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Upcoming Study Endpoint Meeting

Beginning with the End in Mind – Study Endpoints: Targeting Patient-Centered Outcomes

Dates: October 21 – 23, 2013
Location: Bethesda, Maryland, USA
Chairs: Laurie B. Burke, FDA
       Linda S. Deal, Shire

Overview: Attendees will have the opportunity to gain insight into the tradeoffs and various stakeholder perspectives for developing a study endpoint measurement strategy.

Day 3 of this workshop will provide detailed and practical tips for ensuring that measurement tools are adequate to support the targeted objectives with a focus on establishing instrument content validity for the specified clinical trial context of use.
Become Involved

DIA’s Study Endpoints Community (formerly SIAC)

• Community focused on Study Endpoints with 200+ members
• Mission: To develop, share, evaluate, and disseminate information on the selection, development and qualification of study endpoints, including patient reported outcomes (PROs), clinician reported outcomes (ClinROs), observer reported outcomes (ObsROs), and other rating scales, and biomarkers, for use to demonstrate efficacy in medical product development.
• Monthly Educational Series: Next Presentation July 24th: ePRO
• To Join: Go to DIAHOME.org, My DIA, Manage My Communities
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Objectives

• Discuss the FDA criteria for evaluating and qualifying PRO measures
• Discuss the results of qualitative research conducted to support development of a new clinical trial endpoint measure
• Describe how multiple stakeholders have collaborated to develop a PRO measure in a pre-competitive environment
Panelists

• **Stephen Joel Coons, PhD**
  – Executive Director, Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) Consortium, Critical Path Institute (C-Path)
  – *Introduction and Overview of the Critical Path Institute’s PRO Consortium*

• **Elektra Papadopoulos, MD, MPH**
  – Endpoint Reviewer, SEALD, OND, CDER, FDA
  – *Overview of the FDA Patient-Reported Outcome and Drug Development Tool Guidance Documents*
Panelists

• Steven I. Blum, MBA, MA
  – Director, Health Economics, Forest Research Institute
  – Co-Chair, PRO Consortium Depression Working Group
  – *Key Findings from Systematic Reviews of Published Literature and Existing Instruments*

• Mona L. Martin, RN, MPA
  – Executive Director, Health Research Associates, Inc.
  – *Qualitative Development of the Symptoms of Major Depressive Disorder Scale (SMMDS)*
Introduction and Overview of the Critical Path Institute’s PRO Consortium

Stephen Joel Coons, PhD
Executive Director
Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) Consortium
Critical Path Institute (C-Path)
FDA’s Critical Path Initiative

- As stated by the FDA, “To get medical advances to patients, product developers must successfully progress along a multidimensional critical path that leads from discovery or design concept to commercial marketing.”
- The FDA launched the Critical Path Initiative in 2004 to facilitate the steps along the critical path.
- The FDA recognized that better scientific tools were needed to increase the efficiency of clinical trial research, including new approaches to safety testing, trial design, endpoint development, and analyses.
- The intent is for these drug development tools to be developed collaboratively in a pre-competitive environment and made available to anyone that can use them.
Critical Path Institute (C-Path)

- Established in 2005 by the University of Arizona and the FDA
- Dedicated to implementing FDA's *Critical Path Initiative*
- An independent, non-profit organization
- Provides a neutral, pre-competitive venue for collaboration aimed at accelerated development of safe and effective medical products
C-Path (www.c-path.org)

- Primary sources of funding for C-Path operations:
  - Government agency grants
  - Foundation grants/contracts
  - Private philanthropy
  - Membership fees from member firms

- Consortia that receive funding from FDA Grant
  - Coalition Against Major Diseases (CAMD)
  - Predictive Safety Testing Consortium (PSTC)
  - Regulatory Science Consortium for Critical Path to TB Drug Regimens (CPTR)
  - Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) Consortium
PRO Consortium

- Formed in late 2008 by C-Path, in cooperation with the FDA and the pharmaceutical industry

- Membership
  - Only available to medical product (pharmaceutical, device, and diagnostic) companies
  - 25 members in 2013 (all pharmaceutical firms)

- Non-Voting Participants
  - Representatives of governmental agencies
  - Clinical consultants, patients, academics, and CROs partnering in the development of the PRO instruments
PRO Consortium Members

- abbvie
- ACTELION
- ALLERGAN
- AMGEN
- AstraZeneca
- Boehringer Ingelheim
- Bristol-Myers Squibb
- Daiichi-Sankyo
- Eisai
- Forest Laboratories, Inc.
- GlaxoSmithKline
- Horizon Pharma
- Ironwood
- Johnson & Johnson
- Lilly
- MERCK
- Novartis
- Novo Nordisk
- Pfizer
- Roche
- Sanofi
- Shire
- SUNOVION
- Takeda
- UCB

