

additional tools. Formal launch took place at the 2023 Cochrane Colloquium.

Results: Officially launched in September 2023, the LATITUDES Network indexes validity assessment tools developed for healthcare studies in an online library. To date, 10 key tools are featured to help reviewers identify the optimal tool for their use. Nineteen additional tools have met all screening criteria and are also recommended. Information characterizing each tool (e.g., citation and training materials) is provided. Seven tools are currently under development. A mechanism for users to suggest new tools is provided. Additional tools and information on toolkits and online training materials, as well as links to courses and events, will be added over time.

Conclusions: LATITUDES aims to be the primary resource that provides key information to reviewers conducting validity assessments for evidence synthesis, clinical guideline development, and HTA decision-making. It is intended to increase the robustness of evidence synthesis by improving the process of validity assessment, helping scientists use tools more effectively and efficiently, promoting best practices, and harmonizing validity assessment across the globe.

PD39 First Approach For Assessing Statistical Significance In Industry Funded Matching-Adjusted Indirect Comparison Studies: A Scoping Review

Cecilia Farinasso, Aline da Rocha, Flávia Medeiros,
Lays Marra, Patricia Parreira, Layssa Oliveira,
Vinicius Ferreira,
Rosa Lucchetta (rc.lucch@yahoo.com.br) and
Haliton Alves De Oliveira Junior

Introduction: When indirectly compared trials are too heterogeneous to provide a reliable estimate, matching-adjusted indirect comparison (MAIC) studies can be employed. This technique is commonly used for oncology treatments. MAIC is an indirect comparison that adjusts effect-modifying variables through propensity score methods. The objective of this study was to map the characteristics of MAIC studies in oncology.

Methods: We performed a scoping review of the characteristics of MAIC studies that applied MAIC to compare active treatments in oncology. The literature search was last updated in August 2023 in PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library. We extracted sources of funding, outcomes reported, and whether the results were significantly in favor of the trial for which individual patient data (IPD) were available or for the aggregate data. We then calculated the relative risk (RR) and confidence interval (CI) of an outcome favoring the IPD trial technology that was also funded by industry.

Results: A total of 90 studies were included in the review. The pharmaceutical industry was the most frequent funder (n=78; 87%); the source of the IPD data was not reported in 68 studies (76%). In total, 391 efficacy outcome estimates were reported in base case analyses. The risk of favoring IPD while being funded by industry was 93 percent, while the risk of favoring IPD while having other sources of funding was 61 percent (RR 1.520, 95% CI: 1.146, 2.016; p=0.004). Specifically, the RR was 1.246 (95% CI: 0.891, 1.743) for overall survival and 1.426 (95% CI: 0.959, 2.120) for progression-free survival.

Conclusions: MAIC results are influenced by the choice and number of effect-modifying variables used for matching the population. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidelines consider it necessary to provide evidence that the matched estimate will be less biased than the unmatched one. We have concluded that industry funded MAIC studies may be more likely to report results favoring IPD than studies with another funding source.

PD40 Pilot Healthcare Programs - Bridging The Evidence Gap For Innovative Technologies

Jarosław Gruszka (jaroslaw.gruszka@aotm.gov.pl),
Katarzyna Sejbuk-Rozbicka, Magdalena Koperny,
Maciej Dzik, Aleksandra Pelczarska, Joanna Syta and
Kamila Malinowska

Introduction: The scarcity of high quality evidence is a common constraint on the willingness to publicly fund innovative technologies. Our aim was to prepare a Methods and Process Guide to support the development of pilot healthcare programs in Poland. Such guides play a pivotal role in enhancing the quality of pilot programs and confidence in public funding decisions in health care.

Methods: We reviewed guidelines for pilot healthcare programs published by the World Health Organization (WHO) and other healthcare organizations and analyzed the pilot healthcare programs in Poland. The Ministry of Health in Poland and the general public will be invited to provide feedback on the Guide.

Results: Pilot programs serve as valuable testing grounds for healthcare solutions in low risk, small-scale clinical practice settings. A pilot program may be considered for interventions with proven safety and effectiveness, and when the intervention is complex, its implementation requires testing, or the intervention is considered high cost. Our Methods and Process Guide defines key elements of pilot healthcare programs, including objectives, starting criteria, conducting conditions, and monitoring rules. Public consultation on the Guide is underway.

Conclusions: The publicly available Methods and Process Guide should enhance the methodological rigor of pilot healthcare programs in Poland. Well-designed pilot programs are expected to provide high quality real-world data that will facilitate public funding decisions for innovative technologies.