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Abstract

Patient empowerment is one of the main pillars of humanisation. Therefore, consideration of patients’ preferences and expectations should be taken into account during the practice of any healthcare professional. Improving overall survival and quality of life are the main wishes of patients. Indeed, the recent emergence of Patient Reported Outcomes has become an important focus for healthcare providers. The hospital pharmacist specialises in drug evaluation is a professional who evaluates the efficacy, safety, appropriateness and efficiency of treatments prescribed by physicians, and decision-making must be based on both technical factors and the four principles of bioethics. The correct application of evidence-based clinical practice allows to provide patients with increases in survival and/or quality of life, adapting the convenience and costs to the current situation. With this in mind, it could be said that the evaluation of medicines involves a strong commitment to humanisation. On the other hand, organisations that promote the rigorous evaluation and selection of medicines stand as allies of patients, as they have a direct impact on them and an indirect impact on society. Regulatory agencies in charge of approving and financing medicines in healthcare systems play a key role in the process of humanising clinical decision-making and empowering patients. If these agencies approve the use of new medicines based on data that do not measure quality of life or survival of patients when there are already other therapeutic alternatives for these pathologies, they are indirectly failing to meet patients’ expectations and are infringing bioethical principles. This can have a considerable influence on the benefit-risk ratio of drugs, and...
patients may be treated with regimens that do not provide benefit, or may even harm them. Therefore, where should the process of humanisation be oriented? It seems reasonable that the benefit of the patient should be the fundamental objective of the process of humanisation of healthcare, evidently.

Since Berwick first coined the concept of triple aim as the goal of excellence in healthcare (optimal clinical outcomes, lower costs, improved patient satisfaction), humanization has become one of its main objectives. The concept humanization affects a range of activities, some of which have not been clearly defined. This lack of clarity hinders the implementation of measures that would enable patients to make their voice heard. Patient empowerment is one of the main goals of humanization. At present, patient associations and companies (public and private) are making efforts to raise the visibility of this movement. The Guide for Humanization of the Spanish Society of Hospital Pharmacy (SEFH) defines patient empowerment as one of the tenets of humanization. Pharmacy Services have undertaken a wide variety of initiatives aimed at the humanization of their areas of activity. However, many more programs/strategies are needed to adequately incorporate humanization into processes such as drug approval, regulation, evaluation, selection and monitoring. As demonstrated by some studies exploring the opinions of patients about therapeutic decision-making, healthcare professionals should consider patient preferences and expectations. Patients primarily aim at improving their overall survival and quality of life. However, these endpoints are frequently neglected, which shows a failure to meet the principles of Beneficence and Autonomy. This is striking, especially in some types of cancer or rare diseases.

Whereas assessing survival in early stages of neoplastic or rare diseases with a long life expectancy is challenging due to the lack of data, evaluating quality of life is not an insurmountable obstacle. Hence, endpoints related to quality of life should be included in pivotal trials as a primary (or at least secondary) endpoint, which rarely occurs. Second, although quality of life data should be thoroughly interpreted, it is frequently mentioned briefly at the end of the "Results" section. For this reason, the recent emergence of the so-called Patient Reported Outcomes (PROs) has become the focus of patients, scientific societies, researchers and the pharmaceutical industry. This would involve the principles of Beneficence and Autonomy. To analyze these outcomes, it is necessary that healthcare professionals determine whether the endpoints assessed are clinically relevant and have been measured using validated instruments. Moreover, evaluators should avoid considering irrelevant findings that benefit external agents other than patients. Additionally, patient opinions should be individually assessed and considered as a complementary—rather than substitute—element during clinical decision-making. An empowered patient would express his/her preferences for clinicians to take them into account for the selection of a drug therapy. This is especially relevant when several therapeutic options with similar efficacy but different safety profiles are available. This way, clinician’s choice would be based on the aspects related to quality of life that will be most affected, and considering patient opinion. This would accomplish the principle of Autonomy. Likewise, an empowered patient has a better understanding of concepts related to clinical decision-making, efficiency and sustainability of the healthcare system. This would lead to a greater equity in resource use and promote the bioethical principle of Justice. The hospital pharmacist specialized in the evaluation and selection of medicines assesses the efficacy, safety, convenience and efficiency of the treatments prescribed by other physicians. The work of these professionals has a transverse impact on other areas of the Pharmacy Service, such as drug information or patient counseling. Clinical decision-making should not only be based on technical factors, but also on bioethical criteria. Medical and pharmaceutical ethics evaluate interventions based on the four Principles of Bioethics: Beneficence, Non-Maleficence, Autonomy, and Justice. There is a relationship between the technical criteria that determine the place of drugs in therapeutics and the fundamentals of bioethics.

Thus, fulfillment of the principle of Non-Maleficence is guaranteed through the assessment of treatment efficacy and safety in clinical trials. This minimizes the possibility that patients receive an alternative therapy that may cause them an avoidable prejudice, favouring Non-Maleficence. On the other hand, the assessment of treatment appropriateness by drug evaluators would have a significant impact on patient Autonomy, since it favors the selection of therapies that minimize the number of visits to the hospital or have a more convenient route of administration. In this regard, patient opinion on the convenience of a treatment can be determining in decision-making. Finally, assessing the effectiveness of treatments guarantees compliance with the principle of Justice, since the rational use of medicines optimizes the use of resources of the healthcare system. This way, based on the concept of "cost-opportunity", the treatments with a lower economic impact would be used in some patients, without prejudice to the access of other patients to other therapies. Otherwise, it would prevent wasting resources that are needed for other patients.

Drug evaluation is the first step in the process of disease management. An improper drug selection results in suboptimal outcomes being obtained in subsequent pharmaceutical interventions (i.e. pharmacotherapeutic or pharmacogenetic follow-up).

