A Preliminary Analysis of Hemophilia Patient Utility Study of **Treatment Administration Impact: A Discrete Choice** Experiment (DCE) using Time Trade-Off (TTO) Methodology



PO070

Melody Benton^{1,6}, Mark W. Skinner^{2, 3}, Louis P. Garrison⁴, Er Chen⁵, Henry Mead⁵, Lizheng Shi⁶

¹Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans LA, USA; ²Institute for Policy Advancement Ltd., Washington, DC ³McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, ⁴Univ of Washington, The CHOICE Institute, Department of Pharmacy, Seattle, WA, ⁵BioMarin Pharmaceutical Inc, Novato, CA ⁶Tulane University School of Public Health & Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, LA

INTRODUCTION

- Hemophilia A (HA) is a bleeding disorder characterized by factor VIII (FVIII) deficiency.
- HA treatments differ in administration and outcomes.
- This study aims to elicit preferences of adult males (≥18 years) with HA and quantify the incremental impact of treatment attribute changes on health utility with DCE-TTO methodology.
- This study summarized preliminary results in a (full study targets to enroll >80 pilot phase participants)

Table 1. Treatment characteristics and their levels considered in the DCE-TTO survey

METHODS

- HA patients (aged ≥18y) were recruited from the Louisiana Center for Bleeding and Clotting Disorders at Tulane University to participate in a web or in-clinic survey. **Table 5**
- The DCE-TTO survey was developed based on the core outcome set for hemophilia gene therapy (coreHEM), including method and frequency of administration, mental health, chronic pain, and annual bleeding rate.
- Patients completed a DCE-TTO instrument with 20 randomly generated hypothetical choice sets to choose their preferred treatment. Table 1
- Treatment characteristics were analyzed with TTO of 10, 15 and 20 years using conditional logistic models.

CONCLUSIONS

 A one-time IV treatment can improve the health utility over repeated prophylactic administration. Durability of the one-time IV treatment impacts

the incremental utility improvement; patients with hemophilia are willing to trade life years to reduce treatment burden.

Results are preliminary. As more participants complete the survey, statistical power will be greater to test the direction and strength of patient preferences. These results need to be assessed upon completion of the full study.

Treatment characteristic		Levels	obtained from medical records or self-reports.
Treatment	Frequency and mode of treatment	 One-time IV infusion, works for 5yrs, followed by regular hemophilia treatment One-time IV infusion, works for 10yrs, followed by regular hemophilia treatment 2-3 times IV infusion per week 1-2 times SQ injection per month 	 RESULTS The coreHEM outcomes are important for HA, Graph 1 25 HA patients completed the survey (mean a 18-58; 72% with severe hemophilia A). Democlinical characteristics are described in Table 72% reported their current treatment was at H burdensome Table 3 (56% treat > once/week Average EQ-5D-5L VAS for participants was 5L utility score was 0.81 All coreHEM outcomes were statistically sign attributes, Table 4 With TTO component was added, compare time IV treatment with a 10-year or 5-year
Mental Health	Ability to perform normal activities	 Always concerned your hemophilia Occasionally concerned about your hemophilia No concern about your hemophilia 	
Chronic Pain	Pain from a persistent cause	YesNo	treatment with multiple IV infusions weekly associated with an annualized utility decrement vs. 10-year durability, p-yalue=0.012; and 0
Bleeding	Number of bleeds per year	 None 1-4 times 5 or more 	 year durability, p-value=0.018). Treatment with multiple SQ injections mont
Life Duration	Remaining Years of Life	 10 years 15 years 20 years 	associated with an annualized utility dec vs. 10-year durability, p-value=0.214; ar

Socio-demographic data and clinical characteristics, w	ere
obtained from medical records or self-reports. Table 2	

Table 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics of respondents (n=25)