DIA 2013
49th Annual Meeting
PRO Consortium
Mission Statement

To establish and maintain a collaborative framework with appropriate stakeholders for the development of qualified, publicly available PRO instruments for use in clinical trials where PRO endpoints are used to support product labeling claims.
PRO Consortium
Establishing Working Groups

Criteria for selection of therapeutic areas:

- Disease/condition with unmet measurement need and a priority area for the member firms

- Disease/condition with regulatory 'demand' for pre-competitive PRO instrument based on FDA input

- Disease/condition currently reliant on more 'objective' measurement where subjective impact of disease via PRO assessment could provide unique information to support labeling claims
PRO Consortium Goals

- Develop qualified, publicly available PRO instruments
- Enable pre-competitive collaboration that includes FDA input/expertise
- Avoid development of multiple PRO instruments for the same purpose
- Share costs of developing new PRO instruments
- Facilitate FDA’s review of medical products by standardizing PRO endpoints
FDA Qualification

- Qualification is based on an FDA review of evidence that supports the conclusion that a PRO instrument provides a well-defined and reliable assessment of a targeted concept in a specified context of use.

PRO Consortium
Path to Instrument Qualification

- Letter of Intent
- Scoping Stage
- Vendor Selection and Contracting Stage
- Content Validity Stage
  - Qualitative component
  - Quantitative component
- Psychometric Analysis Stage
- Submission of Qualification (Evidence) Dossier
PRO Consortium
Current Working Groups

- Asthma – 11 firms
- Cognition – 9 firms
- Functional Dyspepsia – 3 firms
- Irritable Bowel Syndrome – 3 firms
- Lung Cancer (NSCLC) – 6 firms
- Rheumatoid Arthritis – 7 firms
- Depression – 9 firms
Depression Working Group: Sponsoring Firms

- AbbVie (Co-Chair – Nick Greco)
- Bristol-Myers Squibb
- Eli Lilly and Company
- Forest Research Institute (Co-Chair – Steve Blum)
- Janssen
- Pfizer
- Shire
- Sunovion
- Takeda
Depression Working Group: Other Participants

Expert Panel

- Madhukar Trivedi, MD - UT Southwestern Medical Center
- Linda Carpenter, MD - Brown University
- Michael Thase, MD - University of Pennsylvania

Non-member Participant

- Philip Ninan, MD – retired (Pfizer) WG member

CRO Partner

Health Research Associates, Inc.
Depression Working Group: Rationale

- PRO Consortium members and FDA advisors identified depression as a priority area.

- The (then) director of FDA’s Division of Psychiatry Products expressed an openness to a PRO-based primary endpoint for major depressive disorder (MDD) treatment trials.

- It was unclear whether any existing PRO instruments were ‘fit for purpose’ as an efficacy endpoint in MDD.
Depression Working Group: Goal

To assess the adequacy of existing PRO instruments for capturing important depressive symptom information from the patient’s perspective and, if there is an unmet need, to either modify an existing instrument or develop a new MDD symptom measure.
Depression Working Group
Location on Qualification Path

- **Letter of Intent** - unnecessary
- **Scoping Stage** – completed, FDA feedback received
- **Vendor Selection and Contracting** - completed
- **Content Validity Stage**
  - **Qualitative component** – completed and FDA submission being prepared
  - **Quantitative component** – ready to launch
- **Psychometric Analysis Stage**
- **Submission of Qualification (Evidence) Dossier**
FDA Qualification

...has the potential to:

- More effectively incorporate the patient’s voice into the evaluation of treatment effects
- Increase number of accepted PRO measures used to support claims in product labeling
- Enhance comparability/consistency of endpoints across clinical trials
- Improve efficiency for sponsors in endpoint selection
- Improve product labeling
Overview of the FDA Patient-Reported Outcome and Drug Development Tool Guidance Documents

Elektra Papadopoulos, MD, MPH
Endpoint Reviewer, SEALD, OND, CDER, FDA
Drug Development Tool Qualification: Clinical Outcome Assessments (COAs)
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Treatment Benefit

• Treatment benefit is demonstrated by evidence that the treatment has a positive impact on:
  – How long a patient lives
  – How a patient feels or functions in daily life

• A claim of treatment benefit must be supported by substantial evidence
  – Adequate and well-controlled studies [21 CFR 314.126]
    • *Well-defined and reliable assessments*
Assessing Treatment Benefit

• Measures are well-defined and reliable when
  – Empiric evidence demonstrates that the score quantifies the concept of interest in the targeted context of use

• The concept of interest measured by the score and defined by the endpoint in the clinical trial context of use determines the appropriate labeling or advertising claim

• The context of use includes the targeted purpose and circumstances of measurement
  – FDA reviews whether the available data support the use of the measure in the context defined by the clinical studies that provide evidence of treatment benefit
Measurement Property Documentation

- Defines how the Agency interprets “well-defined and reliable” (21 CFR 314.126) for PRO measures intended to provide evidence of treatment benefit

