VALUE IN HEALTH ▮ (2016) ▮▮▮–▮▮▮

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jval

Health State Utilities Associated with Glucose Monitoring Devices

Louis S. Matza[1,*], *Katie D. Stewart*[1], *Evan W. Davies*[2], *Richard Hellmund*[3], *William H. Polonsky*[4], *David Kerr*[5]

[1]*Outcomes Research, Evidera, Bethesda, MD, USA;* [2]*Outcomes Research, Evidera, London, UK;* [3]*Global Health Economics, Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc., Alameda, CA, USA;* [4]*University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA;* [5]*William Sansum Diabetes Center, Santa Barbara, CA, USA*

ABSTRACT

Background: Glucose monitoring is important for patients with diabetes treated with insulin. Conventional glucose monitoring requires a blood sample, typically obtained by pricking the finger. A new sensor-based system called "flash glucose monitoring" monitors glucose levels with a sensor worn on the arm, without requiring blood samples. **Objectives:** To estimate the utility difference between these two glucose monitoring approaches for use in cost-utility models. **Methods:** In time trade-off interviews, general population participants in the United Kingdom (London and Edinburgh) valued health states that were drafted and refined on the basis of literature, clinician input, and a pilot study. The health states had identical descriptions of diabetes and insulin treatment, differing only in glucose monitoring approach. **Results:** A total of 209 participants completed the interviews (51.7% women; mean age = 42.1 years). Mean utilities were 0.851 ± 0.140 for conventional monitoring and 0.882 ± 0.121 for flash monitoring (significant difference between the mean utilities; $t = 8.3$; $P < 0.0001$). Of the 209 participants, 78 (37.3%) had a higher utility for flash monitoring, 2 (1.0%) had a higher utility for conventional monitoring, and 129 (61.7%) had the same utility for both health states. **Conclusions:** The flash glucose monitoring system was associated with a significantly greater utility than the conventional monitoring system. This difference may be useful in cost-utility models comparing the value of glucose monitoring devices for patients with diabetes. This study adds to the literature on treatment process utilities, suggesting that time trade-off methods may be used to quantify preferences among medical devices.

Keywords: glucose monitoring, medical devices, time trade-off, utility.

Copyright © 2016, International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Health state utilities are typically used to quantify health status and quality of life in economic modeling [1]. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that utility may be influenced not only by health status and treatment outcomes but also by the process of receiving care [2]. These *process utilities* quantify the impact of treatment process attributes such as mode of administration and dose frequency [3,4]. Although the treatment process generally has less impact on utility than on efficacy, safety, or symptom severity [5], it does matter to patients, and it could also have a direct impact on treatment adherence, which can influence outcomes [6–9]. Furthermore, small utility differences associated with treatment process could affect the results of a cost-utility analysis and therefore have important implications for subsequent decision making.

For diabetes, an important aspect of the treatment process is self-monitoring of glucose levels [10–12]. Regular evaluation of glucose levels can guide patients and health care providers when making treatment and lifestyle decisions. For example, glucose levels may be considered when calculating a safe and effective insulin dose, assessing the impact of physical activity on glucose levels, and detecting hypoglycemia [13]. Conventional glucose monitoring requires a blood sample, typically obtained by pricking the finger with a lancing device to obtain the current glucose level [14]. In contrast, the recently developed FreeStyle Libre flash glucose monitoring system (Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc., Alameda, CA) does not require routine finger pricks [15]. Instead, patients obtain glucose readings from a sensor applied to the back of the upper arm. A subcutaneous filament (which is a part of the sensor and extends outward from the bottom skin-facing part of the sensor) monitors interstitial glucose levels and stores up to 8 hours of data. Users scan the sensor with a touchscreen reader

Conflicts of interest: L. S. Matza, K. D. Stewart, and E. W. Davies are employees of Evidera, a company that received funding from Abbott for time spent conducting this study. R. Hellmund is an employee of Abbott. K. Polonsky received funding for time spent on this research. All aspects of the study design, interpretation, and decision to submit for publication were determined by the authors.

* *Address correspondence to:* Louis S. Matza, Outcomes Research, Evidera, Bethesda, MD 20814.

E-mail: louis.matza@evidera.com.

1098-3015$36.00 – see front matter Copyright © 2016, International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.10.007

device to see their present glucose reading and an arrow indicating the glucose level trajectory. Each sensor with its filament is worn on the arm for up to 2 weeks. After 2 weeks, patients remove the sensor and apply a new one that includes a new filament.

Differences in the process of glucose monitoring could have an impact on a patient's quality of life. If this impact were quantified in terms of health state utility, it could be useful for economic modeling. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to estimate the utilities associated with conventional and flash glucose monitoring devices. Because generic preference-based instruments such as the EuroQol five-dimensional questionnaire (EQ-5D) and utility mapping algorithms for questionnaires such as the 36-item short form health survey are unlikely to be sensitive to differences in glucose monitoring, utilities were obtained using vignette-based methods, which are well-suited for isolating the utility impact of a specific treatment process.

