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Session Overview

1. Determining a meaningful outcome through patient interviews (15 min.)
   ➤ Example from psoriasis

2. Supporting a clinical trial endpoint by considering meaningfulness data (15 min.)
   ➤ Example from dysmenorrhea

3. Influencing study endpoints based on feedback from patient interviews (15 min.)
   ➤ Example from gastroesophageal reflux disease

4. Quantifying meaningful score change with modified bookmarking (20 min.)
   ➤ Example from multiple sclerosis

5. Panelist discussion/Q&A (20 min.)
Recap of the 2015 Session

- Logistic regression to interpret change in pain in fibromyalgia
- Linear regression to interpret change in itch severity in plaque psoriasis

Introduction to Novel Methods
- Bookmarking
- Exit interviews
- Conjoint analysis

Productive Panel Discussion
- FDA perspective on methods
- Responder analysis as an endpoint vs. supportive analysis
- Selection of an appropriate anchor
- Thresholds for evaluating improvement versus worsening
Activities Since 2015 Session

- Numerous publications advancing this topic
  - Summary of 2015 session¹
  - Bookmarking extended to interpreting change²
  - Exit interviews used to support responder definition³
  - Novel scale-judgment method applied to PROMIS⁴

- C-Path webinar summarizing 2015 COMPASS* discussion

- COMPASS has this topic on their next meeting agenda to move towards consensus on methods

---

Objectives of the 2016 Session

• This year’s session will build on the momentum over the past year to move beyond numbers to actual meaning from the patient perspective

• Learning objectives:
  1. Recognize how an understanding of outcomes that are meaningful to patients can aid in understanding what score changes are meaningful
  2. Understand what insight emerging approaches might provide to complement or supplement traditional methods
  3. Explain how the approaches presented may be implemented in future instrument development projects to strengthen interpretation of scores on PRO measures
Meaningful Terminology

- **Meaningful Concept**
  - Does the instrument measure the concepts that are important to patients with this condition?

- **Meaningful Outcome**
  - What outcome do patients want to see to know that a treatment is beneficial?

- **Meaningful Change**
  - How much change should be observed in the PRO scores to know that a patient has experienced a meaningful outcome?
Defining an outcome meaningful to patients

Mona Martin, RN, MPA
Executive Director, Health Research Associates

Brian G. Ortmeier, PharmD, PhD
Executive Director and Therapeutic Area Lead, Inflammation Global Health Economics Neurology Global Health Economics, AMGEN Inc.
Presentation Objectives

To provide an example from the therapeutic area of psoriasis to show

– how the responder definition for a PRO measure can reflect both a clinically established threshold,
– and an outcome (or state) that is meaningful to patients undergoing treatment for their psoriasis.
Presentation Objectives

Meaningful Outcome

How do patients describe a meaningful treatment benefit?

Exploring the meaningfulness of a targeted threshold

Meaningful Change

In this case, the meaningful change can be considered the change required to achieve the target threshold or state
Background: Psoriasis

- Chronic plaque psoriasis is a common inflammatory skin disease that significantly impacts health-related quality of life (HRQoL) and leads to impairments in physical functioning and well-being.
- Psoriasis signs: redness, cracking, scaling, flaking.
- Non-observable symptoms: sensations of burning, stinging, pain, and itch.
- The Psoriasis Symptom Inventory (PSI) is a newly developed patient-reported outcome (PRO) measure designed to reflect the patient’s perception of symptom severity of their chronic plaque psoriasis.
Psoriasis Symptom Inventory (PSI)
Score Range: 0-32

For the following group of questions, the “last 24 hours” means from right now - back to yesterday at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Very Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>itch</strong> from your psoriasis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>redness</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>scaling</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>burning</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>stinging</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>cracking</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>flaking</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>pain</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaningful Target Thresholds

• Assessment of psoriasis severity has traditionally been conducted by a small group of clinician reported outcomes.
  – Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI)
  – An estimate of the body surface area (BSA) affected by psoriasis
  – Physician’s Global Assessment (PGA)

• Until relatively recently, a 75% improvement in a PASI score was the standard target for improvement and supported by clinicians as a “meaningful” amount of change.