- Summarizes good measurement principles applicable to any PRO, ClinRO or ObsRO assessment

Guidance for Industry
Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims

Measurement Properties

• Content validity
  – Evidence that the instrument measures the concept of interest including evidence that the items and domains of the instrument are meaningful, comprehensive, appropriate relative to its intended measurement context, population and use

• Established by:
  – Literature review,
  – Expert opinion,
  – Respondent input in the for of qualitative research in the targeted population

• An instrument’s other measurement properties—reliability, construct validity, ability to detect change—cannot be interpreted without first establishing content validity
DDT Qualification Guidance (Draft)

Guidance for Industry

Qualification Process for Drug Development Tools

DRAFT GUIDANCE


U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)

October 2010
Clinical/Medical

- Describe a process NOT evidentiary standards
- Qualification process described for Biomarkers, Animal Models, and Clinical Outcome Assessments (COA)
- Final Guidance expected in 2013
DDT Qualification

• A voluntary submission process for drug development tools (DDTs), intended for potential use in multiple drug development programs

  − Regulatory conclusion that within the stated context of use, the results of the DDT measurement can be relied upon to have a stated interpretation and utility – “fit for purpose”

  − Qualification allows an instrument to be reviewed once (for a particular context of use) and once qualified, further review will not be necessary when used in future clinical trials in the approved context of use

  − Stages of qualification:
    • Initiation, Consultation and Advice, Qualification Review
CDER Review of Letter of Intent

• Qualification review team (QRT) assembled to review the Letter of Intent (LOI)
  – Comprised of representatives from SEALD and the division, and other essential representatives (e.g., statisticians, other centers)

• Review of the LOI
  – Concept of interest and proposed conceptual framework
  – Context of use: disease definition; population; endpoint model; targeted claims

• Three potential CDER responses to LOI
  – Accept as is into qualification process
    • Request initial briefing package (content validity documentation)
  – Request a revised LOI
    • Provide recommendations on what to revise (where our disagreements are)
  – Do not accept this DDT project into the qualification program
Identifying the Concept of Interest

• Identifying and defining the concept (i.e., the thing to measure) is the foundation of instrument validity
• The concept represented by the score of an instrument will form the basis of:
  – Interpretation of clinical trial results
  – Communication of the measured treatment benefit in product labeling (the identified concept will be included in labeling)
• Clear identification of the concept(s) of interest is essential before selection or development of an assessment tool
• Making a final decision about the appropriateness of the concept of interest is impossible without an understanding of the context of use
  – Defining the concept of interest and the context of use is an iterative process
  – Targeted concepts of interest should be in alignment with the key study objectives and targeted labeling claims
Defining Context of Use: Consider the Following

• Disease definition including, if appropriate
  – Disease subtype
  – Disease severity
  – History of previous treatment

• Patient subpopulations
  – Patient demographics
  – Reporting ability
  – Culture and language

• Clinical trial design and objectives
  – Endpoint positioning
  – Endpoint definitions
  – Analysis plan
  – Methods for interpretation of study results
  – Targeted labeling claim

• Clinical practice and study setting
  – Inpatient vs. outpatient
  – Geographic location
  – Clinical practice variation
Consultation and Advice Stage

• **Summary** of content validity documentation
  – Includes draft instrument
  – Iterative approach of qualitative and quantitative methods

• **Summary** of other measurement properties documentation
  – Longitudinal psychometric validation study

• Periodic submissions of status updates (every 6 months)

• Submissions of specific materials for comment (e.g., protocols)
Review of Full Qualification Package

- Full dossier of evidence submitted and reviewed

- When a decision to qualify is made by CDER, notice published as guidance in Federal Register

- Requirement of qualification: instrument made publically available
Benefit of Qualification of COA Instruments

- More effectively incorporate the patient’s voice into the evaluation of treatment benefit and improved product labeling
- Improve comparability/consistency of endpoints across clinical trials
- Improve efficiency for sponsors in endpoint selection
- Instruments would not have to be reviewed by CDER with every IND/NDA/BLA application
- FDA participation during development of these instruments ensures agreement on:
  - Concepts of interest and context of use (including endpoint positioning)
  - Methods of instrument development
- Confidence that the instrument will be accepted by CDER in the qualified context of use
Key Findings from Systematic Reviews of Published Literature and Existing Instruments

Steven I. Blum, MBA, MA
Director, Health Economics, Forest Research Institute
Co-Chair, PRO Consortium Depression Working Group
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Inputs to Qualitative Development Process

- Concept Elicitation & Item Generation
- Draft Measure

Protocol & Interview Guide Development
- Expert Opinion
- Existing Measures
- Literature Review

Concept Elicitation & Item Generation
- Expert Panel/WG Review
- Data

Development of Draft Measure

Literature Review

• Conducted to understand patient’s perspective based on published qualitative studies, including the language that patient’s use to describe their condition, and the symptoms and disease impacts of greatest importance to them

