

Relationship Between Patient-Perceived

Treatment Burden and Health-Related



Quality of Life in Heart Transplant Recipients Kimberly M. Deininger, MPH¹, Jan D. Hirsch, BSPharm, PhD², Sarah A. Graveline, BS², Ashley A. Feist, PharmD², Steven M. Smith, PharmD, MPH³,

¹University of Colorado Schools of Pharmacy and Medicine, Aurora, Colorado; ²University of California San Diego School of Pharmacy, La Jolla, California.; ³University of Florida College of Pharmacy, Gainesville, Florida; ⁴University of Utah College of Pharmacy, Salt Lake City, Utah; ⁵Vanderbilt Heart and Vascular Institute, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Jennifer A. Reich, PhD¹, Joanne LaFleur, PharmD, MSPH⁴, Amrut V. Ambardekar, MD¹, JoAnn Lindenfeld, MD⁵, Christina L Aquilante, PharmD¹

INTRODUCTION

- Patient-perceived treatment burden is a patient's overall estimation of the burden their chronic disease treatment regimen imposes on them and their family [1].
 - Often referred to as the "work of being a patient" [2,3].
- Treatment burden is influenced by patient and treatment characteristics, disease conditions, support systems, and the healthcare system [1-5].
 - Influences health-related decisions, treatment adherence, resource utilization, and personal relationships [1].
- Health-related quality of life (HrQOL) is a patient's perceptions of their mental and physical health and correlates (e.g., health risks and conditions, functional status, social support, and socioeconomic status) [6].
 - Improves from pre- to post-heart transplant (HTx), but decreases over time [7].
 - Poor HrQOL is associated with depression in HTx patients [8].
- Few studies have comprehensively evaluated treatment burden and its relationship to HrQOL in transplant recipients.

OBJECTIVE

To evaluate the relationship between patient-perceived treatment burden and self-reported HrQOL in adult heart transplant recipients.

METHODS

- Study design: Cross-sectional multi-center study.
- **Study sites**: University of Colorado and University of California San Diego.
- Study population:
 - Inclusion criteria: Heart transplant recipients 18-90 years of age; 18 years of age or older at the time of transplant.
- Exclusion criteria: Combined organ transplant (e.g., heart and kidney); re-transplantation.
- Data collection: Single study visit during which patients were administered the following two questionnaires in random order.

Treatment Burden Questionnaire (TBQ)

- Validated 15-item questionnaire published by Tran et al. in 2012 [9].
- Developed in patients with chronic diseases (e.g., diabetes, hypertension).
- Measures degree of burden regarding:
 - Medications;
 - Medical follow-up;
 - Administrative burden; Financial burden; and
- Lifestyle changes.
- Each question is scored on a scale of 0 (not a problem) to 10 (big problem).
 - Total possible score is 150.

	s and of	-	w would you ra cample: blood tests conveniences												
Does not apply □	Not a p	roblem	2 3 4 5 6	7	8	9	□ 10	Bi	g pro	oblei	n				
B. Self-mor	•		and consider ever ng items, please ra	-								-			
Does not apply	Not a		te, shape or size on s (for example, pa	-								ces	caus	sed by	y your
C. Doctor		Does not apply □	Not a problem	0	1	2	3	□ 4	5	□ 6	□ 7	8	□ 9	□ 10	Big problen
difficulti	Not a	B. The nur	mber of times you		ıld t	ake	your	me	dicat	tion	dail	y? □	П	П	,
D. The diff			Not a problem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Big problen
(for exar	nple: fe Not a		orts you make ng your treatmen s)			_				-				,	_
	_	Does not apply	Not a problem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	□ 7	8	9	□ 10	Big problen
E. Arrangi reorgan						4 □ 1 - 1	no v	our	med	dica	tion	(for	exa	ample	: taking them
E. Arrangi reorgan Does not apply	Not a	at specif	essary precaution fic times of the dations such as driving	ay or	mea	als, 1	not b	eing		le to	do	cert		thing	s after taking

Short Form-12v2 Health Survey (SF-12v2)

- Validated 12-item questionnaire published by Ware et al. in 2002 [10].
- Measures functional health and well-being in eight domains: physical functioning, rolephysical, bodily pain, general health, vitality, social functioning, role-emotional, and mental health.
- Questions answered in rating scales which are transformed to mental component summary (MCS) and physical component summary (PCS) scores.
- Scored on a scale of 1-100, higher scores represent greater HrQOL.

