The Impact of Spinal Muscular Atrophy Type 1 on Caregivers in Brazil: **Results of a Global Survey**

Anish Patel¹; Walter Toro¹; Janaina Martins de Lana²; Omar Dabbous¹; Adriana Banzzatto Ortega³ ¹Novartis Gene Therapies, Inc., Bannockburn, IL, USA; ²Novartis Biociências S.A. Pharma, São Paulo, Brazil; ³Hospital Pequeno Príncipe, Curitiba PR, Brazil

Introduction

- SMA is a rare, progressive, genetic neurodegenerative disease that causes loss of both voluntary motor and bulbar functions^{1,2} • SMA1, accounting for >50% of SMA cases, is the most severe
- form, with death often occurring prior to 2 years of age^{1,2} • Patients with SMA1 develop symptoms within the first 6 months of life, including limb weakness, respiratory insufficiency, and poor feeding.¹ Historically, patients with SMA1 did not achieve the ability to sit independently.¹
- A few studies, mostly conducted in the United States and Europe, demonstrated that caregivers of patients with SMA1 are greatly impacted by time-consuming daily care tasks, financial problems, and work adjustments owing to care tasks³
- Overall, data are limited on the impact of the time and costs associated with care for patients with SMA1, particularly in Brazil, where an estimated 250–300 newborns per year are affected by SMA⁴

Objective

• We sought to describe the sociodemographics, HCRU, and time and out-of-pocket costs for caregivers of patients with SMA1 in Brazil

Methods

 An online survey of caregivers in Argentina, Brazil, Japan, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States was conducted to collect data on time spent on and economic impact of caring for a patient with SMA1–3 (Figure 1). Here, we report the results for caregivers of patients with SMA1 in Brazil. Figure 1. Caregiver survey study design

Study Design

Cross-sectional, non-interventional, online survey of voluntary non-HCP caregivers in Brazil. The survey was disseminated to caregivers through patient advocacy groups and principal investigators





Data Collected in Survey



• Caregiver sociodemographics

- Characteristics of patients with SMA cared for by caregivers
- Time spent as a caregiver • Impact of caregiving on employment and income
- HCRU
- Direct medical care: HCP visits, surgeries, or hospitalizations Indirect medical care: out-of-pocket expenses

Participants



Adult, unpaid primary or secondary caregivers of a child or adult with SMA1 at the time of survey completion

- HCP caregivers • Paid caregivers (e.g., home health aides or registered nurses) Caregivers of patients residing in stationary facilities (e.g., nursing
- homes or hospice centers)

Ethics



- All participants provided informed consent electronically
- Study documents and protocols were approved by an international IRB and local ethics committees

HCP, health care provider; HCRU, health care resource utilization; IRB, institutional review board; SMA1, spinal muscular atrophy type

Results

- responded to the survey

with SMA1 Characteristic **Sex**, n (%) Female Male Relationship to the patient, Mother Father Age, years Mean (SD) Median (range) Highest education level com Some primary or secondary GCSEs/O-levels/standard gr Undergraduate degree Graduate degree Marital status, n (%) Single Married or in a domestic part Living with a partner (not mai partnership) Geographic entity, n (%) Rural (countryside or village) Urban (town or city) Number of children in the ho 18 years^a Mean (SD) Median (range) **Current employment status** Employed full time Self-employed/business own Unemployed Full-time caregiver of a perso Current gross income before <R\$2,090.00/month R\$2,090.01-R\$4,180.00/mo R\$4,180.01-R\$10,450.00/m

R\$10,450.01-R\$20,900.00

Prefer not to answer

Presented at The Professional Society for Health Economics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR) International 2024, May 5–8, 2024, Atlanta, GA, USA.