• Improved efficacy of new biologics push potential improvement to PASI 90%, and even PASI 100%.
These new **target thresholds** for clinician determined improvement are commonly referred to as “**clear**” or “**almost clear**”

**Physician’s global assessment scores:**

0  Clear  **PASI 100%**
1  Almost Clear  **PASI 90%**
2  Mild Moderate
3  Moderate
4  Severe
5  Very Severe

*(each with clinician determination of plaque elevation and amount of scaling and redness)*
The Question of Meaningfulness

Based on score distributions from Phase 2 studies, clinical experts suggested that:

“Clear”  \( \text{PSI}=0 \)

“Almost Clear”  \( \text{PSI} < 8 \) (with no single item >1)
For the following group of questions, the “last 24 hours” means from right now - back to yesterday at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Very Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>itch</strong> from your psoriasis?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>redness</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>scaling</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>burning</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>stinging</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>cracking</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>flaking</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Overall, during the last 24 hours, how severe was the <strong>pain</strong> of your skin lesions?</td>
<td>✓=0</td>
<td>✓=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Question of Meaningfulness

But WHAT PSI SCORE represents a threshold or a state that is meaningful to patients?

• How do patients describe their symptom state when they reach a target threshold?

• Are threshold differences between 90% (almost clear) and 100% (all clear) meaningful to patients?
To help understand and to clarify patient perceived meaningfulness of “clear” and “almost clear” score thresholds on the PSI,

A subgroup of 30 subjects were identified from the 220 who had been enrolled in a larger observational study in 8 different treatment centers across the US.

These 30 adult subjects had been treated with one of the new biologics (STELARA® HUMIRA® or ENBREL®)

- 15 had clinician global assessment scores of 0 (clear)
- 15 had clinician global assessment scores of 1 (almost clear)

Qualitative interviews were conducted to obtain patient language to explore the meaningfulness of these incremental treatment benefits.
Patient Descriptions of Symptom State at Target Thresholds

Sample quotes from subjects scoring PSI=0

- I’m just like normal skin
- After the second injection I was... clear of all my psoriasis.
- The medicine’s completely cleared me up.
- My skin is clear right now... no symptoms

- Only on my right side, my elbow. And it's only like three little spots, It doesn't bother me at all.
- Right now,... the tiny red mark over there. It doesn't bother me at all.

Main Characteristic of descriptions for PSI=0
(symptoms either totally gone, or very minor and causing “no bother”)


I have not one skin lesion... But I would say there's still some pain.

Very slight [discoloring on the knee] and that's almost completely gone.

I have a toenail that still has a, it's kind of...pulled back from my skin from the psoriasis. But really that's the only problem I've got from it.

where now you know it’s very light [on the forehead]...but now it’s just real light [on the stomach], there’s no irritation and it’s very light, it’s like a birthmark.

A small plaque maybe once every two months and barely noticeable.

I got just a smudge (redness) on my elbow... lighter now....

Main Characteristic of descriptions for PSI=0.17 to 1.0
(variety of residual symptoms, “less noticeable”)
I have a few [lesions] on my heels.

Some of my nails are separating again and getting the white.

You could see a couple of you know, not big patches but you know, fifty cent sized patches.

When I use my elbows it wants to come back; it’s just really crazy... It’s in my scalp and it’s just it’s minor.

The one on my right knee was really bad and now you can look there and now there is just a slight redness in that area that is hardly even noticeable...

It will get a little bit itchy between my eyes and forehead and like on the sides of my nostrils, if I don't use [cream], then I'll get it through there and it gets red.

I'm looking at my legs now and I've got a little bit. They're not bright red like they had been.

Main Characteristic of descriptions for PSI=3.0 to 6.86
(more symptoms expressed, “hardly noticeable and still mild”)

Sample quotes from subjects scoring PSI=3.0 to 6.86

- I have a few [lesions] on my heels.
- Some of my nails are separating again and getting the white.
- You could see a couple of you know, not big patches but you know, fifty cent sized patches.
- When I use my elbows it wants to come back; it’s just really crazy... It’s in my scalp and it’s just it’s minor.
- The one on my right knee was really bad and now you can look there and now there is just a slight redness in that area that is hardly even noticeable...
- It will get a little bit itchy between my eyes and forehead and like on the sides of my nostrils, if I don't use [cream], then I'll get it through there and it gets red.
- I'm looking at my legs now and I've got a little bit. They're not bright red like they had been.
Are Score Differences Meaningful to Patients?

