


Comparative review of selected health technology assessment agencies: Features and insights for health technology assessment development and improvement
Short title: Health technology assessment agencies and system development

Zonglin Dai, Effie Ka Yue Cheung, Ting Wang, David Makram Bishai, Lei Si, Benjamin Hon Kei Yip, Yingyao Chen, Ian Chi Kei Wong, Andrew J. Mirelman, Manuel Antonio Espinoza, Xue Li



PII: S2950-2667(26)00036-4

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharp.2026.06.007>

Reference: PHARP38

To appear in: *Pharmacoeconomics and Policy*

Received date: 24 February 2026

Revised date: 9 June 2026

Accepted date: 10 June 2026

Please cite this article as: Zonglin Dai, Effie Ka Yue Cheung, Ting Wang, David Makram Bishai, Lei Si, Benjamin Hon Kei Yip, Yingyao Chen, Ian Chi Kei Wong, Andrew J. Mirelman, Manuel Antonio Espinoza and Xue Li, Comparative review of selected health technology assessment agencies: Features and insights for health technology assessment development and improvement
Short title: Health technology assessment agencies and system development,
Pharmacoeconomics and Policy, (2026)
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharp.2026.06.007>

This is a PDF of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form. As such, this version is no longer the Accepted Manuscript, but it is not yet the definitive Version of Record; we are providing this early version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that Elsevier's sharing policy for the Published Journal Article applies to this version, see: <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/sharing#4-published-journal-article>. Please also note that, during the production process, errors may be

discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Comparative review of selected health technology assessment agencies: Features and insights for health technology assessment development and improvement

Comparative review of selected health technology assessment agencies: Features and insights for health technology assessment development and improvement

Short

title:

Health technology assessment agencies and system development

Zonglin Dai ^{a,b,c,1}; Effie Ka Yue Cheung ^{a,b,1}; Ting Wang ^d; David Makram Bishai ^e; Lei Si ^{f,g}; Benjamin Hon Kei Yip ^h; Yingyao Chen ⁱ; Ian Chi Kei Wong ^{b,j,k,l}; Andrew J. Mirelman ^m, Manuel Antonio Espinoza ^{e*}; Xue Li ^{a,b,c*}

^a Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Medicine, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China

^b Centre for Safe Medication Practice and Research, Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China

^c The University of Hong Kong - Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518053, China

^d Centre for Innovation in Regulatory Science (CIRS), London, EC3A 8BE, UK

^e School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China

^f School of Health Sciences, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW 2560, Australia

^g Translational Health Research Institute, Western Sydney University, Penrith, NSW 2751, Australia

^h Jockey Club School of Public Health and Primary Care (JCSPHPC), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China

ⁱ School of Public Health, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200032, China

^j Aston Pharmacy School, Aston University, Birmingham, B4 7ET, UK

^k Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau SAR, 999078, China

^l Advanced Data Analytics for Medical Science Limited, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China

^m Department of Health Financing and Economics, World Health Organization, Geneva, CH-1211, Switzerland

* Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: sxueli@hku.hk (X. Li), mesp@hku.hk (M.A. Espinoza).

¹ Both authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Health technology assessment (HTA) is increasingly used to guide coverage and pricing decisions, but many countries lack formal HTA agencies or rely on fragmented processes. This study aims to compare institutional and procedural features of selected HTA agencies and to derive policy options for establishing, institutionalising, or reforming HTA in diverse health systems. Using the World Health Organization's five-component institutionalisation framework, researchers completed a comparative narrative review of ten HTA systems. Thirty-five structural and procedural elements were extracted and synthesised into five analytical modules covering governance, assessment methods, institutional roles, lifecycle integration, and stakeholder engagement to enable structured cross-country comparison. HTA functions, authority, and processes varied widely. Independent agencies undertook broader mandates, whereas ministry-based units were more closely linked to reimbursement and policy implementation. Assessment relied on hybrid internal-external evidence review models, followed by formal appraisal or deliberation in all systems. Binding coverage outcomes were observed in England, France, Germany, and Brazil, although the legal force and implementation pathway differed across agencies. Pricing negotiation arrangements differed but were commonly linked to appraisal outputs. Horizon scanning, early scientific advice, and disinvestment mechanisms were unevenly implemented, while few systems employed lifecycle-oriented practices. HTA systems differ widely in governance, scope, and authority, and these differences shape their influence on pricing and reimbursement policies. Strengthening statutory integration, analytical capacity, and transparent engagement, especially where HTA is emergent or fragmented, is essential for legitimacy and sustainability. This study offers transferable options for settings without formal HTA agencies and may guide reforms towards sustainable and equitable health system goals.

Keywords: Health technology assessment, Institutional governance, Coverage and pricing, Lifecycle management, Stakeholder engagement

1. Introduction

Health technology assessment (HTA) is now integral to evidence-informed decision-making and efficient resource allocation.¹ As countries pursue universal health coverage under fiscal constraints, HTA supports strategic purchasing by assessing the clinical, economic, and societal value of health technologies.² Over the past three decades, diverse HTA institutions have emerged, shaped by national priorities, governance arrangements, and technical capacity.^{3,4} Established bodies have refined mature methodologies, while newer systems adapt these models to local context.⁵

These institutions assess, generate and appraise evidence to guide funding, pricing, and coverage decisions.¹ Despite their global diffusion, they differ markedly in mandate, governance, funding, and policy influence.^{6–8} Procedures and methods also vary, with some systems focusing on detailed evaluation of individual technologies and others linking assessments more directly to benefit-package design or reimbursement decisions.^{6,9} Such institutional differences affect how evidence is produced, appraised, and integrated into policy, with implications for transparency, stakeholder engagement, and methodological rigour.¹⁰

Yet existing comparative work has focused mainly on high-income settings or on technical methods, with less attention to governance and lifecycle dimensions, particularly in middle-income contexts.^{8,11} Although institutional arrangements vary widely, procedural norms for appraisal and stakeholder involvement are becoming more aligned globally. These principles still require adaptation to national contexts, and lessons from international experience remain essential for strengthening HTA systems and enhancing policy relevance.

