

AHRQ'S Perspective On Clinical Utility

Gurvaneet Randhawa, MD, MPH
Medical Officer,
Senior Advisor on Clinical Genomics
and Personalized Medicine



Outline

Background

AHRQ activities



Background

- Large gaps in knowledge of the impact of therapeutics and (especially) diagnostics on patient outcomes in realworld clinical practice
- Large number of interventions for common diseases: Added value of new?
- Valid information on benefits and harms is critical for decision-making: clinical; guidelines; coverage; regulatory



Background

- Natural history and disease pathogenesis often incompletely understood: Will improvement in surrogate markers improve patient outcomes?
- Limitations in existing infrastructure capabilities and in study methods affect validity and generalizability of conclusions
- Goals of biomedical researchers and clinical providers are typically not aligned



Comparative Effectiveness Research (FCCCER)

- Comparative effectiveness research is the conduct and synthesis of research comparing the benefits and harms of different interventions and strategies to prevent, diagnose, treat and monitor health conditions in "real world" settings.
- The purpose of this research is to improve health outcomes by developing and disseminating evidence-based information to patients, clinicians, and other decision-makers, responding to their expressed needs, about which interventions are most effective for which patients under specific circumstances.

http://www.hhs.gov/recovery/programs/cer/cerannualrpt.pdf



Goals of AHRQ's Effective Health Care (EHC) Program

Established in 2004 for conducting userdriven CER (mandated under MMA)

- Create new knowledge
- Review and synthesize existing knowledge
- Translate and disseminate findings
- Train and build capacity



Genomics Projects

- EPC reports: EGAPP, USPSTF, NIH, CMS, CDC, clinical societies etc.
- RCTs: Warfarin gene-based dosing, two PROSPECT projects
- Computer-based CDS tool for assessing BRCA mutation risk in primary care
- Existing infrastructure to ascertain utilization and outcomes of gene-based applications
- Analytic validity, quality rating and evaluation frameworks of genetic and lab tests



EHC Investments in Electronic Infrastructure

- Distributed research networks: Funded '07
- New: DARTNet (PBRN, link several EMRs)

http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/53/151/2 009_0728DEcIDE_DARTNet.pdf

- Enhancement of existing: HMORN

http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productID=150

Published in Annals of Internal Medicine (2009; 151)



A Focus on Prospective Electronic Clinical Data

- Build on successes and lessons learned from DRN projects
- Goal: Build multi-purpose, dynamic, electronic prospective data systems leveraging current HIT investments
- Spans several AHRQ portfolios:
 - Comparative Effectiveness
 - Health Information Technology
 - Prevention and Care Management
 - Patient Safety



Four ARRA RFAs (> \$100 M Investment)

- CER in ARRA (2009): http://www.hhs.gov/recovery/programs/cer/index.html
- PROSPECT: Prospective Outcome Systems using Patient-specific Electronic data to Compare Test and therapies (AHRQ-ARRA; Six R01s)
- Scalable DRNs (OS-ARRA; Three R01s)
- Enhanced registries for QI and CER (OS-ARRA; Two R01s)
- Electronic Data Methods (EDM) Forum (AHRQ-ARRA; One Cooperative Agreement)



Common Themes Across R01 Projects

- Link multiple healthcare delivery sites
- Connect multiple databases
- Focus on priority populations and conditions
- Prospective, patient-centered outcomes
- Conduct CER
- Valid and generalizable conclusions
- Focus on governance and stakeholder involvement
- Sustainable



Additional Features of Registry and DRN Projects

Registry: Build on existing registry, QI and CER project, sustainable and scalable

Scalable DRN: Multiple cohorts (at least four pairs of increasing complexity), at least two unrelated priority conditions, near-real time, sustainable and scalable



Electronic Data Methods (EDM) Forum

- A central repository and resource for information on the use of prospective electronic clinical data (PECD) for CER
- The EDM Forum:
 - Collects, synthesizes, and shares lessons learned from efforts to build infrastructure and conduct CER
 - Engages stakeholders in the science and also to understand the needs and challenges in this area
 - Builds resources and tools to advance the science and understanding of CER



EDM Forum Activities

- Analytic methods
- Clinical informatics
- Data Governance
 - Security
 - Privacy
 - Access
- CER and learning healthcare system, including:
 - Quality improvement
 - Use in clinical decision support
 - Meaningful engagement



EDM Forum: Organizational Chart

EDM Forum Leadership

AHRQ PO: Gurvaneet Randhawa

AHRQ Staff: Jean Slutsky, Elise Berliner, Yen-Pin Chiang, Scott Smith, Jon White

AcademyHealth PI: Erin Holve

AcademyHealth Staff: Alison Rein, Michael Gluck, Marianne Hamilton Lopez, Beth Johnson, Courtney Segal, Sonia Nagda

EDM Forum Consultants

Mike Stoto, Wade Aubry, Jonathan Nebeker, Neil Sarkar

Steering Committee Chair: Ned Calonge

Subcommittees: Analytic Methods, Clinical Informatics, Data Governance

PROSPECT

Projects

CER HUB PI: Brian Hazlehurst

Kaiser Foundation Research Institute (Northwest)

SUPREME-DM

PI: John Steiner Kaiser Foundation Research Institute

PEAL Network PI: Tracy Lieu Harvard Pilgrim Health Care

COMET
PI: Clete Kushida
Stanford University

WICER

PI: Adam Wilcox Columbia University

Indiana PROSPECT PI: Paul Dexter Indiana University

Enhanced Registries

Projects

SCOAP

PI: David Flum University of Washington

Pediatric Enhanced Registry PI: John Hutton

Children's Hospital Medical Center Cincinnati

Scalable Distributed Research Networks Projects

SCANNER

PI: Lucila Ohno-Machado University of California, San Diego

SPAN

PI: Matthew Daley Kaiser Foundation Research Institute

SAFTINet

PI: Lisa Schilling University of Colorado Denver

http://www.edm-forum.org/publicgrant/Home/



Questions?



Limitations of RCTs

- Highly selected patient populations and clinical settings
- Not useful for detecting rare events or long-term outcomes
- Commonly report surrogate outcomes
- Not suitable for many clinical and policy questions: rapidly evolving technology, large number of variables, utilization, factors affecting adherence, preferences
- Expensive, one-off studies

Limitations in Using Advancing Excellence in Health Care Administrative Claims-based Data

- Created for billing; not research, quality improvement, or clinical decision support
- Lack details on diagnostic tests and results
- Limited clinical information: co-morbidity, disease severity, diet & supplements, type of device or procedure etc.
- Lack patient reported outcomes
- Increased risk of erroneous conclusions due to selection bias, confounding etc.
- Data obtained after considerable lag