



# **Landscape Assessment: Patient Engagement in Health Technology Assessment**

Elisabeth Oehrlein, BA, Jason Harris, Nicole Labkoff, Eleanor Perfetto, PhD, MS, Marc Boutin, JD

# Objective/Methods

## National/ Regional HTAs

Canada

France

Germany

Italy

Spain

United Kingdom

## Professional Organizations

American College of Cardiology/  
American Heart Association

American Society of Clinical Oncology

European Society for Medical Oncology

National Comprehensive Cancer  
Network

## Collaborations/ Independent Organizations

DrugAbacus

European Network for Health  
Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA)

Institute for Clinical and Economic  
Review (ICER)

September -  
October 2016

Targeted web search

Directly emailing  
organizations

What terms are  
used to describe  
engagement?

How and when are  
patients engaged?

Is there evidence of  
patient  
engagement in  
recently completed  
evaluations?

# Results

- Tremendous variation exists in terms, processes, and impact of patient engagement across sampled organizations. Seventeen different terms were identified for describing patient engagement activities

## 1. Terms used by value assessment bodies to describe patient engagement

patient input  
(n=2)

patient group  
submitted  
information  
(n=1)

cooperation  
with patients  
and users  
(n=1)

public  
consultation  
(n=1)

patient  
perspectives  
(n=2)

involvement of  
people  
affected (n=1)

patient  
involvement  
(n=2)

patient and  
public  
involvement  
(n=1)

lay  
involvement  
(n=1)

inclusion of  
patient  
representative  
(n=3)

patient reports  
(n=1)

patient  
preference  
(n=2)

public  
consultation  
(n=1)

stakeholder  
consultation  
(n=1)

open input  
(n=1)

stakeholder  
engagement  
(n=1)

patient  
participation  
(n=1)

## 2. Opportunities for patient engagement across value assessment bodies:

- Patient questionnaires (HTA=2)
- Comment periods (HTA=1; CO=1);
- Participation on committees (HTA=3; PO=3);
- Ability to propose topics (HTA=1);
- Help draft guidance (HTA=1);
- General stakeholder forum (CO=1).

## 3. Evidence of impact:

While many organizations describe engagement opportunities in their documents, only two organizations had clear evidence of engagement impacting decision-making or being consistently incorporated.

# Discussion

- Substantial heterogeneity in the terms used to describe patient engagement activities across organizations
  - Discussion question: How might we get stakeholders across countries to adopt the same language?
- Variety of opportunities for patient engagement are described, however lack of clear evidence to how patient engagement practices are consistently used may contribute to the perception that engagement by HTA's and other value assessors is “tokenistic”
  - Discussion question: What drives certain HTAs to move from opportunities to meaningful engagement?



Eleanor M. Perfetto, PhD, MS

[eperfetto@nhcouncil.org](mailto:eperfetto@nhcouncil.org)

Elisabeth M. Oehrlein

[eoehrlein@umaryland.edu](mailto:eoehrlein@umaryland.edu)