



University of Groningen

Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure

Kraai, Imke

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date: 2017

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Citation for published version (APA): Kraai, I. (2017). Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure [Groningen]: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Copyright Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): http://www.rug.nl/research/portal. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure

Imke H. Kraai

The publication of this thesis was financially supported by Rijksuniversiteit Groningen and Graduate School of Medical Sciences.

Kraai, IH

Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure

ISBN 978-90-367-9626-2 (printed version) ISBN 978-90-367-9627-9 (electronic version)

©2017 – Imke H. Kraai

All rights are reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means – electronic, mechanically, by photocopying, recording otherwise - without the written permission of the author.

Illustrations: M.L.M. Kraai – Morsink Thesis lay-out: I.H. Kraai Cover lay-out: Grafimedia Facilitair Bedrijf RUG

Printed by: Grafimedia Facilitair Bedrijf RUG



Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen op gezag van de rector magnificus prof. dr. E. Sterken en volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties.

De openbare verdediging zal plaatsvinden op

maandag 10 april 2017 om 14.30 uur

door

Imke Hilje Kraai

geboren op 18 maart 1980 te Groningen

Promotores

Prof. dr. J.L. Hillege Prof. dr. T. Jaarsma

Copromotores

Dr. K.M. Vermeulen Dr. M.L.A. Luttik

Beoordelingscommissie

Prof. dr. R. Sanderman Prof. dr. H.P. Brunner - La Rocca Prof. dr. W.J.M. Scholte op Reimer

Paranimfen

Ben Saleem

Maaike Slooff

Eltjo Kraai

Table of contents

		Page number
	General introduction and outline of the thesis	1
Chapter 1	Preferences of heart failure patients in daily clinical practice: quality of life or longevity? <i>European Journal of Heart Failure 2013;15:1113-1121.</i>	11
Chapter 2	"Not getting worse" a qualitative study of perception of Treatment goals in patients with heart failure <i>Submitted</i> .	37
Chapter 3	Perception of impairments by patients with heart failure. European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing 2016;15:178-185.	55
Chapter 4	Optimism and quality of life in patients with heart failure. Palliative & Supportive Care; accepted for publication 2016;	73
Chapter 5	Health-related quality of life and anemia in hospitalized patients with heart failure. International Journal of Cardiology 2012;161:151-155.	93
Chapter 6	Heart failure patients monitored with telemedicine: patient satisfaction, a review of the literature. Journal of Cardiac Failure 2011;17:684-690.	111
Chapter 7	The value of telemonitoring and ICT-guided disease management in heart failure: results from the IN TOUCH study. International Journal of Medical Informatics 2016;85:53-60.	129
	General discussion and future perspectives	153
	Summary	173
	Nederlandse samenvatting – Summary in Dutch	181
	Dankwoord – Acknowledgements	189
	About the Author	195

General introduction and outline of the thesis

Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure



Patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure

Introduction

How patients perceive their disease is increasingly recognized as an important aspect in the treatment trajectory for chronic diseases. In the search for new interventions to treat chronic diseases the focus was in the early days (and even nowadays) mainly on ways to reduce mortality and morbidity and to make efficient use of healthcare resources, which are mainly reflected by the number of (re)hospitalizations. The perception of the patient suffering from a chronic disease, the so-called patient-reported outcome (PRO), was rarely included in the evaluation of new interventions. Nowadays, the European Society of Cardiology, the American Heart Association and the United States Food and Drug Administration also recommend the use of patient-reported outcomes in the evaluation of interventions.¹⁻⁴ Gaining insights into patient-reported outcomes is important with respect to providing personalized care on a patient level, optimizing care on a population level and identifying the most appropriate patient-reported outcomes for clinical trials.

Patient-reported outcomes

Patient-reported outcomes are defined as: "any report of the status of a patient's health condition that comes directly from the patient without interpretation of the patient's response by a clinician or anyone else."⁴ The term patient-reported outcomes is an umbrella term that encompasses any outcome derived from patient reporting,^{5,6} such as health-related quality of life, number and severity of symptoms, physical performance,⁴ patient satisfaction, patient preferences,⁷ perceived control,⁸ disability or handicap, adverse events, treatment tolerability, treatment satisfaction⁹ and activities of daily living.⁵ Patient-reported outcomes can be used to measure the effectiveness of a treatment on the severity of a symptom or sign, the status of the disease from the patient's perspective, the patient's level of functioning, the patient's satisfaction with the treatment or the health status, the degree of health-related quality of life, the degree of disability, or the tolerability of the treatment.

The safety of an intervention can be measured by patient-reported outcomes as well, for example, by measuring the symptoms and signs experienced by the patient. By using patient-reported outcomes in clinical trials, the effect of interventions can be assessed from

a patient's perspective. This approach is particularly useful in interventions aimed at improving symptoms or functional status.¹⁰

Heart failure

Heart failure is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases among older adults. Patients with heart failure have to cope with a chronic and debilitating condition, often characterized by periods of worsening symptoms and hospitalization.¹¹ The prognosis is poor because heart failure generally cannot be cured and can only be managed by non-pharmacological treatment and/or pharmacological treatment, sometimes combined with surgery or implantation of a pacemaker or other device.