Caregiver demographics and patient characteristics • Fourteen caregivers, managing 14 patients with SMA1,

• Caregivers were a mean age of 34.4 years and were either the patient's mother (71.4%) or father (28.6%; Table 1) Table 1. Sociodemographics for caregivers of patients

	Caregivers (N=14)
	10 (71.4)
	4 (28.6)
n (%)	
	10 (71.4)
	4 (28.6)
	24.4(0.2)
	34.4 (8.3)
poloted $p(0/)$	32.5 (20.0–52.0)
npleted, n (%) school	1 (28.6)
ade	4 (28.6) 4 (28.6)
auc	3 (21.4)
	3 (21.4)
	0 (21.4)
	1 (7.1)
nership	9 (64.3)
rried or in a domestic	4 (28.6)
	1 (7.1)
	13 (92.9)
ousehold younger than	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	1.6 (0.9)
(0/) b	1.0 (1.0–3.0)
, n (%) [⊳]	4 (00 7)
) or	4 (26.7)
ner	2 (13.3)
on with SMA	1 (6.7) 8 (53.3)
re taxes, n (%)	0 (00.0)
o taxoo, 11 (70)	4 (28.6)
onth	2 (14.3)
onth	4 (28.6)
month	2 (14.3)
	2 (14.3)
n Education: SD, standard doviation: SMA, spinal mus	· · ·

R\$, Brazilian real; GCSE, General Certificate of Secondary Education; SD, standard deviation; SMA, spinal muscular atrophy. alncluding the patient with SMA1. Caregivers may select more than one option

• The mean age of patients with SMA1 was 3.5 years, and the mean age at SMA diagnosis was 0.7 years (Table 2) Patients achieved their greatest level of motor function at a mean age of 0.7 years

- All patients required the use of respiratory equipment within the last 6 months, whereas most patients (92.9%; 13/14) required mobility equipment, and only six of 14 patients (42.9%) required nutrition equipment

Table 2. Characteristics of patients with SMA1

	•
Characteristic	
Age, years	
Mean (SD)	
Median (range)	
Age at SMA diagnosis, years	
Mean (SD)	
Median (range)	
Time from first signs/symptoms to diagnosis of SMA, months	
Mean (SD)	
Median (range)	
Highest level of motor function achieved, n (%) Head control	
Rolling	
Sitting independently for >10 seconds	
Standing with support	
Standing without support	
Walking with support	
Walking without support	
None of the above	
Age patient maintained highest level of motor function	
achieved, years ^b	
Mean (SD)	
Median (range)	
Current level of motor function, n (%) ^b	
Head control Rolling	
Rolling Sitting independently for >10 seconds	
Standing with support	
Standing with support Standing without support	
Walking with support	
Walking without support	
None of the above	
Respiratory equipment used within the last 6 months, responses (% of responses) ^c	
Cough assist machine	
Non-invasive ventilation	
Nebulizer	
Pulse oximeter	
Suction machine	
BiPAP machine	
Breathing machine	
High-frequency chest wall oscillation	
None	
Mobility equipment used in the last 6 months, responses (% of responses)°	
Ankle-foot orthoses	
Wheelchair	
Adaptive	
Manual	
Manual with power assist wheels	
Corset or spinal jacket	
Special bed	
Hand braces	
None	
Nutrition equipment used in the last 6 months, responses (% of responses) ^c	
NG tube	
G-tube	
iPAP, bilevel positive airway pressure; G-tube, gastric feeding tube; NG, naso-gastric; SD, standard deviation; SMA1, spir	nal muse
BiPAP, bilevel positive airway pressure; G-tube, gastric feeding tube; NG, naso-gastric; SD, standard deviation; SMA1, spir Responses provided by 14 caregivers for a total of 14 patients with SMA1. ⁵Nine of 14 caregivers provided responses. ℃a	