• Inform on the development of the Concept Elicitation Interview Guide
Instrument Review

• Assess key characteristics of a selection of existing instruments, including extent of direct patient input
• Inform on the revision of conceptual (disease) model, identification of preliminary key concepts to measure, and development of our qualitative interview guide
• Guide working group on whether to:
  – Seek qualification of an existing instrument,
  – Recommend modifications to an existing instrument; or
  – Develop a new instrument (items from existing instruments could contribute to item bank).
Search Results

**PRIMARY SEARCH:**
- 177 articles identified
- 42 articles after Initial Abstract Review
- 13 articles after Complete Review

**SECONDARY SEARCH:**
- 608 articles identified
- 28 articles after Initial Abstract Review
- 15 articles after Complete Review
- 28 articles after Complete Review

**Final Literature Review:**
- 19 articles

**Additional: 9 articles dropped because of inadequate methods or focused on topics out of scope**

**Other:**
- 135 articles did not meet inclusion criteria
- 174 duplicates
- 406 did not meet inclusion criteria
Results: Concepts

- Emotional Symptoms
- Cognitive Symptoms
- Signs & Related Concepts
- Symptom-related Impacts
- Physical Symptoms
- Attributions of Cause
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sadness/wanting to cry</td>
<td>“…when I got to work and got into the office, I would just sit there and cry.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>“It’s embarrassing, you feel guilty, you feel weak”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low self-esteem/self-efficacy</td>
<td>“Avoiding things, denying things, being more agitated and aggressive for no apparent reason”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritability/Anger</td>
<td>“It’s like a doorway that I know I can’t go through. I can’t do that to my parents….but I so much would just like to go to sleep and not wake up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness/Hopelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts of death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Symptoms of Depression: Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>“You feel as though you are walking through a bog in the fog, like you’re dragging your limbs around”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>“For me, it’s the sleeping and the withdrawing [that] are a key that something’s wrong”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep Disturbance</td>
<td>“I get real, what I think is physical pain in my arms, my shoulders, my chest, I have headaches at the back of my head”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily Aches &amp; Pains</td>
<td>“Everybody notices the weight loss. Everybody would be like, ‘Oh my God, what’s going on, what happened to you?’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Palpitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tingling in extremities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Symptoms of Depression: Cognitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive thoughts</td>
<td>“I will be released from all of this, all of these thoughts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desynchrony with environment</td>
<td>“I just started waking up early…two in the morning, wide awake …and you start worrying about the next day, and then… you worry about not sleeping. It’s a vicious cycle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Lethargy</td>
<td>“And my mental acuity also went.. it just scared the hee-gee-bees out of me, the lack of concentration I had at work”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Disease-related Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social isolation, decreased social support, stigma</td>
<td>“you want to isolate yourself and you don’t actually want to be a part of all the normal things”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship difficulties</td>
<td>“You don’t like to admit you’re a depressed person… there’s a negative view of someone with depression so you didn’t really let a lot of people know about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties at work</td>
<td>“I get depressed and I don’t wanna do anything. If I didn’t have those symptoms I believe that I would be more active or more motivated to do more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties doing chores at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased self-care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Signs and related concepts

- Concepts not easily defined by patients as symptoms, impacts or a cause of MDD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant life changes</td>
<td>“I had to actually leave the province, how’s that for embarrassment?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>“Extremely stressed at work and feeling physiological effects of the stress . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety</td>
<td>“Because of being depressed I have made really stupid choices... I started having sex with heaps of different people, and drugs and alcohol were even worse. And then the depression came...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug &amp; alcohol abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attributions of Cause

### Concept

| Life events, significant losses | “One of the things that affected me is the two children that died so close together…” |
| Discrimination                  | “I know a lot of black people that's depressed. Every black person I know is depressed” |
| Poverty                        | “Poverty is the reason. If you can meet your needs, the problems will lessen” |

- However, many patients reported limited or no understanding of the condition or its causes
  - Increased feelings of despair and impotence, anxiety, shame and guilt
  - Made it more likely that patients would blame external factors for their symptoms
Summary

• Depression is understood by patients in the terms of the symptoms, signs and disease-related impacts they are experiencing.

• Patients with depression focus their discourse more on their emotions as compared with other known clinical symptoms, such as cognitive and executive functioning symptoms.
Summary

• A range of concepts not easily defined as symptoms of depression or as disease-related impacts were also a substantial focus of patient discourse, suggesting that from the patient’s perspective comorbid symptoms are not distinctively derived from other conditions.

