

This is a repository copy of *Challenges in the assessment of medical devices: the MedtechHTA project*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/111992/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Tarricone, R., Torbica, A. and Drummond, M.F. orcid.org/0000-0002-6126-0944 (2017) Challenges in the assessment of medical devices: the MedtechHTA project. *Health Economics*. pp. 5-12. ISSN 1057-9230

<https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3469>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Health Economics

Challenges in the Assessment of Medical Devices: the MedtecHTA project

Journal:	<i>Health Economics</i>
Manuscript ID	HEC-16-0104.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Supplement paper
Keywords:	medical devices, MedtecHTA, health technology assessment, methods, economic evaluation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Challenges in the Assessment of Medical Devices: the MedtecHTA project

Keywords: MedtecHTA, medical devices, Health Technology Assessment, economic evaluation, methods

For Peer Review

ABSTRACT

Assessing medical devices (MDs) raises challenges which require us to reflect on whether current methods are adequate. Major features of devices are: (i) device-operator interaction can generate learning curve effects; (ii) incremental nature of innovation needs to be addressed by careful identification of the alternatives for comparative and incremental cost-effectiveness analysis) (iii) broader organizational impact in terms of training and infrastructure, coupled with dynamic pricing, requires a more flexible approach to costing.

The objective of the MedtecHTA project was to investigate improvements in HTA methods to allow for more comprehensive evaluation of MDs. It consisted of several work packages concerning i) the available evidence on the currently adopted approaches for regulation and HTA of medical devices; ii) the geographical variation in access to MDs; iii) the development of methodological frameworks for conducting comparative effectiveness research and economic evaluation of MDs; iv) the organizational impact of MDs.

This introductory paper summarises the main results of the project and draws out the main overarching themes. This supplement represents a comprehensive report of all the main findings of the MedtecHTA project and it is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy makers wanting information on the project.

1. Background to the MedtecHTA project

Health technology assessment (HTA) has become increasingly important in health care decision-making in Europe. Although in principle HTA can be applied to all health technologies, its major use in a decision-making context has been in the pricing and reimbursement of pharmaceuticals. However, there are over 200,000 medical devices on the European market (Fraser et al, 2011). These represent a very heterogeneous family of technologies that needs to be better classified for the purpose of HTA. “Medical device”, according to the EU Directive [\(2007\) 2007/47/EC](#), [amending Council Directive 93/42/EEC](#), is defined as “any instrument, apparatus, appliance, software, material or other article, whether used alone or in combination.... to be used for human beings for the purpose of diagnosis, prevention, treatment, monitoring or alleviation of disease”.

While some devices require very simplified assessment, others need to be assessed through a full evaluation of safety, efficacy, effectiveness and economic impact. A thorough HTA would require consideration of final outcomes in terms of life expectancy and health-related quality of life, going far beyond the assessment that devices [currently](#) undergo to obtain a CE (European Conformity) mark, to enable them to be marketed in the European Union. This is particularly true for implantable devices used in cardiology (Boriani et al., 2009; Boriani, Maniadakis, Auricchio, & Vardas, 2010; R. Tarricone & Drummond, 2011), which represent the main focus of the MedtecHTA project.

~~The current EU legal framework already requires for all devices, especially for class III devices, to have safety and performance testing for decision on CE mark. The current EU legal framework already requires all high-risk devices (class III) to have safety and performance testing for decisions on market authorization.~~ Essentially,

Formatted: Font: English (U.K.), Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, English (U.K.)

Formatted: Font: English (U.K.), Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, English (U.K.)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, English (U.K.)

1
2
3
4
5
6 manufacturers must accomplish a conformity assessment and undergo an inspection
7 and certification procedure by one of the Notified Bodies within the EU. In addition,
8 there is stringent post-marketing surveillance, requiring manufacturers of devices to
9 implement a post market clinical follow up plan and a medical device vigilance
10 system ~~“medical device vigilance system”~~ to monitor their products once they are on
11 the market (Cohen & Billingsley, 2011). Conversely, in the United States, a much
12 greater importance is given to pre-market approval (PMA), requiring clinical testing
13 to inform the market about safety and effectiveness. Nevertheless a much lighter ex-
14 post conformity assessment is in place. It must be noted however that the EU
15 Directives for the regulation of medical devices have been the object of relevant
16 amendments in recent years and, although the final document is not available yet, the
17 orientation is for more stringent clinical evidential requirements in the pre-market
18 phase (European Commission, DG Growth, 2016).

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, English (U.K.)

Formatted: Font: English (U.K.), Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: English (U.K.), Not Highlight

19 Nevertheless, medical devices have traditionally been less regulated than
20 pharmaceuticals and the amount of evidence collected for licensing medical devices is
21 generally lower (Fattore, Maniadakis, Mantovani, & Boriani, 2011; Schreyögg,
22 Bäumler, & Busse, 2009; Taylor & Iglesias, 2009). The EU directive in 2007 made
23 some significant changes in this respect by recognizing that it is necessary to enhance
24 the provisions on clinical evaluation, including clarification that clinical data are
25 generally required for all devices (2007/47/EC). Consequently, medical devices
26 placed on the EU market or put into service after March 21st 2010 must be in
27 conformity with these new requirements. However, in contrast to the requirements for
28 pharmaceuticals, due to peculiarity of medical devices, the studies can be small
29 clinical trials or even non randomized clinical investigation, and long term efficacy
30 data are not generally required in the premarketing phase, although a post market

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, English (U.S.)

~~clinical follow up is required~~ However, in contrast to the requirements for pharmaceuticals, the studies can be small clinical trials or even nonrandomized clinical investigations, and long-term efficacy data are not required, thus reducing the knowledge base for subsequent HTA activities.

A full HTA, such as that applied to pharmaceuticals in many EU member states, would require a thorough examination of the clinical and cost-effectiveness of devices. However, medical devices differ from other health technologies in a number of respects: i) they often change rapidly; ii) clinical outcomes often depend on the training, competence and experience of the end-user (Ramsay et al., 2001); iii) pricing is typically more dynamic than that of pharmaceuticals; iv) costs often comprise both procurement costs (including the associated infrastructure) and running costs (including maintenance and consumables).

