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Patient centered:

Any process, program or decision focused on patients in which patients play an active role as meaningfully engaged participants, and the central focus is on optimizing use of patient-provided information. Doing things WITH – not FOR or TO – patients.

Patient-centered outcomes:

Outcomes reported by patients as important to them in the way they experience a disease or treatments for that disease.

– Can only be identified by patients
– Can be outcomes, but also broader

https://nationalhealthcouncil.org/additional-resources/glossary-of-patient-engagement-terms/
Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute Methodology Standards

RQ-6: Measure outcomes that people (representing the population of interest) notice and care about.

Identify and include outcomes the population of interest notices and cares about (e.g., survival, functioning, symptoms, health-related quality of life) and that inform an identified health decision. Define outcomes clearly, especially for complex conditions or outcomes that may not have established clinical criteria. Provide information that supports the selection of outcomes as meeting the criteria of “patient centered” and “relevant to decision makers,” such as patient and decision-maker input from meetings, surveys, or published studies. Select outcomes that reflect both beneficial and harmful effects, based on input from patient informants and people representative of the population of interest.

https://www.pcori.org/research/about-our-research/research-methodology/pcori-methodology-standards
Patient reported (information):

Information that comes directly from the patient; includes outcomes and other information.

Patient-reported outcome:

A measure based on a report that comes directly from the patient about the status of the patient’s health condition (how they feel and/or function) without amendment or interpretation of the patient’s response by a clinician or anyone else.

https://nationalhealthcouncil.org/additional-resources/glossary-of-patient-engagement-terms/
https://www.fda.gov/science-research/focus-areas-regulatory-science-report/focus-area-patient-reported-outcomes-and-other-clinical-outcome-assessments
• **Patient experience data**: Captures patients’ experiences, perspectives, needs, and priorities related to (but not limited to): 1) symptoms of their condition and its natural history; 2) impact of the conditions on their functioning and quality of life; 3) experience with treatments; 4) input on which outcomes are important to them; 5) patient preferences for outcomes and treatments; and 6) relative importance of any issue as defined by patients.

• **Patient focused (patient centered)**: Ensuring PED is meaningfully incorporated into decisions and activities related to their health and well-being.

https://www.fda.gov/science-research/focus-areas-regulatory-science-report/focus-area-patient-reported-outcomes-and-other-clinical-outcome-assessments
https://www.fda.gov/drugs/development-approval-process-drugs/patient-focused-drug-development-glossary#:~:text=Patient%20experience%20data%20can%20be,of%20life%20and%20other%20clinic%20outcome%20assessments
Patient-focused drug development (PFDD) (also called patient-focused medical product development):

A systematic approach to ensure patients’ experiences, perspectives, needs, and priorities (PED) are captured and meaningfully incorporated into the development and evaluation of medical products throughout the medical-product lifecycle.

https://www.fda.gov/science-research/focus-areas-regulatory-science-report/focus-area-patient-reported-outcomes-and-other-clinical-outcome-assessments
FDA Patient-Focused Drug Development Guidance Series for Enhancing the Incorporation of the Patient’s Voice in Medical Product Development and Regulatory Decision Making


Guidance 1: Collecting Comprehensive and Representative Input

Guidance 2: Methods to Identify What is Important to Patients

Guidance 3: Selecting, Developing or Modifying Fit-for-Purpose Clinical Outcomes Assessments

Guidance 4: Incorporating Clinical Outcome Assessments into Endpoints for Regulatory Decision Making
Patient-Centered and Patient-Reported Outcomes

Patient-Centered Outcomes:
• Outcomes patients report as important to them

Patient-Reported Outcomes:
• Outcomes that can only be reported by patients about how they feel and/or function

Sweet spot!
A Framework for Developing Disease-Specific Patient-Centered Core Impact Sets (PC-CIS)

Pool of Potentially Important Impacts

Examples of the wide range of things patients might report as important about the impact a disease or treatment has on their life.