Statements from Patients who were designated “clear” (PGA=0) identified the following states as meaningful:

- Being cleared up, having no lesions.
- Being completely clear
- Not having psoriasis, able to wear shorts
- Not feeling constant itch
- Being 99% psoriasis free
- Not having to worry about redness or soreness
- Its cleared up, no itching
- Better appearance and comfort
- Feeling better, itching less
- Less pain, lessen appearance
- Feeling better about self

Statements from Patients who were designated “almost clear” (PGA=1) identified the following states as meaningful:

- Don’t have cracking
- Peace of mind, irritant gone
- Makes me feel better
- Have more energy
- Increased mobility
- Seeing progressive improvement
- Improved appearance
- Have small lesions
- You feel normal again
- Feel better about yourself
- See it disappearing
- Not scratching constantly

(More definitive statements of Desired State Achieved) (More comments indicate change still in process, improvement happening)
Patient Perceptions of Symptom Status across Target Score Thresholds

**PSI=0**  
*(clear)*  
No Symptoms At all  
Or Small Symptoms Patient is “not bothered”

**PSI=0.17 to 1.0**  
*(almost clear)*  
More symptoms, patient is aware of them, but they are not highly noticeable

**PSI= 3.0 to 6.86**

More symptoms expressed, larger patches, more places, but still talked about as mild and hardly noticeable

(More definitive statements of Desired State Achieved)  
(More comments indicate change still in process, improvement happening)
What do we know about Thresholds that Psoriasis Patients Consider to be Meaningful?

We know what patients with more severe psoriasis consider meaningful from previous qualitative work.

**Severity = 0**
- Patients at lower severity levels want full resolution of their symptoms to consider they have reached a meaningful threshold.

**Severity = 3 or 4**
- A Meaningful change for patients who rate their psoriasis symptoms as 7 or 8 for severity would find meaningful treatment benefit if they could be moved to a severity state of 3 or 4.

**Severity = 7 or 8**
- A meaningful change for patients who rate their psoriasis symptoms as 9 or 10 for severity would find meaningful treatment benefit if they could be moved to a severity state of 7 or 8.

**Severity = 10**
- This change is described as moving from “intolerable” to something they can cope with.

Complication: Psoriasis Recurs.
- Reaching almost clear is meaningful until they have experienced “clear” and that becomes more meaningful threshold.

Patients with lesser severity want greater treatment benefit to be able to call it meaningful.
How does this work enhance our understanding of a meaningful score?

Understanding how patients assign meaning to PRO score thresholds can:

– Provide more information about how the PRO scoring system is working
  • (provided confirmation that patients are understanding the conceptual structure of the instrument)

– Increasing clarity about what threshold or target scores are actually representing
  • (define symptom severity)

– Providing greater context for interpretation of PRO data
  • (expanded definitions into new territories of achievable treatment benefit)
What is a meaningful change?
Ask the patient!

Allison M Nguyen¹, Tjeerd Korver¹, Fang Chen¹, Rob Arbuckle², Alice Turnbull², Josephine M Norquist¹

¹Merck Research Laboratories, Whitehouse Station, NJ (USA); ²Adelphi Values, Bollington, Cheshire (UK)
Background

- Primary dysmenorrhea refers to the syndrome of painful menstruation with no organic cause.
- The Dysmenorrhea Daily Diary (DysDD), a newly developed measure, was found to have good content validity and to be a valid, reliable and responsive measure for assessing primary dysmenorrhea.
- Although methods for interpretation of clinical trial endpoints have been developed and debated for more than a decade, challenges remain in determining the degree of change considered important and meaningful to patients, physicians, payers, and regulators.
Objective & Data Source

• **Objective**: To summarize methodologies, including those based on direct patient input, to determine the degree of change in dysmenorrhea (pelvic pain or cramps) that can be considered meaningful and clinically important.

• **Data Source**: Data from a phase IIb, multinational, randomized, blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial to evaluate the effect of a vaginal ring on primary dysmenorrhea were used for the analyses.
The Dysmenorrhea Daily Diary (DysDD) is a 10-item daily disease-specific ePRO measure with a 24-hour recall period.

The DysDD was completed every day over two treatment cycles.

Pelvic pain (i.e., DysDD Item #3) was assessed using a 0-10 numeric rating scale with 0='no pain or cramps', 10='extreme pain or cramps'.

Sub-concepts reflect item-level measurements, and concepts reflect the broader categories items map to.

Norquist, et al 2012
Directly Asking Subjects to Rate the Significance of Their Change

• Global Assessment of Change (GAC) -
  A single item capturing subjects’ ratings of change in their ‘pain or cramps’ since the start of the study (“much worse”, “worse”, “a little worse”, “the same”, “a little better”, “better”, or “much better”)

• ‘Meaningful’ question
  – Those who reported *worsening* on GAC were then asked: ‘Was this increase in pelvic pain or cramps an important change for you?’ (Yes/No)
  – Those who reported *improvement* on GAC were then asked: ‘Was this decrease in pelvic pain or cramps an important change for you?’ (Yes/No)

• Both completed once at the end of Treatment Cycle 2
The GAC provided the opportunity for subjects to rate both their degree of change AND report whether they felt the change was meaningful.

