

If AI can do the analysis, what should HEOR professionals become exceptionally good at?

This is a question I have been thinking about a lot lately; as we constantly find ourselves in an increasingly fast-paced environment, where technology and expectations are evolving faster than teams can grow, while demands for high-quality and decision-relevant evidence continue to increase.

Having worked with HEOR and evidence generation across Pharma & MedTech for the past 7 years, I have experienced first-hand how time-intensive the process can be.

Much of the work has traditionally been highly specialized and tailored to the specific product, indication, market and submission requirements. Of course, we have always relied on standardised tools, established methodologies, economic models and other reusable building blocks. But the core of the work has typically been about taking these building blocks and developing, adapting and validating them to fit the specific question we need to answer.

AI has the potential to fundamentally change that equation.

Instead of building a submission largely from the ground up and using a relatively small proportion of generic material as our starting point, we may increasingly work the other way around: starting with a largely AI-generated foundation and then layering the product-, market- and decision-specific inputs on top.

That is more than an efficiency gain. It could fundamentally reverse the way we approach evidence generation and submission development.

The question is therefore not simply whether AI can help us produce HEOR work faster. The bigger question is: What happens to the HEOR process when the starting point is no longer the bespoke work, but the generic?

Looking at where the field is heading, this does not appear to be a distant and unrelated scenario. ISPOR has just ranked Artificial Intelligence as the #1 HEOR trend for 2026–2027, with Real-World Evidence ranking #2. The scale of the shift is also hard to ignore.

Looking at the programme for ISPOR Europe 2026, AI is no longer a niche topic sitting at the margins of the programme. It has its own dedicated track, with sessions covering everything from generative AI and prompt engineering to AI-assisted economic modelling, RWE, HTA, agentic AI and even the future skills required in HEOR.

For someone like me, working with HEOR and evidence generation, this feels *less like* a new tool being added to the toolbox, and more like a **fundamental change** to the toolbox itself.

Which is where I think the conversation becomes particularly interesting: **If the way we generate evidence changes fundamentally, what happens to the way we work, the skills we value, and ultimately the role of the HEOR professional?**

But perhaps the most interesting question is what happens to the role of the HEOR professional when the production of evidence itself starts to change, as there is a **fundamental difference between generating evidence and knowing what evidence needs to be generated**.

What decision are we trying to inform? Which uncertainties matter most? Does the comparator reflect clinical reality? What evidence could genuinely influence an HTA or payer decision? And perhaps most importantly, what does “value” actually mean to the different stakeholders involved? These are not simply analytical questions. They require context, judgement and an understanding of how evidence is ultimately used in real-world decision-making.

Interestingly, this is also where the current HEOR conversation around AI seems to be heading. ISPOR's 2026–2027 trends report identifies AI as the #1 trend (<https://www.ispor.org/heor-resources/top-10-heor-trends>), but explicitly highlights the importance of human oversight and responsible use. The upcoming ISPOR Europe programme takes this one step further, with sessions asking how to maintain human judgement, accountability, transparency and scientific rigour as AI becomes increasingly autonomous in HEOR and HTA (<https://www.ispor.org/heor-resources/presentations-database/session-cti/ispor-europe-2026/humans-at-the-helm-navigating-increasing-ai-autonomy-in-heor-and-hta>).

Perhaps the value of the HEOR professional will increasingly shift from producing evidence to judging, challenging and contextualising it. The bottom-line for me is: I don't think AI makes HEOR less important. If anything, it may make good HEOR more important than ever.

So perhaps the real question is not what AI will do to HEOR, but what we want the HEOR professional of the future to be exceptionally good at.

I'd genuinely be interested to hear how others in HEOR, Market Access and Evidence Generation are thinking about this.

#HEOR #MarketAccess #HTA #RWE #EvidenceGeneration #AI