

This is a repository copy of *Authors' Response to: "Health Opportunity Costs and Expert Elicitation: A Comment on Soares et al."* by Sampson, Firth, and Towse.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/169604/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Soares, Marta O orcid.org/0000-0003-1579-8513, Sculpher, Mark J orcid.org/0000-0003-3746-9913 and Claxton, Karl orcid.org/0000-0003-2002-4694 (2021) Authors' Response to: "Health Opportunity Costs and Expert Elicitation: A Comment on Soares et al." by Sampson, Firth, and Towse. *Medical Decision Making*. 272989X20987222. ISSN 1552-681X

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X20987222>

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.

Medical Decision Making

Authors' response to: "Health Opportunity Costs and Expert Elicitation: A Comment on Soares et al." by Sampson, Firth and Towse

Journal:	<i>Medical Decision Making</i>
Manuscript ID	MDM-20-561.R1
Manuscript Type:	Letter to the Editor

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Authors' response to: "Health Opportunity Costs and Expert Elicitation: A Comment on Soares**
4 **et al." by Sampson, Firth and Towse**
5

6
7
8 Authors: Marta O. Soares, PhD¹; Mark J. Sculpher, PhD¹; and Karl Claxton, PhD^{1,2}
9

10
11
12 Author Affiliations:

13
14 ¹Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, Yorkshire, UK

15
16 ²Department of Economics and Related Studies, University of York, York, Yorkshire, UK
17

18
19
20 Corresponding author:

21
22 Marta O. Soares
23 Centre for Health Economics,
24 University of York
25 York, Yorkshire, UK
26 marta.soares@york.ac.uk
27

28 Word count: 1,150
29

30 Funding: None
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 Dear Editor:
4

5 We read with interest Sampson, Firth and Towse's commentary letter¹ on our article, "Health
6 Opportunity Costs: Assessing the Implications of Uncertainty Using Elicitation Methods with
7 Experts"². Our article presents the design, implementation and results of an elicitation exercise
8 aiming to quantitatively gather the (uncertain) beliefs of individuals on a set of quantities. We use
9 methods that our research team is well versed in³⁻⁷. The quantities elicited relate to a set of key
10 uncertainties identified in a previous piece of work -- Claxton et. al. 2015⁸ -- which evaluated the
11 available evidence on health opportunity costs for the UK NHS (HOC), a quantity that is important for
12 supporting policy decisions over investments using public health system funds. Claxton et al. (2015)⁸
13 identified evidence on the effects of changes in expenditure on the life year burden of disease, but
14 no evidence on the likely effects of expenditure on quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs). Linking the
15 effects of expenditure on mortality burden of disease to QALYs is hence the focus of our work.
16
17
18

19 The letter commends our study for its policy value, and for its methodological quality and rigour but,
20 at the same time, raises methodological concerns. The authors provide no references to support
21 their view that these concerns minimise the policy relevance of our findings. In this letter, we
22 respond to these concerns.
23

24 The first methodological concern regards the expertise of the individuals recruited, and we rebut this
25 on three grounds. Firstly, health care practitioners (the substantive experts recruited into this study)
26 directly observe the health effects of the activities of the health system (linked to expenditure), and
27 hence we argue are best placed to evaluate the quantities of interest. Secondly, we followed best
28 practice⁹ in including, in our sample of experts, representatives with specialism in all the different
29 clinical areas of interest (for example, cardiologists, who have the relevant experience in circulatory
30 disease), and also individuals with expertise across clinical areas (for example general practitioners,
31 radiologists, anaesthetists and public health specialists). The authors claim that those without a
32 specialism have no expertise, but this is incorrect as these individuals complement those with
33 specialisms by providing breadth across the different clinical areas, across the types of technologies
34 and services covered by NHS expenditure, and across settings of care. Finally, the authors claim the
35 policy experts possess no substantive expertise. This is true and has been made clear in our study:
36 policy experts were convened separately and asked to elicit by reconciling the information elicited
37 from clinical experts with their own judgements. The fact that some drew entirely on the
38 judgements of substantive clinical experts is a result in itself, and was expected, indicating that these
39 individuals trust the judgements of individuals with substantive expertise. This does not, in any way,
40 impair the validity of the elicitation exercise.
41
42
43
44

45 The second claim by the authors is that the elicited quantities are not meaningful. It should be
46 noted that our paper carefully lays out the definitions of the quantities elicited, and in
47 supplementary material we provide the extensive materials used for training the experts and the full
48 questionnaire used in the elicitation. A number of arguments were presented supporting the
49 authors' claim. It is asserted that we have not used an existing framework for elicitation, such as
50 SHELF¹⁰. A recent review identified that none of the existing frameworks for elicitation has been
51 developed specifically for health care⁶. The protocol we used for this exercise (which was defined *a*
52 *priori*) was developed in accordance with a number of these frameworks, including the principles set
53 out in SHELF¹⁰. It was developed for the health care context and tailored to the specific needs of our
54 exercise. The authors also claim that the level of heterogeneity within disease areas compromises
55 the definition of the quantity of interest. We argue that heterogeneity is unavoidable and clinicians
56 are used to integrating it into their judgements. Moreover, many elicitation have been conducted
57 over heterogeneous quantities, such as in attributing global foodborne disease to specific foods¹¹ or
58
59
60

1
2
3 in defining the relationship between future climate change and the increased risk of armed
4 conflict¹². This is not to say that eliciting under heterogeneity is without its challenges and we
5 acknowledge, in the discussion of our paper, that this may have resulted in the high level of
6 observed within-expert uncertainty (see third claim below).
7