Most Important Impacts

Stakeholder Engagement
Impacts that matters to other stakeholders

Environmental Scan
Impacts, outcomes, measures and endpoints studied or need to be studied

Prioritization Process

✓ Structured  ✓ Transparent  ✓ Multi-stakeholder

Align Possible Downstream Uses

+ Clinical Trials
+ RWE/RWD Studies
+ Product Development
+ Clinical Outcome Assessment Development
+ Core Outcome Sets
+ Audit
+ Quality Measurement
+ Value Assessment
+ Value-Based Arrangements
+ Clinical Decision Support
+ Regulatory Decisions

Pool of Important Impacts from all Stakeholders

Patient-Centered Core Impact Set

Most Important Impacts reported by patients/carers/families

Patient/Carer/Family Engagement
to get to the most important impacts

Important Considerations: Equity, Representativeness, SDOH, Health literacy & numeracy, Culture, Religion, Baseline characteristics, etc.

From Patients: Direct Impacts on Health/Health Outcomes
From Other Stakeholders: Direct Impacts on Health/Health Outcomes
From Patients: Other Meaningful Impacts
From Other Stakeholders: Other Meaningful Impacts
RWD = Real-World Data
RWE = Real-World Evidence
SDOH = Social Determinants of Health
Katja Rudell, PhD
Clinical Outcomes Assessment Team Lead
Parexel Access Consulting
The COA Regulatory considerations from the FDA

- **Background**
- Regulators increasingly want to see the impact of a drug on patient relevant endpoints, which can include PRO assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Patient-Focused Drug Development: Collecting Comprehensive and Representative Input Guidance for Industry, Food and Drug Administration Staff, and Other Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Patient-Focused Drug Development: Methods to Identify What Is Important to Patients Guidance for Industry, Food and Drug Administration Staff, and Other Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Patient-Focused Drug Development: Selecting, Developing, or Modifying Fit-for-Purpose Clinical Outcome Assessments Guidance for Industry, Food and Drug Administration Staff, and Other Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Patient-Focused Drug Development: Incorporating Clinical Outcome Assessments Into Endpoints For Regulatory Decision-Making Guidance for Industry, Food and Drug Administration Staff, and Other Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact to Endpoint Pathway: An Osteoarthritis (OA) PRO Example

**Patient-Centered Core Impact Set**

**Highest Priority**

**Concept**
The “thing” you want to measure

**Measure**
Tool to measure the “thing”

**Outcome**
Meaningful change detected using the tool

**Endpoint**
Meaningful change in a specific study context and hypothesis given population, time period, etc., per analysis plan

CONTINUED PATIENT ENGAGEMENT

Context of use must be considered in measure development for an outcome.
PFDD – Interaction with Pharmaceutical Product Design/Consultancy

**PFDD1**
Build a disease model/patient journey

**PFDD2**
Build hypotheses on what concepts may change

**PFDD3**
Instrument selection/modifications to determine the concept

**PFDD4**
Determine what change in score is patient relevant

**PFDD5**
Check with patients on relevancy of concept and COAs

**PFDD6**
Include best COA in trial/study protocol

**PFDD7**
Determine what change in score is patient relevant

**PFDD8**
Endpoint determination and SAP design
PFDD 1 - General considerations for conducting studies about patient experience data

Key takeaways:

• FDA recommends patient experience data is directly reported from patients unless they are unable to reliably report.

• Consult existing literature and subject matter experts when determining appropriate research questions, sampling, when patient reporting is limited, and study design.

• If the sample size is limited, the research objectives and/or methods should be adjusted accordingly, and any limitations should be noted.
PFDD 1: SCLC EXAMPLE – 2016 – Ojo et al
PFFD 2 – What is Important to Patients

**Objective:** Describes how stakeholders can collect and submit patient experience data and other information from patients and caregivers for medical product development and regulatory decision making.

- **Qualitative methods:**
  Interviews and focus groups to understand patient experience, perspective, preferences, etc.

