



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

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

Brief Report

The Best Methods of Communicating Clinical Trial Data to Improve Understanding of Treatments for Patients with Multiple Sclerosis

Gurpreet K. Reen, PhD^{1,*}, Eli Silber, MD², Dawn W. Langdon, PhD¹

¹Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK; ²Department of Neurology, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Background: Patients' understanding of treatment risks and benefits is a prerequisite for shared decision making. Yet, patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) do not accurately understand treatment information provided in regular clinical consultations. **Objectives:** To identify the best methods of communicating clinical trial data to improve the understanding of treatments among patients with MS and to also examine the relationship between patients' understanding with decisional conflict, individual traits, and MS symptoms. **Methods:** A repeated-measures study was used. A sample of relapsing-remitting patients with MS was recruited from National Health Service sites in the United Kingdom. Patients were presented with hypothetical treatment risks and benefits from faux clinical trials. Treatments were communicated using absolute terms, relative terms, and numbers needed to treat/harm. The presence of baseline information with each method was also manipulated. Patients' understanding and conflict in treatment decisions were assessed. Individual traits and MS symptoms were also recorded. **Results:** Understanding

was better when treatments were communicated in absolute terms (mean 3.99 ± 0.93) compared with relative terms (mean 2.93 ± 0.91 ; $P < 0.001$) and numbers needed to treat/harm (mean 2.89 ± 0.88 ; $P < 0.001$). Adding baseline information to all methods significantly improved understanding (mean 5.04 ± 0.96) compared with no baseline information (mean 1.50 ± 0.74 ; $P < 0.001$). Understanding was not related to conflict in treatment decisions ($r = -0.131$; $P = 0.391$). Numeracy, IQ, and cognitive impairments were significantly related to patients' understanding of treatments. **Conclusions:** Treatment risks and benefits should ideally be communicated using absolute terms, alongside baseline information. Patients with MS with low numeracy, low IQ, and reduced cognitive skills should be supported during treatment education.

Keywords: decision making, multiple sclerosis, patient education, risk communication.

Copyright © 2018, International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR). Published by Elsevier Inc.

Introduction

Shared decision making is advocated in patient-centered health care as an ideal approach for making treatment decisions [1,2]. A prerequisite to shared treatment decisions is patients' understanding of available treatments. Accurate treatment knowledge can ensure patients engage with the decision-making process [3], choose a treatment that aligns with their values [2], and adhere to their chosen treatment [4]. Good treatment knowledge can also reduce decisional conflict, which encompasses the feeling of uncertainty in a treatment choice [5–7]. Nevertheless, not all patient groups show accurate understanding of treatment risks and benefits.

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is a chronic inflammatory condition of the central nervous system, often leading to advanced neurological disability [8,9]. Patients with MS are faced with important decisions about disease-modifying drugs (DMDs), which can help

delay disease progression. These patients, however, find it particularly challenging to understand DMD information during routine health care [10]. One reason may be the complex risk-benefit profiles associated with DMDs. For instance, some DMDs are moderately effective with low risks, whereas other DMDs offer higher efficacy in exchange for higher risks to patients [11]. It is also possible that individual traits and some MS symptoms can confound patients' understanding of treatments. Intelligence, numeracy, and health literacy can typically influence comprehension of treatments [12–15]. Cognitive deficits, prevalent in 40% to 70% of patients with MS [16], can further affect understanding [17]. Other commonly experienced MS symptoms, such as depression, anxiety, and fatigue [18], may also influence understanding, but these have not been previously assessed. It is essential then that understanding of DMDs be improved for patients with MS.

* Address correspondence to: Gurpreet K. Reen, Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham TW20 0EX, UK.

E-mail: Gurpreet.reen.2014@live.rhul.ac.uk.

1098-3015/\$36.00 – see front matter Copyright © 2018, International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR).

Published by Elsevier Inc.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2017.12.015>

Understanding of treatment information derived from clinical trials can be affected by the methods in which this is communicated. Differences between risks and benefits experienced by a patient group taking a new treatment and another patient group taking a placebo during a clinical trial can be communicated in absolute terms (conveying true differences), relative terms (conveying proportional differences), and numbers needed to treat/harm (conveying the average number of patients to take the treatment for one person to experience an outcome). Absolute terms have been shown to improve understanding compared with other methods in nonclinical [19,20] and clinical [21,22] populations. With the addition of baseline information (i.e., the original number of patients in both groups that experience the risk or benefit), understanding improved regardless of the method [19,20,22]. The only study conducted with patients with MS found better understanding when baseline information was added to absolute terms, but did not examine other methods [23]. There is still a need to systematically investigate all methods with patients with MS.