	All of	Most of	Some of	A little of	None of		
	the time	the time	the time	the time	the time		
Accomplished less that would like Were limited in the kin	y	Your 1	Health	and V	Vell-B	Being	
work or other activities							
4. During the <u>past 4 v</u> following problems result of any emoti	This survey a keep track of Thank you for For each of the describes you	how you fe completing te following	el and how v g this survey	well you are a !	able to do y	our usual a	ctivities.
	·						
	1. In gener		ou say your	health is:			
Accomplished less that would like	1. In gener	al, would y	ou say your	health is:	Fair	Poor	
	1. In gener	al, would y			Fair	Poor V	
would like b Did work or other activ	1. In gener Exc	al, would y	ery good	Good	you might one activities?	do during a	No
would like b Did work or other active less carefully than usua 5. During the past 4 v	1. In gener Exc 2. The folloday. Do	al, would y	ery good	Good Good	you might one activities?	do during a	

3. During the past 4 weeks, how much of the time have you had any of the

Statistical analysis:

 Correlation analysis was used to determine relationships between TBQ score, SF-12v2 MCS and PCS, and patient characteristics.

RESULTS

Table 1: Description of study cohort

Characteristic	n=102
Study site	
 University of Colorado 	82 (80.4%)
 University of California 	20 (19.6%)
Caucasian race	74 (72.6%)
Men	78 (76.5%)
Age on day of study consent, years	56 ± 13 (21-84)
Age at transplant, years	49 ± 13 (19-70)
Time post-transplant on day of consent, years	$7.2 \pm 7.0 (0.1-27)$
Transplant Medications	
 Tacrolimus 	66 (64.7%)
 Cyclosporine 	34 (33.3%)
 Mycophenolate 	85 (83.3%)
 Azathioprine 	9 (8.8%)
 Prednisone 	40 (39.2%)
 mTOR Inhibitor 	18 (17.6%)
Total medication count	16 ± 5 (7-30)
Employed	41 (40.2%)
Married/living with partner	71 (69.6%)
Data are presented as n (%) or mean ± SD (range).	

Table 2: Description of treatment burden and HrQOL characteristics

Questionnaire	Measurement	Score
TBQ	Treatment Burden	24.3 ± 21.1 (0-108)
SF-12v2	Quality of Life-Mental Component	$53.2 \pm 8.8 (28.4-68.1)$
3F-1ZVZ	Quality of Life-Physical Component	44.7 ± 10.3 (16.7-62.0)

Data are presented as mean ± SD (range). TBQ, Treatment Burden Questionnaire; SF-12V2, Short-Form 12v2 Health Survey.

Table 3: Patient factors correlated with treatment burden or HrQOL

Questionnaire	Patient Characteristic	Spearman's Rho	P Value
TBQ Score	Age on day of study consent	- 0.30 ^a	0.002
SF-12v2 MCS	Age on day of study consent	0.27^{b}	0.006
SF-12v2 PCS	Employment status (i.e., employed vs not)	0.31 ^c	0.001

TBQ, Treatment Burden Questionnaire; SF-12V2, Short-Form 12v2 Health Survey; MCS, mental component summary; PCS, physical component summary. ^aOlder age correlated with lower treatment burden; ^bOlder age correlated with higher mental quality of life; Being employed correlated with higher physical quality of life compared to not being employed.

Table 4: Relationship between treatment burden and HrQOL

Correlation with TBQ Score	Adjusted Spearman's Rho	Adjusted P Value
SF-12v2-MCS	-0.39 ^a	<0.0001
SF-12v2-PCS	-0.20 ^b	0.049

TBQ, Treatment Burden Questionnaire; SF-12V2, Short-Form 12v2 Health Survey; MCS, mental component summary; PCS, physical component summary. ^aAdjusted for age on day of study consent; ^bAdjusted for age on day of study consent and employment status (i.e., employed vs not).

CONCLUSIONS

- Greater treatment burden was associated with lower patient-reported mental HrQOL after adjusting for age on day of study consent.
- Greater treatment burden was modestly associated with physical HrQOL after adjusting for age on day of study consent and employment status (i.e., employed vs not).
- Assessment of patient-perceived treatment burden may be helpful in identifying patients who are in need of intensified mental health interventions following HTx.

REFERENCES

- 1. Sav et al. Health Expect. 2015;18(3):312-324.
- 2. May et al. BMJ. 2009;339:b2803.
- 3. Eton et al. Patient Relat Outcome Meas. 2012;3:39-49.
- 4. Eton et al. Patient Relat Outcome Meas. 2015:6-117-126.
- 5. Gallacher et al. PLoS Med. 2013;10(6):e1001473.
- 6. Yin et al. PHM. 2016;14:22.
- 7. Czyżewski et al. Ann Transplant. 2014;19:288-294.
- 8. Fusar-Poli et al. JHLT. 2005;24(12):2269-2778.
- 9. Tran et al. BMC Medicine. 2014;12:109.
- 10. Ware et al. Lincoln, RI: Quality Metric Inc. 2002.

RELEVANT FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP DISCLOSURES

I will not discuss off label use and/or investigational use of any drugs/devices. The following relevant financial relationships exist related to this presentation: KMD, JDH, SAG, AAF, SMS, JAR, JL, AVA, JL: No relationships to disclose. CLA: Principal Investigator of ALSAM Foundation Skaggs Scholars Program Grant, which funded the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Study funded by The ALSAM Foundation Skaggs Scholars Program grant at the University of Colorado Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Email for correspondence: christina.aquilante@ucdenver.edu.