In many high-income settings, a single national HTA programme systematically evaluates health technologies and guides coverage or pricing decisions. USA lacks a single national HTA programme, relying on fragmented, payer-specific processes with variable transparency and methods.¹² Some countries also operate hybrid systems, in which the national-level HTA is applied selectively to technologies with substantial expected budget impact, while other coverage decisions remain with or are delegated to individual payers, as in the Netherlands.¹³ Recent policy debates and expert initiatives have reconsidered how HTA-related functions might inform USA drug pricing, coverage, and benefit design, yet no coherent institutional model has been implemented.¹² This context further illustrates the need for comparative, system-level benchmarks to guide countries as they shape and strengthen their HTA arrangements.

Against this background, this comparative review examines ten selected health technology assessment agencies across ten jurisdictions, develops a five-module framework for describing their institutional and procedural features, and derives insights to inform the development, institutionalisation, and improvement of HTA in diverse health systems.

2. Methods

2.1 Study design

We conducted a comparative narrative review of ten HTA systems examining governance structures, processes, and institutional features. Referencing the World Health Organization's (WHO) five components framework for HTA institutionalisation i) mandate establishment, ii) legal foundation, iii) institutional arrangements, iv) procedural mechanisms for assessment and appraisal, and v) monitoring and evaluation, we designed a five-module analytical framework incorporating 35 structural and procedural elements to capture the end-to-end HTA process.^{4,14} These elements were operationalised as comparative items for this review, informed in part by the WHO survey domains, and refined through review of official agency documents, procedural guidance, legislative and regulatory materials, and comparative HTA literature. Table S1 illustrates the mapping of modules and comparative elements. The modules include: i) HTA structure, governance, and institutional functions; ii) assessment scope and methodology; iii) institutional roles in topic selection, assessment and appraisal; iv) integration of HTA into coverage, pricing, and lifecycle management; and v) stakeholder engagement and external collaboration. This modular structure enables systematic comparison and helps readers navigate how HTA systems operate across governance, assessment, and decision-making contexts.

The ten agencies were selected to capture variation in HTA institutionalisation, geographic distribution, and economic settings where well-established processes and publicly available documentation permit systematic comparison. Selection was guided by observable institutional features and the availability of sufficient public documentation for structured cross-jurisdictional comparison. The WHO HTA and Health Benefit Package Survey (2020–2021)¹⁵ and the published cross-country synthesis by Mirelman et al⁴ provided a global context for country-level HTA institutionalisation and informed the broader comparative framing of this review. The sample included National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom and the Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC) in Scotland, the Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee (PBAC) in Australia, the Canada's Drug Agency (CDA, formerly the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health prior to May 2024), the German health technology assessment arrangement involving the Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen, IQWiG) and the Federal Joint Committee (Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss, G-BA), the Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS) in France, the National Committee for Health Technology Incorporation into the Unified Health System (Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no Sistema Único de Saúde, CONITEC) in Brazil, the Agency for Care Effectiveness (ACE) in Singapore, and the Malaysian Health Technology Assessment Section (MaHTAS).⁴ In China, we focused on the National Healthcare Security Administration (NHSA), where HTA-related evidence is used in the National Reimbursement Drug List (NRDL) adjustment process, while broader HTA-related activities are also undertaken by

multiple academic and government-affiliated bodies, including institutions within the National Health Commission.^{2,16} Jurisdictions were selected to illustrate diverse governance arrangements and context-specific adaptation of HTA within publicly funded health systems.

Several jurisdictions host more than one health technology assessment body. For example, Australia separates responsibilities between PBAC and the Medical Services Advisory Committee.¹⁷ In this review, we focused on agencies with a central role in collective coverage and pricing decisions for pharmaceutical products, where such a role exists.

2.2 Data sources and search strategy

Primary data were extracted from official HTA agency websites, which provided the most recent information on governance, procedures, and mandates as of May 2026 (Supplementary data). These were complemented by the WHO HTA and Health Benefit Package Survey (2020–2021),⁴ technical manuals, procedural guidance, government documents, and peer-reviewed literature.^{2,4,18–21} Structured searches covered PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, and grey literature. Following screening for relevance and credibility using predefined criteria, a second reviewer (EKYC) cross-checked key steps in source identification, screening, and data extraction. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and, where needed, adjudication by the senior authors. Supplementary data detail the search strategies, eligibility time frames, and screening and validation procedures.

2.3 Data extraction and analysis

We mapped 35 data elements to the five WHO institutionalisation components and reorganised the elements into five thematic modules. A structured extraction template was developed in Microsoft Excel, adapted from the WHO framework, to capture governance, procedural, and methodological features across jurisdictions. All data were independently verified by a second reviewer, with discrepancies resolved through consensus and reference to primary sources (Supplementary data).

