

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

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/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 MedtecHTA 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 **Challenges in the Assessment of Medical Devices: the MedtecHTA project**
7
8
910 Keywords: MedtecHTA, medical devices, Health Technology Assessment, economic
11 evaluation, methods
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

1
2
3
4
5
6 ABSTRACT
7

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

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

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 1. Background to the MedtecHTA project 7 8

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

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

29
30 [The current EU legal framework already requires for all devices, especially for class](#)
31 [III devices, to have safety and performance testing for decision on CE mark.](#) [The](#)
32 [current EU legal framework already requires all high risk devices \(class III\) to have](#)
33 [safety and performance testing for decisions on market authorization.](#) Essentially,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6 ~~clinical follow up is required. However, in contrast to the requirements for~~
7 ~~pharmaceuticals, the studies can be small clinical trials or even nonrandomized~~
8 ~~clinical investigations, and long term efficacy data are not required~~, thus reducing the
9 knowledge base for subsequent HTA activities.
10
11

12
13 A full HTA, such as that applied to pharmaceuticals in many EU member states,
14 would require a thorough examination of the clinical and cost-effectiveness of
15 devices. However, medical devices differ from other health technologies in a number
16 of respects: i) they often change rapidly; ii) clinical outcomes often depend on the
17 training, competence and experience of the end-user (Ramsay et al., 2001); iii) pricing
18 is typically more dynamic than that of pharmaceuticals; iv) costs often comprise both
19 procurement costs (including the associated infrastructure) and running costs
20 (including maintenance and consumables).
21
22

23 It has been claimed that these special characteristics of devices raise additional
24 challenges which require the HTA community to reflect on whether the current
25 methods are adequate (Drummond, Griffin, & Tarricone, 2009). Three major features
26 of devices deserve special attention: (i) the device-operator interaction can generate
27 learning curve effects and thus risk biases in estimating the size of the benefits; (ii)
28 the incremental nature of innovation (e.g., longer battery life, improvement of the
29 software systems, miniaturisation) needs to be addressed by careful identification of
30 the alternatives for comparative and incremental cost-effectiveness analysis (Fattore
31 et al., 2011; Sorenson, Tarricone, Siebert, & Drummond, 2011; R. Tarricone &
32 Drummond, 2011; Taylor & Iglesias, 2009) (iii) the broader organizational impact in
33 terms of training and infrastructure, coupled with dynamic pricing, requires a more
34 flexible approach to costing. Whether these differences between medical devices and
35 pharmaceuticals require a different framework for HTA needs to be investigated.
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
4
5
6
7
8 **1. The MedtecHTA project**
9

10 The objective of MedtecHTA project was to investigate improvements in HTA
11 methods to allow for more comprehensive economic evaluation of medical devices.
12
13 The project consisted of seven work packages (WPs), organized in three parts. (see
14
15 Table 1.)
16

17 - TABLE 1 HERE ABOUT -
18
19
20
21
22

23 *2.1 Cross country analysis of regulation and HTA of medical devices*
24

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

40 Ciani et al (2015) reported the results of a cross-country analysis of HTA guidelines
41 and available HTA reports on medical devices in assigned countries using a
42 standardized template for comparison. In order to analyse the state of the art in the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

application of guidelines reviewed, a sample of HTA reports was selected from the University of York Centre for Reviews of Dissemination HTA database and systematically reviewed at three levels (i) assessment of the nature of evidence included in the reports (ii) HTA methods applied by reports considering medical devices, and (iii) assessment of approaches and methods used to address uncertainty. They found that although 75% of the agencies surveyed had adopted HTA-specific approaches for medical devices, these were largely organizational or procedural in nature. Only one agency had adopted methodological guidelines specific to medical devices.

In the second paper in this supplement, Ciani et al (2016) focus on the second phase of their research, in which they analysed a sample of HTA reports in the field of cardiovascular disease in order to assess whether there are any key differences in how methods are applied. They found that there were several differences, in the types of clinical studies forming the basis for the HTAs, how the health problem and use of the technology was considered, the description and technical characteristics of the technology and the consideration of the organizational aspects of the use of the technology. Most of these differences arose due to the relative 'complexities' in the use of devices, in terms of the number of interacting components. These include the number and difficulty of the actions required by those delivering or receiving the intervention, the number of groups and organizational levels targeted by the intervention, the number and variability of the outcomes and the degree of flexibility or tailoring of the intervention.

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

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

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

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

clinical preferences in the adoption of devices. These issues are explored further in WP6 of the MedtecHTA project (discussed below).

