

HTW Prioritisation Assessment

Topic Number: TER354

Topic title: Processed or cadaveric nerve allografts (PNA)

Initial screen:

	Yes	No
Is there sufficient evidence on which to base prioritisation assessment scoring? ¹	x	

Summary of scores:

Criterion	Weighting	Score	Contribution
Clinical impact	.25	1	0.25
Budget impact	.25	1	0.25
Burden of disease	.15	1	0.15
Stakeholder interest	.20	2	0.4
Equity	.15	0	0
Total (maximum possible score = 3)			1.05

Details of prioritisation assessment:

Criterion	Definition (Weight)	Score	Score Definition	Comments
Clinical Impact¹		3	Major potential improvement in clinical outcomes	
		2	Moderate potential improvement in clinical outcomes	

Criterion	Definition (Weight)	Score	Score Definition	Comments
	Potential for the technology to have an impact on patient-related health outcomes (benefits and harms) (25)	1	Little potential improvement in clinical outcomes	Evidence suggested that there may be limited benefits to patients. The best evidence from the RCT suggested improvements on one measure of pressure but not on another. And no improvement on disability or pain compared to other approaches. The available review is low quality and the included evidence (small sample uncontrolled studies) and methods (raw comparison of %) mean it has limited validity. May be some benefit in reducing complications at graft site but this didn't come across strongly in evidence.
		0	No expected change in clinical outcomes	
Budget impact²	Impact of the technology on health care spending (25)	3	Major cost savings or expense expected (greater than £1M)	
		2	Moderate cost savings or expense expected (between £200K and £1M)	

Criterion	Definition (Weight)	Score	Score Definition	Comments
		1	Limited cost savings or expense expected (between £20K and £200K)	We have not been able to find much evidence on relative cost of PNA compared to other approaches. There is a single paper which suggests in the discussion that PNA may reduce some theatre time to the lack of need for grafting from another site. But this appears to be limited and patient population is small.
		0	Negligible cost savings or expense expected (less than £20K)	
Burden of disease	The (serious) ³ nature of the condition involved, and the size of the population that would be affected by the technology (15)	3	Affects 5% or more	
		2	Affects from 1% to < 5%	
		1	Affects from 0.05% to < 1%	
		0	Affects < 0.05%	This type of never damage appears to be rare and in available estimates represents only 2-3% of people admitted to a major trauma centre which in turn would be a low proportion of the population. Further, evidence seems to suggest only a subgroup of patients where usual repair isn't possible would benefit.

Criterion	Definition (Weight)	Score	Score Definition	Comments
			<p>+2 (up to a maximum score of 3) for any technology intended to have an effect on a serious condition or a serious aspect of a condition.</p> <p>For example, a technology intended to treat a serious condition, which affects from 1% to < 5% of the population, scores 3. A technology intended to treat a serious condition, which affects < 0.05% of the population, scores 2.</p>	+1 This does appear to be a severe condition with significant impacts on disability and quality of life.
Stakeholder interest	The level of known or anticipated demand for the technology, and/or the likelihood that advice will be adopted.	3	There is clear evidence of stakeholder interest and clear evidence that HTW's advice would be acted upon by NHS Wales	
		2	It is likely that there is both stakeholder interest and that HTW's advice would be acted upon by NHS Wales	Topics was referred by WHSCC and it seems likely that there would be a route to recommendations being adopted
		1	It is likely that there is either stakeholder interest or that HTW's advice would be acted upon by NHS Wales	
		0	There is little or no likelihood of either stakeholder interest or that HTW's advice would be acted upon by NHS Wales	
Equity		3	Major potential to affect equity in health status	
		2	Moderate potential to affect equity in health status	
		1	Minor potential to affect equity in health status	

Criterion	Definition (Weight)	Score	Score Definition	Comments
	The technology has the potential to introduce, increase, or decrease equity in health status (15)	0	Will not affect equity in health status	Does not appear to be any reason that this would impact equity given the limited potential improvement and nature of the condition.

¹ Technologies that may directly affect patient mortality would receive a score of 3 for this criterion, whereas technologies with an intermediate outcome (such as influencing treatment decisions) may receive a lower score.

² Cost ranges are derived from CADTH criteria: converted to £GBP from \$CAN and adjusted using the ratio of Wales population: Canada population.

³ A serious condition or disease is defined as one associated with morbidity that has substantial impact on day-to-day functioning. Short-lived and self-limiting morbidity will usually not be sufficient, but the morbidity need not be irreversible if it is persistent or recurrent. Whether a disease or condition is serious is a matter of clinical judgment, based on its impact on such factors as survival, day-to-day functioning, or the likelihood that the disease, if left untreated, will progress from a less severe condition to a more serious one.

Examples of technologies intended to treat a serious condition include:

- A diagnostic product intended to improve diagnosis or detection of a serious condition in a way that would lead to improved outcomes.
- A product intended to mitigate or prevent a serious treatment-related side effect (e.g., serious infections in patients receiving immunosuppressive therapy).
- A product intended to avoid or diminish a serious adverse event associated with available therapy for a serious condition (e.g., product that is less cardiotoxic than available cancer therapy).
- A product intended to prevent a serious condition or reduce the likelihood that the condition will progress to a more serious condition or a more advanced stage of disease.

Definition taken from WHSCC Prioritisation Document, Section C, A1.

For interpretation of scores, refer to the CADTH topic identification and prioritization process:

https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/HTA_OU_Topic_ID_and_Prioritization_Process.pdf