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But first, housekeeping

• Please note today’s session is being recorded
• To ask a question for discussion during Q&A, please:
  • Either ‘raise your hand’ in the participant window and moderator will unmute you to ask your question live, or
  • Type your question into the chat box
• Slides and recording will be available after today’s session
Agenda

• Introductions
• Evidence DEFINED Overview
• Panel Discussion with experts
• Audience Q&A
The number of consumer digital health apps ballooned over the years, with more than 90,000 new ones introduced in 2020 alone, according to a report by the IQVIA Institute for Human Data Science on digital health trends.

The report found there are now more than 350,000 digital health apps available to consumers. While many are geared toward general wellness or fitness, and some are middling in quality, specific disease management apps are increasing in number.

Problem remains the same – how do we differentiate?
The prevalence of digital health interventions in numbers, capabilities, and acceptance continues to offer promising solutions for improving health outcomes and changing behaviors. Yet, despite significant advances in recent years, the confidence of key decision-making stakeholders remains relatively low. Evidence is needed to determine the reliability and value of digital health products.

So how can we harmonize evidentiary practices to evaluate clinical value for effective translation rigorously?

Evidence in Digital Health for EFfectiveness of INterventions with Evaluative Depth (Evidence DEFINED)

The new standard of excellence framework for evaluating the clinical assessment of digital health products (DHPs).

Meet the experts who developed the Evidence DEFINED framework

A group of 17 experts with different disciplinary backgrounds collaborated to develop the Evidence DEFINED framework. This sprint team represented experts from a variety of different work settings and multiple regulatory and geographic regions.

Meet the team:


- Offers payers, employers, health systems, and other stakeholders a rigorous, rapid approach to assess the clinical value of digital health interventions
- Act as a new standard of excellence framework to help decision makers access evidence for evaluating the clinical assessment of digital health products
- Helps DH companies navigate their commercial strategy and demonstrate the value of their product to stakeholders

Scope of the Evidence DEFINED Framework

**In Scope**
- Generating defensible recommendations regarding adoption levels that may be appropriate for a DHP
- Assessing clinical evidence for digital health interventions through a rapid, rigorous, consistent process

**Out of Scope**
- Decisions for individual patients, caregivers, or clinicians
- Products that serve diagnostic functions exclusively
- Evaluation in critical domains other than clinical evidence (e.g., patient experience, product design, data security, etc.)

**Target Audience**

*Designed to support digital health evidence assessment within stakeholder organizations including:

- Payers
- Pharmacy Benefit Managers
- Health Systems
- Pharmaceutical Companies
- Trade Organizations
- Professional Medical Societies

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Criteria defining digital health interventions (DHIs)

Building on prior work, we define digital health interventions (DHIs) as digital technologies intended to improve health outcomes and change health behaviors.

Following others, we define digital health interventions as patient-facing products that meet the three criteria shown. DHIs are often implemented using smartphone apps, web platforms, consumer-grade wearables, and other digital technologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Product Class</th>
<th>Product Class Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The product falls into one of the three classes of digital health technologies that were defined in a collaboration of stakeholders representing digital health trade organizations.</td>
<td>Digital Health</td>
<td>&quot;Digital health includes technologies, platforms, and systems that engage consumers for lifestyle, wellness, and health-related purposes; capture, store or transmit health data; and/or support life science and clinical operations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Medicine</td>
<td>&quot;Digital medicine includes evidence-based software and/or hardware products that measure and/or intervene in the service of human health.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Therapeutics</td>
<td>&quot;Digital therapeutic (DTx) products deliver evidence-based therapeutic intervention to prevent, manage, or treat a medical disorder or disease.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The product is designed to change one or more health behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The value of the product to the evaluator is contingent on the degree to which it improves one or more health outcomes. These can include clinical outcomes (e.g., incidence of diabetic retinopathy) or surrogate outcomes (e.g., HbA1c).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evidence DEFINED – Digital Medicine Society (DiMe) (dimesociety.org)
A tale of two standards

For Business Objectives

What evidence will drive adoption?

For Population Health

What evidence is needed to support the goal of improving population health?

Both objectives are valid.
An analysis of 78 prior frameworks

**Criterion A: Builds on established best practices**
Leverages established evidence assessment methods that were developed for non-digital interventions (eg, GRADE).

**Criterion B: Adaptation (only) where appropriate**
Addresses evidence quality criteria that are unique to digital health.