3. Results

3.1 Overall patterns across the HTA agencies

Across the ten systems, HTA arrangements cluster around five inter-related components (Table 1). Together, these components describe a shared HTA pathway from early dialogue and topic selection to implementation, monitoring, and possible disinvestment (Fig. 1) and align with pre-assessment, assessment and appraisal, and post-decision stages (Fig. 2). Fig. 3 shows that core assessment and funding-related functions are generally well institutionalised across the ten systems, while topic selection, regulatory alignment, and procurement-related functions are more variable or less developed.

3.2 Module 1 HTA structure, governance and functions

HTA bodies differ in institutional form (Table S2). NICE, HAS, IQWiG, and CDA are separate statutory or arm's-length agencies. PBAC and SMC are expert advisory committees to the government. CONITEC, ACE and MaHTAS are units embedded in ministries of health or national health authorities. In China, the NHSA centres the reviewed arrangements through the NRDL adjustment process.

NICE, SMC, PBAC, HAS, CONITEC, and the German IQWiG/G-BA arrangement have explicit legal mandates and all report to a ministry of health, a national health service, or a statutory insurance body. HTA-based decisions are binding on payers in England and Germany. In France and Brazil, recommendations become binding after endorsement. Agencies are formally advisory in many other systems, but still strongly shape coverage and pricing.

Separate agencies (NICE, HAS, IQWiG, and CDA) tend to have more full-time staff, embedded units (CONITEC, ACE, and MaHTAS) are smaller, and committee-based bodies (PBAC and SMC) are more reliant on part-time experts. Functional breadth varies but commonly includes economic evaluation, clinical guideline development, budgeting support, pricing and reimbursement, benefit package design, while procurement-related roles are generally limited or indirect and are mainly connected to reimbursement listing, price negotiation, or volume-based purchasing.

3.3 Module 2 assessment scope and methodology

HTA agencies differ in technology scope and depth of appraisal (Fig. S1). HAS and CONITEC assess a broad range of technologies, including medicines, vaccines, devices, diagnostics, procedures, digital health, and selected public health interventions. NICE also has a broad scope, although routine vaccine appraisal is only partially covered. The German IQWiG/G-BA arrangement has broad but more pathway-specific coverage. CDA extends beyond pharmaceuticals, PBAC focuses on medicines and vaccines, and SMC focuses mainly on prescription medicines. ACE and MaHTAS are expanding beyond initial or predominant medicines-focused portfolios. In China, the use of HTA-related evidence is expanding within the NHSA-led NRDL drug reimbursement process, although the scope reviewed in this study remained centred on pharmaceuticals. A frequent pattern is to begin with pharmaceuticals and broaden the scope over time.

Assessment programmes range from a single stream for drugs to multiple programmes for different technology types, with primary programmes and outputs summarised in Table S3. Timelines and annual assessment volumes also vary widely (Table S4). PBAC, SMC, ACE, and MaHTAS generally run shorter, more standardised cycles, while NICE, CDA, the German IQWiG/G-BA arrangement and the NRDL adjustment process in China undertake longer and

more resource-intensive evaluations. Annual volumes ranged from a few dozen to one thousand assessments. Most agencies maintain rapid review pathways, although these are less evident in PBAC.

Recommendation structures fall into decision-oriented models that issue positive, conditional, or negative guidance and value-rating models that grade added clinical benefit and link this to reimbursement and price. Most agencies reviewed do not use an explicit cost-effectiveness threshold. Where agencies use thresholds, these serve mainly as flexible reference points rather than fixed cut-offs, with final deliberations also incorporating clinical benefit, unmet need, equity, budget impact, and feasibility.

3.4 Module 3 institutional roles in topic selection, assessment, and appraisal

Across systems, new drug evaluations follow a broadly similar pathway (Fig. 1). After early dialogue in some jurisdictions, nominated topics are checked for eligibility and scoped, followed by evidence assessment and committee appraisal, final coverage and pricing decisions, and later review.

In a few settings, including United Kingdom, Australia and Canada, parallel regulatory-HTA review is well established, Malaysia uses it occasionally, while it is absent in others (Table S5). Most assessments are initiated by manufacturers, while a smaller group of systems also accepts topics from ministries, payers, or clinicians. Only a few agencies, including NICE, ACE and MaHTAS, apply formal topic prioritisation with explicit criteria on clinical importance, budget impact, equity, national priorities, feasibility, and horizon-scanning signals.

Evidence assessment commonly combined in-house review with external academic or expert input, although the extent, tasks, and engagement mechanisms varied across agencies. Evidence reviewed within the NHSA-led NRDL process in China involves multidisciplinary expert assessment and pharmacoeconomic evaluation. External or academic teams support evidence review, model reanalysis, methodological advice, or contextual evidence generation (Tables S5 and S6). Engagement mechanisms vary across systems (Table S5). Several agencies routinely undertake independent reanalysis or de novo studies, whereas others, including SMC, CDA, IQWiG/G-BA, and HAS, generally start from manufacturer-submitted dossiers and supplement these with internal critique, external expert review, or model validation where applicable. Outputs are structured evidence reports summarising clinical, economic, and contextual findings.

Appraisal is carried out by standing experts or multidisciplinary committees that interpret assessment results in light of local policy and budgets. In most systems, these committees advise a ministry, national health service, or statutory payer; in a few (e.g., G-BA and NHSA), the payer body itself acts as the appraisal and decision-making forum. Final coverage decisions and reimbursement conditions are usually endorsed by national or, in federal systems, subnational authorities.

