



# SCIENTIFIC ADVICE: HOW WE SEE THE ROLE OF PATIENTS

## Session 2 – Improving Multi-Stakeholder Early Dialogues and Scientific Advice

François Houyez

Symposium on Improving Patients' Access to Rare Diseases Medicines  
13 February 2019, Brussels

**EURODIS.ORG**

# Evidence generation : a continuum

## Evaluation guidelines and/or Community Advisory Boards (CABs): what can be done?

= A pre-competitive advice

- Multi-developers and HTA
- Explore patient needs
- Instrument selection
- Clinical Outcomes databases...

## Scientific Advice (iterative) and/or CABs +/- HTA: how to do it?

- Study design, comparator
- Protocol development
- Mixed Methods
- Analysis & modelling
- Compassionate use

## Evaluation, HTA, pricing: What's the promise?

- Benefit/risk
- Clinical meaningfulness
- Relative efficacy
- Uncertainties
- Utilities
- Reasonable price



## Post-launch studies (PAES, PASS, PLEG): Is the promise confirmed?

- Pharmacovigilance+++
- Real-life benefits
- Patient satisfaction, adherence
- (Market entry agreements)
- (Observational studies, registries)



# Steps



*Not enough time!*  
*Intimidating!*  
*Frustrating!*

## Find patients

Agency own database and EURORDIS when OMP

## Mentor

By agency and/or EURORDIS

Explain procedure and role

Dofl (+ gvt and health insurers)

Confidentiality undertaking

Documents (e-meetings)

## Involve

Not only to respond to questions, but elaborate their own

In all preparatory discussions

In face-to-face meeting (accompany them if needed)

In feedback

## Evaluate input

Questionnaire to developer

Questionnaire to experts

Questionnaire to patients:

- Do you think your opinion was listened to?
- If not, explain
- Did your advice differ from the one expressed?

## Acknowledge input

No name disclosure

Name organisation and/or country

D -120

- Letter requesting Scientific Advice / Early Dialogue

D -100

- (when relevant), contact EURORDIS to identify patients (share SA request letter) and/or own database of experts

D -75

- **Teleconference** with developer (clarifications and first questions) – **patients included. Ask patients which questions they have**

Patients come in

D -60

- Responses from developer (in writing, **shared with patients**): final documents

D -15

- **E-meeting** between experts and **patients**, key issues discussed, including patients' issues

D 0

- **Meeting**. Developer can also invite **patients** (e.g. CAB members), or CAB letter

D +15

- Written answer, with the **views of patients and reviewed by patients**



## Questions to you

Do you think patients should always be invited and attend the face-to-face meeting? Or only when HTA decide?

Do you think patients should receive the same materials than other experts, or only some of it?  
Could patients discuss issues with others?

Do you think patients who never met with the developer should be involved? Or a mix of “naïve” and more “expert” patients?

SA or ED is a snapshot, and rarely iterative.  
EURORDIS believes it is the start of a dialogue with the developer. What do you think?

Thank you for your attention.

François Houyez

Director of Treatment Information and Access

[francois.houyez@eurordis.org](mailto:francois.houyez@eurordis.org)