The addition of this ‘meaningful’ question is a new approach which was useful for gaining a better understanding of what degree of change the subjects perceive as important.
Responsiveness Analyses

• Responsiveness traditionally assessed by analyzing changes between active and control treatment groups

• Analyses here are based on pooled treatment groups, therefore responsiveness was assessed by analyzing changes between those who improved vs. didn’t improve defined as:
  – ≥1 point mean improvement on the Menstrual Distress Questionnaire (MDQ) ‘cramps’ score
  – Score of ≥4 (“a little better”, “better” or “much better”) on the GAC
  – Score of ≥5 (“better” or “much better”) on the GAC
Clinically Important Responder (CIR) Analyses

- Distribution-based methods to identify the smallest change that would exceed measurement error
  - Based on 0.5 SD, standard error of measurement (SEM) and the minimal detectable change (MDC) with 90 and 95%CI
    - SEM = [SD * \( \sqrt{1-r} \)]
    - MDC = SEM*1.65 or SEM*1.96

- ROC curve analysis to assess the ability of change in pelvic pain or cramps to discriminate between subjects scoring
  - \( \geq 4 \) (“a little better”, “better” or “much better”) vs. <4 on GAC
  - \( \geq 5 \) (“better” or “much better”) vs. <5 on GAC
  - The point on the curve that maximizes sensitivity and specificity is considered the optimal level of change in DysDD pain score that differentiates between responders and non-responders (i.e., CIR)
Interpretation of Results

• All results were qualitatively compared to identify a peak pelvic pain or cramps change score that can be considered meaningful and important to patients

• Input from patients, based on the ‘meaningful’ question used to support the identified threshold for CIR
Results
Responsiveness: Peak change in DysDD item 3 (pain or cramps rating) in responder groups from baseline to treatment cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Definition</th>
<th>Responder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Change in Peak item 3 score (SD) [95%CI]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥1 point mean improvement on the MDQ cramps score</td>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-4.9 (2.77) [-5.25, -4.54]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Responder</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-0.6 (1.66) [-1.00, -0.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥4 on the GAC**</td>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>-4.5 (2.94) [-4.87, -4.10]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Responder</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-1.1 (2.33) [-1.78, -0.46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥5 on the GAC**</td>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-5.0 (2.75) [-5.37, -4.54]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Responder</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-2.1 (2.86) [-2.62, -1.50]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Change from baseline to treatment cycle 2 for the mean pain scores calculated on the day in the menstrual bleeding period with the highest pain rating

*p<0.001

**≥4: “a little better”, “better”, “much better”; ≥5: “better” or “much better”

The DysDD pain or cramps was shown to be responsive to change over time
Triangulation of Results: Change in Item #3 Pain/Cramps Score

Distribution-based (Above ‘noise’):
- SEM: 1.72
- 0.5 SD: 1.57
- MDC_{90}: 2.83
- MDC_{95}: 3.37

ROC:
- ≥ ‘A little better’: 3.00 (AUC: 0.821)
- ≥ ‘Better’: 4.00 (AUC: 0.777)

≥ 3-point change in peak pain/cramps
‘Meaningful’ Data Used to Support CIR

Among subjects who experienced at least a 3-point reduction in peak pelvic pain (n=171)

Global Assessment of Change

A little better (n=25)

Better (n=55)

Much Better (n=86)

Was this decrease important for you?

No

Yes

4 (16%) 21 (84%)

1 (1.8%) 54 (98%)

2 (2%) 84 (98%)

93% reported the change to be meaningful
• ROC curve analyses typically anchor on GAC ratings of “better” or “much better” with responses of “a little better” included in the “no change” or worsening groups
  – ‘Meaningful’ data indicate that subjects who achieve the 3-point change and rate themselves as “a little better” consider that change important
  – Categorizing those subjects with subjects who reported “no change” or worsening is therefore not appropriate

• Evidence to support a cut-point of greater than or equal to 3 should not be driven by subjects achieving changes greater than 3
  – Among subjects who experienced a change equal to 3 points (n=20), 70% reported the decrease to be important
Summary

• A 3-point or greater reduction in the peak pelvic pain or cramps NRS score was found to be a consistent degree of change that is both meaningful and above any inherent “noise” of the measure.