2.3 Methods for assessing the comparative effectiveness of medical devices

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

This preliminary research activity provided the basis for the development of improved methods for evaluating comparative effectiveness of medical devices including recommendations for analytic methods and data collection. The research was an important input to the development of guidelines for the evaluation of Therapeutic Medical Devices under the auspices of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 (EUnetHTA, 2015).

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

2.4 Methods for the economic evaluation of medical devices

Work Package 4 focused on exploring different methods for economic evaluation of medical devices currently adopted in EU countries in order to make suggestions about the development of new methods and offer guidance on future directions in the use of economic evaluation for medical devices. The first part of the research considered how differences in culture and values in EU countries lead to differences in the methodology and use of economic evaluation for policy decisions such as coverage and reimbursement without distinguishing between health technologies (e.g. pharmaceuticals and medical devices). For example, in northern Europe, economic evaluation is widely used in decisions about the reimbursement of new health technologies and cost-utility analysis (with the quality-adjusted life-year as the primary measure of benefit) is the predominant approach. In UK, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (2011) has differentiated between health technologies and has developed the Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme to specifically assess medical devices and diagnostics. In contrast, in central and southern Europe, there is more resistance to the use of economic evaluation in decision making and, where it is used, benefits are more often assessed in terms of clinical added value. In these countries however no distinction is made between health

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

1
2
3
4
5
6 technologies and policy decisions on coverage and reimbursement of medical devices
7
8 are generally not subject to any type of economic analysis. -This part of the research
9
10 provided useful insights into the potential for increasing the use of economic
11
12 evaluation in various EU member states (Torbica et al, 2016b).
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 Finally, building on the findings of both WP3 and WP4, the impact of the learning
30 curve on effectiveness and cost was estimated for endovascular aneurysm repair
31 (EVAR) and fenestrated EVAR (fEVAR). This research is reported in the sixth paper
32 in this supplement (Varabyova et al, 2016). It was found that, in the case of EVAR
33 there was a moderate, but significant effect of learning on both in-hospital mortality
34 and hospital length of stay. The same impact was not found for fEVAR, one reason
35 for which could be its similarity to EVAR, meaning that much of the learning in
36 EVAR was transferable to the new procedure
37
38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 *2.5 Uncertainty in the economic evaluation of medical devices*

9
10 Work Package 5 focused on characterizing uncertainty in the economic evaluation of
11 medical devices and determining future research needs. This research, reported in the
12 seventh paper in this supplement (Rothery et al, 2016), sets out a number of
13 conceptual issues when dealing with uncertainty and the value of research in the
14 context of some of the specific characteristics of devices such as learning curve
15 effects, incremental device innovation and dynamic pricing. It uses value of
16 information analysis to explore the optimal timing of reimbursement decisions and the
17 suitability of conditional coverage decisions, such as 'only in research' and 'approval
18 with research'.

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

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 *2.6 Organizational impact of medical devices*

43
44
45 The final methodological issue investigated in the MedtechHTA project was the
46 organizational impact of medical devices. In this part of the project the aim was to
47 propose a methodology that will allow for incorporating organizational issues in a
48 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 collaboration with the European Society of Cardiology. The objective was to explore
8 the role of physicians' motivation and organizational factors in the adoption and
9 diffusion of medical devices. The survey focused on 7 different catheter-based or
10 implantable cardiovascular devices. Multivariate hierarchical modeling was used to
11 determine the associations between the various motivational and organizational
12 factors and device diffusion and use. This research is reported in the eighth paper in
13 this supplement (Hatz et al, 2016).
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

2. Dissemination of project findings

In the final phase of the project (Part III), the findings and results from the previous phases were collated into a final report (WP7), which provides recommendations for decision-makers, in formulating health policy, within the medical devices industry, as well as in the management of health care organizations. In addition, recommendations on developments in methodology were made for the scientific community. These recommendations are summarized in the final paper in this supplement (Tarricone et al, 2016b). These are divided into; recommendations for policy, recommendations for methods and recommendations for further research.

Taken together, the papers in this supplement represent a comprehensive report of all the main findings of the MedtecHTA project and give references to other published outputs for the project. It is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy makers requiring information on the project.

