What matters most? An exploration of decision criteria considered by patients with GEP-NET and physicians using holistic Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis
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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

• Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) provides a structured and transparent approach to support evidence-based decision making by health technology assessment agencies, patients and healthcare providers.

• This study aimed to explore the decision criteria used by patients with gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumors (GEP-NET) and physicians.

OBJECTIVES

• To explore the preferences and underlying criteria that patients and clinicians use when making their decisions on the treatment options for unresectable, well-differentiated GEP-NET.

• To assess the variability of what matters most to patients.

• To gain insights on decision criteria for other rare diseases.

• To provide useful tools and resources for stakeholders to facilitate evidence-based decision making.

METHODS

• A decision support framework was designed based on EVIDEM structure, literature review, and participants’ insights.

• Participants were instructed to divide 100 points across the criteria, and divide 100 points across the benefit-risk criteria.

• Participants were instructed to divide 100 points across the criteria, and divide 100 points across the benefit-risk criteria.

• The open-source EVIDEM MCDA framework was designed to stimulate structured and transparent decision making.

DESIGN

• Mixed-methods study including quantitative and qualitative data collection.

RESULTS

• The majority of participants deemed that all criteria of the EVIDEM MCDA framework were important for decision-making.

• Participants found the process innovative and helpful since it allowed them to make informed decisions.

• Among Benefit-risk criteria, Disease severity (mean 0.19 ± SD 0.12) and Disease symptoms (mean 0.01) were assigned the highest weights (Figure 3).

• Safety/tolerability (mean 0.1 ± 0.08) followed by Comparative effectiveness (0.17 ± 0.07) and Comparative safety/tolerability (0.13 ± 0.08) (Figure 4).

• This study illustrates how holistic MCDA reveals and structures the complexity and variability of what matters most to patients.
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