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Categories of Evidence and Consensus

- **Category 1**: Based upon high-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus (≥85%) that the intervention is appropriate.

- **Category 2A**: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus (≥85%) that the intervention is appropriate.

- **Category 2B**: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is NCCN consensus (50-85%) that the intervention is appropriate.

- **Category 3**: Based upon any level of evidence, there is major NCCN disagreement (at least 3 institutions on each side) that the intervention is appropriate.

*All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise noted.*
Categories of Preference

- **Preferred intervention:** Interventions that are based on superior efficacy, safety, and evidence; and, when appropriate, affordability

- **Other recommended intervention:** Other interventions that may be somewhat less efficacious, more toxic, or based on less mature data; or significantly less affordable for similar outcomes

- **Useful in certain circumstances:** Other interventions that may be used for selected patient populations (defined with recommendation)

All recommendations in the NCCN Guidelines are considered appropriate
Categories of Preference: Goals

• Stratify Guidelines to clarify panel and institutional preferences for interventions

• Provide guidance to users of the Guidelines on which recommendation(s) is considered optimal

• Continue to provide a wide range of recommendations to meet varying clinical circumstances and patient preferences
Categories of Preference: Why

• To preserve the NCCN Guidelines as the go-to resource for clinical and shared decision-making;

• To maintain breadth of NCCN recommendations for special circumstances that require them;

• Because fewer interventions used regularly result in more efficient and safer care;

• And because restrictive pathways are being adopted in response to payer demands.
PPVF Initiative is Driving Forward the Patient Voice in Value Assessment

✓ Developed condition-agnostic framework for patient-centered value assessment
✓ Solicited input and synthesized 100 public comments
✓ Gathered patient input via surveys/focus groups
✓ Released Version 1.0 (infographic and methodology report) to the public

Phase II: Test & Refine (2017 – 2018)
✓ Quantified scoring methodology & illustrated its components in 2 conditions
✓ Co-developed with advanced breast cancer patients a “Preparation for Shared Decision-Making” tool
✓ Created foundation for technical advancement of PPVF components in external value assessment

Phase III: Applications (2018 to present)
➢ Leverage the PPVF’s domains, criteria, and measures to reframe the value conversation from the patient’s perspective
➢ Validate and test the “Preparation for Shared Decision-Making” tool in the clinical setting

Since Phase I, the PPVF has been guided by a multi-stakeholder Steering Committee spanning patient groups, providers, payers, and industry

1. Version 1.0 materials can be found at the following link: http://avale.re/2pJsAd1
2. The PPVF Scoring Methodology can be found at the following link: http://avalere.com/expertise/providers/insights/avalere-releases-patient-perspective-value-framework-scoring-methodology
3. The PPVF-driven SDM tool prototype can be found at the following link: http://avalere.com/expertise/providers/insights/developing-a-shared-decision-making-tool-in-collaboration-with-patients-and
Advances in cancer care have significantly improved patient outcomes (25%) but the cost draws new attention ($100k-$300k)

Key Purchaser Interests

- Timely access to appropriate care with limited obstacles and barriers
- Unwelcome level of financial burden to a course of treatment
- Balancing quality/improved cancer care outcomes while keeping a prudent eye on costs

Complex Support Processes

Quality of Network (MD, PCMH, ACO)
Second Opinion & Tumor Board
Dedicated cancer hotline/nurseline
Specialized Case Management
Site of Care/Pharmaceuticals
Radiation, Chemotherapy, Immunotherapy
Therapy adherence & tolerance
Patient experience & safety
Clinical trials eligibility & enrollment
Financial considerations
Back-to-work support
Palliative care, Hospice & End of Life