It has been claimed that these special characteristics of devices raise additional challenges which require the HTA community to reflect on whether the current methods are adequate (Drummond, Griffin, & Tarricone, 2009). Three major features of devices deserve special attention: (i) the device-operator interaction can generate learning curve effects and thus risk biases in estimating the size of the benefits; (ii) the incremental nature of innovation (e.g., longer battery life, improvement of the software systems, miniaturisation) needs to be addressed by careful identification of the alternatives for comparative and incremental cost-effectiveness analysis (Fattore et al., 2011; Sorenson, Tarricone, Siebert, & Drummond, 2011; R. Tarricone & Drummond, 2011; Taylor & Iglesias, 2009) (iii) the broader organizational impact in terms of training and infrastructure, coupled with dynamic pricing, requires a more flexible approach to costing. Whether these differences between medical devices and pharmaceuticals require a different framework for HTA needs to be investigated.

1. The MedtecHTA project

The objective of MedtecHTA project was to investigate improvements in HTA methods to allow for more comprehensive economic evaluation of medical devices.

The project consisted of seven work packages (WPs), organized in three parts. (see Table 1.)

- TABLE 1 HERE ABOUT -

2.1 Cross country analysis of regulation and HTA of medical devices

Part 1 of the project was essentially preparatory and included the necessary groundwork for the subsequent research activities. WP 1 considered the available evidence on the currently adopted approaches for the HTA of medical devices and on international regulatory guidance on the licensing of medical devices. Tarricone et al (2014) reviewed regulatory practices in the EU, US and 5 other countries and concluded that a number of actions are required to make the clinical evidence gathered through the regulatory process more relevant to HTA. These include the development of international standards on the types of clinical evidence required for the market approval of medical devices and agreement on the balance of clinical data collection pre- and post-launch. The latter is important because of the possibility that, owing to the learning curve and the organizational impact of devices, data from pre-launch clinical trials may not be ideal for assessing effectiveness and cost-effectiveness.

Ciani et al (2015) reported the results of a cross-country analysis of HTA guidelines and available HTA reports on medical devices in assigned countries using a standardized template for comparison. In order to analyse the state of the art in the

1
2
3
4
5
6 application of guidelines reviewed, a sample of HTA reports was selected from the
7
8 University of York Centre for Reviews of Dissemination HTA database and
9
10 systematically reviewed at three levels (i) assessment of the nature of evidence
11
12 included in the reports (ii) HTA methods applied by reports considering medical
13
14 devices, and (iii) assessment of approaches and methods used to address uncertainty.
15
16 They found that although 75% of the agencies surveyed had adopted HTA-specific
17
18 approaches for medical devices, these were largely organizational or procedural in
19
20 nature. Only one agency had adopted methodological guidelines specific to medical
21
22 devices.

23
24 In the second paper in this supplement, Ciani et al (2016) focus on the second phase
25
26 of their research, in which they analysed a sample of HTA reports in the field of
27
28 cardiovascular disease in order to assess whether there are any key differences in how
29
30 methods are applied. They found that here were several differences, in the types of
31
32 clinical studies forming the basis for the HTAs, how the health problem and use of the
33
34 technology was considered, the description and technical characteristics of the
35
36 technology and the consideration of the organizational aspects of the use of the
37
38 technology. Most of these differences arose due to the relative 'complexities' in the
39
40 use of devices, in terms of the number of interacting components. These include the
41
42 number and difficulty of the actions required by those delivering or receiving the
43
44 intervention, the number of groups and organizational levels targeted by the
45
46 intervention, the number and variability of the outcomes and the degree of flexibility
47
48 or tailoring of the intervention.

51 *2.2 Geographical variation in the use of medical devices in the EU*

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Work Package 2 considered the geographical variation in the use of medical devices
7
8 in EU countries by estimating the rate of adoption of selected medical technologies in
9
10 the field of electrophysiology. This subspecialty of cardiology widely uses
11
12 implantable medical devices whose efficacy has been demonstrated by a number of
13
14 randomized clinical trials. In one respect these devices resemble pharmaceuticals as
15
16 they have a curative and/or a secondary prevention function and ~~can~~might be tested
17
18 in clinical trials similar to those conducted on drugs. On the other hand, they differ
19
20 from pharmaceuticals because they are subjected to incremental changes (e.g.
21
22 dimensions and software), learning curve effects due to device-operator interactions
23
24 and price dynamics which make trial designs similar to pharmaceuticals not always
25
26 suitable for medical devices. These overall characteristics make the area of
27
28 electrophysiology an interesting case to study.

29
30 Results obtained in this field also have a higher degree of transferability to other class
31
32 III medical devices. Through the analysis of national/local guidelines and data from
33
34 registries and administrative databases, rates of utilization were mapped to provide
35
36 evidence of different degrees of access within member states, and whether this
37
38 adoption is in line with the existing evidence on clinical and cost effectiveness.
39
40 Valzania et al (2015) reported a systematic review of the literature on implant rates
41
42 for cardiac implantable electrical devices (CIEDs) in Europe. They found that there
43
44 had been a recent rise in implant rates, with large geographic differences. For
45
46 example, the ratio between the regions with the highest and lowest implant rates
47
48 within the same country ranged from 1.3 and 3.4 for cardiac pacemakers, whereas the
49
50 ratio between the countries with the highest and lowest implant rates ranged from 2.3
51
52 and 87.5. The determinants of these differences (namely epidemiological, cultural,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 [and socio-economic factors](#)) were only partly explored and differences in study
7 methodology could be one reason for the reported differences.
8

9
10 Therefore, in a subsequent phase of the research, reported in the third paper in this
11 supplement, Torbica et al (2016a) undertook a new study of implant rates, the first to
12 use the national hospital discharge datasets available in 5 EU countries. They provide
13 evidence on differences in use of medical devices within and between member states,
14 investigate the determinants of differences in access to CIEDs, and assess the
15 potential and limitations of administrative databases for the analysis of utilization
16 rates of medical devices in electrophysiology.
17

18
19 It is the first international paper to explore simultaneously differences both between
20 countries and within the regions of those countries. [Results show that higher levels](#)
21 [of tertiary education among the labor force and % of aged population are positively](#)
22 [associated with implant rates of CIED. Regional per capita GDP and number of](#)
23 [implanting centers appear to have no significant effect. Institutional factors, captured](#)
24 [by fixed country effect, are shown to be important for the diffusion of CIED.](#)
25

