HERU Training Course – Identifying, Appraising and Applying Health Economics Evidence for Public Health, 29th October 2015

Feedback Form

1.	**What is your overall assessment of the course? (1 = insufficient – 5 = excellent)**				
	1 -	2 -	3 - 1	4 - 9	5 - 6

2. **Which topics or aspects of the course did you find most interesting or useful?**

- Calculation of QALYs with EQ5D
- Sources of information
- Exercises
- Thought provoking in terms of how I will apply
- Exercise 'critical approval – very good – very good
- All aspects were helpful to me
- Intro to Economic Evaluation, Appraisal & Group work in afternoon
- Identifying studies less so but only through having had a lot of experience in systematic reviewing previously.
- Critical appraisal exercise
- database search
- A range of approaches kept a difficult topic (for me) interesting
- handouts useful, will use references
- Review of study & thinking about how you might plan a study + discussion about types of economic evaluation
- Appraisal / searching
- Interesting overview of appraisal techniques etc. Good build up from basic intro to economic evaluations onwards
- Overview of Economic Evaluation
- Introduction to Economic Evaluation & Appraising Economic Studies were particularly good
- All of the topics and group work activities & presentations were interesting and very useful
- How to Drummond checklist
- The critical review of papers
- Appraisal
- Group Exercises

3. **Did the course achieve the objectives set?**

Yes 17 No No response

If not, why?

4. **Knowledge and information gained from participation.**

Met your expectations Yes 16 No Partly 1

Will be useful/applicable in my work Definitely 9 Mostly 6 Somehow 2 Not at all

5.	**How do you think the course could have been made more effective?** • Instead of using the asthma study to illustrate Drummond, walk through "ideal" design of a study that fits the criteria • Exploring more the challenge of application to real NHS world of decision making • I think there was a good balance of seminar delivery and interactive • I was a bit alarmed on reading the article, thinking the day may be beyond me, but felt I did get to grips with some of the issues as the day went on. • maybe to have an expert on each table to help guide discussions • Maybe doesn't need the whole presentation on databases of evidence – could have been a summary with takeaway sheet. You refer to MRC guidance on complex interventions – maybe expansion on what this means and how it affects appraisals. • Literature review essential but a little dry. Understand attendees may not regularly undertake reviews. • Very good mix of lecture and interactive – well done. • More exercises and more hours – 1.5 days • Consider other methods – SPOI, PBMA, Qualitative aspects; stakeholders, decision making etc
6.	**Comments and suggestions (including activities or initiatives you think would be useful, for a future course)** • preparing health economic based argument for use/non use resources • Found 'answer ' sheets very helpful and will be helpful for feeding back to team. Future course – more detail on cost-benefit / effectiveness / utility • None – everything relevant was here! • Greater emphasis on study design • The section on literature search was too long • make it a 1.5 or 2 day course with more appraisal exercises • Work of New Economists Forum, Micro-finance as a public health intervention.
7.	**Further comments and suggestions – please add below** • Not sure that all of the Drummond criteria are particularly clear or pertinent • Great course – glad I attended • Really enjoyed it; thanks • I think the course was excellent. The content and delivery of the presentations and course was spot on. Thank you. PS Location & facilities at the meeting worked very well • Thank you • Sign in / Registration was not obvious – could have been "moved" or laid out better • Excellent content • One thing there is no point in producing handouts with screen shots with typing too small to read – don't bother. Overall really good! Thank you! • States in agenda course for those with no prior experience in economic evaluation – my assumption is most attendees had experience either reading economic evaluations or being involved with in work setting. Course also seemed geared up for this target group with some experience. I thought this was good and appropriate but just for future course advertising of target audience.