- **Quantitative methods:**
  Quantifiable data collection (e.g., surveys) and statistical methods to summarize patient experience data.

- **Mixed methods:**
  Combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches (e.g., survey with open-ended and fixed response options).
PFDD 2 - Conceptual Model design – SCLC Altman 2022 /23

**Development of a Conceptual Model of Patient Experience in Small-Cell Lung Cancer (SCLC): A Qualitative Interview**

**CONCLUSIONS**

In this study, we addressed a gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive understanding. The experiences of SCLC patients were described in detail, highlighting key aspects of their experiences.

**INTRODUCTION**

- SCLC represents nearly 10% of all lung cancers. SCLC occurs primarily in smokers and is a very aggressive type of lung cancer.
- PROs are important tools in clinical management and drug development as disease and treatment-related symptoms may impact patients' lives in ways that are only known to the patients.
- While PRO assessments exist for lung cancer, none of these are SCLC-specific.
- To better PRO assessments in clinical trials of patients with SCLC and other high-grade solid tumors, it is crucial to understand SCLC symptoms and the impacts of SCLC on QoL from the perspectives of patients with SCLC.
- However, the patient experience of SCLC is not well documented in qualitative lung cancer research, with most studies focusing on the long-term experience more broadly or the non-small cell lung cancer experience specifically.
- It is important to fill this gap in the literature by collecting information directly from patients with SCLC on the symptoms and daily life impacts they experience.

**Fig. 1 Conceptual model of clinical treatment benefit**
PFDD 3 and 4 - Provide Rationale for Each COA Selection + Endpoint Design

**Concept of Interest:** "the aspect of an individual's experience or clinical, biological, physical, or functional state that the assessment is intended to capture (reflect)"

**Context of Use:** Specifies the way COA scores will be used as the basis for an endpoint, including the purpose of their use in a medical product development program

- In a clinical trial, it is important to carefully select concepts that, when measured adequately:
  - Reflect an aspect of health that is important to patients
  - Have the ability to be modified by the investigational treatment
  - Could demonstrate **clinically meaningful differences** between study arms within the time frame of the planned clinical trial
- Patient and/or caregiver input can be used to identify which aspect(s) of a **concept is most impactful for patients**. This input will help sponsors in selecting or developing a COA that measures what is important to patients.

**Context of use considerations may include:**

- **Use of the COA:** Clinical trial objectives and how COA will be used to support COA-based endpoints
- **Target population:** Disease/condition; participant selection criteria
- **Study context:** Clinical trial design
- **Timing:** When assessment(s) of the COA is/are conducted; total amount of time COAs take
- **COA implementation:** Method of administration, setting, and who the COA will be collected by (e.g., patient, investigator, caregiver, etc.)
INTRODUCTION (cont’d)

- PSALC instrument
  - Contains nine symptoms
  - Each symptom is evaluated on a 4-point ordinal scale
    - 1: not at all
    - 2: a little
    - 3: quite a bit
    - 4: very much
  - Total score is calculated as the sum of nine symptom scores
  - The higher the total score, the worse the symptoms are

PFDD 3 - Instrument Patient Assessment of Lung Cancer
Chen et al, 2007
PFDD 4 - Meaningful change estimates – Anchor based approach

- Patients with higher ECOG scores (i.e., lower performance status) on average had higher PSALC total scores (i.e., worse symptoms) compared to patients with lower ECOG scores.

Note: Only patients with both ECOG and PSALC scores at baseline were included in this analysis.
ECOG performance status: 0 = Normal activity, asymptomatic; 1 = Symptomatic, but fully ambulatory; 2 = Symptomatic, in bed in less than 50% of normal daytime.
The moral of the story is…

• Always, always **check the ISPOR database for COA materials**. Many companies have published materials for you to use and peruse.

• **Talk to the COA experts** and consultants available to you in your company, CRO and or standalone COA consultancy.