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 ~~Regional per capita GDP appeared to have a small, but significant, effect on use of~~
41 ~~CIEDs. In addition, the % of residents having tertiary education, the age of the~~
42 ~~population and life expectancy were associated with higher implant rates. Increased~~
43 ~~competition (expressed in terms of the implant rates in each region), fostered the use~~
44 ~~of technologies.~~ However, even after controlling for clinical, epidemiological and
45 (crude) economic indicators, significant variation in implant rates still exist. They
46 argue that there should be closer examination of the role of organizational factors and
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 clinical preferences in the adoption of devices. These issues are explored further in
7
8 WP6 of the MedtechHTA project (discussed below).
9

10 11 *2.3 Methods for assessing the comparative effectiveness of medical devices* 12 13

14
15
16 The core part of the project (Part II) sought to develop an improved methodological
17
18 framework for conducting HTA of medical devices by acknowledging the
19
20 complexities which arise from their integration into clinical practice. The research
21
22 conducted in WP3, began by considering the approaches and methodologies used for
23
24 comparative effectiveness research by conducting a systematic review of the
25
26 methodological literature. It was found that, although most of the good research
27
28 practices in the evaluation of all health technologies apply to medical devices, the
29
30 interventions involving the use of medical devices should be considered as complex
31
32 interventions, owing to the importance of user and context independence. Therefore,
33
34 specific randomized controlled trial designs need to be considered, dealing with
35
36 surgeons' and patients' preferences, incremental product development and user
37
38 dependence. In addition, high quality disease- or device-based registries are needed to
39
40 assess safety and long-term effectiveness (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016a).

41
42 This preliminary research activity provided the basis for the development of improved
43
44 methods for evaluating comparative effectiveness of medical devices including
45
46 recommendations for analytic methods and data collection. The research was an
47
48 important input to the development of guidelines for the evaluation of Therapeutic
49
50 Medical Devices under the auspices of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 (EUnetHTA,
51
52 2015).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The framework and new methodological approaches were then tested on medical
7 devices at different stages of development and diffusion within the health care system.
8
9
10 First, the use of a method of evidence synthesis that allows for the meta-analysis of
11 RCT and observational data, using bias adjustment based on a formal elicitation
12 exercise involving experts, was explored in the case of total hip replacement. This is
13 reported in the fourth paper in this supplement (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016b).
14
15
16
17

18 19 20 *2.4 Methods for the economic evaluation of medical devices*

21 Work Package 4 focused on exploring different methods for economic evaluation of
22 medical devices currently adopted in EU countries in order to make suggestions about
23 the development of new methods and offer guidance on future directions in the use of
24 economic evaluation for medical devices. The first part of the research considered
25 how differences in culture and values in EU countries lead to differences in the
26 methodology and use of economic evaluation for policy decisions such as coverage
27 and reimbursement without distinguishing between health technologies (e.g.
28 pharmaceuticals and medical devices). For example, in northern Europe, economic
29 evaluation is widely used in decisions about the reimbursement of new health
30 technologies and cost-utility analysis (with the quality-adjusted life-year as the
31 primary measure of benefit) is the predominant approach. In UK, the National
32 institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (2011) has differentiated between health
33 technologies and has developed the Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme to
34 specifically assess medical devices and diagnostics. In contrast, in central and
35 southern Europe, there is more resistance to the use of economic evaluation in
36 decision making and, where it is used, benefits are more often assessed in terms of
37 clinical added value. In these countries however no distinction is made between health
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

1
2
3
4
5
6 technologies and policy decisions on coverage and reimbursement of medical devices
7 are generally not subject to any type of economic analysis. -This part of the research
8
9 provided useful insights into the potential for increasing the use of economic
10 evaluation in various EU member states (Torbica et al, 2016b).

11
12
13
14 The second part of the research, reported in the fifth paper of this supplement
15 (Tarricone et al, 2016a) used two case studies of implantable cardiac devices in order
16 to demonstrate current, and possible future approaches to the use of economic
17 evaluation. The case studies, implantable ~~converter~~ cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs)
18 and transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) were chosen in order to explore a
19 wide range of device characteristics, including the significance of irreversible
20 decisions and the complexity associated with evolving technologies. Most of the
21 published economic evaluations and HTA reports located in the literature review did
22 not take account of the special features of medical devices (i.e. learning curves,
23 incremental innovation, dynamic pricing and organizational aspects) in the base case
24 analysis, but were sometimes considered in sensitivity analyses. Overall, the
25 conclusion was that the existing economic evaluations did not pay enough attention to
26 the specific characteristics of devices explored in the MedtecHTA project.
27
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 Finally, building on the findings of both WP3 and WP4, the impact of the learning
40 curve on effectiveness and cost was estimated for endovascular aneurysm repair
41 (EVAR) and fenestrated EVAR (fEVAR). This research is reported in the sixth paper
42 in this supplement (Varabyova et al, 2016). It was found that, in the case of EVAR
43 there was a moderate, but significant effect of learning on both in-hospital mortality
44 and hospital length of stay. The same impact was not found for fEVAR, one reason
45 for which could be its similarity to EVAR, meaning that much of the learning in
46 EVAR was transferable to the new procedure
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

2.5 *Uncertainty in the economic evaluation of medical devices*

Work Package 5 focused on characterizing uncertainty in the economic evaluation of medical devices and determining future research needs. This research, reported in the seventh paper in this supplement (Rothery et al, 2016), sets out a number of conceptual issues when dealing with uncertainty and the value of research in the context of some of the specific characteristics of devices such as learning curve effects, incremental device innovation and dynamic pricing. It uses value of information analysis to explore the optimal timing of reimbursement decisions and the suitability of conditional coverage decisions, such as ‘only in research’ and ‘approval with research’.

Such conditional reimbursement policies are now becoming popular in a number of countries, given the growing recognition that, for medical devices, there will always be considerable evidence gaps, particularly in evidence on effectiveness. As in the other WPs, a case study is chosen to illustrate the use of methods at different stages of device development and diffusion. The example chosen is enhanced external counterpulsation (EECP), a device used to provide symptomatic relief from chronic refractory angina, where the existence of substantial irrecoverable costs and price changes have a substantial impact on coverage decisions.