• Among subjects who experienced ≥ 3-point reduction in their peak pelvic pain or cramps, the vast majority (93%) reported that the decrease in their pain was important.
How does asking the patient enhance our ability to determine meaningful score changes?

• Traditional analyses of responsiveness, anchor/distribution-based methods, and ROC curves, combined with the ‘meaningful’ data was a novel approach to substantiate a CIR for use in future clinical trials

• The ‘meaningful’ question provided insight into the degree of change patients feel is meaningful and argues against categorizing “a little better” with “no change” or “worsening”

• Consistent with the emphasis on greater 'patient-centricity', this approach directly utilizes patient input to define an important treatment effect
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Frontloading clinical programs with patients’ perspective of meaningful change.

Example of GERD

Katarina Halling, MSc
Global Head, Patient Reported Outcomes, AstraZeneca and Industry Co-Director, PRO Consortium
This research was performed with significant contributions from:

• Anna Rydén, AstraZeneca

• Maria Karlsson

• Jean Paty, Quintiles

• Mona Martin, HRA

• Nimish Vakil, Aurora Wilkinson Medical Clinic
Background

• Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) are the most commonly prescribed class of medication for the treatment of heartburn and acid-related disorders.

• Partial response to a PPI is a problem.

• AZ has a compound in development that targets transient lower esophageal sphincter relaxations.

• The primary endpoint was GERD symptoms.
The primary treatment goal for lesogaberan is to provide 24-hour symptom relief in patients with persistent GERD symptoms, who experience a partial response to PPI treatment.
Change in regulatory landscape: old vs newer expectations in what to measure for a similar label

What concept to measure...

Then
Heartburn

Now
"All relevant and important GERD symptoms"

... to obtain the label

GERD Symptom relief
GERD Symptom relief
In GERD, complete symptom resolution had become “standard” and the expected outcome by HCPs, regulator and payers.
Two critical aspects that had implications for the design

‟All relevant and important GERD symptoms‟

What is a meaningful change for patients with GERD with a partial response to PPIs?

GERD Symptom Relief

And Implications for the Target Product Profile!
Response rates during 4 weeks treatment with lesogaberan 65mg twice daily

**Chi-square** \( P = .026 \)

**Percentage of patients with treatment response = at most one 24-hour period with heartburn or regurgitation of not more than mild intensity during the last 7 days of treatment**

- **Lesogaberan (n = 114)**
  - 16%
- **Placebo (n = 118)**
  - 8%

**Percentage of symptom-free days during the 4-week treatment period**

- **Lesogaberan (n = 114)**
  - Heartburn: 36%, Regurgitation: 37%
- **Placebo (n = 118)**
  - Heartburn: 21%, Regurgitation: 23%, Heartburn and regurgitation: 19%

**Patient Reported Symptoms**

**RDQ (Reflux Disease Questionnaire)**

**Recording of the intensity of the following symptoms in the eDiary every morning and evening:**

- A burning feeling behind the breastbone
- A burning feeling in the center of the upper stomach
- A pain in the center of the upper stomach
- An acid taste in your mouth
- Unpleasant movement of material upwards from the stomach

**2a @ RDQ Baseline**

- A burning feeling behind your breastbone?
  - Did not have
  - **Very mild**
  - Mild
  - Moderate
  - Moderately Severe
  - Severe
Main objectives of the PRO study

• Assess the psychometric properties of the e-diary in the target population.

• Selection of symptoms for primary end-points in future trials.

• Define clinically meaningful change through quantitative and qualitative methods and establish the responder definition in the target population:
  ▪ In trial interviews before (n=42) and after (n=37) treatment;
  ▪ Triangulation across multiple quantitative methods (e.g. cumulative frequency distribution, anchor and distribution-based);
  ▪ Select PRO anchor that has intuitive meaning and reflects important change for patients to qualifying change according to meaningful/important;
Draft conceptual framework

Items in modified RDQ

- Burning feeling / pain, breastbone
- Burning feeling / pain, upper stomach
- Heartburn

- Acid / bitter taste in mouth
- Unpleasant movement of material upwards
- Stomach contents into throat / mouth

- Cough
- Difficulty swallowing
- Hoarseness
- Burping

Domains

Heartburn

Regurgitation

Extra Esophageal (prel-name)

Burping

GERD Symptoms

Endpoint?
Study Design

Optimized PPI treatment (Min 4 weeks before enrolment)

Subject enrolment → Partial Responders → PPI+Placebo → Follow-up

Part 1: 8-12 days
Part 2: 4 weeks
12-16 days

Visit
1 2 3 4 5 6

Interviews (~N=40)

eDiary (Twice daily)