6 **References**

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

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

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

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

Field Code Changed

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

17 Ciani, O., Wilcher, B., Blankart, C. R., Hatz, M., Rupel, V. P., Erker, R. S., . . .
 18 Taylor, R. S. (2015). HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT OF
 19 MEDICAL DEVICES: A SURVEY OF NON-EUROPEAN UNION
 20 AGENCIES. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*,
 21 31(03), 154-165. doi:10.1017/s0266462315000185

22 Cohen, D., & Billingsley, M. (2011). Europeans are left to their own devices. *BMJ*,
 23 342(may13 2), d2748-d2748. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2748

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

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar,
 Superscript

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

32 EUnetHTA (2015). Therapeutic medical devices
 33 [https://eunethta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/The
 34 raapeutic%20medical%20devices_Guideline_Final%20Nov%202015.pdf,
 35 accessed July 23rd, 2016].

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

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar,
 Superscript

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

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

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6 Ramsay, C. R., Grant, A. M., Wallace, S. A., Garthwaite, P. H., Monk, A. F., &
7 Russell, I. T. (2001). Statistical assessment of the learning curves of health
8 technologies. *Health Technology Assessment*, 5(12). doi:10.3310/hta5120

9
10 Schreyögg, J., Bäumler, M., & Busse, R. (2009). Balancing adoption and affordability
11 of medical devices in Europe. *Health Policy*, 92(2-3), 218-224.
12 doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.03.016

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

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

17
18 Tarricone, R., & Drummond, M. (2011). Challenges in the clinical and economic
19 evaluation of medical devices: The case of transcatheter aortic valve
20 implantation. *Journal of Medical Marketing: Device, Diagnostic and*
21 *Pharmaceutical Marketing*, 11(3), 221-229. doi:10.1177/1745790411412242

22
23 Tarricone, R., Torbica, A., Ferré, F., & Drummond, M. (2014). Generating
24 appropriate clinical data for value assessment of medical devices: what role
25 does regulation play? *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes*
26 *Research*, 14(5), 707-718. doi:10.1586/14737167.2014.950233

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

27
28 Taylor, R. S., & Iglesias, C. P. (2009). Assessing the Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness
29 of Medical Devices and Drugs: Are They That Different? *Value in Health*,
30 12(4), 404-406. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00476_2.x

31
32 Valzania, C., Torbica, A., Tarricone, R., Leyva, F., & Boriani, G. (2015). Implant
33 rates of cardiac implantable electrical devices in Europe: A systematic
34 literature review. *Health Policy*. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.11.001

35
36 Ciani O et al (2016). This supplement.

37
38 Torbica A et al (2016a). This supplement.

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

39 Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016a). (Under submissionThis supplement)

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

41 Torbica A et al (2016b). (Under submissionThis supplement)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

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

43 Varaboyova Y et al (2016). This supplement.

44 Rothery C et al (2016). This supplement.

45 Hatz M et al (2016). This supplement.

46 Tarricone et al (2016b). This supplement.

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

Challenges in the Assessment of Medical Devices: the MedtecHTA project

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

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5 ABSTRACT
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

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
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

1. Background to the MedtechHTA project

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

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

26 The current EU legal framework already requires for all devices, especially for class
27 III devices, to have safety and performance testing for decision on CE mark..
28 Essentially, manufacturers must accomplish a conformity assessment and undergo an
29 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

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

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.

1
2
3 The project consisted of seven work packages (WPs), organized in three parts. (see
4
5 Table 1.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

- TABLE 1 HERE ABOUT -

12
13
14
15 *2.1 Cross country analysis of regulation and HTA of medical devices*
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

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 application of guidelines reviewed, a sample of HTA reports was selected from the University of York Centre for Reviews of Dissemination HTA database and systematically reviewed at three levels (i) assessment of the nature of evidence included in the reports (ii) HTA methods applied by reports considering medical

devices, and (iii) assessment of approaches and methods used to address uncertainty.

They found that although 75% of the agencies surveyed had adopted HTA-specific approaches for medical devices, these were largely organizational or procedural in nature. Only one agency had adopted methodological guidelines specific to medical devices.

In the second paper in this supplement, Ciani et al (2016) focus on the second phase of their research, in which they analysed a sample of HTA reports in the field of cardiovascular disease in order to assess whether there are any key differences in how methods are applied. They found that there were several differences, in the types of clinical studies forming the basis for the HTAs, how the health problem and use of the technology was considered, the description and technical characteristics of the technology and the consideration of the organizational aspects of the use of the technology. Most of these differences arose due to the relative 'complexities' in the use of devices, in terms of the number of interacting components. These include the number and difficulty of the actions required by those delivering or receiving the intervention, the number of groups and organizational levels targeted by the intervention, the number and variability of the outcomes and the degree of flexibility or tailoring of the intervention.