3.5 Module 4 institutional integration of HTA into coverage, pricing, and lifecycle management

HTA is increasingly organised as a lifecycle process, linking early identification, assessment, adoption, monitoring, and possible disinvestment. This relies on horizon scanning, early scientific advice, use of real-world evidence, and periodic reassessment.²²

Formal horizon scanning functions are operated by CDA, SMC, HAS, CONITEC-linked units, ACE, MaHTAS, and by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Innovation Observatory to support NICE. NICE, CDA, PBAC, IQWiG/G-BA, and HAS provide structured early scientific advice or pre-submission consultation mechanisms (Table S7).

Formal post-listing review mechanisms include guidance review or withdrawal (NICE), delisting or modification of listings under the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme, reassessment of reimbursement status (HAS), reassessment or prescribing restriction/exclusion (G-BA), disinvestment or exclusion of technologies (CONITEC), and renewal or removal from the reimbursement list (China NRDL), typically in response to emerging evidence, safety concerns, or changes in clinical or economic value.

Across jurisdictions, HTA plays a central role in post-approval pricing. Positive or conditional recommendations commonly trigger price negotiations, managed entry agreements, or value-based adjustments, and inform centralised or mixed procurement models that reflect each system's broader financing and governance arrangements.

3.6 Module 5 stakeholder engagement

Across agencies, HTA bodies generally lead assessment and support appraisal or dissemination, while governments, payers, or statutory bodies retain primary responsibility for selection, reimbursement, pricing, or implementation decisions. Patients, clinicians, academic experts, and industry sponsors usually contribute through submissions, hearings, consultations, or advisory input rather than formal voting roles (Fig. S2).

Links with regulators are strongest where early advice or parallel review structures exist. In these settings, HTA agencies and medicines regulators coordinate scientific advice and, in some cases, align timelines for regulatory approval and reimbursement decisions (Table S8^{16,21,23–26}). Other systems rely on looser collaboration, with more informal exchanges or early dialogue still in development.

4. Discussion

This review found substantial variation across the selected jurisdictions in the institutional organisation, procedural design, and policy integration of HTA systems, particularly in formal authority, the allocation of assessment and appraisal responsibilities, and the extent to which

HTA was linked to coverage, pricing, reassessment, and other post-listing processes. These findings suggest that HTA ranges from an advisory evidence review function to a more direct role in healthcare decision-making.

4.1 Institutional arrangements and governance

The comparative results suggest that institutional architecture is an important feature of how HTA is organised and linked to decision-making. Agencies established as separate entities often show greater procedural separation from ministries, whereas HTA units embedded in ministries or national health authorities tend to operate with closer alignment to ministerial or payer priorities. Hybrid arrangements, in which technical assessment is institutionally separated from final political or payer endorsement, reflect different ways of balancing technical independence and public accountability across health systems.⁹ In this context, HTA governance can also be understood within the broader literature on public-sector delegation, institutional autonomy, and accountability, where greater autonomy may strengthen technical credibility but also raise questions about democratic legitimacy.²⁷ These findings expand on prior comparative studies that described national differences primarily in technical standards, by adding a broader examination of governance structures, levels of procedural transparency, and the policy authority of HTA recommendations.³

4.2 Appraisal, deliberation, and value frameworks

Although evidence generation and appraisal remain anchored in clinical and economic evaluation, many agencies increasingly consider ethical, social, organisational, legal, and contextual dimensions of value.²⁸ In Europe, the HTA Core Model, developed within the European Network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA), supports this in part by providing a structured multidimensional framework for HTA.²⁹ Subsequent Commission-supported methodological cooperation fostered convergence through shared guidance, collaborative assessment practices, and cross-country learning, although uptake has varied across jurisdictions.³⁰ These broader value frameworks reflect appraisal practice across systems, where committees interpret clinical, economic, and contextual evidence in light of wider policy, professional, and patient considerations. HTA has long combined comparative clinical assessment, economic evaluation, and committee-based deliberation, with assessment in many systems focusing substantially on relative clinical effectiveness compared with current standards of care. HTA appraisal and clinical guideline development share important features such as evidence synthesis coupled with structured deliberation.³¹ These patterns suggest that variation in HTA recommendation-making not only informs methodological choices but also the institutional arrangements through which evidence is interpreted and applied in decision-making.

4.3 Lifecycle integration and procedural innovation

The integration of horizon scanning, early scientific engagement, and reassessment processes illustrates a growing shift from static appraisal toward continuous evaluation across the technology lifecycle.^{22,32} Several mature agencies, including NICE and HAS, have developed lifecycle-oriented mechanisms that connect early evidence-generation activities with later reassessment in order to reduce uncertainty and support more efficient resource allocation.²² The persistence of gaps in structured disinvestment, however, signals a critical weakness in many systems, particularly in emerging economies.³³ Addressing these gaps will be critical for emerging HTA systems to fully realise the benefits of continuous evaluation and strengthen the link between evidence generation, resource allocation, and benefit-package management.³⁴

4.4 Stakeholder engagement and public legitimacy

Stakeholder engagement and transparency are widely recognised as central to the legitimacy of HTA.^{35,36} Although multi-stakeholder participation, including patients, clinicians, policymakers, and industry, is rising, implementation varies markedly across settings. Recent studies identified important differences in the extent, timing, and influence of patient and public involvement, as well as persistent practical and institutional barriers such as limited capacity, inconsistent procedures, and variable uptake of patient input.^{37–40} Agencies in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Canada, and Brazil (via CONITEC's public consultation) have established structured mechanisms that enhance trust and align decisions with societal values. In contrast, Malaysia and China show limited or selective participation, with fewer formalised opportunities for stakeholder input. Engagement mechanisms alone do not ensure influence; meaningful impact requires well-defined and transparent processes and genuine integration of stakeholder input.³⁶ Strengthening transparent, substantive engagement remains essential for accountable and credible HTA policy.

