

## Referenser till kapitel Hälsoekonomi

1. Tandvårds- och läkemedelsförmånsverkets (TLV), Allmänna råd TLVAR 2017:1.
2. Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS), Choices in Methods for Economic Evaluation 2020.
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), Guide to the methods of technology appraisals 2013: Process and methods. 2013.
4. Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC), Working with SMC – A Guide for Manufacturers. 2017.
5. Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC), Guidance to manufacturers: Question and answer document on economic submissions to the Scottish Medicines Consortium. 2017.
6. Statens Legemiddelverk (SLV), Guidelines for the submission of documentation for single technology assessment (STA) of pharmaceuticals 2018.
7. Carlsson P, Arnell A, Eliasson M, Hälsoekonomi får allt större roll för sjukvårdens prioriteringar. Läkartidningen, 2006;103:3617–23.
8. Socialstyrelsen, Nationella riktlinjer för diabetesvården 2010 – Stöd för styrning och ledning, Socialstyrelsen 2010.
9. Glick H A, Doshi J A, Sonnad S S, Polsky D, Economic Evaluation in Clinical Trials 2nd ed. 2014, Oxford University Press.
10. Latimer N R, Survival Analysis for Economic Evaluations Alongside Clinical Trials - Extrapolation with Patient-Level Data: Inconsistencies, Limitations, and a Practical Guide. Medical Decision Making, 2013;33(6):743–754.
11. Petrou S, Rationale and methodology for trial-based economic evaluation. Clinical Investigation, 2012; 2:1191-1200.
12. Sculpher M et al, Whither trial-based economic evaluation for health care decision making? Health economics, 2006;15:677–87.
13. Simoens S, Health economic assessment: a methodological primer. International journal of environmental research and public health, 2009;6(12):2950–2966.
14. Briggs A, Sculpher M, Claxton K, Decision Modelling for Health Economic Evaluation. Handbooks in Health Economic Evaluation. 2006, Oxford University Press.
15. Buxton M J et al, Modelling in economic evaluation: an unavoidable fact of life. Health Econ, 1997;6(3): 217–27.
16. Caro J J et al, Modelling good research practices - overview: a report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modelling Good Research Practices Task Force-1. Med Decis Making, 2012;32(5):667–77.
17. Halpern M T, McKenna M, Hutton J W, Modelling in economic evaluation: an unavoidable fact of life. Health Econ 1998;7(8):741–2.
18. Drummond M F, Sculpher M J, Claxton K, Stoddart G L, Torrance G W, Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes 4th ed. 2015. Oxford University Press.
19. Jain R, M Grabner, Onukwugha E, Sensitivity analysis in cost-effectiveness studies: from guidelines to practice. Pharmacoeconomics 2011;29(4):297–314.
20. Husereau D et al, Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) Explanation and Elaboration: A Report of the ISPOR Health Economic Evaluation Publication Guidelines Good Reporting Practices Task Force. Value in Health 2013;16(2):231–250.
21. Husereau D et al., Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement. Int J Technol Assess Health Care 2013;29(2):117–22.
22. Bilinski A et al, When cost-effective interventions are unaffordable: Integrating cost-effectiveness and budget impact in priority setting for global health programs. PLOS Medicine, 2017;14(10):e1002397.
23. Ghabri S and. Mauskopf J, The use of budget impact analysis in the economic evaluation of new medicines in Australia, England, France and the United States: relationship to cost-effectiveness analysis and methodological challenges. Eur J Health Econ 2018;19(2):173–175.

24. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F et al, Principles of good practice for budget impact analysis II: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Good Research Practices – Budget Impact Analysis Value Health 2014;17(1):5–14.
25. Socialdepartementet, Hälso- och sjukvårdslag (1982:763) 1982.
26. Tandvårds- och läkemedelsförmånsverket (TLV). Högkostnadsskyddet 2021 <https://www.tlv.se/lakemedel/hogkostnadsskyddet.html>
27. Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner (SKR). Statsbidraget för läkemedelsförmånerna 2020: Överens-kommelsen mellan staten och SKR. <https://skr.se/download/18.7ac7d9cf16ef9a6cd174260d/1576251495566/2019-13-Sammanst%C3%A4llning-L%C3%A4kemedelsbidraget-2020.pdf>
28. Socialstyrelsen, Uppdaterad prognos av läkemedelsförsäljningen i Sverige 2020–2023.
29. Vård- och omsorgsanalys, Ordning i leden? Utvärdering av ordnat införande av nya läkemedel. 2017, Stockholm.
30. Rådet för Nya Terapier (NT-rådet). Nationellt ordnat införande. 2021. <https://www.janusinfo.se/nationelltinforandeavlakemedel/saarbetarvi.4.4771ab7716298ed82ba979d4.html>
31. Rådet för Nya Terapier (NT-rådet). NT-rådet (nya terapier). 2021. <https://www.janusinfo.se/nationelltinforandeavlakemedel/saarbetarvi/rollerochkontaktupp gifter/roller/ntradetnyaterapier.5.4771ab7716298ed82ba5e87.html>
32. Tandvårds- och läkemedelsförmånsverket (TLV). Klinikläkemedelsuppdraget. 2021 <https://www.tlv.se/lakemedel/kliniklakemedelsuppdraget.html>
33. Rådet för Nya Terapier (NT-rådet). Horizon scanning. 2020. <https://www.janusinfo.se/nationelltinforandeavlakemedel/saarbetarvi/arkiv/horizonscanning.5.4771ab7716298ed82ba97a85.html>
34. Rådet för Nya Terapier (NT-rådet). Kriterier för urval. 2021. <https://www.janusinfo.se/nationelltinforandeavlakemedel/saarbetarvi/arkiv/urval.5.4771ab7716298ed82ba97aca.html>
35. Andersson E et al, Risk sharing in managed entry agreements - A review of the Swedish experience. Health Policy 2020;124(4):404–410.
36. Williams B A, Perils of evidence-based medicine.
37. Grossman, J and Mackenzie F J, The randomized controlled trial: gold standard, or merely standard? Perspectives in Biology and Medicine 2005;48(4):516–534.
38. Eichler H G, Abadie E, Breckenridge A, Flamion B, Gustafsson L L, Leufkens H, Rowland M, and Schneider C K, Bloechl-Daum B, Bridging the efficacy–effectiveness gap: a regulator's perspective on addressing variability of drug response. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery 2011;10(7):495–506.
39. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Clinical Trial Endpoints for the Approval of Cancer Drugs and Biologics: Guidance for Industry Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Editor. 2018.
40. Anagnostou V et al, Immuno-oncology Trial Endpoints: Capturing Clinically Meaningful Activity. Clinical Cancer Research, 2017;23(17):4959–4969.
41. Gyawali B, Hey S P, and Kesselheim A S, Evaluating the evidence behind the surrogate measures included in the FDA's table of surrogate endpoints as supporting approval of cancer drugs. EclinicalMedicine 2020;21:100332.
42. Zhang J et al, Endpoint surrogacy in oncology Phase 3 randomised controlled trials. Br J Cancer 2020; 123(3):333–334.
43. Suvarna V R, Real-world evidence (RWE) - Are we (RWE) ready? Perspectives in clinical research 2018;9(2):61–63.

