

From Professor Sir John Tooke FMedSci

c/o Liberty.Dixon@acmedsci.ac.uk

0203 176 2186

20 January 2016

Sir Hugh Taylor
Chair, Accelerated Access Review and
Chair, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust
Great Maze Pond
London
SE1 9RT



When we met in May 2015 we discussed some of the synergies between the work that the Academy was undertaking and the terms of reference of your review. I am writing as the now former President of the Academy of Medical Sciences to update you on our activities and respond to the interim report of the Accelerated Access Review.

The report clearly highlights the breadth of issues faced in delayed access to medical innovations, and the potential benefits from overcoming these barriers. The five propositions laid out within the report emphasise the utmost importance of patient engagement and an evolution of the healthcare system to facilitate access to these innovations, factors which have been recognised as essential in the Academy's work on implementation of stratified medicine. In addition, we hope that there will be further clarification on those types of medicines within the scope of the recommendations of the Review that will benefit from the new pathways, and how this scope is determined, as well as clearer definitions of the terms such as 'promising' used to describe these medicines.

The Academy is undertaking an ongoing workstream on '*How society uses evidence to judge the risks and benefits of medicines*', exploring issues around the evidence underlying decisions about treatment options.¹ This project is looking at the communication of evidence to support decision-making, and perceptions and perspectives of society about this evidence. In particular, the workstream aligns with those aspects of the Accelerated Access Review focused on the evaluation of new products, regulatory decision-making and stakeholder engagement, and we envision that the findings of this project will shape future discussions on access to medical innovations. Another aspect of this project is considering the strengths and limitations of different sources of evidence, an element which is supported by the recent Academy FORUM workshop on '*Real world evidence*'. We will keep the Accelerated Access Review group updated on this project.

As you are aware, the Academy held a Fellows' discussion dinner on 13 July 2015, as part of its contribution to the Review.² Discussions at this meeting also focused on the importance of evaluation and the opportunity presented by real world data, as well as the need for a more sophisticated and flexible approach to pricing and reimbursement and creating 'headroom' within the limited NHS budget for innovative technologies. We do hope that these points will be considered throughout the Review process and will inform the final report.

41 Portland Place
London W1B 1QH

+44 (0)20 3176 2150
info@acmedsci.ac.uk
www.acmedsci.ac.uk

We would be happy to further discuss the workstreams outlined above in person, and look forward to seeing the final report and associated next steps to ensure uptake of innovative medical technologies in the UK.

With best wishes

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Lechler', written over a horizontal line.

¹ <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/how-does-society-use-evidence-to-judge-the-risks-and-benefits-of-medicines/>

² Academy of Medical Sciences (2015). Accelerated Access Review discussion dinner, 13 July 2015.
<http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/download.php?f=file&i=32186>

41 Portland Place
London W1B 1QH

+44 (0)20 3176 2150
info@acmedsci.ac.uk
www.acmedsci.ac.uk