4.5 HTA as a mechanism for health system stewardship

A critical finding is the central and expanding role of HTA in pricing, reimbursement, and negotiation processes across all the reviewed jurisdictions. This transformation marks a shift from analytical evaluation to strategic stewardship of health system value, ensuring that innovation aligns with efficiency and fiscal responsibility.⁴¹ Despite this progress, integration of HTA recommendations into binding policy decisions varies; a reflection of the differences in institutional authority, accountability, and policy integration.^{35,42} Sustaining this transformative role requires continuous reinforcement of institutional authority, methodological rigour, and policy integration to ensure that HTA remains a credible and effective pillar of evidence-informed health system governance.⁹

4.6 Good practices and cross-agency collaboration in HTA

The comparative framework applied in this study aligns with the domains outlined in the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR) HTA Council Good Practices Recommendations, which include institutional governance, transparent assessment, contextualisation, implementation, and monitoring.⁴³ Viewing the analysis through this lens indicates that national HTA systems, although developed to address their own policy and health-system contexts, are progressively aligning with internationally recognised features of good practice such as early scientific advice, structured stakeholder engagement, and explicit appraisal and decision-making procedures. Interpreting the findings in relation to these principles extends the contribution of this comparison beyond descriptive mapping by illustrating differences in both institutional maturity and adherence to good-practice standards.

Cross-jurisdiction collaboration is also a growing driver of methodological alignment and capacity strengthening. In Europe, the European Union (EU) HTA Regulation has been described as a move towards a more harmonised HTA framework, introducing joint clinical assessments, joint scientific consultations, and closer cooperation among Member States.⁴⁴ Regional collaboration also continues through networks such as HTAsiaLink, which support peer learning, capacity building, and shared methodological development across jurisdictions.⁴⁵

This analysis underscores the ongoing challenges of strengthening HTA systems, especially in settings with limited resources. Rapid advances in digital, genomic, and artificial intelligence-based technologies heighten methodological demands, while gaps in data, regulatory alignment, and technical capacity constrain effective HTA institutionalisation. Priority areas include adaptable frameworks, greater use of real-world evidence, and evaluation of HTA impact on outcomes and equity. Policymakers should invest in capacity building, support greater methodological standardisation where appropriate, embed transparent processes, and expand international collaboration to support sustainable and equitable health system development.⁴⁶

4.7 Implications for low- and middle-income countries

For low- and middle-income countries, the findings suggest HTA is often more practical when introduced through incremental, decision-linked arrangements embedded in ministries of health or payer institutions.¹⁴ Early implementation is commonly more feasible when focused on pharmaceuticals or other high-budget-impact technologies, using explicit topic selection and relatively simple assessment approaches that match data and analytical capacity.³ Regional networks and academic partnerships may strengthen technical capacity and support institutional development, particularly where local HTA expertise remains limited.^{21,45} However, the transferability of models from higher-income settings remains constrained by weak routine data systems, fragmented financing arrangements, and broader political and

institutional context, all of which can affect the production, acceptance and implementation of HTA recommendations.

4.8 Limitations

This study relies primarily on publicly available data from official agency websites, technical manuals, and published literature, which may not reflect the most recent or nuanced developments in institutional practice, especially in jurisdictions where transparency is limited. The selection of ten jurisdictions, while designed to capture a range of HTA maturity, does not encompass all global contexts, particularly low-income countries. Differences in data granularity, reporting standards, and language barriers may also introduce inconsistencies in cross-jurisdiction comparisons. In rapidly evolving policy environments, institutional arrangements may change over time, and the characterisation presented here reflects publicly available information identified during the study period.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates substantial variation in how HTA systems are governed, structured, and integrated into health policy processes. Institutional design, degree of independence, and procedural transparency determine the breadth of their roles within decision-making frameworks. Using the WHO institutionalisation framework, this comparative analysis advances understanding of the relationship between governance arrangements and the maturity of HTA systems, providing evidence to support efforts aimed at strengthening institutional capacity, methodological consistency, and transparency in evidence-informed health policy. These comparative lessons also serve as a practical reference for governments and stakeholders seeking to establish or expand HTA functions within their health systems.

