

Name, Address and Organisation: Rita Faria, Centre for Health Economics, University of York, UK.

Grant Application Number: 4942

Project title: Research visit to University of Tokyo on economic evaluation for health technology assessment in Japan

Date of Grant letter: 1st March 2016

- 1. Please summarise your project with reference to the initial proposal, indicating any changes made to your original application.**

I proposed a research visit to develop the methods and practice of economic evaluation for health technology assessment in Japan. The research visit was meant to take place between the 9th-20th May 2016 at the University of Tokyo, Japan, hosted by Professor Isao Kamae. The short duration of the research visit meant that the Canon Institute for Global Studies (CIGS) was better placed to offer a visiting fellowship rather than the University of Tokyo. Professor Kamae is research director of CIGS and hence could also host me there. Since I was able to secure a large number of appointments during the first week of the visit, I shortened the research visit to CIGS by two days from the 20th to the 18th of May.

- 2. To what extent was your project breaking new ground? What aspects of it were new and/or significant?**

The research visit broke new ground for a number of reasons. It was well timed since the Japanese government introduced a pilot to test health technology assessment in April. I engaged and presented to a wide range of people from various backgrounds, including academia, consultancy companies and pharmaceutical industry. The presentations ranged from the basics of economic evaluation for health technology assessment to the latest developments in economic evaluation in the UK:

- I presented at CIGS to an academic audience on how economic evaluation is used in the UK and on my specific research interests (see Appendix 1 for slides).
- I participated in a discussion on health technology assessment in the University of Tokyo with Masters' students.
- I presented in two panels in the 2016 Annual Meeting of Health Technology Assessment international, in Tokyo, where the audience was mainly composed of academics representatives of ministries of health and health technology assessment agencies from across the world (see Appendices 2 and 3 for slides).
- I met with Professor Masaru Mimura and Dr Mitsuhiro Sado from Keio University, who have projects in the evaluation of an intervention to reduce the progression of dementia. Subsequent to that meeting, I presented to this research group on a project I have on dementia care (see Appendix 4 for slides).
- I presented to the health economics study group on how health technology assessment and economic evaluation is conducted in the UK (see Appendix 5 for slides). The study group is composed of representatives from the pharmaceutical industry and consultancy companies. Subsequently to this meeting, I was invited to discuss the methods and processes of health technology assessment with key representatives of a consultancy company (GR consulting).

Furthermore, I was introduced to a large number of people with an interest in health technology assessment (see Appendix 6 for business cards). We discussed how health technology assessment and economic evaluation are used in the UK for decision-making and key learnings for Japan.

- 3. How was your project executed? Did it proceed to plan? Did you achieve your objectives? If it was an event, please attach the programme and full publicity. If it was a trip/visit, please attach the itinerary.**

The objectives of the research visit were to: (i) provide researchers with the opportunity to gain insights into the methods which are currently used extensively in the UK, (ii) to discuss the challenges in applying these methods in the Japanese context and to propose ways of addressing them, and (iii) to develop new research collaborations. All the three objectives were achieved. My presentations and the discussions that ensued enabled researchers and other stakeholders interested in health technology assessment to understand the methods and processes used in the UK. There were many instances where we discussed the feasibility of the UK approaches to Japan and possible adaptations. Thirdly, I am discussing researchers at Keio University the possibility of a new research collaboration on dementia care.

The visit itinerary is attached in Appendix 7. In my proposal, I had planned to: present seminars, deliver a workshop, collaborate on Professor's Kamae project and participate and present at the 2016 Annual Meeting of Health Technology Assessment international. The project delivery mostly proceeded to plan. I presented three seminars and participated and presented at the 2016 Annual Meeting. I did not present the workshop on the methods and practice in economic evaluation in the UK because it was not selected for presentation at the 2016 Annual Meeting. It was also unfeasible to collaborate in Professor's Kamae project on the challenges facing the implementation of economic evaluation and health technology assessment in Japan. Nonetheless, my trip achieved its objectives and will facilitate collaborations in the future.

4. What were the principal outcomes of the project? Its initial results? The expected lasting impact? If appropriate, include number of participants/audience numbers/attendees.

The initial outcomes of my research visit were:

- Meeting and being introduced to a wide range of people, including academics, policy-makers and industry representatives with an interest in economic evaluation and health technology assessment (see Appendix 6 for business cards).
- Discussing the methods and practice economic evaluation and health technology assessment in the UK and how could these be adapted to Japan (see Appendices 1-5 for presentations). The presentations had a good size audience, from approximately 15 researchers in CIGS to approximately 50 on one of the panels in the 2016 Annual Meeting.

I expect that, on the long term, the different stakeholders in Japan will view the University of York as the preferred partner to further develop the methods and practice in health technology assessment and economic evaluation. This is already starting with the potential collaboration with researchers at Keio University on the evaluation of an intervention to reduce the progression of dementia.

5. Finally, what are your plans for the future and how will the continuity of your project be guaranteed?

I was invited to comment on the draft paper on the pilot evaluation of an intervention to reduce the progression of dementia led by Dr Mitsuhiro Sado and colleagues from Keio University. The pilot evaluation is currently ongoing and is due to finish by Autumn. If the pilot evaluation has positive results, Dr Sado and I will discuss my input in the evaluation 'proper' and how to adapt the intervention to the UK context and its subsequent evaluation.

More generally, I will contact key individuals whom I met during my visit to restate my key areas of research interest, the areas where the University of York has the most expertise, and reinforce our openness for research collaborations in the future.

Name & date: Rita Faria, 01/06/2016