Patients ^a (N=14)	 Level of care provided All caregivers were either the patient's primary (57.1%; 8/14) or co-primary (42.9%; 6/14) caregiver The mean (SD; median [range]) patient care time reported by 	Figure 5. respirato their pati
3.5 (4.0) 2.5 (0.9–15.9)	 caregivers (N=14) was 62.8 (60.0; 24.0 [8.0–168.0]) hours/week Caregivers reported that respiratory treatments, therapies, and physical therapy were the most time-consuming activities in caring for their patients with SMA1 (Figure 2) 	100 53.8 80 -
	Figure 2. Most time-consuming tasks reported by caregivers of patient with SMA1	és 60 – – 40 – 7.7 – 38.5
0.7 (1.0)	Auxiliary nursing techniques Diapering	20-
0.5 (0.1–4.0)	n=1 Therapy equipment n=1	0 Cough assist machine
6.2 (10.9)	Hygiene Exercise/physical therapy/therapies	(n=13) in
2.5 (0-40)	various n=1	V E I (I BiPAP, bilevel positive ai
5 (35.7)	Everything n=2	 Caregive travel an
0	Support in bothing Respiratory treatments	outside o
3 (21.4)	n=2	(Figure
0	Support in movement/posture management n=3	Figure 6. caregiver
0	SMA1, spinal muscular atrophy type 1.	
1 (7.1)	 Employment and income Of the 14 caregiver respondents, nine stopped working and two 	
0	reduced their working hours to provide care for their patients with SMA1 (Figure 3)	
5 (35.7)	 Caregivers (n=2 respondents) reduced their working hours by a mean (SD; median [range]) of 4.0 (0; 4.0 [4.0–4.0]) hours/week Figure 3. Employment changes for caregivers of patients 	Buy
0.7 (0.7)	with SMA1	Buying equipn
0.5 (0–1.8)	Reduced working hours but stayed at the same job n=2	Adapting my l
2 (22.2)		special bed adaptive toi
0	Continued working as before	bathroom sin
4 (44.4)	n=3	
0		+
0		
0	SMA1, spinal muscular atrophy type 1.	Help insid
0	Within the last 6 months, four of five caregivers (80.0%) took	SMA1, spinal muscular
3 (33.3)	days off from work related to caregiving, and the mean (SD; median [range]) number of days these four caregivers took off	
	from work was 22.5 (15.5; 17.5 [10.0–45.0]) days • Eleven of 14 caregivers (78.6%) reported an impact on income	• A small r
13 (23.6)	related to caregiving with an estimated mean (SD; median [range]) income reduction of R\$2,833.30 (816.50; 3,000 [1,500–	participa The acci
12 (21.8)	4,000])/month for six caregiver respondents	Several
11 (20.0)	HCRU	behavior to valida
10 (18.2)	 All caregivers consulted at least one HCP during the last 6 months for their patient with SMA1. Patients required 	or nonsp
5 (9.1)	multidisciplinary care from several types of HCPs (Figure 4).	The leng
1 (1.8)	 For patients with SMA1 who had surgeries, surgery types included gastrostomies (n=8 responses), gastrostomies with 	telescop imprecis
1 (1.8)	Nissan fundoplication (n=2 responses), tracheostomies (n=2	question
1 (1.8)	responses), and orchiopexies or shunting (n=1 response each) • Seven of 14 patients (50.0%) had ≥1 overnight hospitalizations,	encoura this optic
0	excluding SMA-related surgeries, within the last 6 months	
	 The primary reasons for these hospitalizations were chest infection/breathing difficulties (n=4), and COVID-19, infection, 	Con
	or feeding difficulties (n=1 each)	 In Brazi often re
12 (38.7)	 The mean (SD; median [range]) duration of these 	Caregiv
4 (12.9)	hospitalizations for these seven patients was 7.9 (7.2; 5.0 [1.0–21.0]) days	providir
2/4 (50.0)	 Caregivers reported paying out-of-pocket expenses for most 	therapieOften ca
1/4 (25.0)	respiratory and mobility, but not nutritional, equipment needed for their patients with SMA1 (Figure 5)	working
1/4 (25.0)	Figure 4. Most common HCPs consulted within the past	Caregiv
4 (12.9)	6 months for patients with SMA1 ^a	and accEarly SI
3 (9.7)		modifyi
3 (9.7)		and ass patients
1 (3.2)	$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} & \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{u} $	References
1 (6 7)	4 - 10	1. Keinath MC, e 2. Lally C, et al. (
1 (6.7) 3 (20 0)	0 Pediatricians Physiotherapists Nutritionists Pulmonologists/	3. Brandt M, et a 4. Ivama-Brumm
3 (20.0)	Neurologists Speech and Orthopedic Non-specialist	2022;7:e00863
8 (53.3) atrophy type 1. y select more than one option.	a Only includes HCPs with ≥10 responses. HCP, health care provider; SMA1 spinal muscular atrophy type 1.	

