1800-1950

- Instrumentalization

1950-1980

Ethical challenges:
- Priority setting
  - Prioritization
  - Allocation
  - Rationing
- Physician-Patient interaction
- Autonomy / Paternalism
- Dignity
- Social development
- Ideology

Responses

Governance
- Priority setting
- Health Technology Assessment (HTA)

Profession
- Ethical dilemmas
- Medical Ethics
- Office of Technology Assessment (USA)
- President’s Commission
- Principle based ethics.
- Social development
- Science and Technology Studies (STS)

Phases of Ethics in HTA
1. Acknowledgement: Definition
2. Foul attempts: Initial stumbling tries
3. Professionalization: The ethicists arrive
4. Pluralism: No consensus
5. International collaboration (EUnetHTA; SEA-Q; INTEGRATE-HTA)
6. National Standards (NOKC, SBU, HAS, Synthesized framework)
7. HTA in Ethics
**Facts and Values**

Assessment versus Appraisal

- **Facts ↔ Values**
- **Assessment ↔ Appraisal**
- **Synthesis of information**
- **Add on ethics, tool**
- **Amateurship**
- **Few methods**
- **“Pure” methods**
- **Liberal use of methods**
- **Ad hoc literature search**
- **Result oriented (report)**
- **Ethics in HTA**
- **Anything goes**

**Trends**

- Facts ↔ Values
- Assessment ↔ Appraisal
- Synthesis of information
- Add on ethics, tool
- Amateurship
- Few methods
- “Pure” methods
- Liberal use of methods
- Ad hoc literature search
- Result oriented (report)
- Ethics in HTA
- Anything goes

**EUnetHTA Core Model**

- **Topics**
  - Principal questions about the ethical aspects of technology
    - Autonomy
    - Human dignity
    - Human integrity
    - Beneficence/ nonmaleficence
    - Justice and Equity
    - Rights
    - Legislation
  - Issues:
    - Specific questions within each topic
- **Approach:**
  - Clarify questions, consider their relevance, identify information sources, perform literature searches.

**Approaches to address ethical issues with technology**

- **Conventional approaches**
  - Traditional approaches in moral philosophy
    - Deontological
    - Utilitarianism
- **Prosessional approaches**
  - Coherence analysis
  - Wide Reflective Equilibrium

**Acknowledging values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic va</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>HTA</th>
<th>HTA</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid p</td>
<td>Avoid p</td>
<td>Avoid p</td>
<td>Avoid p</td>
<td>Avoid p</td>
<td>Avoid p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
<td>Pursue pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>Esthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Non-esthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
<td>Therapeutic vs. Non-esthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts and values</td>
<td>Facts and values</td>
<td>Facts and values</td>
<td>Facts and values</td>
<td>Facts and values</td>
<td>Facts and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy related values</td>
<td>Policy related values</td>
<td>Policy related values</td>
<td>Policy related values</td>
<td>Policy related values</td>
<td>Policy related values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hofmann 2005; Hofmann et al 2015

**Flowchart summarizing HAS’ method for assessing ethical aspects**

- **Stage 1:** Identification of the organization
  - (Preparatory stage prior to voting the report)
- **Stage 2:** Reporting arguments in the assessment report
  - (writing the first part of the text aiming to analyze views and values included in the report)
- **Stage 3:** Examination of the arguments in the assessment report
  - (writing the second part of the text dealing with the ethical arguments included in the report)
Ethics in INTEGRATE-HTA

The Socratic (Axiological) Approach

1. Identify the intended purpose of the health technology and reveal the background for the assessment;
2. Identify involved persons, groups, and stakeholders (e.g., patients, relatives, professionals, industry);
3. Identify relevant moral questions (from a list of questions, Table 1) and justify the selection;
4. Perform literature search in accordance with the identified moral questions;
5. Analyze and discuss the moral questions identified (in step 3) on the basis of:
   - Existing literature;
   - Hearings/Statements of involved parties (or their representatives) or qualitative studies (relevant qualitative studies should be included in the literature search);
6. Wrap up and summarize the process and the content.

Framework for ethical evaluation in HTA (Heintz et al 2016)
Pluralism: A problem?

Yes
- Small scientific ambitions
- No transferability
- Limited international quality control, peer review
- Low status or prestige

No
- Relevant evaluations are context dependent
- Some aspects may be transferrable, if not all
- Increased status through relevance for decisions

Normative Conclusion

- Awareness is important
- Better to use one method than to use none.
- Application and impact can increase if the value issues involved both in HTA and decision making process is acknowledged.