References

1. O'Rourke B, Oortwijn W, Schuller T. The new definition of health technology assessment: A milestone in international collaboration. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2020;36(3):187–190. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462320000215>.
2. Chen Y, Zhao K, Liu G, et al. Health technology assessment to inform decision making in China: Progress, challenges, and sustainability. *BMJ*. 2023;381:e068910. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-068910>.
3. Falkowski A, Ciminata G, Manca F, et al. How least developed to lower-middle income countries use health technology assessment: A scoping review. *Pathog Glob Health*. 2023;117(2):104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20477724.2022.2106108>.
4. Mirelman AJ, Goel K, Edejer TT. The global landscape of country-level health technology assessment processes: A survey among 104 countries. *Health Policy OPEN*. 2025;8:100138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hopen.2025.100138>.
5. Drummond M, Barbieri M, Cook J, et al. Transferability of economic evaluations across jurisdictions: ISPOR good research practices task force report. *Value Health*. 2009;12(4):409–

418. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00489.x>.
6. Fontrier AM, Visintin E, Kanavos P. Similarities and differences in health technology assessment systems and implications for coverage decisions: Evidence from 32 countries. *PharmacoEconomics Open*. 2022;6(3):315–328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41669-021-00311-5>.
7. Millar R, Morton A, Bufali MV, et al. Assessing the performance of health technology assessment (HTA) agencies: Developing a multi-country, multi-stakeholder, and multi-dimensional framework to explore mechanisms of impact. *Cost Eff Resour Allocation*. 2021;19(1):37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12962-021-00290-8>.
8. Nemzoff C, Shah HA, Heupink LF, et al. Adaptive health technology assessment: A scoping review of methods. *Value Health*. 2023;26(10):1549–1557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2023.05.017>.
9. Oortwijn W, Jansen M, Baltussen R. Evidence-informed deliberative processes for health benefit package design – part II: A practical guide. *Int J Health Policy Manag*. 2022;11(10):2327–2336. <https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2021.159>.
10. Trowman R, Migliore A, Ollendorf DA. The value and impact of health technology assessment: Discussions and recommendations from the 2023 Health Technology Assessment International Global Policy Forum. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2023;39:e75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462323002763>.
11. Liu S, Xia Y, Yang Y, et al. Mapping of health technology assessment in China: A comparative study between 2016 and 2021. *Glob Health Res Policy*. 2024;9:4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41256-023-00339-6>.
12. Mulligan K, Lakdawalla D, Neumann P, et al. Health technology assessment for the U.S. healthcare system. USC Schaeffer Center for Health Policy & Economics. Published February 26, 2020. Accessed May 24, 2026. <https://schaeffer.usc.edu/research/health-technology-assessment-for-the-u-s-healthcare-system/>.
13. Enzing JJ, Knies S, Boer B, et al. Broadening the application of health technology assessment in the Netherlands: A worthwhile destination but not an easy ride? *Health Econ Policy Law*. 2021;16(4):440–456. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744133120000237>.
14. Bertram M, Dhaene G, Tan-Torres Edejer T, eds. Institutionalizing health technology assessment mechanisms: a how-to guide. World Health Organization. Published March 7, 2021. Accessed May 24, 2026. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020665>.
15. World Health Organization. HTA country/area profiles 2020/2021. World Health Organization. Published 2021. Accessed May 24, 2026. https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/health-economics/hta-country-profiles-2020-21/hta_updated_merged_final.pdf?sfvrsn=75ac91f6_5.
16. Chen W, Zhang L, Hu M, et al. Use of health technology assessment in drug reimbursement decisions in China. *BMJ*. 2023;381:p1427. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.p1427>.
17. Kim H, Byrnes J, Goodall S. Health technology assessment in Australia: The pharmaceutical benefits advisory committee and medical services advisory committee. *Value Health Reg Issues*. 2021;24:6–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vhri.2020.09.001>.
18. Drummond MF, Augustovski F, Bhattacharyya D, et al. Challenges of health technology assessment in pluralistic healthcare systems: An ISPOR council report. *Value Health*. 2022;25(8):1257–1267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2022.02.006>.
19. Roza S, Junainah S, Izzuna MMG, et al. Health technology assessment in Malaysia: Past, present, and future. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2019;35(6):446–451. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462319000023>.
20. Lessa F, Ferraz MB. Health technology assessment: The process in Brazil. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*. 2017;41:e25. <https://doi.org/10.26633/RPSP.2017.25>.
21. Sharma M, Teerawattananon Y, Dabak SV, et al. A landscape analysis of health technology assessment capacity in the Association of South-East Asian Nations region. *Health Res Policy*

