

Using qualitative methods to develop grounded relevant content for preference surveys in a specific rare bleeding disorder (sRBD)

Grant S¹, Gold A², Pavisic I³,
Doma R⁴, Rudell K³

¹Parexel International LLC, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UK;
²Parexel, San Francisco, CA, USA; ³Parexel, London, UK;
⁴Parexel International, Durham, NC, USA

Objective

- › Preference studies require identification of relevant attributes for the subject matter.
- › Literature attributing the factors to patient and Health Care Professional (HCP) treatment preferences in a specific rare bleeding disorder (sRBD) are lacking, which makes attribute selection challenging.
- › The study used a qualitative approach to inform and refine the attribute selection process for a sRBD.

Methods

- › A literature review was conducted followed by two focus groups with HCPs from Japan, Italy, Germany, United States, and United Kingdom.
- › Content analysis was performed to refine attributes and levels for the preference survey.

Conclusions:

Using a qualitative approach to attribute selection informed three literature determined attributes (joint health improvement, patient adherence, and patient management costs) to be excluded, as they were not relevant for this case use. This attribute selection approach will improve the relevancy and appropriateness of content for the design of future preference surveys in a specific rare bleeding disorder.

Results

- › Of the initial eight attributes, joint health improvement; number of treated bleeding events; concerns about safety of long-term treatment; risk of treatment side effects, frequency of intravenous infusions, hospital resource use, patient adherence, patient management costs considered as factors of relevance to bleeding disorders.
- › Three attributes were excluded: joint health improvement, patient adherence, patient management costs. Reasons for exclusion were due to overlap conceptual overlap, differences between countries that yielded attributes that weren't comparable, and relevance for patients / clinicians. For example, patient management costs were not as relevant to patients as it was for HCPs and varied widely between countries.

