

**Methods:** We conducted a scoping review to examine the nature of health technology assessment (HTA) processes, current methods, and policies for medicines in ten jurisdictions. The jurisdictions included in this study are Australia, Canada, France, Germany, South Korea, the Netherlands, United Kingdom (divided into England, Scotland and Wales), and United States of America. The information was extracted from the websites of International Network of Agencies for Health Technology Assessment (INAHTA) member agencies in the selected jurisdictions, grey literature from governments' websites, and peer-reviewed literature.

**Results:** Overall median time from submission of the evidence dossier to HTA recommendations for most jurisdictions is 22 weeks. Although there are similarities in the time taken to reach a funding decision, there are considerable variations in the time taken for patients to have funded access to medicines after HTA recommendations. Only a few countries mentioned a specific timeline within which medicines approved for funding should be listed. Time taken for price negotiations and other arrangements (i.e., risk-sharing agreements) may contribute to varying timelines for listing medicines for funding. Mostly, such negotiations are confidential and may not be time limited.

**Conclusions:** There was surprising consistency, globally, in the time it takes for funding decisions after medicines registration. The causes of delays in the medicines' listing decisions are multifactorial and mostly occur after HTA recommendations. The parallel regulatory-assessment process and prioritization tend to reduce the time to a funding decision. However, transparency is needed in the listing process to improve overall timeliness.

## OD02 Developing Components For A National Strategy For Heart Valve Disease In Canada

John M Sproule ([jsproule@ihe.ca](mailto:jsproule@ihe.ca)), Lindsey Warkentin and David Messika-Zeitoun

**Introduction:** The research included a rapid review of current literature to describe epidemiology, management, and system impact of heart valve disease (HVD) in adult populations. Key issues were identified in consultation with expert focus groups and were framed across the continuum of care and systemic policy issues. The groups were adapted and adjusted during deliberations.

**Methods:** A rapid literature review was conducted on HVD key interventions and evidence of effectiveness along with expert interviews to identify high-level themes for reform. This served as the evidentiary backgrounder. Two virtual policy engagements with clinical leaders, patients, and health system managers were conducted. The focus was their collective drafting of recommendations. These workshops identified nine thematic areas and developed associated recommendations for action under each theme. The success of the process is evident as the report has been taken up as a roadmap for ongoing research and policy work.

**Results:** A comprehensive grouping of recommendations for improving HVD detection, management, and treatment in Canada was produced. It was designed to be comprehensive to then allow

more targeted work to proceed under an evidence-informed and clinically endorsed agenda.

**Conclusions:** Heart valve conditions are increasingly treatable, especially if detected early. Innovation in treatments as well as detection and management to address gaps in care were identified as the most urgent priorities. The key result was formation of formal working groups with a professional society to explore spoke–hub-and node models for care delivery and to launch awareness programs for early detection.

## OD04 The EQ-5D-5L Value Set For Ghana

Rebecca Addo ([Rebecca.Addo@uts.edu.au](mailto:Rebecca.Addo@uts.edu.au)),  
Brendan Mulhern, Richard Norman, Richmond Owusu,  
Rosalie Viney and Justice Nonvignon

**Introduction:** Ghana's reference case, developed to guide the conduct of economic evaluation as part of health technology assessment (HTA) guidelines, recommends the conduct of cost–utility analysis using outcomes such as quality-adjusted life years (QALYs). There is no national value set available for the Ghanaian population to be used in estimating QALYs. This study aimed to develop a value set for Ghana using the EuroQol 5-dimension 5-level questionnaire (EQ-5D-5L) instrument.

**Methods:** Face-to-face preference data were collected from 300 adults across three regions of Ghana using the adapted version of the EuroQol Valuation Technology (EQ-VT) standardized valuation protocol developed specifically for EQ-5D-5L valuation studies using composite time-trade-off (cTTO) and discrete choice experiments (DCEs). Different preference models were generated using both the cTTO and DCE data, individually or together to provide complementary results on respondents' utility preferences. Models explored include generalized least squares, tobit, heteroskedastic, logit, and hybrid. The best-fitting model was selected for the value set based on its logical consistency, ability to account for left-censored and heteroskedasticity data, and statistical significance of parameters.

**Results:** The 300 interviews provided 4,500 cTTO responses and 4,200 DCE responses. The demographic characteristics of respondents were representative of the Ghanaian population for religious background, level of education, and marital status. The preferred model chosen for the Ghana value set was hybrid tobit, random effect heteroskedastic, constrained model. The predicted value for the worst attainable health on the EQ-5D-5L (i.e., health state 55555) was  $-0.493$  and that of the best health state (11112; except full health) was  $0.969$ . The largest decrement was registered for level five mobility (0.369) followed by pain/discomfort (0.312), self-care (0.273), anxiety/depression (0.271), and usual activities (0.268).

**Conclusions:** This is the first Ghanaian EQ-5D-5L value set based on social preference derived for a nationally representative sample in Ghana. The value set will play a key role in the institutionalization of HTA in Ghana and the use of economic evaluation studies to inform priority setting where different health technologies can be compared. A planned findings dissemination to stakeholders is underway.