• Patients’ attributions of cause of depression should be investigated in detail during the qualitative interviews to provide important information on how they see the causes and impacts of their disease, but it may not be relevant for assessing illness severity.
Articles Contributing to the Review

- Borba, C.; DePadilla, L.; Druss,BG.; McCarty, FA.; Von Esenwein, SA.; Sterk, CE. A Day in the Life of Women with a Serious Mental Illness: A Qualitative Investigation. Womens Health Issues. 2011. 4:286–292
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- Hagerty, B.; Williams, SA.; Liken, M. Prodromal symptoms of recurrent major depressive episodes: A Qualitative Analysis. Am J Orthopsychiatry. 1997. 67(2)
Articles Contributing to the Review

Literature Review

• Systematic search of MEDLINE and PsychINFO

• Primary Search Strategy:
  – Published in English language between 1991 and 2011
  – Peer-reviewed journal
  – Included community trials, case control studies, cohort studies, cross sectional studies, and qualitative studies
  – Studies had to include adults with diagnosed MDD
  – Principal search terms (used alone and in combination): Major depression; qualitative; focus groups, symptoms, impacts, patient attitude

• Secondary Search Strategy
  – Searched for ’depression’ AND ‘qualitative’ since January 2009
Methods

• Systematic review of existing MDD symptom measures and related published literature was conducted using PubMed, University of Oxford PRO Measurement Group and the Cochrane Library
  – The following combinations of keywords were used for the search: “Patient Reported Outcome(s)”, “Clinician Reported Outcome(s) AND “Depression”, “Depressive Symptoms”, “Depressed Mood”, “Depression Index”, “Depression Scale(s)”, “Depression Instrument(s)”, “Depression Measure(s)”
Methods

• Conducted searches of the following internet sources
  – ProQolid (Patient Reported Outcome and Quality of Life Instruments Database)
  – OLGA (Online Guide to Quality of Life Assessment)
  – ISPOR Databases (International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research)
**Methods**

*Search limited to those articles and instruments in English for which information on both their development process and psychometric properties were available.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages</strong></td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Humans only</td>
<td>Animal studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Studies</strong></td>
<td>Cross-sectional or longitudinal; Used original data; included patients with depression</td>
<td>Letter, editorial, commentary, discussion paper, non-systematic reviews that have no original data, practice guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Instruments</strong></td>
<td>Patient reported outcomes; Clinician Reported outcomes; Measure depressive symptoms; Had to describe development process; Had to include psychometric properties</td>
<td>Instruments which do not measure depressive symptoms or primarily measure health related quality of life, functional status and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods

• Instruments were ranked based on number of citations from the Institute of Scientific Information Web of Science database with detailed reviews conducted for top-cited instruments.

• Areas of inquiry for candidate instrument review:
  – Name of Measure, Acronym, and Purpose
  – Concepts measured, number of items in each (sub)scale
  – Overall content coverage of targeted concepts
  – Developmental History
  – Published use in mental health studies & in clinical trials
  – Reliability results (internal consistency, test-retest reproducibility)
  – Results related to convergent and discriminant validity
  – Ability to detect change over time
  – Other useful information
Search Strategy and Outcome

Literature Review

- Original Search: 138 articles identified
  - Initial Abstract Review: 126 articles reviewed
    - 12 articles excluded
      did not meet inclusion criteria
    - Full Article Review: 42 articles selected
      - 84 articles excluded
        did not meet inclusion criteria

Instrument Review

- Instrument Identification: 26 PROs/ClinROs identified
  - In Depth Review: 13 instruments reviewed
  - Rank instrument citations using ISI
## Results – Instruments Selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDI/BDI-II</td>
<td>Beck Depression Inventory</td>
<td>5,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHQ</td>
<td>General Health Questionnaire</td>
<td>2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale</td>
<td>2,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM-D</td>
<td>Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDS</td>
<td>Geriatric Depression Scale</td>
<td>1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POMS/POMS-SF</td>
<td>Profile of Mood States</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRS/MADRS-S</td>
<td>Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression Scale</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSI</td>
<td>Brief Symptom Inventory</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ-9</td>
<td>Patient Health Questionnaire</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZUNG SDS</td>
<td>Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS-C/IDS-SR</td>
<td>Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIDS-C/QIDS-SR</td>
<td>Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMIS</td>
<td>Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Other Instruments Identified

Not Selected for In-Depth Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIME-MD</td>
<td>Primary Care Evaluation of Mental Disorders</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIS</td>
<td>Clinical Global Impression of Severity</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDI</td>
<td>Major Depression Inventory</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Hamilton Depression Inventory</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURO-D</td>
<td>EURO-D Scale</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Carroll Rating Scale for Depression</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLDS</td>
<td>Quality of Life Depression Scale</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE-AD</td>
<td>Duke Anxiety Depression</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI</td>
<td>Short Depression Inventory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Depression Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>RAND Depression Screener</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSS</td>
<td>Signs of Depression Screening Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Instrument Versions