Other PRO measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaningful Concept</th>
<th>Does the instrument measure the concepts that are important to patients with this condition?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmed in Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Outcome</td>
<td>What outcome do patients want to see to know that a treatment is beneficial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explored in Interview 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Change</td>
<td>How much change should be observed in the PRO scores to know that a patient has experienced a meaningful outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explored in Interview 2 and quantitatively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives of the interviews

Interview 1

• To understand how patients describe in their own words what type of GERD symptoms they experience and if and how these symptoms are a problem to them
• To confirm that the symptoms and concepts included in the PRO symptom tool are relevant and important in the target patient population
• To understand how patients’ lives are impacted by their GERD symptoms
• To explore what patients regard as successful treatment for their GERD or reflux symptoms, and what they would consider to be “symptom control” and “sufficient symptom control”

Interview 2

• To understand what, if any, symptom change the patient has experienced since the add-on treatment with AZD3355 or Placebo started, and how the patient perceives this change
• To explore what patients consider to be a meaningful or important change in their GERD symptoms
Results:
Interview before treatment
Patients most often expressed their bother with symptoms in terms of frequency (62% of total responses mentioned).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Expressions</th>
<th>Number of mentions</th>
<th>% of mentions in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the definitions of “Symptom Control” pertained to partial as opposed to complete, symptom control.
Interview after treatment

• Perception of change in symptoms?

• Was the change important?

• Was the change meaningful?

• Did the medication provide sufficient symptom control?

• Was the treatment successful?
Interview 2: Reports of Sufficient Symptom Control and Treatment Success

- Complete symptom relief (N=4)
- No Relief (N=4)
- Partial Relief throughout the Treatment Period (N=22)
- Relief in the first 2 weeks of the Treatment Period, with decline in the second (N=3)
- Relief only in the second 2 weeks of the Treatment Period (N=3)

NB: Treatment change during the study relates to change irrespective of which treatment (placebo or AZD3355) the patient had received.
Of the 22 patients who reported experiencing partial symptom relief throughout the treatment period, 17 indicated that the medication provided sufficient control of their symptoms and that the treatment was successful:

- Improvement reported in symptom frequency $n=7$
- Improvement reported in symptom severity $n=5$
- Improvement reported in both frequency and severity $n=5$
Patient quotes from interview 2

• [The symptoms are] “extremely mild and very infrequent.”

• “…everything that I’ve felt in the past has lessened intensity and the frequency. It’s not as severe and it’s so much less now than before.”

• “They did seem to lessen the number of times per day, um, that I had probably the most common symptom, which was a burping sensation and acid in my throat and back of my mouth. I did not see as often, either on a daily or during the course of a week.”
Proposed responder definition

Proportion of patients experiencing at least 3 more symptom free* days on average per week compared to baseline (entire treatment period).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Intensity defined as symptom free days (at least)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>PGIC n(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unchanged n=174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All items</td>
<td>&lt;=Very mild</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All items</td>
<td>&lt;=Mild</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>65 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>42 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges that complicated definition of meaningful change

• It had to be right and robust as it was the primary endpoint.

• Changing regulatory landscape.

• We went for a GERD symptoms claim.

• Target patient population was defined by lack of response.

• Several key symptoms that had to be taken into consideration.

• Severity and frequency.
How did the qualitative interviews increase the Understanding of Meaningful Change from a Patient Perspective?

• Challenged the previous notion that patients with GERD only expect symptom resolution.

• Increased the understanding of patient definition of “control” and “sufficient control”.

• Enabled triangulation approach to define meaningful change.

• Enabled patients to explain more what the quantitative change in the study meant to them.

• Provided foundation for any similar compound for the future
Using vignettes to establish thresholds for status and change

Karon F. Cook, PhD
Northwestern University, Chicago

Cheryl Coon, PhD
Michael Kallen, PhD

THRESHOLDS
• Vignettes to quantify levels of symptoms and outcomes: PROMIS and Neuro-QOL case studies
• Vignettes to quantify change: Case study in MS fatigue
• Keeping it real: extending the method by attending to context.
• In conclusion: What insight was gained using this approach versus traditional methods?
Background

How much we know

Building State of the Art Measures

How to Interpret Scores on State of the Art Measures
Review Article

Cut Points on 0–10 Numeric Rating Scales for Symptoms Included in the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale in Cancer Patients: A Systematic Review

Wendy H. Oldenmenger, RN, PhD, Pleun J. de Raaf, MD, Cora de Klerk, PhD, and Carin C.D. van der Rijt, MD, PhD

Department of Medical Oncology (W.H.O., P.J.d.R., C.C.D.v.d.R.), Erasmus MC Daniel den Hoed Cancer Center and Department of Medical Psychology and Psychotherapy (C.d.K.), Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

Context. To improve the management of cancer-related symptoms, systematic screening is necessary, often performed by using 0–10 numeric rating scales. Cut points are used to determine if scores represent clinically relevant burden.