• **Some instruments** were developed prior to recent guidelines, but may still be relevant and meet standard KPI for COA development and validation.

• Follow where possible **guidance from the regulatory agencies** – they have more knowledge and insights into the process….

• And finally…. 
## Decision Making on Patient Relevant COA Selection?

Common KPI from 20 years experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-KPI</th>
<th>PRO/ ObsRO</th>
<th>ClinRO</th>
<th>PERF-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient Relevancy</td>
<td>Has been developed with patients/caregiver input?</td>
<td>Has the ClinRO been developed with patient and clinician input?</td>
<td>Can be performed by patient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden Time for Administration</td>
<td>Does the administration take longer than human attention spans?</td>
<td>Needs limited clinician training + recalibration?</td>
<td>Is performing test time causing pain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretability</td>
<td>Is the score relevant to patients?</td>
<td>Is the score relevant to clinicians and patients?</td>
<td>Is the score relevant to patients and testers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readability/Complexity</td>
<td>Can patients understand the questions? (Double Barrel check)?</td>
<td>Can clinicians understand the instructions?</td>
<td>Is the task – ecologically valid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural validity</td>
<td>Is the concept valid in all countries?</td>
<td>Is the clinical test used/trained in medical schools of the countries?</td>
<td>Does the performance test work in all countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some flaws can be overcome by modifications, **critically flawed COAs are best left behind**
Kathy Wyrwich, PhD
Senior Director, Patient-Reported Outcomes Assessment Team
Bristol Myers Squibb
What is Alopecia Areata?

Alopecia areata (AA) is an autoimmune disease that causes individuals to lose hair on:
  • scalp
  • eyebrows
  • eyelashes
  • face
  • body

It affects ~2% of the world's population

A Case Study: Incorporating the Patient Voice in the Development of COAs for Severe Alopecia Areata

Kathy Wyrwich, PhD
Senior Director, WW HEOR Advanced Scientific Capabilities, Patient-Reported Outcomes Assessment (PROA)
The Setting: 2017

- No approved systemic treatment for alopecia areata (AA)
- The Severity of Alopecia Tool (SALT; Olsen 2004) is widely clinician-reported outcome measure used to assess the extent of scalp-hair loss in patients with (AA)
  
  SALT score of **0** = No scalp hair loss
  
  SALT score of **100** = Complete scalp hair loss

- Guidelines defined AA treatment success as a 50% SALT improvement
  
  - However, there was no clinical consensus on these endpoints, and patient perspectives on treatment success were unknown

- No standardized method to assess eyebrow or eyelash hair loss

- Several open-label clinical studies reported success in hair regrowth using Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors
The Challenge: Understand the Outcomes of Priority to Persons with Severe AA (SALT ≥ 50)

– Is scalp hair loss the most important AA concern? Eyebrows? Eyelashes? Other?

– Should there be a composite scoring measurement process that incorporates the importance of AA hair loss in other areas besides the scalp?

– How to best address the assessment need for:
  • Appropriate ClinRO and PRO tools?
  • Meaningful change thresholds that assess what is most important to patients seeking treatment?
The Solution: Listening to Clinicians and Patients

- Conducted noninterventional, cross-sectional, qualitative interview study to understand:
  - clinicians’ perspectives
  - patients’ perspectives and expectations of a clinically meaningful treatment outcome
- Developed a content-valid Investigator's Global Assessment (IGA) to measure distinct and clinically relevant gradations of scalp-hair loss support the definition of treatment success
- Later, developed a content valid:
  - Patient-reported outcome (PRO) measure of scalp hair loss
  - ClinRO and PRO measures to assess eyebrow, eyelash and nails
  - Adapted PRO measure for AA (Skindex-16 AA)
Ten expert dermatologists who regularly treated patients with AA characterized AA by scalp-hair loss to varying extents:

- Many patients with AA experience scalp-hair loss only
- In nearly every case, they ‘treated to the scalp’
  - Other areas (e.g., eyebrows, eyelashes and body-hair loss) targeted only if the absence of hair was bothersome to the patient
What We Heard: Listening to Clinicians on Meaningful Treatment Success

- The 10 clinicians emphasized that clinically meaningful treatment success was a combination of the amount of scalp-hair growth, density, location and quality, with an emphasis on amount.