2.6 *Organizational impact of medical devices*

The final methodological issue investigated in the MedtechHTA project was the organizational impact of medical devices. In this part of the project the aim was to propose a methodology that will allow for incorporating organizational issues in a broader HTA framework. A systematic review of the literature was conducted, which

1
2
3
4
5
6 was used to develop a large (54 item) survey of cardiologists, conducted in
7
8 collaboration with the European Society of Cardiology. The objective was to explore
9
10 the role of physicians' motivation and organizational factors in the adoption and
11
12 diffusion of medical devices. The survey focused on 7 different catheter-based or
13
14 implantable cardiovascular devices. Multivariate hierarchical modeling was used to
15
16 determine the associations between the various motivational and organizational
17
18 factors and device diffusion and use. This research is reported in the eighth paper in
19
20 this supplement (Hatz et al, 2016).
21
22
23

24 **2. Dissemination of project findings**

25
26 In the final phase of the project (Part III), the findings and results from the previous
27
28 phases were collated into a final report (WP7), which provides recommendations for
29
30 decision-makers, in formulating health policy, within the medical devices industry, as
31
32 well as in the management of health care organizations. In addition, recommendations
33
34 on developments in methodology were made for the scientific community. These
35
36 recommendations are summarized in the final paper in this supplement (Tarricone et
37
38 al, 2016b). These are divided into; recommendations for policy, recommendations for
39
40 methods and recommendations for further research.
41

42 Taken together, the papers in this supplement represent a comprehensive report of all
43
44 the main findings of the MedtecHTA project and give references to other published
45
46 outputs for the project. It is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy
47
48 makers requiring information on the project.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Boriani, G., Biffi, M., Martignani, C., Diemberger, I., Valzania, C., Bertini, M., & Branzi, A. (2009). Expenditure and value for money: the challenge of implantable cardioverter defibrillators. *QJM*, *102*(5), 349-356. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcp025

Boriani, G., Maniadakis, N., Auricchio, A., & Vardas, P. (2010). Health economics and outcomes research: a new challenge and field of action for the European Heart Rhythm Association. *Europace*, *12*(5), 601-603. doi:10.1093/europace/euq028

Ciani, O., Wilcher, B., Blankart, C. R., Hatz, M., Rupel, V. P., Erker, R. S., . . . Taylor, R. S. (2015). HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT OF MEDICAL DEVICES: A SURVEY OF NON-EUROPEAN UNION AGENCIES. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*, *31*(03), 154-165. doi:10.1017/s0266462315000185

Cohen, D., & Billingsley, M. (2011). Europeans are left to their own devices. *BMJ*, *342*(may13 2), d2748-d2748. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2748

[Directive 2007/47/EC of the European parliament and of the Council of 5 September 2007 \(2007\). Official Journal of the European Union, 21 September 2007 \[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:247:0021:0055:en:PDF; accessed July 23rd 2016\].](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:247:0021:0055:en:PDF)

Drummond, M., Griffin, A., & Tarricone, R. (2009). Economic Evaluation for Devices and Drugs—Same or Different? *Value in Health*, *12*(4), 402-404. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00476_1.x

[EUnetHTA \(2015\). Therapeutic medical devices \[https://eunethta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/The%20rapeutic%20medical%20devices%20Guideline%20Final%20Nov%202015.pdf; accessed July 23rd 2016\].](https://eunethta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/The%20rapeutic%20medical%20devices%20Guideline%20Final%20Nov%202015.pdf)

[European Commission, DG Growth \(2016\) http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/medical-devices/regulatory-framework/revision_en \[accessed 23rd July 2016\].](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/medical-devices/regulatory-framework/revision_en)

Fattore, G., Maniadakis, N., Mantovani, L. G., & Boriani, G. (2011). Health technology assessment: what is it? Current status and perspectives in the field of electrophysiology. *Europace*, *13*(suppl 2), ii49-ii53. doi:10.1093/europace/eur083

[National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence \(NICE\) \(2011\). Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme. Methods Guide. London: NICE \[https://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/NICE-guidance/NICE-medical-technologies/Medical-technologies-evaluation-programme-methods-guide.pdf; accessed July 23rd 2016\].](https://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/NICE-guidance/NICE-medical-technologies/Medical-technologies-evaluation-programme-methods-guide.pdf)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Italian (Italy), Do not check spelling or grammar

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Italian (Italy), Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar, Superscript

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar, Superscript

Formatted: Italian (Italy), Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Auto, English (U.S.), Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar, Superscript

Ramsay, C. R., Grant, A. M., Wallace, S. A., Garthwaite, P. H., Monk, A. F., & Russell, I. T. (2001). Statistical assessment of the learning curves of health technologies. *Health Technology Assessment*, 5(12). doi:10.3310/hta5120

Schreyögg, J., Bäumlner, M., & Busse, R. (2009). Balancing adoption and affordability of medical devices in Europe. *Health Policy*, 92(2-3), 218-224. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.03.016

Sorenson, C., Tarricone, R., Siebert, M., & Drummond, M. (2011). Applying health economics for policy decision making: do devices differ from drugs? *Europace*, 13(suppl 2), ii54-ii58. doi:10.1093/europace/eur089

Tarricone, R., & Drummond, M. (2011). Challenges in the clinical and economic evaluation of medical devices: The case of transcatheter aortic valve implantation. *Journal of Medical Marketing: Device, Diagnostic and Pharmaceutical Marketing*, 11(3), 221-229. doi:10.1177/1745790411412242

Tarricone, R., Torbica, A., Ferré, F., & Drummond, M. (2014). Generating appropriate clinical data for value assessment of medical devices: what role does regulation play? *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research*, 14(5), 707-718. doi:10.1586/14737167.2014.950233

Taylor, R. S., & Iglesias, C. P. (2009). Assessing the Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness of Medical Devices and Drugs: Are They That Different? *Value in Health*, 12(4), 404-406. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00476_2.x

Valzania, C., Torbica, A., Tarricone, R., Leyva, F., & Boriani, G. (2015). Implant rates of cardiac implantable electrical devices in Europe: A systematic literature review. *Health Policy*. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.11.001

Ciani O et al (2016). This supplement.

Torbica A et al (2016a). This supplement.

Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016a). (~~Under submission~~ This supplement)

Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016b). This supplement.

Torbica A et al (2016b). (~~Under submission~~ This supplement)

Tarricone R et al (2016a). This supplement.

Varaboyova Y et al (2016). This supplement.

Rothery C et al (2016). This supplement.

Hatz M et al (2016). This supplement.

