

BAHCI

**Bringing a Health Claim to Information:
Measuring the impact of health data on the
health outcomes of European citizens**

Marie Delnord

Herman Van Oyen

FNRS May 15th 2018

MSCA2017 Standard IF – Life Sciences

AREAS:

Public health and epidemiology

Health services, health care research

Bioinformatics, e-Health, medical informatics

Keywords: *health information systems, health system performance, surveillance and monitoring, health indicators, european public health, eHealth, evidence-based health interventions*

Project coordination

Beneficiary: Sciensano: Belgian interfederate Research Public Health Institute

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Herman Van Oyen, Director Dept Epidemiology and public health (Sciensano). Professor Epidemiology at Ghent University, Editor-in-Chief of Archives of Public Health and Editor of the International Journal of Public Health.

Research focus: epidemiological methods, survey research, ageing and disabling process, and monitoring of health inequality. He has led 8 European research projects, on HIS, Life and Health Expectancy, and on Health Inequality including the current Joint Action on Health Information.

Project coordination

Researcher:

Marie Delnord is French, 31 y/o. She recently obtained her PhD in Epidemiology. She has over 7 years of research experience in the field of epidemiology and public health, with a specialization in the areas of maternal and child health and comparative international analyses.

“This MSCA project is a unique opportunity for me to consolidate my credentials as a European public health researcher and expand my career possibilities beyond the perinatal health field.” – Marie Delnord

Background

EU Member States share similar levels of development and access to care. Yet, key population health indicators vary widely across countries.

The societal burden of health inequalities is high
-> *leveraging evidence to achieve better health outcomes is a priority.*

Health Information Systems are the cornerstone of public health interventions. In Europe however there is heterogeneity in the level and nature of evidence that are available to decision-makers and key stakeholders

What is the impact of differences in health information (HI) capacity on the population burden of disease?

Aim



Provide a “HI Impact Index” that could be used by EU public health decision makers to:

1. Measure the uptake of evidence into policies and care
2. Assess the impact of HI on population health overall and in priority areas for Europe:
 - maternal and child health,
 - chronic diseases,
 - antimicrobial resistance,
 - Injury prevention, and
 - patient reported outcomes and experiences.

Originality



- Addresses an important knowledge gap in EU-HIS evaluation
- Examines the potential of new sources and types of data for routine European public health monitoring (ie. big data, social media, health apps)
- Inclusive multi-stakeholder approach

Methods

1. **Provide a conceptual framework** for assessing the impact of health data on health outcomes:

Months M1-M12; Deliverables: D1. Systematic review, D2. Policy brief

2. **Develop the “HI Impact Index”** by conducting a web-based DELPHI consensus process with at least 20 European experts from the public, private sector and civil society

Months M6-M9; D3. Data management plan D4. Scientific publications

3. **Pilot the “HI Impact Index”** and measure associations with publicly available European health status indicators in priority health areas

Months M9-M20; D5. HI Impact Index available on the www.sciensano.be

Scoring

7,154 proposals submitted to the Standard EF panel. **1701 proposals in Life Sciences.**

BAHCI Total score: 94.60% , in top 10%

Each section (Excellence, Impact and Implementation) rated from 0-5 :

4– Very good. *The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.* **5– Excellent.** *The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*

Excellence (4.7/5)

*“The candidate has identified an **important research field** and provides **very good background** (...)”*

- “Gender aspects are very convincingly integrated and well thought through in terms of health differences”*
- “The state-of-the-art, objectives and overview of the action are precisely specified and very well presented.”*
- “The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host institution is clearly articulated”*

Scoring

Impact (4.8/5)

*“The expected impact of the planned research and training on the experienced researcher’s career prospects after the fellowship is **ambitious and very plausible.**”*

*“**The new knowledge generated** by the action will be disseminated and **exploited in multiple credible strategies.** The project benefits from multiple approaches that include a **range of stakeholder groups**”*

*The frequency and nature of **communication activities** are well **described and have highly nuanced approaches** to audiences, such as multifaceted communication media, including European Commission events, a news article, press release and a short quiz for the public.*

Scoring

Implementation (4.7/5)

*“The **beneficiary’s active contribution to the research and training activities** is coherent. The available infrastructure, facilities and logistics are very well suited for the success of this project.*

*“The organisation and management structure, as well as the **progress-monitoring mechanisms** in place are very good and monthly formal meetings with the supervisor have been adequately foreseen.”*

*“The **Gantt chart is very well presented and is complete**. The work plan and the resources mobilized are very well identified to ensure that the research and training objectives will be achieved.”*

*“The lists of major deliverables and major milestones are carefully prepared, taking into account the **training activities of the researcher and a range of dissemination and communication actions**.”*

Tips



- Choose a well known laboratory, with a good reputation.
- Underline the main achievements of your host laboratory: patents, publications, number of PhD, contracts, international projects...
- Show that you have made an effort to get to know your future colleagues/work environment.
- Find synergies between your project and on-going activities in your laboratory

Tips



- Be concrete when describing the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host organization
- Think through each of the evaluation criteria – don't glance over.
- Be specific about “why” (you are the right candidate), and “how” (you will manage your project).
- Don't be shy about your contingency plan and risk management.