Introduction / Objective
Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is a structured decision-making process that offers flexibility to incorporate multiple objectives and criteria into a single evaluation.1 MCDA has potential as a supplemental tool to traditional value assessment, however, education and training on MCDA in the United States is lacking.2 The objective of this work was to educate stakeholders on MCDA approaches in value assessment and to assess value perceptions using hypothetical treatment case examples.

Two hypothetical treatment profiles were presented to participants, each with similar cost-efficacy evidence. One treatment was for Non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma and the other for recurring migraines. Participants were asked to rate these as being consistent with “Low,” “Intermediate”, or “High” value care, both before and after the use of an MCDA tool.

Results

A Wilcoxon signed rank test showed no significant differences (p-value > 0.086) between ratings in value before and after consideration of treatment MCDA scores for Treatment A.

A Wilcoxon signed rank test showed no significant differences (p-value > 0.388) between ratings in value before and after consideration of treatment MCDA scores for Treatment B.

Conclusion
Significant differences in perceived value between Treatment A and Treatment B, before the considering MCDA, shows that despite consistent economic evidence, Treatment A and Treatment B had different perceptions of value. Suggesting nuances in other clinical evidence may have played a part in value judgements. Findings suggest nuances in other clinical evidence may play a part in value judgements. Further educational exercises and MCDA applications are needed before MCDA can be applied for V/HTA use in the United States.
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