Tarricone et al (2016b). This supplement.

Formatted: Italian (Italy), Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Italian (Italy), Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Table 1 Overview of project work plan

Parts of the overall project	Work packages included
I: Cross-country analysis of HTA practices and utilization of medical devices	WP 1 Cross-country Analysis of HTA
	WP 2 Geographic variation in access to medical devices
II: Methodological issues in HTA of medical devices	WP 3 Comparative effectiveness of medical devices
	WP 4 Economic evaluation of medical devices: overview of different approaches
	WP 5 Uncertainty and Value of Information for medical devices
	WP 6 Organizational impact of medical devices
III: Conclusions, synthesis and recommendations	WP 7 Recommendations on HTA methods for medical devices

1
2
3 **Challenges in the Assessment of Medical Devices: the MedtecHTA project**
4
5
6

7
8 Keywords: MedtecHTA, medical devices, Health Technology Assessment, economic
9
10 evaluation, methods
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

ABSTRACT

Assessing medical devices (MDs) raises challenges which require us to reflect on whether current methods are adequate. Major features of devices are: (i) device-operator interaction can generate learning curve effects; (ii) incremental nature of innovation needs to be addressed by careful identification of the alternatives for comparative and incremental cost-effectiveness analysis) (iii) broader organizational impact in terms of training and infrastructure, coupled with dynamic pricing, requires a more flexible approach to costing.

The objective of the MedtecHTA project was to investigate improvements in HTA methods to allow for more comprehensive evaluation of MDs. It consisted of several work packages concerning i) the available evidence on the currently adopted approaches for regulation and HTA of medical devices; ii) the geographical variation in access to MDs; iii) the development of methodological frameworks for conducting comparative effectiveness research and economic evaluation of MDs; iv) the organizational impact of MDs.

This introductory paper summarises the main results of the project and draws out the main overarching themes. This supplement represents a comprehensive report of all the main findings of the MedtecHTA project and it is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy makers wanting information on the project.

1. Background to the MedtechHTA project

Health technology assessment (HTA) has become increasingly important in health care decision-making in Europe. Although in principle HTA can be applied to all health technologies, its major use in a decision-making context has been in the pricing and reimbursement of pharmaceuticals. However, there are over 200,000 medical devices on the European market (Fraser et al, 2011). These represent a very heterogeneous family of technologies that needs to be better classified for the purpose of HTA. “Medical device”, according to the EU Directive (2007) 2007/47/EC amending Council Directive 93/42/EEC, is defined as “any instrument, apparatus, appliance, software, material or other article, whether used alone or in combination... to be used for human beings for the purpose of diagnosis, prevention, treatment, monitoring or alleviation of disease”.

While some devices require very simplified assessment, others need to be assessed through a full evaluation of safety, efficacy, effectiveness and economic impact. A thorough HTA would require consideration of final outcomes in terms of life expectancy and health-related quality of life, going far beyond the assessment that devices currently undergo to obtain a CE (European Conformity) mark, to enable them to be marketed in the European Union. This is particularly true for implantable devices used in cardiology (Boriani et al., 2009; Boriani, Maniadakis, Auricchio, & Vardas, 2010; R. Tarricone & Drummond, 2011), which represent the main focus of the MedtechHTA project.

The current EU legal framework already requires for all devices, especially for class III devices, to have safety and performance testing for decision on CE mark.. Essentially, manufacturers must accomplish a conformity assessment and undergo an inspection and certification procedure by one of the Notified Bodies within the EU. In

1
2
3 addition, there is stringent post-marketing surveillance, requiring manufacturers of
4 devices to implement a post market clinical follow up plan and a medical device
5 vigilance system to monitor their products once they are on the market (Cohen &
6 Billingsley, 2011). Conversely, in the United States, a much greater importance is
7 given to pre-market approval (PMA), requiring clinical testing to inform the market
8 about safety and effectiveness. Nevertheless a much lighter ex-post conformity
9 assessment is in place. It must be noted however that the EU Directives for the
10 regulation of medical devices have been the object of relevant amendments in recent
11 years and, although the final document is not available yet, the orientation is for more
12 stringent clinical evidential requirements in the pre-market phase (European
13 Commission, DG Growth, 2016).

14
15 Nevertheless, medical devices have traditionally been less regulated than
16 pharmaceuticals and the amount of evidence collected for licensing medical devices is
17 generally lower (Fattore, Maniadakis, Mantovani, & Boriani, 2011; Schreyögg,
18 Bäumlner, & Busse, 2009; Taylor & Iglesias, 2009). The EU directive in 2007 made
19 some significant changes in this respect by recognizing that it is necessary to enhance
20 the provisions on clinical evaluation, including clarification that clinical data are
21 generally required for all devices (2007/47/EC). Consequently, medical devices
22 placed on the EU market or put into service after March 21st 2010 must be in
23 conformity with these new requirements. However, in contrast to the requirements for
24 pharmaceuticals, due to peculiarity of medical devices, the studies can be small
25 clinical trials or even non randomized clinical investigation, and long term efficacy
26 data are not generally required in the premarketing phase, although a post market
27 clinical follow up is required, thus reducing the knowledge base for subsequent HTA
28 activities.

1
2
3 A full HTA, such as that applied to pharmaceuticals in many EU member states,
4
5 would require a thorough examination of the clinical and cost-effectiveness of
6
7 devices. However, medical devices differ from other health technologies in a number
8
9 of respects: i) they often change rapidly; ii) clinical outcomes often depend on the
10
11 training, competence and experience of the end-user (Ramsay et al., 2001); iii) pricing
12
13 is typically more dynamic than that of pharmaceuticals; iv) costs often comprise both
14
15 procurement costs (including the associated infrastructure) and running costs
16
17 (including maintenance and consumables).
18
19

20
21 It has been claimed that these special characteristics of devices raise additional
22
23 challenges which require the HTA community to reflect on whether the current
24
25 methods are adequate (Drummond, Griffin, & Tarricone, 2009). Three major features
26
27 of devices deserve special attention: (i) the device-operator interaction can generate
28
29 learning curve effects and thus risk biases in estimating the size of the benefits; (ii)
30
31 the incremental nature of innovation (e.g., longer battery life, improvement of the
32
33 software systems, miniaturisation) needs to be addressed by careful identification of
34
35 the alternatives for comparative and incremental cost-effectiveness analysis (Fattore
36
37 et al., 2011; Sorenson, Tarricone, Siebert, & Drummond, 2011; R. Tarricone &
38
39 Drummond, 2011; Taylor & Iglesias, 2009) (iii) the broader organizational impact in
40
41 terms of training and infrastructure, coupled with dynamic pricing, requires a more
42
43 flexible approach to costing. Whether these differences between medical devices and
44
45 pharmaceuticals require a different framework for HTA needs to be investigated.
46
47
48
49