Objectives. The aim of this systematic review was to explore the evidence on cut points for the symptoms of the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale.

Methods. Relevant literature was searched in PubMed, CINAHL®, Embase, and PsycINFO®. We defined a cut point as the lower bound of the scores representing
Scaling latent constructs using self-report

Educational and Psychological Testing

Health Outcomes Assessment
Educational Standard Setting
Educational standard setting is, “the proper following of a prescribed, rational system of rules or procedures resulting in the assignment of a number to differentiate between two or more states or degrees of performance” (p. 100).

Math is our friend!
Which shape shows the fraction $\frac{1}{4}$?
Which figure shows halves?

Select all the pictures that show equal parts.

What fraction of the shape is green?

What fraction of the balloons are red?

Which fraction is greater?

Which shape shows the fraction $\frac{1}{4}$?
Developing

Proficient

50.0

60.0

Advanced

42.5 47.5 52.5 57.5 62.5 67.5
I was too tired to eat.

I felt tired.

It depends.
It depends.
I (rarely) felt helpless.
I (sometimes) had mood swings.
I (never) felt worthless.
I (sometimes) felt lonely.

Items chosen to maximize variation in response.
I (sometimes) felt worthless.
I (sometimes) withdrew from people.
I (often) felt like crying.
I (often) felt depressed.
Clinical cut score recommendations mapped onto distribution of actual patient scores
Creating meaningful cut-scores for Neuro-QOL measures of fatigue, physical functioning, and sleep disturbance using standard setting with patients and providers

Karon F. Cook · David E. Victorson · David Cella · Benjamin D. Schalet · Deborah Miller

Abstract

**Purpose** To establish clinically relevant classifications of health outcome scores for four Neuro-QOL measures (lower extremity function, upper extremity function, fatigue, and sleep disturbance).

**Methods** We employed a modified educational standard-setting methodology to identify cut-scores for symptom

**Conclusions** The modified bookmarking method is effective for defining thresholds for symptom severity based on self-reported outcome scores and consensus judgments. Derived cut-scores and severity levels provide an interpretative context for Neuro-QOL scores. Future studies should explore whether these findings can be replicated and evaluate the validity of the classifications.
Change
Vignettes for Estimating Important Change

- N= 500 participants with MS
- Internet panel
- Branched exercise
Internet Vignette Exercise

• Collect Demographics and Clinical Information
• Administer the Neuro-QoL Fatigue Short Form
• Branch respondents into 8 Groups based on scores
• Ask patients to rate the severity of each vignette compared to their own level of fatigue (i.e., better, same, worse)
• Ask respondents to indicate whether difference would “make a difference in my daily life”
In PART B, you will

• Look at the fatigue reports of 7 people who have MS

• Compare each person’s fatigue to your own fatigue. For example, your fatigue might be greater.

• Or, you might decide your fatigue is the SAME or LESS than that other person’s.
If you decide your fatigue is DIFFERENT from the other person’s, you will then

• Consider what it would be like to have this person’s fatigue, and

• Decide if the difference would matter to you in your daily life.
Depending on your own fatigue, you may decide that none, some, or all of these people have more, less, or the same amount fatigue.

There are no “right” answers—just your own thoughtful judgments.
This is what Ms. Anderson said about his fatigue over the last 7 days. She reported that she:

- sometimes felt weak all over.
- often had to limit social activity because she was tired.
- sometimes had trouble starting things because she was too tired.
- often was too tired to take a short walk.
- often had trouble finishing things because she was too tired.

[Q50] Compared to Ms. Anderson’s, has YOUR FATIGUE been:

- Greater than Ms. Anderson’s
- The same as Ms. Anderson’s
- Less than Ms. Anderson’s

[T Score = 58]
You said YOUR FATIGUE over the past week was *Greater* than MS. ANDERSON'S FATIGUE.

[Q51] If your fatigue IMPROVED to Ms. Anderson’s level, would it make a difference in your daily life?

- It *wouldn’t* really make a difference in my daily life.
- It *would* make a difference in my daily life (things I do day-to-day would be easier).

