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Context

To improve foresight and “prospective prudence” in PH: evidence-based quantification

Existing approaches needing improvement, evaluation (Fehr et al. 2012 JECH 66(12):1088 – 91)

Helpful:

- Status quo of tool development and of practical experiences gained
- Opinions on perspectives for quantitative health foresight and impact assessment
Methods

Survey aiming at collecting relevant information from the “provider” side (toolmakers)

Survey topics:
- Status quo of model development and availability
- Experiences made with model usage
- Options for further development
- Options for (comparative) evaluation
- Options for maintenance and continued availability of the tools including their data contents
Methods (2)

Interrelated views:

- For each tool: current development status, including significant applications, experiences gained
- For each item of interest, comparison across tools

Results are used to identify opportunities and threats to the overall approach
## Considered tools in the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARMADA</th>
<th>MSLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYNAMO-HIA</td>
<td>POHEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECOS</td>
<td>Prevent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight Obesity</td>
<td>QBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Forecasting</td>
<td>RIVM-CDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>SimSmoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>MicMac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTARESE / HEIMTSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prelim results: Responses

Questionnaires sent out to: authors of 15 tools

Responses so far:

- Declined to respond = 1
- No response = 4
- Full response concerning 12 of these tools; and 2 new versions -> 14 tools in total
Tool development / availability

Tool development
Ready for use: 14 (of 14)
Maintenance / Updating: Updated = 7, new versions = 2, no update = 5 (of 14)
Information on tool development = 8 (of 14)

Tool availability
Can be used by others than developers = 7 (of 14)
User support = 13 (of 14)
Tool use / evaluation

**Tool use**
Wide variation of usage
Results made available = 10 (of 14)

**Tool evaluation**
Evaluation conducted = 4 (of 14)
Results made available = 3 (of 4)
Specific qualities

Handling uncertainty = 14 (of 14) (various shades)
Maintenance & availability assured = 6 (of 14)
Tool use: Satisfied = 6, Could be more = 6 (of 14)
Evaluation as a priority? No = 9; Yes; = 4; If done by others = 1 (of 14)
Financial support: Yes = 7 (of 14) (N/A since superseded = 2)
Discussion

- A considerable number of tools is currently “ready for use”
- In some cases completely new versions have been developed
- Often, results of tool usage are published
- Half of the tools is accessible for outside users; practitioners can choose among them
- For those that are accessible, most developers are not satisfied with the extent of their usage
Discussion (2)

- Handling of uncertainty is a standard feature but handled in different ways / various degrees of sophistication.
- Most tools cannot handle SES inequalities within the tools inside; data are probably lacking for modeling this.
- Evaluation of tools is rare; mostly not seen as priority, but most are interested in a collaborative evaluation.
Discussion (3)

Results of this current survey are going to be merged with existing knowledge, including from our earlier workshops on impact quantification.

Further groups to be surveyed:

- advanced HIA practitioners as key users
- policy-makers as primary target group for the information produced with these tools
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