50 51 52 **1. The MedtecHTA project** 53

54
55 The objective of MedtecHTA project was to investigate improvements in HTA
56
57 methods to allow for more comprehensive economic evaluation of medical devices.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The project consisted of seven work packages (WPs), organized in three parts. (see
4
5 Table 1.)
6

7 - TABLE 1 HERE ABOUT -
8
9

10 11 12 *2.1 Cross country analysis of regulation and HTA of medical devices*

13
14 Part 1 of the project was essentially preparatory and included the necessary
15
16 groundwork for the subsequent research activities. WP 1 considered the available
17
18 evidence on the currently adopted approaches for the HTA of medical devices and on
19
20 international regulatory guidance on the licensing of medical devices. Tarricone et al
21
22 (2014) reviewed regulatory practices in the EU, US and 5 other countries and
23
24 concluded that a number of actions are required to make the clinical evidence
25
26 gathered through the regulatory process more relevant to HTA. These include the
27
28 development of international standards on the types of clinical evidence required for
29
30 the market approval of medical devices and agreement on the balance of clinical data
31
32 collection pre- and post-launch. The latter is important because of the possibility that,
33
34 owing to the learning curve and the organizational impact of devices, data from pre-
35
36 launch clinical trials may not be ideal for assessing effectiveness and cost-
37
38 effectiveness.
39
40
41
42

43
44 Ciani et al (2015) reported the results of a cross-country analysis of HTA guidelines
45
46 and available HTA reports on medical devices in assigned countries using a
47
48 standardized template for comparison. In order to analyse the state of the art in the
49
50 application of guidelines reviewed, a sample of HTA reports was selected from the
51
52 University of York Centre for Reviews of Dissemination HTA database and
53
54 systematically reviewed at three levels (i) assessment of the nature of evidence
55
56 included in the reports (ii) HTA methods applied by reports considering medical
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 devices, and (iii) assessment of approaches and methods used to address uncertainty.
4
5 They found that although 75% of the agencies surveyed had adopted HTA-specific
6
7 approaches for medical devices, these were largely organizational or procedural in
8
9 nature. Only one agency had adopted methodological guidelines specific to medical
10
11 devices.
12

13
14 In the second paper in this supplement, Ciani et al (2016) focus on the second phase
15
16 of their research, in which they analysed a sample of HTA reports in the field of
17
18 cardiovascular disease in order to assess whether there are any key differences in how
19
20 methods are applied. They found that here were several differences, in the types of
21
22 clinical studies forming the basis for the HTAs, how the health problem and use of the
23
24 technology was considered, the description and technical characteristics of the
25
26 technology and the consideration of the organizational aspects of the use of the
27
28 technology. Most of these differences arose due to the relative ‘complexities’ in the
29
30 use of devices, in terms of the number of interacting components. These include the
31
32 number and difficulty of the actions required by those delivering or receiving the
33
34 intervention, the number of groups and organizational levels targeted by the
35
36 intervention, the number and variability of the outcomes and the degree of flexibility
37
38 or tailoring of the intervention.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *2.2 Geographical variation in the use of medical devices in the EU*

46

47 Work Package 2 considered the geographical variation in the use of medical devices
48
49 in EU countries by estimating the rate of adoption of selected medical technologies in
50
51 the field of electrophysiology. This subspecialty of cardiology widely uses
52
53 implantable medical devices whose efficacy has been demonstrated by a number of
54
55 randomized clinical trials. In one respect these devices resemble pharmaceuticals as
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they have a curative and/or a secondary prevention function and might be tested in
4 clinical trials similar to those conducted on drugs. On the other hand, they differ from
5 pharmaceuticals because they are subjected to incremental changes (e.g. dimensions
6 and software), learning curve effects due to device-operator interactions and price
7 dynamics which make trial designs similar to pharmaceuticals not always suitable for
8 medical devices. These overall characteristics make the area of electrophysiology an
9 interesting case to study.

10
11 Results obtained in this field also have a higher degree of transferability to other class
12 III medical devices. Through the analysis of national/local guidelines and data from
13 registries and administrative databases, rates of utilization were mapped to provide
14 evidence of different degrees of access within member states, and whether this
15 adoption is in line with the existing evidence on clinical and cost effectiveness.
16
17 Valzania et al (2015) reported a systematic review of the literature on implant rates
18 for cardiac implantable electrical devices (CIEDs) in Europe. They found that there
19 had been a recent rise in implant rates, with large geographic differences. For
20 example, the ratio between the regions with the highest and lowest implant rates
21 within the same country ranged from 1.3 and 3.4 for cardiac pacemakers, whereas the
22 ratio between the countries with the highest and lowest implant rates ranged from 2.3
23 and 87.5. The determinants of these differences (namely **epidemiological, cultural,**
24 **and socio-economic factors**) were only partly explored and differences in study
25 methodology could be one reason for the reported differences.

26
27 Therefore, in a subsequent phase of the research, reported in the third paper in this
28 supplement, Torbica et al (2016a) undertook a new study of implant rates, the first to
29 use the national hospital discharge datasets available in 5 EU countries. They provide
30 evidence on differences in use of medical devices within and between member states,
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 investigate the determinants of differences in access to CIEDs, and assess the
4 potential and limitations of administrative databases for the analysis of utilization
5 rates of medical devices in electrophysiology.
6
7
8

9
10 It is the first international paper to explore simultaneously differences both between
11 countries and within the regions of those countries. Results show that **higher levels of**
12 **tertiary education among the labor force and % of aged population are positively**
13 **associated with implant rates of CIED. Regional per capita GDP and number of**
14 **implanting centers appear to have no significant effect. Institutional factors, captured**
15 **by fixed country effect, are shown to be important for the diffusion of CIED.**
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 However, even after controlling for clinical, epidemiological and (crude) economic
28 indicators, significant variation in implant rates still exist. They argue that there
29 should be closer examination of the role of organizational factors and clinical
30 preferences in the adoption of devices. These issues are explored further in WP6 of
31 the MedtechHTA project (discussed below).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *2.3 Methods for assessing the comparative effectiveness of medical devices*