- When asked to describe the amount of scalp hair indicative of treatment success for patients with severe AA, responses were:
  - 90% (n = 1 clinician)
  - 80% (n = 5 clinicians)
  - 75% (n = 3 clinicians)

  1 clinician strongly preferred a ≥ 50% change metric vs. a static amount.

Wyrwich et al 2020
What We Heard: Listening to Clinicians

Colour of percentage indicates category name proposed by clinician to describe the amount of scalp-hair loss:
- None
- Limited
- Moderate
- Severe
- Complete
- None; additional category needed

Summary of clinician opinion:
Vibrancy of colour indicates the proportion of clinicians stating that the category name describes the amount of scalp-hair loss

Wyrwich et al 2020
Before Listening to Patient: The Draft AA-IGA™

- Clinician Panel reviewed the detailed clinician data with a focus on the larger hair-loss range, and proposed that the fifth category descriptor (Very Severe) ‘Very Severe’ include nearly complete scalp-hair loss (95–99% hair loss), a patient presentation that is clinically very similar to 100% scalp-hair loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alopecia Areata Investigator Global Assessment™ (AA-IGA™)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the patient’s scalp hair loss, as it looks today.

The Severity of Alopecia Tool (SALT; Olsen et al 2004) is recommended to assess the extent (0-100%) of scalp hair loss.

© 2017 Eli Lilly and Company. All rights reserved.
What We Heard: Listening to Patients

30 US patients participated; 25 adults (ages 18-72) and 5 adolescents (ages 15-17)
   All had prior experience with severe AA (SALT ≥ 50)
   24 patients (80%) had eyebrow and/or eyelash involvement
   18 patients (60%) were currently or previously treated with oral JAK inhibitor
   13 patients (43%) were receiving no AA treatment at the time of interview

Results

Scalp-hair loss was the most bothersome AA sign/symptom for 77% (n = 23)

Patients with SALT scores < 100% (n = 19) described their current scalp hair:
   - amount of scalp hair (n = 18)
   - hair density (n = 9)
   - length (n = 6)

Wyrwich et al 2020
What We Heard From Patients: *What amount of scalp hair – short of 100% – would you consider a treatment success?*

![Bar chart showing the amount of scalp hair indicative of treatment success](chart.png)

Wyrwich et al 2020
All 30 patients confirmed the appropriateness of the AA-IGA and the gradations
6 patients spontaneously commented on the clinician accuracy in answering
- trained in assessing scalp hair loss
- can view the whole head
Achieving “Limited” (1–20% hair loss) would be a treatment success
What We Learned: Clinicians Then Patients Interviews

When reviewed with clinicians and patients, the AA-IGA™ was supported as a meaningful ClinRO of scalp hair loss.

A qualitative investigation of a quantifiable treatment success threshold for a ClinRO is possible through a well-designed interview process with expert clinicians and the appropriate patient population...especially when new treatments requires a patient-centric solution!

The depth of our gratitude.

Both clinicians and patients provided honest and numerically intense insights that yielded alignment reflective of the patient voice.

Wyrwich et al 2020
Open Discussion

Moderated by:
Hoda Fotovvat, PhD
Research Associate III
Evidera
Sign up to join our Special Interest Group

• To join a SIG scan the QR code or find us at: https://www.ispor.org/member-groups/special-interest-groups

• Question for the Clinical Outcome Assessment or Patient-Centered Special Interest Group? Email us at:
  ClinicalOutcomeSIG@ISPOR.org
  or
  PatientSIG@ISPOR.org
THANK YOU!