THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH

The National Pharmaceutical Council has collected six years of survey data about stakeholders’ views on comparative effectiveness research (CER) and its potential impact on health care decision-making.

KEY TRENDS HAVE EMERGED:

- Health care decision-makers agree CER will ultimately have a positive impact on health care decision-making.
- They believe the full impact of CER is at least three to five years in the future.
- Translating CER results into actionable recommendations could increase its impact.

STAKEHOLDERS CONSISTENTLY RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF CER:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THERE ARE MANY ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGED IN CER. STAKEHOLDERS SAID:

- NIH and PCORI are leaders when it comes to funding and monitoring CER, and the biopharmaceutical industry is also expected to have a role in this area.
- PCORI, NIH and AHRQ continue to be leaders for establishing CER priorities.
- Patient Groups are also seen as having a key role.
- Academia and Biopharmaceutical Industry remain strong leaders in conducting research.
- PCORI and AHRQ are expected to play leadership roles in establishing CER standards.
- AHRQ, PCORI and Academia have leadership roles for CER translation and dissemination.

NPC’S SURVEY ALSO ASKED STAKEHOLDERS ABOUT THE BROADER CURRENT HEALTH CARE ENVIRONMENT

- Agreed-Upon Research Standards: Compared to 2011, more stakeholders are optimistic that there is growing movement toward widely agreed-upon research standards.
- Research Priorities: 35 percent of stakeholders thought research priorities somewhat and/or adequately reflected treatment choices faced by patients and providers.
- Completeness of the Comparative Effectiveness Evidence Base: Most stakeholders still do not think the breadth of evidence is “complete enough to inform the choices faced by patients and providers.”
- Transparent and Objective Processes: Slightly less than half of survey respondents said there is little or no transparency in evidence evaluation.
- Use of Real-World Evidence: 48 percent of stakeholders said use of real-world evidence is limited in decision-making.
- Value Assessment of Treatments: 56 percent of respondents said the value of treatments remains narrowly focused on only clinical effectiveness instead of considering other factors.

The survey was fielded between September 14, 2015, and January 11, 2016, among key stakeholders who are knowledgeable about CER. These stakeholders include researchers, thought leaders, government, academic health plans, employers, business coalitions, and associations. A total of 146 stakeholders participated.

For more information, please visit: www.npcnow.org/cersurvey16
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