

CDA-AMC's Evaluation of AI Search Tools for Health-Technology-Assessment Evidence Synthesis

AI in the Public Sector · Good practice · Canada

Quality score: 80/100

Evidence strength: Quasi-experimental

Summary

Canada's Drug Agency ran a peer-reviewed, 7-project comparison of Lens.org, SpiderCite and Microsoft Copilot against manual systematic-review search for drug-reimbursement evidence, finding all three AI tools recalled far fewer relevant studies than trained searchers.

Key dimensions

Dimension	Score
Evidence of impact / measured public value	3/3
Transparency, fairness & accountability	3/3
Transferability / demonstrated replication	2/3
Scalability beyond pilot	2/3
Governance, capability & sustainability	2/3

Evaluated by C-NAPSE

Data sources

[C-NAPSE web research](#) — accessed 2026-07-01

[Canada's Drug Agency \(CDA-AMC, formerly CADTH\)](#) — accessed 2026-07-01

[PMC — peer-reviewed comparative study](#) — accessed 2026-07-01

[CDA-AMC — position statement on AI in HTA](#) — accessed 2026-07-01

[CDA-AMC — 2024-2025 annual report](#) — accessed 2026-07-01

Cite this — Evidoria. *CDA-AMC's Evaluation of AI Search Tools for Health-Technology-Assessment Evidence Synthesis*. Persistent ID: 064e7db6-bf3f-485e-9f41-0c69ef22b8c8.