• There are often a number of Different Versions of instruments, including versions with differing lengths
  – For the 13 instruments evaluated, over 40 different iterations or versions were identified
  – Clinician- (ClinRO) versus Patient-reported (PRO) versions
  – Versions ranged in length from 1 item (GDS-1) to 65 items (Original POMS)

• Implication: need to ensure that instrument has adequate coverage of key concepts while at the same time not creating unnecessary patient burden
Results – Concepts Measured

• Instruments vary in terms of Concept Coverage: which concepts are measured and how they are measured.
  – Coverage varies across different instruments as well as between different versions of the same instrument (due to length or additional concepts being added/deleted in newer versions).
  – Some instruments have items which include descriptions of multiple concepts in a single item.
# Results – Concepts Measured

## Emotions/Mood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions/Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Pleasure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritability/Hostility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Compassion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Swings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Concepts Measured

## Negative Affect/Sense of Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Lonely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Negative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless/Helpless</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthlessness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Hate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Blame</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Concepts Measured

## Cognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Lethargy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Overwhelmed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixation on Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive Thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Concepts Measured
### Energy/Fatigue/Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy/Fatigue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue/Exhaustion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethargic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/Low Energy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Sleepiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiredness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Interest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Self-Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Concepts Measured

### Physical Symptoms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathing Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Palpitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily Pain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach Discomfort</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tingling Extremities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Concepts Measured

## Eating Behavior/Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eating Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Appetite</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Appetite</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Loss</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Eating Behav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic Attacks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Concepts Measured

## Social Function/Activity Impairment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Social Engage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Activity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Impairment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Difficulty w/ Daily Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Impacts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Concepts Measured

### Sleep Impacts/Self-Harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Concept</th>
<th>BDI</th>
<th>HADS</th>
<th>HAM-D</th>
<th>GHQ</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>POMS</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>ZUNG</th>
<th>MADRS</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>IDS</th>
<th>PROMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sleep Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Awakening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Fall Asleep</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sleep Diff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversleeping</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff Remain Asleep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Harm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Off Dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Harm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts of Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: X denotes presence of measurement.*
Results – Response Scale/Recall Period

• A variety of Response Scales are used including numerical, categorical/Likert-type and dichotomous.

• **Implication:** response scale may vary depending on whether measuring severity, frequency, duration of signs, symptoms and impacts. Response scale needs to be interpretable for patients.

• Recall Periods vary from “present time” (BDI-I, HAM-D, Zung) to “last few weeks” (GHQ).
  – 7-day recall period was the most utilized recall period (50% of instruments reviewed).
  – Recall period may vary between mode of administration: MADRS-C (no specific period), MADRS-S: 3 days.

• **Implication:** need to ensure that recall period is sensitive enough to detect changes in status and variability of symptom or impact being measured.
Results – Patient Input

• Many existing instruments have limited documentation of patient involvement during the initial development process.
  – HADS: patients completed self-assessment scale and were interviewed
  – PROMIS Depression Item Bank included patient focus groups and cognitive interviews.
• Many instruments were developed based on expert clinical opinion or were derived from other instruments

• Implication: need to avoid use of medical terminology and ensure language used is accessible and understandable by patients

• Most instruments used patients during “validation period”
  – Most instruments demonstrate acceptable scores for reliability and validity

• Implication: documentation of “content validity” required for qualification of a PRO instrument under the FDA PRO Guidance.
Limitations

• Information on patient involvement in the development process for existing measures is limited.
  – Importance of “content validity” and “patient-centered” outcomes research have increased in recent years.
  – Many older published articles focus primarily on the psychometric measures for validity and do not describe the instrument development process in detail.
  – This review included reports of patient-involved to the extent that such reports were published.

• This systematic review focused on instruments predominantly measuring MDD symptoms, and not those that measure more distal concepts like quality-of-life, functional status and satisfaction.
  – FDA is less likely to accept measures which measure more distal impacts (such as social function) or more general HRQOL concepts.
Limitations

• The detailed review did not include less frequently cited instruments.
  – Potentially excludes new instrument or ones that have been less frequently used

• Use in clinical trials is limited to uses identified in publications included in our review, which focused on the articles related to the instrument development process and psychometric properties.
  – It did not include articles pertaining use of the instrument in clinical trials for assessing efficacy, as this was beyond the scope of our research objectives
Conclusions

• There are a large number of existing patient-reported outcome measures for major depressive disorder
  – These instruments vary greatly in terms of concepts measured, instrument length, response options, anchoring, scoring algorithms, and recall period
  – Limited information is available in the literature on the developmental history of existing depression symptom inventories, making it unclear whether the inventory items were developed with direct patient input.
Conclusions

• In the absence of additional information about the patient’s involvement during development of these instruments it is unlikely these scales will satisfy the requirements set forth in the FDA PRO Guidance
  – Qualitative research could support qualification of an existing scale - if an existing measure could be shown to have content validity.
  – An existing scale could also provide the basis for modification or development of a new scale.

