



## Three Trends Medical Leaders Need to Know about How Customers Are Making Decisions

Across the last year, Advisory Board spoke with 50+ medical and HEOR executives, as well as 100+ decision-makers across the health care ecosystem to understand the impact of key trends and market disruptions. Through these conversations, we identified three trends that are influencing customers' decision making and impacting how medical leaders should approach 2021.

LEARN MORE

Want to learn more about our research? Check us out at <u>advisory.com/medicalleader</u> or email <u>medicalleader@advisory.com</u>

## Health technology assessment organizations are no longer "emerging" stakeholders. They have become entrenched sources of influence in U.S. payer and provider decision-making.

Over the last few years, a growing number of loosely-termed <u>health</u> <u>technology assessment (HTA)</u> organizations are increasingly evaluating evidence, conducting cost/benefit analyses, and opining on the value of drugs, devices, and diagnostic technologies. Key players in this space are now core stewards of medical value—exerting significant influence on product use and value decisions among payer and provider customers.

<u>ICER</u> is a prominent example. Its assessments of value for new medical treatments, measured in cost-per-QALY,<sup>1</sup> reliably generate buzz among a cross-section of industry stakeholders. In 2020, ICER played a key role in how Gilead Sciences priced Remdesivir during its Covid-19 rollout. But ICER is not the only organization weighing in on medical value. Other key players in this space, such as Innovation and Value Initiative (IVI), ECRI, and Lumere, are prominent voices in conversations about the clinical benefits and relative value of new treatments and medical supplies in the U.S.

In practice, payers and providers typically use HTAs to aggregate data and support a range of decisions—like product purchasing, formulary coverage, and clinical guideline development. Increasingly, HTAs are also used to support appropriate use at the point of care. For example, Lumere provides clinical decision support tools that HCPs can embed directly in the EHR. And ICER recently launched ICER Analytics and The ICER Evidence Compendium, both of which enable payers, providers, patient groups, and regulators to more readily access ICER's reports during clinical decision-making.

With Covid-19 intensifying the debate over medical value, we expect these stakeholders to become even more influential than they are today. Consequently, medical and health economics and outcomes research (HEOR) executives should develop holistic, proactive, cross-functional HTA engagement strategies. Organizations that fail to account for HTAs in their evidence generation, medical communication, and customer engagement plans risk heightened barriers to adoption and patient access.

1) Quality-adjusted life year.

### 

## 02

### The growing use of physician-tophysician communication platforms is diffusing and diversifying medical influence across a broader—and harder to control—network of voices.

Medical leaders have long recognized that key opinion leaders (KOLs) are "dying." That is, the traditional academic key opinion leader is no longer the only source, or even the primary source, of medical influence. In the last few years, medical leaders have shifted their focus from traditional KOLs toward those with localized influence, such as Pharmacy and Therapeutics (P&T) and Value Analysis Committee (VAC) leaders. But the pace of change in digital communications means that even this strategy is no longer sufficient.

Today, nearly all HCPs rely on information-sharing platforms and digital physician networks like Doximity, epocrates, UpToDate, and Sermo. These platforms provide access to real-time, tailored medical information and evidence synthesis, as well as robust online forums for HCPs to share insights and opinions with their peers. For example, HCPs on Sermo can "rate" individual drugs. HCPs on Doximity can discuss individual patient cases, seek second opinions, and weigh in on new clinical evidence.

The upshot is that medical information—and in particular, medical opinion has become ubiquitous. The network of voices influencing clinical decisions is much more diffuse than before. And influence is shifting away from prominent academic opinion leaders toward physicians who feel like peers. Utilization data from Doximity show that HCPs increasingly prefer insight from peers with similar educational backgrounds, similar training experiences, or who treat similar patients. Many times, Doximity users will even vet information they hear from KOLs by conferring with their peers online. In short, the very notion of who counts as an opinion leader or influencer is evolving.

Of course, this new landscape of medical influence will have a profound impact on medical communication strategy. Medical leaders must identify and understand the new patterns of influence that result from online communication platforms. This includes not only who has influence, but also what kind of evidence matters in these spaces and what formats of information resonate most. For example, early evidence suggests that influence patterns vary by specialty and that video-based information is easier for busy audiences to understand and retain.

# 03

### Patient voices are getting louder and stronger, causing other health care stakeholders to shift their thinking about what constitutes value and meaningful evidence.

Despite the industry's buzz around patient-centricity, true patient-centeredness remains more aspiration than reality. This isn't due to lack of effort. Like many aspects of health care, complex and competing incentives can hinder stakeholder alignment on basic definitions, methods, and objectives for patient-centeredness. But while many stakeholders continue to wrestle with a shared definition of patient-centricity, several are finding new and impactful ways to incorporate patients' voices into clinical development processes, regulatory guidelines, and analytical methods. As a result, those stakeholders are poised to significantly influence conversations about value and appropriate treatment selection.