- Syst.* 2021;19(1):19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-00647-0>.
22. Pichler FB, Boysen M, Mittmann N, et al. Lifecycle HTA: Promising applications and a framework for implementation. An HTAi Global Policy Forum Task Force report. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care.* 2024;40:e50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462324000187>.
 23. Ofori-Asenso R, Hallgreen CE, De Bruin ML. Improving interactions between health technology assessment bodies and regulatory agencies: A systematic review and cross-sectional survey on processes, progress, outcomes, and challenges. *Front Med.* 2020;7:582634. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2020.582634>.
 24. Wang T, McAuslane N, Goettsch WG, et al. Regulatory, health technology assessment and company interactions: The current landscape and future ecosystem for drug development, review and reimbursement. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care.* 2023;39:e20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462323000144>.
 25. Lima SGG, Brito C, Andrade CJC. Health technology assessment in Brazil - an international perspective. *Cien Saude Colet.* 2019;24:1709-1722. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018245.17582017>.
 26. Sani NM, McAuslane N, Kasbon SH, et al. An evaluation of Malaysian regulatory process for new active substances approved in 2017 using the OpERA methodology. *Ther Innov Regul Sci.* 2020;54(5):1215–1224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43441-020-00140-4>.
 27. van de Sande J, de Graaff B, Delnoij D, et al. Incorporating public values through multiple accountability: A case study on quality regulation of emergency care in the Netherlands by an independent regulatory agency. *Adm Soc.* 2022;54(6):1178–1206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00953997211057056>.
 28. Culyer AJ. HTA—algorithm or process? comment on “expanded HTA: Enhancing fairness and legitimacy”. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2016;5(8):501–505. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2016.59>.
 29. Kristensen FB, Lampe K, Wild C, et al. The HTA core model®—10 years of developing an international framework to share multidimensional value assessment. *Value Health.* 2017;20(2):244–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.12.010>.
 30. Urbina I, Adams R, Fernandez J, et al. Advancing cooperation in Health Technology Assessment in Europe: Insights from the EUnetHTA 21 project amidst the evolving legal landscape of European HTA. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care.* 2024;40:e75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462324004689>.
 31. Hogervorst MA, Vreman RA, Zawada A, et al. Synergy between health technology assessments and clinical guidelines for multiple sclerosis. *Clin Transl Sci.* 2023;16(5):835–849. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.13492>.
 32. Oortwijn W, Sampietro-Colom L, Habens F, et al. How can health systems prepare for new and emerging health technologies? the role of horizon scanning revisited. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care.* 2018;34(3):254–259. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462318000363>.
 33. Elshaug AG, Watt AM, Mundy L, et al. Over 150 potentially low-value health care practices: An Australian study. *Med J Aust.* 2012;197(10):556–560. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja12.11083>.
 34. Drummond M, Tarricone R, Torbica A. Assessing the added value of health technologies: Reconciling different perspectives. *Value Health.* 2013;16(1):S7–S13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2012.10.007>.
 35. Botwright S, Sittimart M, Chavarina KK, et al. Good practices for health technology assessment guideline development: A report of the health technology assessment international, HTAsiaLink, and ISPOR special task force. *Value Health.* 2025;28(1):1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2024.09.001>.
 36. Kulembekova L, Hailey D, Kulzhanov M, et al. Stakeholders’ involvement in health technology assessment in Kazakhstan, Poland and Bulgaria. *Patient Prefer Adherence.* 2024;18:1009–1015. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S455838>.

37. Facey K, Boivin A, Gracia J, et al. Patients' perspectives in health technology assessment: A route to robust evidence and fair deliberation. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2010;26(3):334–340. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462310000395>.
38. Gagnon MP, Tanchou Dipankui M, Poder TG, et al. Patient and public involvement in health technology assessment: Update of a systematic review of international experiences. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2021;37:e36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462321000064>.
39. Dimitrova M, Jakab I, Mitkova Z, et al. Potential barriers of patient involvement in health technology assessment in central and eastern European countries. *Front Public Health*. 2022;10:922708. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.922708>.
40. Holtorf AP, Bertelsen N, Jarke H, et al. Stakeholder perspectives on the current status and potential barriers of patient involvement in health technology assessment (HTA) across Europe. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2024;40:e81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462324004707>.
41. Towse A, Garrison LP Jr. Can't get No satisfaction? will pay for performance help? : Toward an economic framework for understanding performance-based risk-sharing agreements for innovative medical products. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2010;28(2):93–102. <https://doi.org/10.2165/11314080-000000000-00000>.
42. Pereira J, Alves J, Rodrigues B, et al. HTA reshaping: Rethinking the health technology assessment framework in Portugal. *Portuguese J Public Health*. 2021;39(1):36–47. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000516501>.
43. Kristensen FB, Husereau D, Huić M, et al. Identifying the need for good practices in health technology assessment: Summary of the ISPOR HTA council working group report on good practices in HTA. *Value Health*. 2019;22(1):13–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2018.08.010>.
44. Desmet T, Brijs M, Vanderdonck F, et al. Implementing the EU HTA regulation: Insights from semi-structured interviews on patient expectations, Belgian and European institutional perspectives, and industry outlooks. *Front Pharmacol*. 2024;15:1369508. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2024.1369508>.
45. Teerawattananon Y, Luz K, Yothasmutra C, et al. Historical development of the HTAsiaLINK network and its key determinants of success. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2018;34(3):260–266. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462318000223>.
46. Delnoij DMJ, Dawoud DM, Elvidge J, et al. Innovating HTA: A call for capacity building and standardization. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2026;42:e8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462326103456>.

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Sequential health technology assessment workflow from pre-assessment to post-decision, showing main procedural stages from early dialogue to monitoring and possible disinvestment. HTA: health technology assessment.




Fig. 2. Institutional design modules for health technology assessment mapped onto pre-assessment, assessment and appraisal, and post-decision stages.




Fig. 3. Intensity of institutionalisation of key health technology assessment system functions across ten selected agencies. NICE: national institute for health and care excellence; SMC: scottish medicines consortium; CDA: canada's drug agency; PBAC: pharmaceutical benefits advisory committee; IQWiG: institute for quality and efficiency in health care (institut für qualität und wirtschaftlichkeit im gesundheitswesen); G-BA: federal joint committee (gemeinsamer bundesausschuss); HAS: french national authority for health (haute autorité de santé); CONITEC: national committee for health technology incorporation into the unified health system (comissão nacional de incorporação de tecnologias no sistema único de saúde); ACE: agency for care effectiveness; MaHTAS: malaysian health technology assessment section; NHSA: national healthcare security administration; HTA: health technology assessment.




Table 1 Institutional design dimensions and summary categories for health technology assessment systems.