Scan QR code to access the poster

EE10

. Out-of-pocket expenses caregivers reported for ory, mobility, and nutrition equipment needed for ients with SMA1 equipment Paid for equipment accessories Did not pay for equipment or accessories Do not remember Mobility equipment equipmen equipment Suction (n=11) machine (n=3) machine (n=5) (n=1) (n=2)assist wheels irway pressure; G-tube, gastric feeding tube; NG, naso-gastric; SMA1, spinal muscular atrophy type ? ers also reported paying out-of-pocket expenses for nd accommodations, equipment, and help inside or of the home to care for their patients with SMA1 Additional out-of-pocket expenses reported by rs of patients with SMA1 Equipment and medical costs Buying equipment: bathtub, chair, therapy equipment Buying equipment adaptable car n=1 Buying equipment: special car, chair, cough apparatus, oximeter lying equipment: car n=1 ment: parapodium n=2 Traveling to medical appointments n=12 home (e.g., ds, chairs, oilet seats, Accommodations close nks/faucets) to hospital n=8 Paying for help at home (e.g., home health care) n=9 e or outside of the home Travel and accommodations atrophy type 1.

tations

number of participants completed the survey, and not all ants responded to all survey questions

uracy of caregiver survey responses could not be verified survey questions targeted intimate and discreet ors of everyday life. This type of information is often hard ate, as the participants' answers tend to be inaccurate pecific

gthening of the recall period was likely to trigger the bic memory effect and cause participants to insert se answers. In addition, because answers to several ns were not mandatory, participants may have become aged to excessively rely on the "skip" button whenever on was allowed.

clusions

I, caregivers were parents of children with SMA1 who equired the use of respiratory and mobility equipment vers reported a substantial impact on their time for ng care, particularly because of respiratory treatments, es, and physical therapy

aregivers reduced their working hours or stopped , leading to a reduction in income

vers reported out-of-pocket costs for equipment, travel commodations, and help inside or outside of the home MA identification and early access to diseaseng treatments may reduce the impact on caregivers sociated costs, because early treatment can improve ' clinical outcomes and health-related quality of life

et al. Appl Clin Genet. 2021;14:11–25. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2017;12:175 I. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2022;17:274. nell AM, et al. BMJ Glob Health.

BiPAP, bilevel positive airway pressure; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; G-tub gastric feeding tube; GCSE, General Certificate of Secondary Education; HCP, health care provider; HCRU, health care resource utilization; IRB, institutional review board; NG, nasogastric; R\$, Brazilian real; SD, standard deviation; SMA, spinal muscular atrophy; SMA1 spinal muscular atrophy type 1 Acknowledgments and Disclosures

This study was funded by Novartis Gene Therapies, Inc. The authors also wish to thank the patients, families, and caregivers for their willingness to participate in this survey, which was sponsored by Novartis Gene Therapies, Inc. Editorial support was provided by Sarah Hauze, PhD, Kay Square Scientific, Newtown Square, PA. This support was funded by Novartis Gene Therapies, Inc. Disclosures: AP, WT, and OD are employees of Novartis Gene Therapies, Inc., and own stock/other equities. ABO has nothing to disclose.