

(FDA) and the European Commission (EC) to help improve health outcomes. To ensure sustainability, digital health interventions (DHI) require funding by payers. Evidence-informed decision and policy making requires an assessment of the impact on relevant outcomes vs current healthcare practice. Various national and international organizations are involved in creating or guiding the development of standards for the evidence required for digital technologies.

Methods. We undertook an intensive individual investigation of the websites of leading payer and health technology assessment (HTA) bodies in France, UK, Germany, Belgium, Austria, Finland, Canada, Australia, and the USA to identify new frameworks and any updated information. As the objective focused on evaluation frameworks which were used across DHIs by a particular payer to support pricing and reimbursement decisions, we excluded individual case studies where DHIs had been assessed, regulatory frameworks for approval of DHIs and frameworks which assessed feasibility or applicability of a DHI since these were not directly influencing the decision for funding.

Results. We found six frameworks which directly address digital health interventions for the purposes of pricing and reimbursement: NICE Evidence Standards, FinCCHTA, MSAC, Germany BfArM, Belgium RIZIV and France HAS. The context for the framework and the requirements were compared on parameters including those normally found in HTA and for criteria related to digital technologies. The parameters included varied considerably across the frameworks as did the level of evidence expected to be available for the assessment. In some cases, these related to the level of risk or impact of the intended DHI.

Conclusions. While DHIs are increasingly used in health, HTA is struggling to adapt to assess these technologies. Due to the multidisciplinary nature of digital health (combination of health care and technology), and the speed and rate of change of innovations in this area, an approach based upon the risk assessment posed by the technology seems reasonable. In this way the level of effort can be tailored to those interventions which seek to influence care or predict outcomes rather than those which are tailored to increased awareness of the patient about their condition.

PD46 Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis In Healthcare: Scientometric And Bibliometric Analysis

Zeqi Dai (daizq_1015@163.com), Simin Xu, Xue Wu, Ruixue Hu, Huimin Li, Haoqiang He, Jing Hu and Xing Liao

Introduction. Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is a useful tool in complex decision-making situations and has been used in medical fields to evaluate treatment options and drug selection. We aimed to provide valuable insights on the use of MCDA in health care through examining the research focus of existing studies, major fields, major applications, most productive authors and countries, and most

common journals in the domain using a scientometric and bibliometric analysis.

Methods. Publications related to MCDA in health care were identified by searching the Web of Science Core Collection on 14 July 2021. Three bibliometric software programs (VOSviewer, Bibliometrix, and CiteSpace) were used to conduct the analysis.

Results. A total of 410 publications were identified from 196 academic journals (average yearly growth rate of 32% from 1999 to 2021), with 23,637 co-cited references by 871 institutions from 70 countries or regions. The USA was the most productive country (n=80), while the Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (n=16), Université de Montréal (n= 13), and Syreon Research Institute (n=12) were the most productive institutions. The biggest nodes in every cluster of author networks were Aoa Alaa Zaidan, Mireille Goetghebeur, and Zoltan Kalo. The top journals in terms of number of articles (n=17) and citations (n=1,673) were Value in Health and the Journal of Medical Systems, respectively. The research hotspots mainly included the analytic hierarchy process (AHP), decision-making, health technology assessment, and healthcare waste management. In the recent literature there was more emphasis on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and fuzzy Technique for Order Preference by Similarities to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS). Big data, telemedicine, TOPSIS, and the fuzzy AHP, which are well-developed and important themes, may be the trends in future research.

Conclusions. This study provides a holistic picture of the MCDA-related literature published in health care. MCDA has a broad application in different topic areas and would be helpful for practitioners, researchers, and decision makers working in health care when faced with complex decisions. It can be argued that the door is still open for improving the role of MCDA in health care, both in its technologies and its application.

PD47 Associations Of Orphan Designation And Other Drug Development-Related Factors On Rollout Times And Health-Technology-Assessment Recommendations Of New-Active-Substances

Belen Sola-Barrado (bsola@cirsoci.org), Tina Wang and Neil McAuslane

Introduction. The orphan designation has been used by the European Medicines Agency to incentivize the development of drugs treating rare diseases with high-unmet medical needs by supporting their development process and economic returns. This study evaluated the impact of the regulatory orphan designation and other drug development-related factors on the rollout times and Health-Technology-Assessment (HTA) recommendations of new active substances (NASs).