



# What does the patient want?

#### to be cured (duh!)

- If not cured, then to be taken care of:
  - Via the best treatment
  - With empathy and dignity
  - To be heard and informed

#### What is a PRO?

 Measurement of any aspect of a patient's health status that comes directly from the patient

#### Examples:

M MAR

- Function
- Symptoms (intensity, frequency)
  Satisfaction (with medication)
- Well-being
- Quality of life (QOL).



#### ...so our goal is...

- To establish an ongoing conversation of "how are you" with all stakeholders
- Do it without overburdening the patient, clinician or the system
- Accomplish this in an environment where everyone is stressed and has no time
- Sounds simple, right?

#### Everyone in this room cares about what the patient has to say in theory but how do we use PROs in reality?

- 1) Make assessing PROs simple (burden)
- 2) Make PROs easy to understand
- 3) Link PROs to "hard outcomes"
- 4) Answer "what do I do with PRO data?"
- Treat PROs like any other vital sign/lab test

### Too many surveys: too little time

- Hirotsugu Aigaa. Bombarding people with questions: a reconsideration of survey ethics. Bull World Health Organ. Nov 2007; 85(11): 823.
- "A survey, again? You are the third survey team who visited us during these couple of months. I am fed up with ..."
- These words greeted me and my assistant at a house in Zalingei Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) camp in Darfur in 2004. Health surveys play an increasingly critical role in responses to humanitarian crises and in monitoring progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, yet survey ethics are rarely discussed.





#### Genesis

- Affordable Care Act Beacon Project
- SE MN Health care agencies share data in the clinic in real time
- Include PRO data
- Focus groups and literature developed a list of 25 questions
- "Great! But there is no way in \*\*\*\* that will work..."

#### Fifteen Years Ago (September, 1995)

- Plethora of assessment tools for quality of life (QOL) and patientreported outcomes (PROs)
- Disappointing recent clinical trial results in terms of missing data, clinical significance, reliability issues
- "...so you're suggesting we should all do with QOL what a dog does to a fire hydrant..."

#### Today

- Guidelines for virtually all outstanding issues
  - missing data (Fairclough, Design and Analysis of Quality of Life Studies in Clinical Trials, Chapman-Hall, 2010)
  - clinical significance (Sloan et al, MCP, 2002)
  - psychometrics (Sloan et al, Current Problems in Cancer, 2005/2006)
  - regulatory issues (Sloan et al, Value in Health, 2008)
  - Item response theory (Reeve et al, QOLR, 2007)
  - Inclusion in clinical practice (Guyatt et al, MCP/VH, 2008)
  - Genetics (Sloan et al, December 2010, QOLR)







Site	BMA-	BMA+	P-value		
GL	9.1	16.7	<0.0001 0.0032 0.0003		
GU	15.5	52.4*			
ung	7.0	10.8			
Breast	16.6	26.2	0.0002		



# Multivariate Cox Model for Survival

Variable	P-Value	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)					
BMA-	<.001	1.56 (1.40, 1.75)					
Performance Score (1-2 versus 0)	<.001	1.77 (1.62, 1.93)					
Age	0.075	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)					
Minority	0.219	0.91 (0.79, 1.06)					
GI	<.001	1.37 (1.14, 1.65)					
Lung	<.001	2.02 (1.65, 2.47)					
Breast	0.006	0.64 (0.47, 0.88)					
GU	0.078	1.46 (0.96, 2.21)					

# **Replication of results**

- A recent meta-analysis (n=13,874) indicated that 36 of 39 studies indicated that analogues of BMA+ were significantly associated with overall survival (*Gotay*, JCO, 26: 1355 1363, March 2008)
- Another meta-analysis involving over 10,000 patients indicated that BMA+ analogue was prognostic for survival (Efficace, ASCO 2008)
- A literature review of over 100 studies from 1982 to 2008 indicated that BMA+ measures were significant independent predictors of survival duration (*Montazeri, HQLO, 7:102, 2009*)

COD MAND CLINIC

Is this convincing evidence that BMA+ is a promising prognostic factor for cancer patient survival?

### • What is BMA+?

#### BMA- = a score of 5 or less in patient-reported QOL on a 0-10 scale

Directions: Please circle the number (0-10) best reflecting your response to the following that describes your feelings during the past week, including today.

How would you describe:

your overall Quality of Life? 0 1 As bad as it can be

4 9

10 As good as it can be

This is a reliable and valid measure for cancer patient populations (Sloan, MCP, 2002 & JCO, 20 cut-off validation: Butt, JPSM,2008; Sloan, Value in Health, 2007; Temel, J Thorac Oncol, 2006 MAND CLINIC