For example, health technology assessment organizations like ICER and IVI are creating value frameworks designed specifically to help payers and providers elevate the patient voice in value assessments. FDA is developing guidance on how to capture patient-centered and patient-reported endpoints in clinical trials, potentially expanding the role of patient preference in new product approvals and label expansions. Research organizations, like PROMIS and PCORI, are educating stakeholders about the value of patient-centered and patient-reported data. And some payers and providers have even developed outcomes-based contracts that incorporate patient-reported outcomes, like quality of life metrics, thereby tying reimbursement to measures that truly matter to patients.

The pandemic and its aftermath will only exacerbate consumer anxiety about the clinical, financial, and quality of life trade-offs among different treatment options. Payers, IDNs, individual HCPs, and even digital information-sharing platforms will face new pressure to incorporate patient perspectives into the formularies, frameworks, and tools that guide patient/provider decisions.

To ensure medical evidence and value messaging resonate with these diverse stakeholders, medical leaders must monitor how the voice of the patient influences customers' priorities and decision-making processes, and develop evidence that directly supports patient-centered decision-making.

Want to learn more about our research? Check us out at <u>advisory.com/medicalleader</u> or email <u>medicalleader@advisory.com</u>

#### CREDITS

PROJECT DIRECTOR

Pamela Divack

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Brandi Greenberg

CONTRIBUTING EXPERTS

Solomon Banjo

Katie Schmalkuche

Daphney Gaston

DESIGNER

Kate Young

### LEGAL CAVEAT

Advisory Board has made efforts to verify the accuracy of the information it provides to members. This report relies on data obtained from many sources, however, and Advisory Board cannot guarantee the accuracy of the information provided or any analysis based thereon. In addition, Advisory Board is not in the business of giving legal, medical, accounting, or other professional advice, and its reports should not be construed as professional advice. In particular, members should not rely on any legal commentary in this report as a basis for action, or assume that any tactics described herein would be permitted by applicable law or appropriate for a given member's situation. Members are advised to consult with appropriate professionals concerning legal, medical, tax, or accounting issues, before implementing any of these tactics. Neither Advisory Board or or y of this report, there are used by Advisory Board or any of its employees or agents, or sources or other third parties, (b) any errors or omissions in this report, whether caused by Advisory Board or any of its employees and agents to abide by the terms set forth herein.

Advisory Board and the "A" logo are registered trademarks of The Advisory Board Company in the United States and other countries. Members are not permitted to use these trademarks, or any other trademark, product name, service name, trade name, and logo of Advisory Board without prior written consent of Advisory Board. All other trademarks, product names, service names, trade names, and logo os used within these pages are the property of their respective holders. Use of other company trademarks, product names, service names, trade names, and logos or images of the same does not necessarily constitute (a) an endorsement by such company of Advisory Board and its products and services, or (b) an endorsement of the company or its products or services by Advisory Board. Advisory Board is not affiliated with any such company.

#### IMPORTANT: Please read the following.

Advisory Board has prepared this report for the exclusive use of its members. Each member acknowledges and agrees that this report and the information contained herein (collectively, the "Report") are confidential and proprietary to Advisory Board. By accepting delivery of this Report, each member agrees to abide by the terms as stated herein, including the following:

- 1. Advisory Board owns all right, title, and interest in and to this Report. Except as stated herein, no right, license, permission, or interest of any kind in this Report is intended to be given, transferred to, or acquired by a member. Each member is authorized to use this Report only to the extent expressly authorized herein.
- 2. Each member shall not sell, license, republish, or post online or otherwise this Report, in part or in whole. Each member shall not disseminate or permit the use of, and shall take reasonable precautions to prevent such dissemination or use of, this Report by (a) any of its employees and agents (except as stated below), or (b) any third party.
- 3. Each member may make this Report available solely to those of its employees and agents who (a) are registered for the workshop or membership program of which this Report is a part, (b) require access to this Report in order to learn from the information described herein, and (c) agree not to disclose this Report to other employees or agents or any third party. Each member shall use, and shall ensure that its employees and agents use, this Report for its internal use only. Each member may make a limited number of copies, solely as adequate for use by its employees and agents in accordance with the terms herein.
- 4. Each member shall not remove from this Report any confidential markings, copyright notices, and/or other similar indicia herein.
- 5. Each member is responsible for any breach of its obligations as stated herein by any of its employees or agents.
- 6. If a member is unwilling to abide by any of the foregoing obligations, then such member shall promptly return this Report and all copies thereof to Advisory Board.



655 New York Avenue NW, Washington DC 20001 202-266-5600 | **advisory.com**