This is what Ms. Anderson said about his fatigue over the last 7 days. She reported that she:

- sometimes felt weak all over.
- often or always had to limit social activity because she was tired.
- sometimes had trouble starting things because she was too tired.
- often was too tired to take a short walk.
- often had trouble finishing things because she was too tired.
You said YOUR FATIGUE over the past week was **LESS** than MS. ANDERSON’S FATIGUE.

[Q52] If your fatigue WORSENED to Ms. Anderson’s level, would it make a difference in your daily life?

- It *wouldn’t* really make a difference in my daily life.
- It *would* make a difference in my daily life (many of the things I do day-to-day would be harder).

This is what Ms. Anderson said about his fatigue over the last 7 days. She reported that she:

- sometimes felt weak all over.
- often or always had to limit social activity because she was tired.
- sometimes had trouble starting things because she was too tired.
- often was too tired to take a short walk.
- often had trouble finishing things because she was too tired.
N=30 Raw Sore = 31; T = 58.8
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Devil in the Details

ANALYSIS
Please tell us how much confidence you have that your answers to these items reflect how you would judge actual changes in your fatigue:

- 1 = Not at all confident
- 2 = A little bit confident
- 3 = Moderately Confident
- 4 = Very Confident
Perfect judgments would never be expected
- identify vignettes ≥ current score as important improvement
- endorse ≤ than their current score as important worsening

Calculated proportion of these “out of range” judgments for improvement and for worsening
Correlated number of out of range judgments with

- Education
- Fatigue
- Confidence
RESULTS: Judgment Validity

• Confidence Ratings
  – Mean = 3.3 (SD = 0.71)
  – Between moderately and very confident
RESULTS: Judgment Validity

- Correlation between # of out of range judgments and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Ratings</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue Score</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS

### Out of Range Judgments

- **Person level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># out of range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses to Estimate Thresholds for Interpreting Change

• Mean based on following
  – for each participant identified the shortest distance endorsed as “enough to make a difference in my daily life.”
  – calculation was repeated after dropping “out of range” responses
• Minimum distance endorsed by respondent as meaningful change
N=30 Raw Sore = 31; T = 58.8
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Analyses to Estimate Thresholds for Interpreting Change

- Threshold that identifies 50% of those endorsing distance as meaningful change.
- Sensitivity, Specificity, Negative predictive value (NPV), Positive predictive value (PPV)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Identified the minimum distance endorsed as “meaningful” by each respondent
- Calculated the mean, range, and SD of these minimum distances across persons
Thresholds for Interpreting Change

At what threshold are 50% of those endorsing important change captured by the threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Worsening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaningful Worsening
Classification Statistics Across Range of Change Scores

Classification Statistic

Change Score

Specificity
PPV
NPV
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Context is everything

• Judging Vignettes Is a Challenging Task
  – Could refine methods using cognitive interviews
  – Conduct exercise as interview

• Some people said no amount of change was different from their level of fatigue.

• More Fundamentally
  • What do patients consider when judging change
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Sources of Vignette error
  – No real gold standard; Self-rating isn’t a true gold standard
  – Fatigue scores themselves have error
  – Error in interpreting vignettes

• Sources of error in other methods
  – Retrospective recollections subject to bias
  – Every judgment at every point of time has error
Chemistry
How do vignettes enhance our ability to determine meaningful score change?

– Another strategy for “getting the truth surrounded”

– Allows scores on multiple item measures to be used to estimate thresholds for status and change.

– Another tool
“The process of writing vignettes is a process of discovering what you know.

Rebecca Yamin, "Through Many Eyes." Reconsidering Archaeological Fieldwork, ed. by Hannah Cobb et al. (Springer, 2012).
Panel Discussion

Moderator
 – Cheryl D. Coon, PhD – Principal, Outcometrix

Presenters
 – Mona Martin, RN, MPA – Executive Director, Health Research Associates
 – Allison Martin Nguyen, MS – Sr. Principal Scientist, Patient Reported Outcomes & Study Endpoints Group, Merck & Co., Inc.
 – Katarina Halling, MSc – Global Head, Patient Reported Outcomes, AstraZeneca and Co-Director, PRO Consortium
 – Karon Frances Cook, PhD – Research Professor in Medical Social Sciences, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

Panelists
 – Wen-Hung Chen, PhD – Reviewer, COA Staff, OND, CDER, FDA
 – Tara Symonds, PhD – Strategic Lead, Clinical Outcomes Assessments and Partner, Clinical Outcome Solutions
 – Kathleen (Kathy) Wywrich, PhD – Executive Director, Center of Excellence for Outcomes Research, Evidera