**Criterion C: Vigilance increased where appropriate**
Specifies evidence quality criteria requiring increased vigilance in the current regulatory context.

**Criterion D: Evidence-to-recommendation guidelines are provided.**

### Key Strengths of Evidence DEFINED

1. **Evidence DEFINED leverages established, rigorous evidence assessment methods** that were developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE).

2. **Evidence DEFINED supplements established methods** to address unique considerations in digital health evidence assessment.

3. **Evidence DEFINED applies increased vigilance were needed**, in the current regulatory context.

4. **Evidence DEFINED provides evidence-to-recommendations guidelines**, specifying what levels of adoption may be appropriate for each level of evidence quality.

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
# Evidence-to-Recommendation Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONABILITY LEVEL</th>
<th>ACTIONABILITY CRITERIA</th>
<th>ADOPTION LEVEL THAT MAY BE APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>APPROX. ENROLLMENT THAT MAY BE APPROPRIATE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0                   | One or more of the following:  
  ● Clear evidence of harm or ineffectiveness for the current DHI version  
  ● The DHI is not clinically appropriate, per advice of clinical subject matter experts.  
  ● The risk balance is unfavorable due to safety concerns, per subject matter experts.  
  ● There are unaddressed concerns regarding misleading or false claims. | Adoption not recommended. | N/A |
| 1                   | All of the following:  
  ● Very low or low-quality evidence (per GRADE definitions; "very low" includes no evidence)  
  ● Low clinical risk or well-managed risk with appropriate clinical rationale  
  ● Plausibility of clinically meaningful impact relative to usual care (or an alternate, relevant comparator) OR noninferior clinical outcomes with plausible improvement in a domain such as access, equity, user experience, or cost. Meaningful impact is defined by an effect size magnitude at or above minimal clinically important difference, per credible guidelines and/or peer-reviewed literature. | Feasibility Pilot: Focus is enrollment, engagement, user experience, safety. | N ≤ ~100 |
| 2                   | All of the following:  
  ● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Level 1  
  ● Low-to-moderate quality evidence (per GRADE definitions). Real-world evidence may be included.  
  ● No or minimal uncertainty (per GRADE) around value to stakeholders (often patients and their families)  
  ● Acceptable or likely acceptable (per GRADE) to stakeholders | Small Clinical Pilot: Primary outcomes are clinical. | Up to several hundred. |
| 3                   | All of the following:  
  ● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Levels 1-2  
  ● Moderate-to-high quality evidence (per GRADE). Real-world evidence may be included. | Large Clinical Pilot: Primary outcomes are clinical. | ~300 ≤ N ≤ ~3,000 |
| 4                   | All of the following:  
  ● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Levels 1-3  
  ● Two or more high-quality RCTs support efficacy and safety  
  ● Preferred: One or more RCTs have 3rd-party data monitoring and analysis  
  ● Preferred: Real-world evidence of safety and effectiveness | May be appropriate to scale. | No limit for appropriate patients. |

*Enrollment targets are guidelines and should have statistical justification

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Key Efficiencies in Evidence DEFINED

Evidence DEFINED incorporates screening steps to avoid investing effort where adoption is not possible.

Evidence DEFINED minimizes gathering of information that may have limited impact on adoption decisions.

Source: https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/
Evidence DEFINED

The Evidence DEFINED Framework is comprised of the following steps:

1. **Step 1. Screening**
   Each organization defines and screens for absolute requirements (e.g., compliance with data privacy standards, appropriate reading levels, absence of clinical red flags, etc.). This avoids investing effort in DHPs that are not candidates for adoption.

2. **Step 2. Apply an established method designed for non-digital products**
   Apply an established evidence assessment framework that was developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE). Many stakeholder organizations already use such frameworks routinely for evidence assessment in non-digital domains.

3. **Step 3. Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist**
   Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist (Table 2) to address considerations unique to DHPs or requiring greater vigilance in digital health.

4. **Step 4. Make actionable recommendations**
   Apply evidence-to-recommendation guidelines (Table 3) to generate a defensible recommendation regarding levels of adoption that may be appropriate for the relevant DHP.

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Evidence DEFINED

**Process**

*The Evidence DEFINED Framework is comprised of the following steps:*

1. **Step 1. Screening**
   Each organization defines and screens for absolute requirements (e.g., compliance with data privacy standards, appropriate reading levels, absence of clinical red flags, etc.). This avoids investing effort in DHPs that are not candidates for adoption.

