

This is a repository copy of *Modeling in Early Stages of Technology Development: Is an iterative approach needed? : Comment on "Problems and Promises of Health Technologies: The Role of Early Health Economic Modeling"*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/153542/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Drummond, M.F. orcid.org/0000-0002-6126-0944 (2019) Modeling in Early Stages of Technology Development: Is an iterative approach needed? : Comment on "Problems and Promises of Health Technologies: The Role of Early Health Economic Modeling". International Journal of Health Policy and Management. ISSN 2322-5939

<https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2019.118>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

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.

1 **Type: Commentary**

2 **Modeling in Early Stages of Technology Development: Is an iterative approach**
3 **needed?**

4 Comment on “Problems and Promises of Health Technologies: The Role of Early
5 Health Economic Modeling”

6 **Abstract**

7 A recent paper by Grutters et al makes the case for early health economic modeling in
8 the development of health technologies. A number of examples of the value of early
9 modeling are given, with analyses being performed at different stages in the
10 development of several non-drug health technologies. This commentary
11 acknowledges the contribution of the paper by Grutters et al and argues for an
12 iterative and integrated approach to early modeling, assessing the cost-effectiveness
13 of the technology, the value of future research and the interaction with the
14 manufacturer’s pricing and revenue expectations.

15

16 **Key words:** innovation policy, innovation, health technology assessment, health
17 economic modeling, early assessment.

18

19 **Introduction**

20 In their recent paper, Grutters et al (1) discuss the role of early health economic
21 modeling in making key decisions in the development of health technologies. Their
22 observations are based on 32 early modeling analyses of non-drug technologies
23 undertaken by a subsidiary group of a university hospital in the Netherlands. The
24 analyses were all conducted as a result of requests from technology sponsors, the
25 majority of which were medical devices companies, although 3 analyses were
26 conducted following requests by clinicians and/or clinical departments from the
27 hospital.

28 The modeling analyses were performed at different stages in the development of the
29 technologies, from ‘idea screening’, through ‘concept development’, to the ‘pre-
30 market phase’ to ‘market access’. The authors note that some researchers may not
31 consider the final phase to constitute ‘early modeling’, but I accept their view that this
32 stage still precedes any formal modeling presented to authorities in an official
33 reimbursement submission. The main finding is that none of the assessments resulted
34 in a firm ‘go/no-go’ decision about the technologies concerned, since none

1 demonstrated that the technology could never be cost-effective. However, the
2 assessments were helpful in gaining an insight into the technology's potential cost-
3 effectiveness in its intended context by informing further development or
4 implementation. These insights could include the positioning of the technology (eg
5 position in the clinical pathway, of suitability for different patient sub-groups), or the
6 need for additional research.

7 Therefore are two, interlinked, modeling efforts that could be performed. The first is
8 the modeling of the potential cost-effectiveness of the product, viewed from the
9 perspective of the external decision-maker(s) that will partly determine the market
10 access for the technology. The second effort is a financial modeling effort, from the
11 perspective of the company, to assess whether the potential financial returns will
12 justify the investments in developing the product.

13

14 **Value of the Grutters et al study**

15 The main value of the study by Grutter et al is that, since the analyses were performed
16 by an independent organization, the findings could be placed in the public domain,
17 following some restrictions to preserve confidential findings on the technologies
18 concerned. This is important, since although much has been written about the
19 potential value of early health economic modeling, there are few published examples
20 of its impact or value. This is because the vast majority of analyses have been
21 conducted in-house by technology manufacturers (mainly pharmaceutical
22 companies), where there is little need or incentive to make them public. The closest
23 we see to actual examples relate to the preparatory work conducted by manufacturers
24 to support 'early engagement' discussions with regulators and reimbursement
25 authorities (2).

26

27 **Issues for further discussion**

28 Although the paper by Grutters et al makes a strong case for the role of early health
29 economic modeling, there are other issues meriting discussion, should we wish to
30 assess how useful early modeling could be. The first issue relates to the question of
31 go/ no-go decisions. It is correct to argue that if all the assessments conclude that a
32 technology is cost-effective, it is hard to argue that it should be abandoned. But it is
33 not clear how the assessments undertaken considered the price (or acquisition cost) of
34 the technologies concerned. Some of the analyses conducted close to market access

1 presumably included a price, but it is not clear whether the analyses conducted in
2 earlier stages of development accounted for the manufacturer's price expectations, or
3 if any were even articulated. In the absence of inclusion of any price, or if price was
4 varied in a sensitivity analysis, the modeling could still give the manufacturer an
5 indication of whether particular price expectations could be met.