Taking the above into account, an appropriate drug selection certainly represents a strong commitment to humanization. The correct application of evidence-based clinical practice provides patients with treatments that improve their survival and/or quality of life. In addition, treatment convenience and costs are adjusted to each individual case, thereby meeting the three aims of Berwick. The creation of organizations and entities that promote a thorough and transparent evaluation and selection of medicines emerge as essential allies to patients. Likewise, there are tools available for the adequate interpretation of data from clinical trials. These tools are based on objective criteria and enable correct therapeutic decision-making, which, in turn, directly benefits patients and, indirectly, society. This, however, collides with some situations in which the non-funding or restriction of medicines in certain clinical contexts is denounced, without further investigation of the reasons why these decisions are taken. An example is belantamab mafodotin in patients with refractory multiple myeloma, a drug that has been demanded by some organizations, but which benefit is unclear, with a cost yet unjustified.

Although not directly, regulatory agencies in charge of approving and financing medicines in healthcare systems play a key role in the process of humanising clinical decision-making and empowering patients. These entities, such as the European Medicines Agency (EMA) or the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) evaluate the scientific evidence currently available about the effects of drugs for specific indications. Patient expectations are not met and some principles of bioethics are violated if these entities approve the use of new drugs based on clinical trial data for surrogate endpoints that do not measure quality of life or survival, when other alternative therapies are already available for these diseases. The assessment of surrogate endpoints in clinical trials is acceptable when there is an unmet need in a specific clinical setting where other drugs have not demonstrated a clinically relevant benefit, or when the patient has a good prognosis and the surrogate endpoints assessed correlate with final endpoints. The approval of new drugs based on immature results that do not meet these criteria might result in suboptimal treatments, causing an unacceptable level of uncertainty. This may influence the benefit-risk balance of a drug significantly. Thus, some patients could be treated with schemes that do not provide any clinical benefit or that may compromise their health, thereby violating the principles of Beneficence and Non-Maleficence. A recent example is the use of the combination of olaratumab and...
doxorubicin in soft tissue sarcoma, which marketing authorization was withdrawn due to an unfavorable benefit-risk balance.

Furthermore, accelerated access programs are being created to facilitate access to new medicinal products in clinical settings with unmet needs. This very positive strategy, however, should be implemented with caution to prevent that entities authorize the use of new drugs based on interim data in diseases for which there is already a therapeutic option available.

Claims from patients for rapid access to new molecules could lead regulatory agencies to fail to complete the standard authorization procedures that guarantee the efficacy and safety of treatments. In this setting, a correct design of clinical trials assessing the efficacy and safety of new drugs represents a guarantee. A limitation of single-arm clinical trials is that they complicate the inference of causality between the administration of the drug and the outcomes observed. This limitation is overcome in phase III trials thanks to patient randomization to a control arm. In clinical trials, randomization prevents a potential misbalance of factors across patient cohorts. Additionally, it enables researchers to attribute clinical outcomes to a specific therapeutic intervention rather than to the natural course of the disease based on the characteristics of the patient. Therefore, data from single-arm studies (and their interpretation) are hardly generalizable to other populations.

A thorough drug evaluation also requires assessing its associated costs. However, some regulatory medicines agencies such as the EMA do not assess the economic impact prior to approval of a new drug. This may pose a problem in the future, considering that the cost of some therapies, such as onc-hematologic treatments, has risen considerably in the recent times. Although cost evaluation and humanization could be apparently unrelated, they are actually closely related. If the costs of new drugs—especially those with a higher economic impact—are not assessed, there is a risk of underestimating the cost for the clinical benefit obtained or wasting resources, thereby limiting access of other patients to a adequate treatment. Should healthcare humanization allow failing to treat a patient because all resources were used in another patient receiving a treatment with a high level of uncertainty? Certainly, the answer is no. It is essential that regulatory agencies, in collaboration with the pharmaceutical industry, are committed to avoiding this situation. In this line, the Directorate-General for Pharmacy and Health Products took a step forward and incorporated pharmacist randomization in clinical trials assessing the efficacy and safety of new drugs recently, which fulfills the principle of justice.

Hospital pharmacists specialized in drug evaluation and positioning analyze new drugs and their potential role in meeting patient needs. The technical criteria applied, such as efficacy, quality of life or safety, are intended to assess the extent to which a drug meets the primary needs of patients. Indeed, the most important endpoints to which evaluators give, intended to assess the extent to which a drug meets the primary needs of patients. Therefore, cross-level collaboration between centers were medicines are available should not overrule the know-how accrued from long-term involvement of a multidisciplinary team. Efforts should be made to raise awareness on humanization among all healthcare professionals involved in the selection, prescription and administration of drugs. The use of healthcare resources should be aimed at meeting patient preferences and expectations, which are focused on improving survival and quality of life. Therefore, cross-level collaboration between centers were medicines are available and regulatory medicines agencies is essential. This way, prior to the authorization and marketing of new molecules, the pharmaceutical industry should be required to provide further data about patient-centered endpoints.

Healthcare humanization has gained considerable relevance in recent years. This movement has spread across almost all areas of hospital pharmacy, including pharmaceutical care or the dispensing of oncologic medicines to pediatric patients. All these interventions are aimed at meeting patient needs and preferences. As mentioned above, patients primarily want to improve their life expectancy and quality of life. This is also the main goal of drug evaluation. Therefore, humanization is a positive process that should always comply with the Principles of Bioethics (Beneficence, Non-Maleficence, Autonomy and Justice). As described above, these principles are closely related to basic criteria for drug evaluation (efficacy, safety, convenience and cost). Then, where should this new humanization process be directed to? The primary goal of any healthcare humanization process should be certainly aimed at achieving patient benefit.
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