• Further research is required to understand whether the concepts measured by these instruments are adequately supported by direct patient input and can provide a basis for qualification according to the PRO/DDT Guidance.
  – Alternatively, development of a new patient-reported outcome measure could be considered.
Qualitative Development of the Symptoms of Major Depressive Disorder Scale (SMMDS)

Mona L. Martin, RN, MPA
Executive Director, Health Research Associates, Inc.
Objectives

• Complete qualitative concept elicitation (CE) and cognitive interviews with subjects diagnosed with MDD to support preliminary development of a patient-reported outcome (PRO) measure to assess treatment benefit in major depressive disorder clinical trials.
Methods - Study Population

• Recruitment was designed to enroll a diverse sample of patients similar to those who would be using the PRO instrument in future clinical trials of MDD treatments.
  • No formal recruitment quotas were employed, each site targeted recruitment of a mix of patients with varying severity of MDD and MDD-treatment histories, as well as broad representation across demographic characteristics such as age, sex, race/ethnicity, marital status, and educational attainment and employment status.
  • Subjects were recruited from 6 U.S. clinical sites (CT, FL, IL, NY, OK, WA)
Methods - Study Population

- The eligibility criteria for the targeted interview population were designed to reflect common entry criteria for clinical trials in major depression:
  - Inclusion Criteria: Male and Female subjects between the ages of 18 to 65, inclusive, who met DSM-IV-TR criteria for MDD; and were being treated on an outpatient basis; and had experienced a major depressive episode within the previous 6 months; and had a Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HAM-D) score of > 18 at the time of screening
  - Exclusion Criteria: Current or past history of a personality disorder, schizophrenia or other psychotic disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, or post-traumatic stress disorder; significant risk of suicide; positive urine drug screen or recent clinically significant alcohol abuse or drug use.
Methods – Concept Elicitation Interviews

- Semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted by trained research staff with a representative sample of adult MDD patients in the US who recently experienced a major depressive event.
  - Interviews followed a pre-approved interview guide and used open-ended questions and day-reconstruction exercises to elicit spontaneous reports of symptom/impact concepts.
  - Subsequent probing was used to assess concepts not spontaneously reported by subjects.
  - Subjects were asked to rate the severity and level of bother or difficulty for reported symptoms and impacts.
  - To guide item development, subjects were asked about appropriateness of measuring the severity, frequency, or duration of each concept.
Methods - Content Analysis

• All interview sessions were audio recorded and transcribed.
• The CE Interview transcripts were coded and analyzed by trained qualitative coders using Atlas.ti, and were summarized by like-content using an iterative coding framework.
  • Coded concepts were grouped by similarity of content and analyzed to identify the most relevant expressions and most common language used by patients.
• A Saturation Grid was used to track symptoms and impacts expressed during the interviews and assess saturation of concept.
  • Transcripts were ordered chronologically in groups of 8 transcripts. Codes from each group were compared with previous groups to determine whether any new additional unique concepts emerged.
Methods - Item Generation

• An item-generation meeting was held by the development team, where concepts identified from published literature, existing instruments, and the qualitative data from the CE interviews were reviewed as the basis for selection of concepts for inclusion in PRO measurement.

• This initial evaluation process resulted in the selection of candidate symptom concepts to be targeted for PRO measurement.

• During subsequent review by the development team, these targeted concepts were further reduced by removing synonymous or problematic concepts, and a draft version of the questionnaire was prepared for evaluation in cognitive interviews and a translatability assessment.
Methods – Cognitive Interviews

- Cognitive interviews were conducted to evaluate concept relevance, understandability, and structure of the draft items, and to facilitate further instrument refinement.
- Three separate waves of interviews with patients with MDD were conducted
  - Following each wave, the development team considered the findings and used the information to modify the draft instrument.
- A semi-structured cognitive interview guide was designed to capture the subject’s comprehension of items and ability to complete the draft PRO instrument.
  - Updated versions of the interview guide were created for each of the three interview waves.
  - Questions in the interview process asked about: the comprehension and relevance of the individual items; the fit of the response scales; the appropriateness of the recall period and item wording; and any lack of clarity of items, terminology, instructions, or sentence structure.
Methods – Cognitive Interviews

• During the cognitive interviews, the draft instrument items were completed and evaluated by patients with MDD, recruited through the same process and eligibility criteria as used previously for the CE interviews.

• Cognitive interview transcripts were summarized in cognitive report tables for analysis.