6 The point is that, whatever the benefits in improved health and cost savings, any
7 technology could be rejected on grounds of lacking cost-effectiveness if the
8 manufacturer's price expectations were too high. Ideally, the manufacturer's price
9 expectations would be set early on and revised upwards or downwards as more
10 information about the technology's performance, or the need for additional research,
11 becomes known. However, in most cases, decisions about price are usually discussed
12 quite late in the development process, when arguably the decision might mainly be
13 based on recovery of as many of the research and development costs as possible,
14 rather than the level of profit that the technology is likely to make overall. Therefore,
15 in order to best interpret the results of modeling, price expectations should be set
16 earlier and reset periodically based on the acquisition of new information.

17 Secondly, as Grutters et al note, early health economic modeling can be useful in
18 guiding future research into the technology concerned. This is often because of the
19 need to obtain more accurate estimates of the key parameters of the model, but could
20 also be because the model indicates that there may be benefits from studying the
21 technology in new patient populations or at a different position in the treatment
22 pathway.

23 Grutters et al are a little sceptical about whether probabilistic sensitivity analysis is
24 the best way of characterizing uncertainty in situations where the quality of the
25 information about the new technology is poor. Rather, they favour the use of
26 deterministic sensitivity analysis. There is debate about this issue in the health
27 economics literature, although one of the arguments in favour of a probabilistic
28 approach is that it facilitates the use of formal value of information (VoI) analysis to
29 guide future research. For example, VoI analysis can provide an estimate of the
30 overall value of conducting more research to reduce decision uncertainty. It can also
31 identify which model parameters it would most important to estimate more precisely.
32 In addition, as Rothery et al (3) point out, VoI analysis provides the manufacturer
33 with a formal approach for considering the trade-off, at different stages of
34 development, between carrying out further research and revising price expectations

1 for the technology downwards. This links back to the point about pricing expectations
2 made earlier.

3 Thirdly, one of the interesting features of the paper by Grutters et al is that it
4 demonstrates that early health economic modeling can be performed at different time
5 points in the development of a technology. In the paper, the time points were
6 determined by the timing of the requests for analyses by the technology's sponsor. In
7 two cases the analysis was performed twice, although it is not clear whether this was
8 at different time points or not. However, in principle, early stage health economic
9 modeling is not a 'one-time' activity, but should be continuous and iterative, with the
10 modeling being updated as more information becomes available, either about the
11 technology itself or the environment in which it would be used (eg emergence of new
12 technologies, changes in prices, etc.) (4)

13 For example, the price of the existing technology, that the manufacturer's technology
14 seeks to replace, could fall, making the new technology less attractive. This happened
15 with drug-eluting stents in the United Kingdom. The price of bare metal stents fell,
16 causing the incremental cost-effectiveness of drug-eluting stents to rise above the
17 acceptable threshold in the UK (5). Alternatively, a new competitor technology could
18 emerge, or there could be a change in decision-makers' requirements for evidence on
19 effectiveness or cost-effectiveness.

20

21 **Towards a comprehensive role for early stage modeling**

22 Grutters et al should be congratulated on an important contribution to the debate about
23 the value of early health economic modeling. Based on their findings and the issues
24 raised above, one could argue for a more comprehensive role for early stage health
25 economic modeling. First, it would be iterative, with modeling being performed at
26 multiple points in the development of the technology, normally at key points where
27 either (i) an important decisions about the need for further research, or a change in
28 positioning or pricing expectations needed to be made, or (ii) there was an important
29 change in the external environment affecting the likely success or value of the
30 technology.

31 Secondly, the modeling effort would comprise three, interlinked efforts (i) cost-
32 effectiveness modeling from the perspective of the intended payer or reimbursement
33 authority; (ii) modeling of the future research strategy for the technology, based on
34 value of information analysis where possible and; (iii) financial modeling, of expected

1 research costs, technology price and revenue, from the perspective of the
2 manufacturer.

3

4 **References**

5 1. Grutters JPC, Govers T, Nijboer J, Tummers M, van der Wilt GJ, Rovers, MM.
6 Problems and promises of health technologies: the role of early health economic
7 modeling. *Int J Health Policy Manag* 2019; X (X): XX.

8

9 2. Backhouse, M., Wonder, M., Hornby, E., Kilburg, A., Drummond, M.F., Mayer,
10 F.K. Early Dialogue Between the Developers of New Technologies and Pricing and
11 Reimbursement Agencies. *Value in Health* 2011 14(4) 608-615.

12

13 3. Rothery C, Claxton K, Palmer S, Epstein D, Tarricone R, Sculpher MJ.
14 Charecterising uncertainty in the assessment of medical devices. And determining
15 future research needs. *Health Economics* 2017; 26 (suppl. 1): 109-123.

16

17 4. Sculpher, M., Drummond, M.F. and Buxton, M.J. The iterative use of economic
18 evaluation as part of the process of health technology assessment. *Journal of Health*
19 *Services Research and Policy* 1997; 2(1): 26-30.

20

21 5. Drummond, M.F., Griffin, A., Tarricone, R. (2009) Economic evaluation for devices
22 and drugs. Same or different? *Value in Health*; 12(4) 402-404.

23

24

25