Module number	Dimension	Category options
Module 1: structure, governance and functions	Type of organisation	Arm's-length statutory agency; expert advisory committee; scientific or non-profit institute; and HTA unit or centre within the government or payer
	Legal mandate for HTA	Statutory or explicit legal basis; no explicit legal mandate
	Reporting authority	Ministry or department of health; social insurance or payer body; and mixed health authorities (national and sub-national)
	Status of HTA outputs	Legally binding; advisory (may become binding after approval); and advisory only
	Core funding source	Public government budget; public social or health insurance funds; and mixed public funding; no private core funding
	Institutional capacity	Small HTA unit; medium-sized agency; large agency; and capacity supplemented by external academic or assessment networks

	Transparency of HTA reports	Full public access; partial or limited public access
	HTA functions supported	Economic evaluations; clinical practice guidelines; planning and budgeting support; pricing and reimbursement negotiations; quality of care indicators; pay for performance objectives; benefit package design; public procurement of medicines; and protocols for public health programmes
Module 2: assessment scope and methodology	Assessment scope	Drugs; vaccines; devices; diagnostics; procedures; and digital health; and public health
	Assessment volume	Reported number of assessments per year
	Assessment timelines	Defined assessment timelines and target durations
	Rapid review option	Rapid review pathway available; no rapid review pathway
	Types of recommendations	Multi-level recommendation categories; binary recommendation structure
	Cost-effectiveness threshold	Explicit reference cost-effectiveness threshold; no explicit or fixed threshold; and context-specific GDP-linked threshold
	Core evaluation focus	Clinical and economic evaluation; clinical benefit and added value; and multidimensional evaluation (clinical, economic, budget impact, equity, feasibility)
	Key decision criteria	Clinical effectiveness and safety; incremental costs and cost effectiveness; budget impact and affordability; disease severity and unmet need; patient values and quality of evidence; and system impact and feasibility
Module 3: institutional roles in topic selection, assessment and appraisal	Parallel review with regulatory drug approval	No parallel review; systematic parallel review; and selective or occasional parallel review

	Assessment initiation/dossier submission	Manufacturer-led submission; government or payer-initiated topics; and mixed submission pathways (manufacturers and public entities)
	Topic selection	Formal topic selection and prioritisation; eligibility screening only; mandatory assessment without topic selection; and policy-driven topic filtering
	Prioritisation criteria	Clinical importance; budget impact; inequities in access; alignment with national priorities; feasibility of evaluation; new evidence or horizon scanning signals; and system impact and health gain
	In-house assessment	Primarily in-house assessment; mixed in-house and external assessment; and primarily external assessment
	Independent evidence generation by the HTA agency	Independent evidence generation present; independent evidence generation absent
	Academic involvement in assessment	Regular or structured academic involvement; occasional, optional or ad hoc academic involvement; and no formal external academic involvement
	External assessment teams	Academic evaluation centres or consortia; external expert reviewers; national HTA academic networks; and ad hoc external collaborators
	Type of external commissioning	Long-term framework agreements; project-based contracts or tenders; internal appointments of external experts; and network-based collaboration
	Internal assessment teams	Dedicated technical or scientific teams; committee-based technical review; and HTA units within ministries or payer agencies
	Appraisal committee	Standing multidisciplinary appraisal committees; plenary or subcommittee structures; and advisory expert panels

	Final approval decision maker	Ministry or department of health; national health service or payer organisation; social insurance decision-making body; and sub-national health authorities
Module 4: integration into coverage, pricing and lifecycle management	Formal horizon scanning process	Dedicated horizon scanning system; no formal horizon scanning
	Early scientific advice	Formal early scientific advice programme; informal or ad hoc pre-submission dialogue; and no early scientific advice
	Disinvestment/delisting process	Structured reassessment and delisting process; case-triggered delisting; reassessment without a formal delisting framework; and no formal disinvestment process
	Pricing schemes and supporting indicators	Patient access schemes and managed entry agreements; value-based pricing mechanisms; rating of added benefit or clinical value; and price regulation linked to HTA outcomes
	Authority in price negotiation	Ministry or department of health; national health service or payer organisation; and statutory health insurance bodies or negotiation alliances
	Procurement role	Central or national procurement role; shared national and sub-national procurement; and limited or no direct procurement role
Module 5: stakeholders across all stages	Stakeholder groups in HTA	HTA agencies; government and policymakers; payers and insurers; healthcare professionals; academia and independent experts; patients and patient groups; and industry and sponsors

HTA: health technology assessment; GDP: gross domestic product.

CRedit Author Contribution

Zonglin Dai: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Effie Ka Yue Cheung:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – review & editing. **Ting Wang:** Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Writing – review & editing. **David Makram Bishai:** Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Lei Si:** Validation,


Writing – review & editing. **Benjamin Hon Kei Yip**: Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Yingyao Chen**: Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Ian Chi Kei Wong**: Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Andrew J. Mirelman**: Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Manuel Antonio Espinoza**: Conceptualization, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing. **Xue Li**: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Research Impact Fund, Research Grants Council, University Grants Committee of the Hong Kong SAR, China (Project No.: R7007-22F).



Highlights

- A five-module framework compared institutional features across ten HTA systems.

- Ten selected HTA systems differed in governance, structure, and policy integration.
- Institutional design shaped the breadth of HTA roles in decision-making.
- HTA reform should strengthen capacity, methods, and transparency.
- Comparative lessons can guide governments to establish or expand HTA functions.

Journal Pre-proof