8
9 The authors of the commentary also claim that the assumption of conditional independence (used in
10 defining the quantities for the elicitation) cannot be sustained, and justify this by the possibility of
11 spillover effects. This argument is, however, flawed. First, conditional independence is well
12 established in the elicitation literature as an alternative to eliciting correlation.⁹ Whilst the validity of
13 conditional independence may be difficult to demonstrate, eliciting absolute quantities
14 independently, as proposed by the authors of the letter, is certainly not a valid approach. Finally, in
15 our study, spillover effects were explicitly excluded by requesting individuals only to consider
16 expenditure, and its health effects, in the same disease area.
17
18

19 The third claim by the authors relates to the level of uncertainty in responses. In the discussion to
20 our paper, we acknowledge the challenges in eliciting policy-relevant, but broad-ranging, quantities,
21 which are by definition uncertain. To support this claim, the authors question the validity of some of
22 the responses. At the end of every section of the elicitation, participants were asked whether they
23 were *confident* the answers they had given reflected their views and uncertainties. Response options
24 were 'yes', 'not sure' and 'no'. We examined the qualitative feedback from participants and there
25 was no suggestion that the answers lacked face-validity (see section 'Face Validity and Qualitative
26 Feedback' of our paper², and supplemental material). Additionally, results were largely unchanged
27 when those that responded 'no' or 'not sure' were removed.
28
29

30 For these reasons we dispute the substantive points raised by Sampson, Firth and Towse¹. The
31 authors conclude by making the point that estimates are uncertain. There is uncertainty
32 surrounding both the causal effects of changes in expenditure on mortality outcomes (which is
33 reported in a sequence of publications¹³⁻¹⁵) and how these are likely to translate into QALY effects
34 (reported in this paper²). The use of expert elicitation, which elicits uncertainty as well as point
35 estimates, is key to making the judgements required to support policy explicit.¹⁶ This allows for
36 scrutiny, discussion and accountability, which promotes the advancement of methods and
37 applications to inform policy choice and unavoidable decisions; such as: how much can a health care
38 system afford to pay for the benefits offered by a new pharmaceutical? As with estimates of any
39 policy relevant parameter, the question is what does the balance of evidence suggests? We maintain
40 our conclusion that the balance of evidence suggests that the health effects of changes in
41 expenditure are, if anything, likely to be greater than suggested by the mounting empirical estimates
42 (evolving from Claxton et al. 2015⁸) of the effect of changes in health expenditure on mortality
43 outcomes.¹³⁻¹⁵
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1 Sampson, C., Firth, I. & Towse, A. Health Opportunity Costs and Expert Elicitation: A Comment on Soares et al. . *MDM (forthcoming)*.
- 2 Soares, M. O., Sculpher, M. J. & Claxton, K. Health Opportunity Costs: Assessing the Implications of Uncertainty Using Elicitation Methods with Experts. *Medical Decision Making* **40**, 448-459, doi:10.1177/0272989x20916450 (2020).
- 3 Soares, M. O. *et al.* Methods to elicit experts' beliefs over uncertain quantities: application to a cost effectiveness transition model of negative pressure wound therapy for severe pressure ulceration. *Stat Med* **30**, 2363-2380, doi:10.1002/sim.4288 (2011).
- 4 Bojke, L. & Soares, M. Encyclopedia of Health Economics. *Elsevier* (2014).
- 5 Soares MO, Sharples L, Morton A, K., C. & Bojke L. Experiences of structured elicitation for model based cost-effectiveness analyses. *Value in Health* **21**, 715-723 (2018).
- 6 Bojke L *et al.* Developing a reference case for expert elicitation in healthcare decision making. (NIHR, London, UK, 2019).
- 7 MO., S., G., N. & L., B. *Eliciting expert judgements in HTA. Report commissioned for the NICE methods update.*, <https://www.york.ac.uk/media/che/documents/Elicitation-NICE-final-report-York_01042020.pdf> (2020).
- 8 Claxton, K. *et al.* Methods for the estimation of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence cost-effectiveness threshold. *Health Technol Assess* **19**, 1-503, v-vi, doi:10.3310/hta19140 (2015).
- 9 Anthony O'Hagan *et al.* Uncertain Judgements: Eliciting Experts' Probabilities. *Wiley* 338 (2006).
- 10 O'Hagan T & Oakley J. The Sheffield Elicitation Framework (SHELF). (2008).
- 11 Hoffmann, S. *et al.* Attribution of global foodborne disease to specific foods: Findings from a World Health Organization structured expert elicitation. *Plos One* **12**, e0183641, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0183641 (2017).
- 12 Mach, K. J. *et al.* Climate as a risk factor for armed conflict. *Nature* **571**, 193-197, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1300-6 (2019).
- 13 Martin, S., Lomas, J. & Claxton, K. Is an ounce of prevention worth a pound of cure? A cross-sectional study of the impact of English public health grant on mortality and morbidity. *Bmj Open* **10**, e036411, doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036411 (2020).
- 14 Lomas, J., Martin, S. & Claxton, K. Estimating the Marginal Productivity of the English National Health Service From 2003 to 2012. *Value in Health* **22**, 995-1002, doi:10.1016/j.jval.2019.04.1926 (2019).
- 15 Claxton, K., Lomas, J. & Martin, S. The impact of NHS expenditure on health outcomes in England: Alternative approaches to identification in all-cause and disease specific models of mortality. *Health Economics* **27**, 1017-1023, doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3650 (2018).
- 16 Morgan, M. G. Use (and abuse) of expert elicitation in support of decision making for public policy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 7176-7184, doi:10.1073/pnas.1319946111 (2014).