# Long history of development and validation of questions for diagnostic use

LASA Linear Analog Self Assesment 12 questions

# Putting PROs into Practice Real time

ems SAS-D	lata Mana	gements	lystem								Keturs to Hum H	Har I Light
				Real	Time	QOL I	nitiati	ve				
			Line	ar Anal	ogue Si	elf Asse	ssmen	t (LASA	)			
Please feeling	check ti s during	the past	er (0-10) week, in	best refi scluding	ecting yo today,	our respo	onse to t	he follow	ing that	describe	s your	
How w	ould you	describ	•:									
1. Your	overal Q	abity of Li	fe? (0+A	is bad as	it can be,	10=As g	ood as it	can be)				
# N/A	C 0	C 1	C 2	c3	C4	C5	C.6	07	C.8	C 9	C 10	
2 Your	overal m	ontal (into	Rectual) s	well being	77 (0=As1	ad as it i	can be, 1	)=As goo	d as it ca	n be]		
# N/A	<b>c</b> 0	C1	r2	<b>c</b> 3	C4	C5	C.6	C7	68	<b>c</b> 9	C 10	
3. Your	overal pl	vsicalwa	Ebeina?	(0=As be	ed as it ca	n be. 104	As good	as it can	bel			
# N/A	co	c1	c2	C3	C4	C.5	C6	e7	cs	C9	C 10	
4 Your	oural or	notional w	all bains	O tille Are I	had as it.	in he ti	links and	d an it cia	(bal)			
# N/A	r o	01	C2	03	C.4	C.5	CB	C7	C.S.	C 9	C 10	
5. Your	level of s	ocial activ	A = 0) SAD	is bed as	it can be,	tu=As g	ood as it	can two)				
# N/A	C.0.	.C.1	02	0.3	C4	C5	C 6	07	0.8	.09	C.10	
			A Country of Country	States in the second		ALC: NO.	A	and in case of	and it			

Pt ZZ111111: Please click on the 0	LASA Scor	es by V n links	for Dise	nce Tre ease Ma	atment Star	athways.
MAROON represent complaint Items i Items in GREEN represent a	s that are w in RED repr 2 points or	orse tha esent a more im	n avera drop of provem	ge (5 pc 2 points ent on th	ints or below or more ne measure si	i and may warrant a nce the last visit.
Factor Measured (0=worst QOL and 10=best QOL)	Baseline	Week 1	Week 3	Week 5	Last Week of Rx	Last Week of Rx Minus Week 5
Quality of Life	9	7	10	7	8	1
Aental (Intellectual) WB	8	10	7	6	9	3
Physical WB	7	6	7	9	3	-6
Emotional WB	9	8	6	8	7	-1
Social Activity Level	7	4		10	10	0
Spiritual WB	6	10	6	7	9	2
ain Frequency	2	2		4	2	-2
Pain Severity	3	5		0	3	3
atique Level	2	6	1	1	1	0
evel of Support	9	8	5	10	8	-2
Inancial Concerns	7	7	9	9	10	1
		100		-	-	



	Singi	e-li	tem		OL,	, ta	ligi	le a	and	pain	
DL	age single th	anumh	er (0, 10	) hast n	floatin			to the	fallowi		
tha	at describes y	our fee	lings du	iring th	e past	week, ii	icludin	g today	ionown	ig	
н	ow would yo	u descri	be:								
1.	your overall Quality of Life?										
	0 1 As bad as it can be	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 As good as it can be	
2.	the severity	of your	pain, o	n the av	erage?						
	0 1 No pain	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 Pain as bad as it can be	
3.	your level o	f fatigu	e, on the	averag	e?					it can be	
	0 1 No fatigue	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 Fatigue as bad a it can be	
1											











# Case Study

- 8 year cancer survivor annual visit
- Rated QOL as a 2 out of 10
- Initiated conversation
- Insomnia

H MANO CLINIC

- "stupid thoughts"
- Suicidal ideation

# **Case Study**

- Psych referral
- Anti-depressant
- 1 month later QOL was 7

# Case Study

- 57 year old colorectal cancer patient, halfway through chemo (folfiri)
- Patient's labs, tx look fine
- Fatigue of 2 (bad)

- Try dose modification
- Labs, tx remain fine, fatigue score improves to 8 for remainder of Tx

#### Case Study

- Surgical patient says pain is 7
- Objective test for mobility indicates level associated with no pain
- Surgeon combines PRO and test data
  - Will give you more pain meds because you seem to be saying you need them
  - Watch for cognition and constipation

#### Findings (Hubbard, JOP, May, 2014)

- QOL and fatigue measured in over 30,000
   clinical visits
- Oncology staff provided feedback:
  - 86% endorsed the use of PROs
  - Over 90% indicated that it did not change clinic
  - visit time nor did it add more work
    Allowed for a validation of their perception of patient well-being
  - Enhanced their practice, established more goals
  - They felt more prepared for the visit
  - Raised issues otherwise undiscovered in 25%-40% of cases

#### We know incorporating PROs into Oncology Practice improves communication (Detmar, JAMA, 2002; Velikova, JCO, 2012)

- Incorporating standardized QOL assessments in daily clinical oncology practice facilitates the discussion of QOL issues and can heighten physicians' awareness of their patients' QOL.
- But what do we do with PRO information?

# So how do we use this clinical trial science to make it real in the clinic?

- We know that a deficit in patientreported overall QOL is associated with a doubling of the risk of death across a broad spectrum of cancer patients.
- We know the cutoff is similar across many PRO domains.
- We also know that a change of two points on a 0-10 scale is non-ignorable.

Testing Real-time QOL assessment in a radiation oncology clinical practice (MCS1065, PI: Halyard; ASCO, 2012)

- 96% of patients would participate in this study again or recommend others to use the system
- 90% of physicians/nurse/nurse practitioners are satisfied/highly satisfied with the communication with their patient during the visit

# ...meanwhile in the Mayo oncology clinic....

- September 1, 2010: all oncology patients administered overall QOL and fatigue single items upon intake
- As part of a quality improvement project, the QOL and fatigue measures became part of the EMR, right after the pain assessment.

THIN MAND CLINIC