Methods

Health State Development

Two health state descriptions (often called vignettes or scenarios) were drafted and refined on the basis of expert clinician input, device instructions for use, and literature review. Telephone interviews were conducted with two clinicians (a UK endocrinologist [MD] and a US clinical psychologist [PhD] who specialized in diabetes) to inform health state development. Questions focused on patients' typical experiences with diabetes and glucose monitoring. Later, the clinicians reviewed multiple drafts of the health states and provided comments regarding their clarity, comprehensiveness, and accuracy.

A literature review was conducted to support the health state content, focusing on diabetes symptoms [16–20], treatment, glucose monitoring, [11,13,21–25], and the two glucose monitoring approaches represented in the health states [15,26]. Further information about the glucose monitoring devices was obtained from the instructions for use that accompanied each device [14,27].

The two health states were identical in their description of a patient with diabetes requiring insulin injections and checking glucose levels about 3 times per day (see Appendix A in Supplemental Materials found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.10.007). Published guidelines vary regarding the number of times glucose levels should be checked each day, with recommendations depending on the type of diabetes and treatment regimen [13,19,20,22,28,29]. For the current health states, a frequency of 3 times per day was selected based on consideration of the multiple guidelines and input from clinicians. Although the frequency of glucose monitoring varies among patients, 3 times per day is a common testing frequency among patients treated with multiple daily insulin injections [30].

The health states differed only by the method of glucose monitoring (conventional and flash). Therefore, any preference difference between the two health states can be attributed specifically to differences in glucose monitoring strategies. To avoid potential bias, none of the study materials named the glucose monitoring devices, and health states were not numbered or lettered. Instead, they were referred to by color (purple and blue) appearing on the border of the health state cards.

To ensure respondents understood the glucose monitoring process, each health state was presented with the corresponding glucose monitoring device, and the interviewer explained how each statement in the health states corresponded to the device parts. The device parts were presented on a device display page, which included materials necessary for 2 weeks of glucose monitoring (see Appendices B and C in Supplemental Materials found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.10.007). After reviewing each health state and device display page, participants watched a brief instructional video demonstrating how each device is used.

Participants

Participants were required to be at least 18 years old, residing in the United Kingdom, able to understand study procedures, and able and willing to give informed consent. The inclusion criteria did not require that participants meet any specific clinical criteria because interviews were intended to yield utilities that may be used in cost-utility analyses for submission to health technology assessment agencies, which often prefer that utilities represent general population values [31–33]. Participants were recruited via newspaper and online advertisements.

Pilot Study

The health states were tested in a pilot study with 19 general population participants in London (10 women; mean age = 37.9 years; age range = 20–59 years). Health states were valued in time trade-off (TTO) interviews. The TTO methodology varies across studies, and the pilot study explored several variations of TTO procedures [34]. Two time horizons (10-year and a time horizon based on each respondent's self-reported life expectancy) and two trading increments (5% and 10%) were tested.

Pilot study participants consistently reported that the health states, device displays, and demonstration videos were clear and easy to understand. Some participants suggested minor revisions in formatting and word choice, and the study materials were edited accordingly. All TTO time horizons and trading intervals yielded utility scores in a similar range. The 10-year time horizon was selected for use in the subsequent main study because it was relatively easy for participants to understand and complete. In addition, this time horizon is consistent with many published studies including the commonly cited Measurement and Valuation of Health Study that derived tariffs for the EQ-5D [35,36].

Utility Interview Procedures and Scoring

After finalizing the health states and methods on the basis of the pilot study, the health states were rated in a TTO valuation study in Edinburgh and London in March 2015. All participants provided written informed consent, and the study was approved by an independent institutional review board (Ethical & Independent Review Services, Study No. 14158).

The order in which the two health states were presented was randomized (i.e., half reviewed the conventional monitoring first, and the other half reviewed the flash monitoring first). For each health state, participants reviewed the health state text and materials on the device display page, with guidance from the interviewers. During this process, interviewers introduced the health state and explained the device materials (presented on the device display page) using a standardized script. After the participants indicated that they understood the health state and device, the video was shown as a review of the device procedures.

After the participants had reviewed both health states along with the device materials and videos, they were asked which of the two they would prefer. The TTO task then began, with participants rating the health state that they were randomized to review first, followed by the second health state. Following commonly used TTO procedures [1], participants were offered a choice between spending 10 years in the health state being rated or shorter lengths of time in full health. The duration of time in full health was varied in 6-month increments in the following

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5104877

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5104877

Daneshyari.com