Getting omics into healthcare
-what’s for sale
and why aren’t governments buying?
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Reimbursement of health care through the Commonwealth public purse

Pharmaceuticals $9.2 billion pa

Non-pharmaceuticals $20 billion pa

PBAC

MSAC
The ICER value framework
(Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio)

\[
\text{ICER} = \frac{\text{Net costs A} - \text{net costs B}}{\text{Net effects A} - \text{net effects B}}
\]

Effects = Life years gained (LYG) or Quality adjusted life years gained (QALYG)
Cost effectiveness and decisions

- More cost, less effect (✗)
- More cost, more effect
- Less cost, more effect (✔)
- Less cost, less effect (؟)
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Comparative clinical effectiveness

Incremental cost per outcomes achieved

Other benefits or problems (ie. oral vs IV)

Contextual considerations (clinical need, alternatives)

VALUE
Financial implications for
government health budgets - Affordability

- Drugs + tests + imaging + services + XX + XX
- Over a 5 year period
- Estimates of patient numbers
- Proportions of current population being treated
- Patient preferences
- Setting - primary care or specialist
- Likelihood of new tests/medicines or treatments
- Uptake pattern – unmet demand or latent populations
Who is selling and who is buying?

**PBS (drugs)**
- Single seller – pharma
- Single buyer - commonwealth
- Single negotiation on payment mechanisms
- Manage risk of leakage or excessive expenditure (risk share and price volume arrangements)

**MBS (non-drugs)**
- Multiple sellers
- Multiple buyers
- Often no negotiation – pay the asking price
- Uncontrolled risk of excess expenditure
Genomics a lever to bend the (healthcare) cost curve?
Sources of uncertainty for buyers?

- Evidence base is sparse
- Evidence is not fit for purpose
- ICERs often high but low total financial cost if only used in rare groups
- Gatekeepers poorly defined
- High risk of use outside reimbursement conditions
- Paying for test results that aren’t ordered
- Assessing “value” of a “black box”
What is a black box?

• “assay composed of or derived from multiple molecular measurements and interpreted by a fully specified computational models to produce a clinically actionable result” ETO-IOM, 2012

• Re-stated: Multiple inputs, processing by predictive algorithm, probabilistic outputs

• Black boxes appear black to all except those who develop and operate them – source of uncertainty and suspicion from regulators and payers
Current framework for evaluation is not sufficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Big data nuances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical validity</td>
<td>Test ability to measure accurately and reliably the analyte</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical validity</td>
<td>Ability to predict the disorder</td>
<td>+++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical utility</td>
<td>Ability to improve patient outcomes</td>
<td>+++++++++++++++++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discovery study

- Inputs
- Computer algorithm
- Reporting

Validation studies
- Independent samples
- Use the black box without re-optimisation

3 if proximate outcomes
1 if distant outcomes (10 yrs)

- Analytical validity
- Clinical validity
- Clinical utility
- Prognostic value
- Predicting treatment effect
Independent assessor

- Assess development pipeline
- Adherence to quality control
- Complete separation of discovery and validation
- Description of confounders in the validation data set
- Standard HTA assessment of quality and scientific rigor
- Similarities of participants in discovery/validation with proposed reimbursed population
- Variability over time – must show alterations don’t affect results
Reactive approach: traditional HTA assessment (value based assessment)

- Evidence
- Cost of test
- ICER
- Financial cost
Proactive approach: integration at health system level

- Identify sector needs
- Facilitate technology development process
- Clinical utility of genetic testing for sectors of community
- Cost of genetic/genomic testing
- Demand for genomic testing
Innovative approach: integration with broader economy

• Best **outcome** for the population as a whole

• Deliver major **economic outcomes:**
  
  *shared gain/shared risk*
  
  *new industries in health/science/education - based on knowledge not sophisticated manufacturing*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reactive: Fee for service for individual tests | - Economic incentive for oversupply  
- Inequity in access  
- Fragmentation of care delivery | - Current state  
- Increasingly unsustainable |
| Proactive: Sourcing tests that a health system needs | - Avoids fragmentation  
- Coordinated service delivery | - Identify needs  
- Political cooperation – state & commonwealth  
- Preparedness to prioritise |
| Innovative: Creating publically owned research | - Shared reward for taxpayers and patients and local industry | - Build partnerships between academia and industry  
- Redesign research workforce training |