• In parallel with the cognitive interview process, a translatability assessment (TA) was conducted on the draft instrument to assess the potential for difficulty in translating the items to maintain content equivalency.
  • The findings from the TA process were used to make revisions to select PRO items prior to the closure of the cognitive interview process.
## Results – Subject Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Concept Elicitation N=40</th>
<th>Cognitive Interviews N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age in years: mean (SD); [range]</strong></td>
<td>46.2 (11.8); [21-63]</td>
<td>44.6 (13.4); [18-59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender: Female: n (%)</strong></td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>9 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial and Ethnic Group: n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic):</td>
<td>18 (45.0%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Hispanic):</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Ethnicity not reported):</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American:</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results – Subject Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Concept Elicitation N=40</th>
<th>Cognitive Interviews N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education Completed: n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional School</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since diagnosis with MDD: mean (SD); [range]</td>
<td>7.8 (8.7); [0-40]</td>
<td>12.3 (12.0); [0.9-42.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since onset of most recent MDE: mean (SD); [range]</td>
<td>1.0 (1.8); [0-8]</td>
<td>1.9 (1.5); [0.5-4.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM-D Total Score at Screening: mean (SD); [range]</td>
<td>24.4 (4.3); [19-39]</td>
<td>24.4 (5.3); [19-36]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Concept Elicitation

• A total of 40 subjects participated in the CE interviews. They were an average of 46.2 years old, were 67.5% female, 45.0% white (non-Hispanic), and had an average HAM-D total score of 24.4 at enrollment.

• Analysis of the transcripts resulted in 3022 symptom expressions and 830 impact expressions.
  – Expressions were coded and grouped into 105 concepts (91 symptom and 14 impact) in 15 hypothesized domains (11 symptom and 4 impact).
Results – Concept Elicitation

• Saturation of concept (the point at which no new concepts were elicited) was achieved after the fourth of five transcript groups (eight transcripts per group)

• Inter-rater reliability was assessed in five transcript pairs, and was observed to be high with 85.4 to 92.1% agreement between raters for the identification of symptom concepts being expressed in the transcripts, and 97.5 to 99.1% agreement between raters on code assignment for identified concepts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th># of New Concepts Identified Per Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcript Group (8 transcripts/group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions/Mood</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep Disturbances</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Self</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Harm/Suicide</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Behaviors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Burden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Strategies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total new concepts per transcript group (n/105)</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong> (91.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Item Generation

• The item generation evaluation process resulted in the selection of candidate symptom concepts to be targeted for PRO measurement.

• Predominance of symptom mentions as well as whether such mentions were spontaneous or probed and the relative severity and bother of the symptoms/impacts provided a context for evaluating individual concepts.

• The development team agreed to focus on symptoms and not disease impacts for the measure.
Results – Item Generation

- Because no existing PRO measure comprehensively assessed the selected concepts, the development team decided to develop a new measure, rather than attempting to either qualify or modify an existing measure.

- During subsequent review by the development team, the targeted concepts were further reduced by removing synonymous or problematic concepts, and a 36-item draft questionnaire was prepared for evaluation in cognitive interviews and the translatability assessment.
Results – Cognitive Interviews

• A total of 15 subjects participated in three waves of CIs. The subjects were an average of 44.6 years old, were 60.0% female, 73.3% white (non-Hispanic), and had an average HAM-D total score of 24.4 at enrollment (Table 1).

• Over the three waves, one item was removed and four others were substantially modified based on cognitive interview findings and recommendations from a formal translatability assessment.\(^5\)

• Other minor instrument formatting and wording modifications were made based on the results of a formal migratability assessment for electronic PRO data collection platforms (ePRO).
Symptoms of Major Depressive Disorder Scale (SMDDS)

- The newly-created scale, the Symptoms of Major Depressive Disorder Scale (SMDDS), is a 35-item instrument that measures each concept using a 5-point verbal rating scale and a 7-day retrospective recall period for each of the items.
- Items in the SMDDS are hypothesized to be organized into 11 sub-domains.
- Sixteen of the items focus on the intensity of symptoms with a rating scale from “not at all” to “extremely.”
- The remaining nineteen items focus on the frequency or the amount of time a symptom was experienced and employ a rating scale from “never” to “always.”
Proposed Conceptual Framework

Depression Symptoms

- Negative Emotions/Mood (7-items)
- Negative Affect (2-items)
- Anxiety (3-items)
- Low Energy (1-item)
- Cognition (4-items)
- Physical Symptoms (4-items)
- Sleep Disturbances (2-items)
- Eating Behavior (2-items)
- Low Motivation (4-items)
- Sense of Self (3-items)
- Self-Harm/Suicide (3-items)
Conclusions

• The SMDDS is a 35-item PRO measure intended for use as an endpoint in MDD clinical trials to support medical product labeling.
  • The SMDDS was developed in accordance with the FDAs PRO Guidance and best practices.
  • Qualitative interviews have provided evidence for content validity.
  • Cognitive interviews provided evidence that the instructions, items and response options are comprehensible, easy to complete and address key symptoms of MDD that are relevant to patients with the condition.
• Future quantitative studies will confirm the measurement properties of the SMDDS and support FDA qualification.