2. **Step 2. Apply an established method designed for non-digital products**
   Apply an established evidence assessment framework that was developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE). Many stakeholder organizations already use such frameworks routinely for evidence assessment in non-digital domains.

3. **Step 3. Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist**
   Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist ([Table 2](#)) to address considerations unique to DHPs or requiring greater vigilance in digital health.

4. **Step 4. Make actionable recommendations**
   Apply evidence-to-recommendation guidelines ([Table 3](#)) to generate a defensible recommendation regarding levels of adoption that may be appropriate for the relevant DHP.

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Evidence DEFINED

The Evidence DEFINED Framework is comprised of the following steps:

1. **Step 1. Screening**
   Each organization defines and screens for absolute requirements (e.g., compliance with data privacy standards, appropriate reading levels, absence of clinical red flags, etc.). This avoids investing effort in DHPs that are not candidates for adoption.

2. **Step 2. Apply an established method designed for non-digital products**
   Apply an established evidence assessment framework that was developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE). Many stakeholder organizations already use such frameworks routinely for evidence assessment in non-digital domains.

3. **Step 3. Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist**
   Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist (Table 2) to address considerations unique to DHPs or requiring greater vigilance in digital health.

4. **Step 4. Make actionable recommendations**
   Apply evidence-to-recommendation guidelines (Table 3) to generate a defensible recommendation regarding levels of adoption that may be appropriate for the relevant DHP.
The Evidence DEFINED Framework is comprised of the following steps:

**Step 1. Screening**
Each organization defines and screens for absolute requirements (e.g., compliance with data privacy standards, appropriate reading levels, absence of clinical red flags, etc.). This avoids investing effort in DHPs that are not candidates for adoption.

**Step 2. Apply an established method designed for non-digital products**
Apply an established evidence assessment framework that was developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE). Many stakeholder organizations already use such frameworks routinely for evidence assessment in non-digital domains.

**Step 3. Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist**
Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist (Table 2) to address considerations unique to DHPs or requiring greater vigilance in digital health.

**Step 4. Make actionable recommendations**
Apply evidence-to-recommendation guidelines (Table 3) to generate a defensible recommendation regarding levels of adoption that may be appropriate for the relevant DHP.

Source: https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/
# Examples of Evidence Quality Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Assessment Criterion</th>
<th>Evidence Criterion Group</th>
<th>Rationale for Inclusion and Notes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Recommended Actionability Level Change</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the target population includes underserved patients, then study samples should have included such patients.</td>
<td>Group 1. Adaptations recommended for DH.</td>
<td>DHIs often require adaptations for underserved patient populations. For example, adaptations may be needed to address varying levels of literacy, health literacy, numeracy, digital literacy, and broadband access.</td>
<td>✔ Example meeting criterion: An organization is assessing a DHI for use in underserved patient communities. The DHI has shown effectiveness among racial minority subgroups as well as subgroups residing in low-SES zip codes.</td>
<td>Decrease rating by 1-2 levels.</td>
<td>Strongly Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗ Example not meeting criterion: An organization is assessing a DHI for use in underserved patient communities. Relevant studies investigated high-SES patients only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI modifications implemented during and after trials are documented.</td>
<td>Group 1. Adaptations recommended for DH.</td>
<td>DHIs are often improved iteratively, through software updates. Current versions may have clinically meaningful differences from trialed Versions. DHSPs should report a) the product version in use at the start of a trial, b) the dates of product updates, and c) the product changes implemented with each update.</td>
<td>✔ Example meeting criterion: Software versions used during and after a trial are reported in a public website. A summary of each update is provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗ Example not meeting criterion: Software versioning information is not reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
### Examples of Evidence Quality Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Assessment Criterion</th>
<th>Evidence Criterion Group</th>
<th>Rationale for Inclusion and Notes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Recommended Actionability Level Change</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Patients who declined to participate are not used as comparators. | Group 2. Increased vigilance recommended for DH. | Patients who enroll in health management programs often differ meaningfully from those who decline to participate. For example, enrollees may have stronger motivation to self-manage chronic conditions. Matching on demographics does not resolve this. | ✔ Example meeting criterion  
The rate of acute clinical events for DHI users is 15% lower than that of randomly assigned, waitlisted controls  
✖ Example not meeting criterion  
The rate of acute clinical events for DHI users is 15% lower than that of demographics-matched adults who declined to participate. | Decrease rating by 1-2 levels. | Strongly Preferred |
| It is not assumed that numerous peer-reviewed publications indicate effectiveness or safety | Group 2. Increased vigilance recommended for DH. | Published editorials may be relevant, but are not a substitute for evidence. High numbers of published, low-quality studies should not be confused with high-quality evidence. | ✔ Example meeting criterion  
High-quality, peer-reviewed evidence shows a mean A1c reduction of 0.7, relative to no change in controls.  
✖ Example not meeting criterion  
A DHSP published editorials but not clinical evidence. | Peer-reviewed editorials should not impact evidence ratings. Low-quality evidence should not justify ALs greater than 2, even if multiple peer-reviewed articles are available | Essential |