Jolaineu nom medical records of self-reports. Table Z	Characteristic	Adult patients*	
RESULTS		(n=25)	
	Age, years, Mean (SD)	34 (11.57)	
The coreHEM outcomes are important for patients with HA, Graph 1 25 HA patients completed the survey (mean age 34, range 18-58; 72% with severe hemophilia A). Demographic and clinical characteristics are described in Table 2 .	Race, <u>Ethnicity</u> n (%) White Black Asian <u>Hispanic or Latino/a</u> Non-Hispanic or Latino/a	20 (0.80%) 4 (0.16%) 1 (0.04%) <u>2 (0.08%)</u> 23 (0.92%)	
72% reported their current treatment was at least slightly burdensome Table 3 (56% treat > once/week).	Health insurance, n (%) Private ^{II}	16 (0.64%)	
Average EQ-5D-5L VAS for participants was 74.4; EQ-5D- 5L utility score was 0.81	Public ¹ Employment status, n (%) ~	9 (0.36%)	
All coreHEM outcomes were statistically significant attributes, Table 4	Long Term Sick/Disability, Unemployed, Retired	7 (0.88%)	
 With TTO component was added, compared with a one- 	Full-Time/Part-time Student	3 (0.12%)	
time IV treatment with a 10-year or 5-year durability, treatment with multiple IV infusions weekly was associated with an annualized utility decrement (0.024	Annual Income, n (%) ^a < \$USD 25,000 >\$USD 25,000	11 (0.44%) 14 (0.56%)	
vs. 10-year durability, p-value=0.012; and 0.021 vs. 5- year durability, p-value=0.018).	Education level, n (%) High school or less ^{&} >4y, 4y college or others [#]	10 (0.40%) 15 (0.60%)	
 Treatment with multiple SQ injections monthly was also associated with an annualized utility decrement (0.012 vs. 10-year durability, p-value=0.214; and 0.009 vs. 5- 	Disease severity, n (%) Mild/moderate Severe	7 (0.28%) 18 (0.72%)	
year durability, p-value=0.334). Graph 1. Regression Coefficient*-DCE on coreHEM attributes n=25)	ABR, n (%) No bleeds ^b 1 to 4 bleeds > 5 bleeds	8 (0.32%) 12 (0.48%) 5 (0.20%)	
DCE without TTO	FVIII inhibitors in the past, n (%)	7 (0.28%)	
-0.2 -0.225 -0.225	Current treatment (at time of consent), n (%) On-demand Prophylaxis ^{‡‡}	7 (0.28%) 6 (0.24%) 18 (0.72%)	
-0.6 -0.651 -0.651 -0.651 -0.622 -0.82 -0.802	Iype of treatment (at time of consent), n (%) ^{§§} Short-acting FVIII Long-acting FVIII	2 (0.08%) 12 (0.48%)	
-1 -1.2	Frequency of Treatment, n (%) > than once a week (2,3,4 times a	14 (5.3%)	
-1.4 -1.367 -1.374 -1.474 <u>-1.474</u> <u>-1.474</u> <u>Bleeds</u>	Once every 2-4 weeks < than 4 weeks (once every 5 or 6 weeks) ^c	2 (0.08%) 9 (0.36%)	
1-time IV infusion, 5years 1-2 times SQ injection per month vs 10years 2-3 times IV infusion per week vs 10years 0ccasionally concerned about HA vs no concern HA vs no concern HA vs no concern HA vs no concern bleeds per year vs no 5 or more bleeds per year vs no bleeds vs no bleeds vs no bleeds vs no bleeds 0 per year vs no bleeds 0 per ye	Previous/current use of central device, n (%)	4 (0.16%)	
gnificant when comparing at least one level of that attribute with the reference level	Previous/Current Joint Procedure	8 (0.32%)	
	Previous/Current Joint Problems	19 (0.76%)	
ISCUSSIONS	History of HIV	5 (0.20%)	
DCE attributes leveraged coreHEM framework for gene therapy, which was developed by a multi-stakeholder	History of Hepatitis C General health over the past 4 weeks, n (%)	7 (0.28%)	
patient-led task force. The use of DCE-TTOs is an innovation in measuring the	Very good to Excellent Fair to Good	10 (0.40%) 15 (0.60%)	

*IV intravenous, ** SQ Subcutaneous

Table 3. Burden of hemophilia treatment, n (%) AdultPatients (n=25)		
No burden	• 7 (0.28%)	

	7 (0.2070)
Slight burden	• 10 (0.40%)
Moderate burden	• 6 (0.24%)
Severe burden	• 2 (0.08%)

Table 4. DCE-TTO Annualized Utility Decrement (n=25)

10yr Durability (multiple IV weekly infusions)	0.024
5yr Durability (multiple IV weekly infusions)	0.021
10yr Durability (multiple SQ monthly injections)	0.012
5yr Durability (multiple SQ monthly injections)	0.009

Table 5. DCE-TTO Survey Example

Attribute	Treatment A	Treatment B
Treatment	2-3 IV Infusions Per Week	1-2 times SQ injection per month
Mental Health	Always Concerned	Never Concerned
Chronic Pain	Yes	No

Graph 1. Regression Coefficient*-DCE on coreHEM (n=25)



DISCUSSIONS

- DCE attributes leveraged coreHEM frameworl therapy, which was developed by a multi-stake patient-led task force.
- The use of DCE-TTOs is an innovation in measuring the



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Hemophilia patients and their families, Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, The Louisiana Center for Bleeding and Clotting Disorders, Tulane University School of Medicine, McMaster University, Institute for Policy Advancement, University of Washington, BioMarin

health utility of hemophilia treatment administration. Future studies will compare this approach with other approaches such as standard health utility measures and vignettebased utility measures.

• The small study sample was recruited from a single hemophilia treatment center in Louisiana. We can not generalize the results to other study settings.

REFERENCES

SD, standard deviation; ABR, annualized bleed rate; Adult patients aged ≥18 years *All were male HA, ^IIncludes employer/group sponsored or individual commercial insurance plans; Includes Medicare, Medicaid or other federal insurance; & includes prefer not to answer, #Includes 2-year, vocational or technical degrees; ^{‡‡}Those reporting no treatment/don't know; ^{§§}Respondents could report more than one; none not shown, ^{¶¶}Includes bypassing agents, non-factor products (e.g. emicizumab), or none, ~Two patients are full-time students and work part-time, a Includes don't know/prefer not to answer, ^bIncludes don't know, ^cIncludes don't know

1. Franchini, M., & Mannucci, P. M. (2013). Acquired haemophilia A: a 2013 update. Thromb Haemost, 110(6), 1114-1120. 2. Core outcome set for gene therapy in haemophilia: Results of the coreHEM multistakeholder project. (2018). Haemophilia., 24(4), e167-e172.

Presented at the European Association for Haemophilia and Allied Disorders/ Manchester | 7-10 February 2023