This study is the last of three experiments investigating optimal methods of communicating treatment information to patients with MS to culminate in an educational intervention. Previous two experiments examined numerical and graphical methods, types of frequencies, and ways of framing treatment risks and benefits. The main objective of the present study was to identify the best method of communicating clinical trial data. Specific hypotheses were as follows: 1) absolute terms would improve understanding, 2) baseline information would improve understanding, 3) patients' decisional conflict would reduce with better understanding, and 4) individual traits and cognitive impairments will be associated with understanding.

Methods

Participants

Patients were recruited from two UK National Health Service clinics. Patients diagnosed with relapsing-remitting MS, taking a DMD, able to provide informed consent, and meeting study sensorimotor task demands were included. There was no selection on the basis of cognitive impairment. Patients were excluded if their condition or medication had changed in the last 4 weeks, or if they had a significant medical and/or psychiatric condition besides MS. Patients had a visual acuity of at least 20/70 [24]. The study received ethical approval from the National Health Service Research Ethics Committee.

Materials

Patients were presented with a hypothetical disease with progressive characteristics similar to MS. Two hypothetical treatments were provided for this disease. Treatment risk-benefit profiles were based on DMD clinical trials [e.g., [25,26]] to mimic real clinical decisions. Risks and benefits were presented for 1, 2, and 5 years of taking the treatment. Each treatment had one minor risk (e.g., flu-like symptoms), one adverse risk (e.g., kidney failure), and one benefit (delays in progression of disease symptom).

Design

A repeated-measures design was used. Treatment risks and benefits were communicated using six different methods: absolute terms, relative terms, and numbers needed to treat/harm, each with or without baseline information (see Fig. 1). Three methods were randomly assigned to each treatment at the beginning of the study. Treatment order was counterbalanced

Methods to communicate clinical trial data	
In a clinical trial, 1000 MS patients were given Drug A and 1000 MS patients were given a placebo.	
Baseline information	"150 patients taking Drug A experienced risk B, and 50 patients taking placebo experienced risk B"
Absolute terms	"100 more patients taking Drug A will experience risk B"
Relative terms	"2 times as many patients taking Drug A will experience risk B"
Numbers needed to harm	"10 patients would have to take Drug A for 1 patient to experience risk B"

Fig. 1 – Example showing the following methods to communicate clinical trial data: baseline information, absolute terms, relative terms, and numbers needed to treat/harm. It is an example of treatment risk only. Actual study contained hypothetical treatment names and a potential risk (e.g., liver failure). MS, multiple sclerosis.

between patients using a Latin square design [27]. The study was conducted with the chief investigator. The session took between 1.5 and 2 hours and included multiple breaks for patients as required.

Measures

Primary outcome measure

Understanding. Six questions assessed understanding immediately after a treatment risk or benefit. Questions were author-developed but adapted from previous studies [28–30]. Patients first reported the number of people who experienced the risk/benefit of the treatment over the three time periods. Answers were deemed correct if within 10% of the precise value [28,29]. Patients then stated the differences in risks/benefits between the treatment and placebo groups over the three time periods. This was a multiple-choice question, with one correct answer out of four possible options.

Secondary outcome measures

Decisional conflict. Patients were asked to make a treatment decision: choose a treatment, choose no treatment, or state that they were unsure. Conflict in decisions was recorded using the patient-reported Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS), validated for use in health care decisions [5]. The scale consists of 16 items divided into five subscales: uncertainty, feeling uninformed, values, support, and effective decision.

Individual traits and MS symptoms. Demographic characteristics, disease variables, and disability status of patients [31] were recorded. A short eight-item word recognition task assessed health literacy: the Rapid Estimate of Adult Literacy in Medicine-Revised [32]. Numeracy was assessed by the arithmetic subtask from the Verbal and Spatial Reasoning Scale [33]. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale [34] assessed affective MS symptoms and has been validated for use with patients with MS [35]. Fatigue was assessed via the patient-reported Fatigue Severity Scale [36], originally developed for the MS population [36]. The Wechsler Test of Adult Reading Scale [37] measured premorbid IQ, which is not altered by cognitive deficits [38]. The

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7388886>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7388886>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)