevant evidence

The capacity of decision makers, including government, insurers, and health providers, to analyse all this information is limited

Governmental publications do have the descriptive data but no further analyses

---
Opportunities

The OS will start monitoring the use of certain high-cost technologies (R 370)

Extension of the use of EMRs
Data linked to reimbursement and payment is more detailed and of better quality, especially in the private sector

The vertical integration of insurance companies and healthcare providers create opportunity for complete data repositories.
Some successful initiatives (like Amil in Oncology) have awakened interest

Use in HTA submissions is increasing
Increasing use of RWE in HTAs will promote industry to generate the data
Progressive improvements in data quality
Innovative experiences are improving healthcare provision (and outcomes)

RWE is available from longitudinal data from surveys and registries
Data are freely accessible for any research group interested in further statistical analyses