42
43
44

45 The core part of the project (Part II) sought to develop an improved methodological
46 framework for conducting HTA of medical devices by acknowledging the
47 complexities which arise from their integration into clinical practice. The research
48 conducted in WP3, began by considering the approaches and methodologies used for
49 comparative effectiveness research by conducting a systematic review of the
50 methodological literature. It was found that, although most of the good research
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practices in the evaluation of all health technologies apply to medical devices, the
4
5 interventions involving the use of medical devices should be considered as complex
6
7 interventions, owing to the importance of user and context independence. Therefore,
8
9 specific randomized controlled trial designs need to be considered, dealing with
10
11 surgeons' and patients' preferences, incremental product development and user
12
13 dependence. In addition, high quality disease- or device-based registries are needed to
14
15 assess safety and long-term effectiveness (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016a).

16
17
18 This preliminary research activity provided the basis for the development of improved
19
20 methods for evaluating comparative effectiveness of medical devices including
21
22 recommendations for analytic methods and data collection. The research was an
23
24 important input to the development of guidelines for the evaluation of Therapeutic
25
26 Medical Devices under the auspices of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 (EUnetHTA,
27
28 2015).

29
30
31 The framework and new methodological approaches were then tested on medical
32
33 devices at different stages of development and diffusion within the health care system.
34
35 First, the use of a method of evidence synthesis that allows for the meta-analysis of
36
37 RCT and observational data, using bias adjustment based on a formal elicitation
38
39 exercise involving experts, was explored in the case of total hip replacement. This is
40
41 reported in the fourth paper in this supplement (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016b).

42 43 44 45 46 47 *2.4 Methods for the economic evaluation of medical devices*

48
49 Work Package 4 focused on exploring different methods for economic evaluation of
50
51 medical devices currently adopted in EU countries in order to make suggestions about
52
53 the development of new methods and offer guidance on future directions in the use of
54
55 economic evaluation for medical devices. The first part of the research considered
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how differences in culture and values in EU countries lead to differences in the
4 methodology and use of economic evaluation for policy decisions such as coverage
5 and reimbursement without distinguishing between health technologies (e.g.
6 pharmaceuticals and medical devices). For example, in northern Europe, economic
7 evaluation is widely used in decisions about the reimbursement of new health
8 technologies and cost-utility analysis (with the quality-adjusted life-year as the
9 primary measure of benefit) is the predominant approach. In UK, the National
10 institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (2011) has differentiated between health
11 technologies and has developed the Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme to
12 specifically assess medical devices and diagnostics. In contrast, in central and
13 southern Europe, there is more resistance to the use of economic evaluation in
14 decision making and, where it is used, benefits are more often assessed in terms of
15 clinical added value. In these countries however no distinction is made between health
16 technologies and policy decisions on coverage and reimbursement of medical devices
17 are generally not subject to any type of economic analysis. This part of the research
18 provided useful insights into the potential for increasing the use of economic
19 evaluation in various EU member states (Torbica et al, 2016b).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 The second part of the research, reported in the fifth paper of this supplement
42 (Tarricone et al, 2016a) used two case studies of implantable cardiac devices in order
43 to demonstrate current, and possible future approaches to the use of economic
44 evaluation. The case studies, implantable cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs) and
45 transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) were chosen in order to explore a wide
46 range of device characteristics, including the significance of irreversible decisions and
47 the complexity associated with evolving technologies. Most of the published
48 economic evaluations and HTA reports located in the literature review did not take
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 account of the special features of medical devices (i.e. learning curves, incremental
4 innovation, dynamic pricing and organizational aspects) in the base case analysis, but
5 were sometimes considered in sensitivity analyses. Overall, the conclusion was that
6 the existing economic evaluations did not pay enough attention to the specific
7 characteristics of devices explored in the MedtecHTA project.
8

9
10 Finally, building on the findings of both WP3 and WP4, the impact of the learning
11 curve on effectiveness and cost was estimated for endovascular aneurysm repair
12 (EVAR) and fenestrated EVAR (fEVAR). This research is reported in the sixth paper
13 in this supplement (Varabyova et al, 2016). It was found that, in the case of EVAR
14 there was a moderate, but significant effect of learning on both in-hospital mortality
15 and hospital length of stay. The same impact was not found for fEVAR, one reason
16 for which could be its similarity to EVAR, meaning that much of the learning in
17 EVAR was transferable to the new procedure.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 *2.5 Uncertainty in the economic evaluation of medical devices*

35
36 Work Package 5 focused on characterizing uncertainty in the economic evaluation of
37 medical devices and determining future research needs. This research, reported in the
38 seventh paper in this supplement (Rothery et al, 2016), sets out a number of
39 conceptual issues when dealing with uncertainty and the value of research in the
40 context of some of the specific characteristics of devices such as learning curve
41 effects, incremental device innovation and dynamic pricing. It uses value of
42 information analysis to explore the optimal timing of reimbursement decisions and the
43 suitability of conditional coverage decisions, such as ‘only in research’ and ‘approval
44 with research’.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Such conditional reimbursement policies are now becoming popular in a number of
4
5 countries, given the growing recognition that, for medical devices, there will always
6
7 be considerable evidence gaps, particularly in evidence on effectiveness. As in the
8
9 other WPs, a case study is chosen to illustrate the use of methods at different stages of
10
11 device development and diffusion. The example chosen is enhanced external
12
13 counterpulsation (EECP), a device used to provide symptomatic relief from chronic
14
15 refractory angina, where the existence of substantial irrecoverable costs and price
16
17 changes have a substantial impact on coverage decisions.
18
19