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

Work Package 2 considered the geographical variation in the use of medical devices in EU countries by estimating the rate of adoption of selected medical technologies in the field of electrophysiology. This subspecialty of cardiology widely uses implantable medical devices whose efficacy has been demonstrated by a number of randomized clinical trials. In one respect these devices resemble pharmaceuticals as

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
12
13
14
15
16
17

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

50 Therefore, in a subsequent phase of the research, reported in the third paper in this
51 supplement, Torbica et al (2016a) undertook a new study of implant rates, the first to
52 use the national hospital discharge datasets available in 5 EU countries. They provide
53 evidence on differences in use of medical devices within and between member states,
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 It is the first international paper to explore simultaneously differences both between
10 countries and within the regions of those countries. Results show that higher levels of
11 tertiary education among the labor force and % of aged population are positively
12 associated with implant rates of CIED. Regional per capita GDP and number of
13 implanting centers appear to have no significant effect. Institutional factors, captured
14 by fixed country effect, are shown to be important for the diffusion of CIED.
15
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
32
33
34
35
36 the MedtecHTA project (discussed below).
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 interventions involving the use of medical devices should be considered as complex
5 interventions, owing to the importance of user and context independence. Therefore,
6 specific randomized controlled trial designs need to be considered, dealing with
7 surgeons' and patients' preferences, incremental product development and user
8 dependence. In addition, high quality disease- or device-based registries are needed to
9 assess safety and long-term effectiveness (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016a).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 This preliminary research activity provided the basis for the development of improved
19 methods for evaluating comparative effectiveness of medical devices including
20 recommendations for analytic methods and data collection. The research was an
21 important input to the development of guidelines for the evaluation of Therapeutic
22 Medical Devices under the auspices of the EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 (EUnetHTA,
23 2015).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The framework and new methodological approaches were then tested on medical
32 devices at different stages of development and diffusion within the health care system.
33 First, the use of a method of evidence synthesis that allows for the meta-analysis of
34 RCT and observational data, using bias adjustment based on a formal elicitation
35 exercise involving experts, was explored in the case of total hip replacement. This is
36 reported in the fourth paper in this supplement (Schnell-Inderst et al, 2016b).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

2.4 Methods for the economic evaluation of medical devices

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

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

The second part of the research, reported in the fifth paper of this supplement (Tarricone et al, 2016a) used two case studies of implantable cardiac devices in order to demonstrate current, and possible future approaches to the use of economic evaluation. The case studies, implantable cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs) and transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) were chosen in order to explore a wide range of device characteristics, including the significance of irreversible decisions and the complexity associated with evolving technologies. Most of the published economic evaluations and HTA reports located in the literature review did not take

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

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 MedtecHTA 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 was used to develop a large (54 item) survey of cardiologists, conducted in collaboration with the European Society of Cardiology. The objective was to explore the role of physicians' motivation and organizational factors in the adoption and diffusion of medical devices. The survey focused on 7 different catheter-based or implantable cardiovascular devices. Multivariate hierarchical modeling was used to determine the associations between the various motivational and organizational factors and device diffusion and use. This research is reported in the eighth paper in this supplement (Hatz et al, 2016).

2. Dissemination of project findings

In the final phase of the project (Part III), the findings and results from the previous phases were collated into a final report (WP7), which provides recommendations for decision-makers, in formulating health policy, within the medical devices industry, as well as in the management of health care organizations. In addition, recommendations on developments in methodology were made for the scientific community. These recommendations are summarized in the final paper in this supplement (Tarricone et al, 2016b). These are divided into; recommendations for policy, recommendations for methods and recommendations for further research.

Taken together, the papers in this supplement represent a comprehensive report of all the main findings of the MedtechHTA project and give references to other published outputs for the project. It is intended to be the main source for researchers and policy makers requiring information on the project.

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://eunethhta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/The%20therapeutic%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., Bäumler, 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 Ciani O et al (2016). This supplement.
34

35 Torbica A et al (2016a). This supplement.
36

37 Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016a). (This supplement)
38

39 Schnell-Inderst P et al (2016b). This supplement.
40

41 Torbica A et al (2016b). (This supplement)
42

43 Tarricone R et al (2016a). This supplement.
44

45 Varaboyova Y et al (2016). This supplement.
46

47 Rothery C et al (2016). This supplement.
48

49 Hatz M et al (2016). This supplement.
50

51 Tarricone et al (2016b). This supplement.
52

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