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Evidence DEFINED

The Evidence DEFINED Framework is comprised of the following steps:

1. **Step 1. Screening**
   Each organization defines and screens for absolute requirements (e.g., compliance with data privacy standards, appropriate reading levels, absence of clinical red flags, etc.). This avoids investing effort in DHPs that are not candidates for adoption.

2. **Step 2. Apply an established method designed for non-digital products**
   Apply an established evidence assessment framework that was developed for non-digital interventions (e.g., GRADE). Many stakeholder organizations already use such frameworks routinely for evidence assessment in non-digital domains.

3. **Step 3. Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist**
   Apply the Evidence DEFINED supplemental checklist (Table 2) to address considerations unique to DHPs or requiring greater vigilance in digital health.

4. **Step 4. Make actionable recommendations**
   Apply evidence-to-recommendation guidelines (Table 3) to generate a defensible recommendation regarding levels of adoption that may be appropriate for the relevant DHP.

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
# Evidence-to-Recommendation Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONABILITY CRITERIA LEVEL</th>
<th>ACTIONABILITY CRITERIA</th>
<th>ADOPTION LEVEL THAT MAY BE APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>APPROX. ENROLLMENT THAT MAY BE APPROPRIATE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>One or more of the following:</td>
<td>Adoption not recommended.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Clear evidence of harm or ineffectiveness for the current DHI version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The DHI is not clinically appropriate, per advice of clinical subject matter experts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The risk balance is unfavorable due to safety concerns, per subject matter experts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● There are unaddressed concerns regarding misleading or false claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All of the following:</td>
<td>Feasibility Pilot: Focus is enrollment, engagement, user experience, safety.</td>
<td>N ≤ ~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Very low or low-quality evidence (per GRADE definitions; &quot;very low&quot; includes no evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Low clinical risk or well-managed risk with appropriate clinical rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Plausibility of clinically meaningful impact relative to usual care (or an alternate, relevant comparator) OR noninferior clinical outcomes with plausible improvement in a domain such as access, equity, user experience, or cost. Meaningful impact is defined by an effect size magnitude at or above minimal clinically important difference, per credible guidelines and/or peer-reviewed literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All of the following:</td>
<td>Small Clinical Pilot: Primary outcomes are clinical.</td>
<td>Up to several hundred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Low-to-moderate quality evidence (per GRADE definitions). Real-world evidence may be included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● No or minimal uncertainty (per GRADE) around value to stakeholders (often patients and their families)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Acceptable or likely acceptable (per GRADE) to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All of the following:</td>
<td>Large Clinical Pilot: Primary outcomes are clinical.</td>
<td>~300 ≤ N ≤ ~3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Levels 1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Moderate-to-high quality evidence (per GRADE). Real-world evidence may be included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All of the following:</td>
<td>May be appropriate to scale.</td>
<td>No limit for appropriate patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Meets or exceeds all criteria for Actionability Levels 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Two or more high-quality RCTs support efficacy and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Preferred: One or more RCTs have 3rd-party data monitoring and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Preferred: Real-world evidence of safety and effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enrollment targets are guidelines and should have statistical justification

Source: [https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/](https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/evidence-defined/)
Panel discussion

Source: Link here
Evidence DEFINED

1. Check out the Evidence DEFINED framework in Nature Digital Medicine

2. Access all resources on DiMe’s new webpage

3. Let us know your thoughts and how you are using it (DiMe will showcase it via Resource in action)
Join Integrated Evidence Plans and help streamline the path to regulatory and commercial success to optimize health outcomes for the greatest number of patients.
How to build a fit-for-purpose regulatory strategy to advance your business strategy

Tuesday, July 25, 2023 | 12 - 1pm ET
Navigating Reimbursement for Virtual First Care (V1C)

Wednesday, August 2, 2023 | 12pm-1pm ET
THANK YOU