20 21 22 23 *2.6 Organizational impact of medical devices*

24
25 The final methodological issue investigated in the MedtecHTA project was the
26
27 organizational impact of medical devices. In this part of the project the aim was to
28
29 propose a methodology that will allow for incorporating organizational issues in a
30
31 broader HTA framework. A systematic review of the literature was conducted, which
32
33 was used to develop a large (54 item) survey of cardiologists, conducted in
34
35 collaboration with the European Society of Cardiology. The objective was to explore
36
37 the role of physicians' motivation and organizational factors in the adoption and
38
39 diffusion of medical devices. The survey focused on 7 different catheter-based or
40
41 implantable cardiovascular devices. Multivariate hierarchical modeling was used to
42
43 determine the associations between the various motivational and organizational
44
45 factors and device diffusion and use. This research is reported in the eighth paper in
46
47 this supplement (Hatz et al, 2016).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **2. Dissemination of project findings**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the final phase of the project (Part III), the findings and results from the previous
4 phases were collated into a final report (WP7), which provides recommendations for
5 decision-makers, in formulating health policy, within the medical devices industry, as
6 well as in the management of health care organizations. In addition, recommendations
7 on developments in methodology were made for the scientific community. These
8 recommendations are summarized in the final paper in this supplement (Tarricone et
9 al, 2016b). These are divided into; recommendations for policy, recommendations for
10 methods and recommendations for further research.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Taken together, the papers in this supplement represent a comprehensive report of all
21 the main findings of the MedtecHTA project and give references to other published
22 outputs for the project. It is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy
23 makers requiring information on the project.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Boriani, G., Biffi, M., Martignani, C., Diemberger, I., Valzania, C., Bertini, M., & Branzi, A. (2009). Expenditure and value for money: the challenge of implantable cardioverter defibrillators. *QJM*, *102*(5), 349-356. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcp025
- Boriani, G., Maniadakis, N., Auricchio, A., & Vardas, P. (2010). Health economics and outcomes research: a new challenge and field of action for the European Heart Rhythm Association. *Europace*, *12*(5), 601-603. doi:10.1093/europace/euq028
- Ciani, O., Wilcher, B., Blankart, C. R., Hatz, M., Rupel, V. P., Erker, R. S., . . . Taylor, R. S. (2015). HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT OF MEDICAL DEVICES: A SURVEY OF NON-EUROPEAN UNION AGENCIES. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*, *31*(03), 154-165. doi:10.1017/s0266462315000185
- Cohen, D., & Billingsley, M. (2011). Europeans are left to their own devices. *BMJ*, *342*(may13 2), d2748-d2748. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2748
- Directive 2007/47/EC of the European parliament and and of the Council of 5 September 2007 (2007). Official Journal of the European Union, 21 September 2007 [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:247:0021:0055:en:PDF; accessed July 23rd 2016].
- Drummond, M., Griffin, A., & Tarricone, R. (2009). Economic Evaluation for Devices and Drugs—Same or Different? *Value in Health*, *12*(4), 402-404. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00476_1.x
- EUnetHTA (2015). Therapeutic medical devices [https://eunethta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/The_rapeutic%20medical%20devices_Guideline_Final%20Nov%202015.pdf; accessed July 23rd, 2016].
- European Commission, DG Growth (2016) http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/medical-devices/regulatory-framework/revision_en [accessed 23rd July 2016].
- Fattore, G., Maniadakis, N., Mantovani, L. G., & Boriani, G. (2011). Health technology assessment: what is it? Current status and perspectives in the field of electrophysiology. *Europace*, *13*(suppl 2), ii49-ii53. doi:10.1093/europace/eur083
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) (2011). Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme. Methods Guide. London: NICE [https://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/NICE-guidance/NICE-medical-technologies/Medical-technologies-evaluation-programme-methods-guide.pdf; accessed July 23rd 2016]

- 1
2
3 Ramsay, C. R., Grant, A. M., Wallace, S. A., Garthwaite, P. H., Monk, A. F., &
4 Russell, I. T. (2001). Statistical assessment of the learning curves of health
5 technologies. *Health Technology Assessment*, 5(12). doi:10.3310/hta5120
6
- 7 Schreyögg, J., Bäumlner, M., & Busse, R. (2009). Balancing adoption and affordability
8 of medical devices in Europe. *Health Policy*, 92(2-3), 218-224.
9 doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.03.016
10
- 11 Sorenson, C., Tarricone, R., Siebert, M., & Drummond, M. (2011). Applying health
12 economics for policy decision making: do devices differ from drugs?
13 *Europace*, 13(suppl 2), ii54-ii58. doi:10.1093/europace/eur089
14
- 15 Tarricone, R., & Drummond, M. (2011). Challenges in the clinical and economic
16 evaluation of medical devices: The case of transcatheter aortic valve
17 implantation. *Journal of Medical Marketing: Device, Diagnostic and*
18 *Pharmaceutical Marketing*, 11(3), 221-229. doi:10.1177/1745790411412242
19
- 20 Tarricone, R., Torbica, A., Ferré, F., & Drummond, M. (2014). Generating
21 appropriate clinical data for value assessment of medical devices: what role
22 does regulation play? *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes*
23 *Research*, 14(5), 707-718. doi:10.1586/14737167.2014.950233
24
- 25 Taylor, R. S., & Iglesias, C. P. (2009). Assessing the Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness
26 of Medical Devices and Drugs: Are They That Different? *Value in Health*,
27 12(4), 404-406. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00476_2.x
28
- 29 Valzania, C., Torbica, A., Tarricone, R., Leyva, F., & Boriani, G. (2015). Implant
30 rates of cardiac implantable electrical devices in Europe: A systematic
31 literature review. *Health Policy*. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.11.001
32
33
34
35
36
- 37 Ciani O et al (2016). This supplement.
38
- 39 Torbica A et al (2016a). This supplement.
40
- 41 Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016a). (This supplement)
42
- 43 Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016b). This supplement.
44
- 45 Torbica A et al (2016b). (This supplement)
46
- 47 Tarricone R et al (2016a). This supplement.
48
- 49 Varaboyova Y et al (2016). This supplement.
50
- 51 Rothery C et al (2016). This supplement.
52
- 53 Hatz M et al (2016). This supplement.
54
- 55 Tarricone et al (2016b). This supplement.
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Overview of project work plan

Parts of the overall project	Work packages included
I: Cross-country analysis of HTA practices and utilization of medical devices	WP 1 Cross-country Analysis of HTA
	WP 2 Geographic variation in access to medical devices
II: Methodological issues in HTA of medical devices	WP 3 Comparative effectiveness of medical devices
	WP 4 Economic evaluation of medical devices: overview of different approaches
	WP 5 Uncertainty and Value of Information for medical devices
	WP 6 Organizational impact of medical devices
III: Conclusions, synthesis and recommendations	WP 7 Recommendations on HTA methods for medical devices