44. Sherman R E et al, Real-World Evidence - What Is It and What Can It Tell Us? *N Engl J Med* 2016;375(23):2293–2297.
45. Franklin J M et al, Emulating Randomized Clinical Trials with Nonrandomized Real-World Evidence Studies: First Results from the RCT DUPLICATE Initiative. *Circulation*, 2020.
46. Anglemeyer A, Horvath H, Bero L, Healthcare outcomes assessed with observational study designs compared with those assessed in randomized trials. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014(4).
47. Gray J et al, Extrapolation of Individual Survival Curves: What Can We Learn From Registry Data? *Value in Health* 2018;21.
48. Jackson C et al, Extrapolating Survival from Randomized Trials Using External Data: A Review of Methods. *Med Decis Making* 2017;37(4):377–390.
49. Lakdawalla D N et al, Predicting Real-World Effectiveness of Cancer Therapies Using Overall Survival and Progression-Free Survival from Clinical Trials: Empirical Evidence for the ASCO Value Framework. *Value Health* 2017;20(7):866–875.
50. Collins R et al, The Magic of Randomization versus the Myth of Real-World Evidence. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020;382(7):674–678.
51. Orsini L S, Berger M, Crown W, Daniel G, Eichler H G, Goettsch W, Graff J, Guerino J, Jonsson P, Lederer N M, Monz B, Mullins C D, Schneeweiss S, Brunt D V, Wang S V, Willke R J, Improving Transparency to Build Trust in Real-World Secondary Data Studies for Hypothesis Testing - Why, What, and How: Recommendations and a Road Map from the Real-World Evidence Transparency Initiative. *Value in Health* 2020;23(9):1128–1136.
52. Blommestein H M, Franken M G, and Uyl-de Groot C A, A practical guide for using registry data to inform decisions about the cost effectiveness of new cancer drugs: lessons learned from the PHAROS registry. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2015;33(6):551–60.
53. Gliklich R E, Dreyer N A, Leavy M B, Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide 3rd ed. Vol. Report No:13(14)-EHC111. 2014, Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
54. Makady A et al, Policies for Use of Real-World Data in Health Technology Assessment (HTA): A Comparative Study of Six HTA Agencies. *Value Health* 2017;20(4):520–532.
55. Griffiths E A et al, The Role of Noncomparative Evidence in Health Technology Assessment Decisions. *Value Health*, 2017;20(10):1245–1251.
56. Berger M L et al, Good practices for real-world data studies of treatment and/or comparative effectiveness: Recommendations from the joint ISPOR-ISPE Special Task Force on real-world evidence in health care decision making. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2017;26(9):1033–1039.
57. Tandvårds- och läkemedelsförmånsverket (TLV). Pågående regeringsuppdrag. 2020. <https://www.tlv.se/om-oss/om-tlv/regeringsuppdrag.html>
58. Tandvårds- och läkemedelsförmånsverket (TLV). Uppföljning av cancerläkemedel och andra läkemedel via alternativa datakällor. 2020. [https://www.tlv.se/download/18.2fb232d9174ba11bd5bb0054/1601626715921/uppfoljning\\_av\\_cancerlakemedel\\_och\\_andra\\_lakemedel\\_via\\_alternativa\\_datakallor.pdf](https://www.tlv.se/download/18.2fb232d9174ba11bd5bb0054/1601626715921/uppfoljning_av_cancerlakemedel_och_andra_lakemedel_via_alternativa_datakallor.pdf).
59. Emilsson L et al, Review of 103 Swedish Healthcare Quality Registries. *J Intern Med*, 2015;277(1):94–136.