Although survival after the diagnosis of heart failure has improved in the past 30 years, the prospects of patients with heart failure remain poor, and no less than 50% of patients with heart failure will die within four years after diagnosis.^{11,12} Heart failure affects about 10% of men and 8% of women over the age of 60 years and the prevalence increases with age.¹² The prevalence varies between 2 and 3% and rises sharply at around 75 years of age, resulting in a prevalence of between 10 and 20% in patients aged 70 to 80 years.¹¹ In the last two decades, the heart failure population changed to a population with a higher percentage of very elderly patients, who have a higher number of comorbidities.¹³ As a result, the care for patients with heart failure has also changed. The first step towards organizing the treatment and care more efficiently involved the establishment of specialized heart failure outpatients clinics that are characterized by a strong collaboration between heart failure nurses and cardiologists^{14,15} and the introduction of so-called Disease Management Programs. These are multidisciplinary intervention designed to improve quality and cost effectiveness of care, using a systemic approach and employing multiple treatment modalities.^{16,17} The use of a Disease Management Program in heart failure clinics is currently part of standard care for patients with heart failure in several European countries.¹⁸

Nowadays the European Society of Cardiology and American Heart Association also recommend careful monitoring of heart failure patients by means of telephonic assessments or telemonitoring, in addition to regular visits to the outpatient clinic.¹⁹ Telemonitoring makes it possible to collect information about the patients' condition, for instance, blood pressure, heart rate, and weight, on a frequent basis without the patient having to leave his or her

home. This information can be used to treat the patient more effectively, to prevent hospitalization, and to improve the prognosis.

Patient-reported outcomes in heart failure trials

Two types of end points are considered to be clinically meaningful in the evaluation of treatment in patients with heart failure. The first type of endpoint evaluates changes in clinical status, for example, symptoms, health-related quality of life, well-being and functional capacity. The second type of endpoint evaluates the risk of a major clinical event,²⁰ for example, mortality, death or hospitalization. Until recently, and despite the treatment objectives, cardiovascular trials have been primarily oriented at endpoints that evaluate the risk of a major clinical event. However, it is clear that health-related quality of life in patients with heart failure is seriously reduced compared with both a normative population²¹ and patients suffering from other diseases.²² From a patient's perspective, the treatment of heart failure should be primarily aimed at the relief of symptoms and improvement in health-related quality of life.¹¹

In 2001, Packer proposed a clinical composite score that combines both types of endpoints.²⁰ This clinical composite score classifies each randomized patient as improved, unchanged, or worse, depending on the clinical response during the trial and the clinical status at the end of the trial.²⁰ The use of composite endpoints is recommended by the European Society of Cardiology Heart Failure Association.² A derivative of the composite score proposed by Packer is used in the African-American Heart Failure Trial (A-HeFT).^{23,24} The primary efficacy variable in the A-HeFT was a composite score of clinical outcomes including death, first readmission for heart failure, and change in health-related quality of life. In this scoring system, a sum score was calculated for each component, depending on whether or not a given event was experienced by the patient. This makes it possible to assign a numeric value to each study subject so that all patients contribute directly to the total group score.²³ The composite endpoint of the A-HeFT was also used in the Innovative ICT guided disease management combined with telemonitoring in outpatient clinics for chronic heart failure patients (IN TOUCH) trial.²⁵

The prevalence of patient-reported outcomes, such as health-related quality of life, in contemporary cardiovascular trials is 16%.¹⁰ This percentage is on the rise after the US Food and Drug Administration recommended its use in medical product development⁴ and because

of the aforementioned recommendations by the European Society of Cardiology² and the American Heart Association.¹ Furthermore, knowledge about patient-reported outcomes is vital for the delivery of optimal and personalized health-care to patients with heart failure. Use of patient preferences makes it possible to assess preference regarding quality of life or longevity. Research has shown that older patients may not tolerate or benefit from guideline-recommended heart failure therapies.²⁶

Therefore, it is important that the health-care provider knows the preferences of a patient with respect to quality of life or longevity, assesses and communicates prognoses, and discusses goals of care so as to deliver optimal healthcare to a patient.^{11,27} In addition, from the perspective of healthcare policy and research, which use patient-reported endpoints, knowledge of patient preferences regarding different interventions is an important component of rational decision making. These insights into the preferences of patients enable open and personalized discussions of preferences in treatment and care decisions, and can guide the future development of more patient-centred care.

Aims of this thesis

Research on new interventions generally uses traditional outcomes such as hospitalization and mortality. However, the question is whether patients with heart failure actually consider these traditional outcomes to be important or that they perceive other outcomes to be equally or even more important.

A key challenge in heart failure care is to understand and to find ways to help patients with heart failure to live a normal life within the limits imposed by their disease. Hence, knowledge of which treatment goals patients with heart failure prefer is vital. This knowledge can be used to identify the most appropriate patient-reported outcomes for clinical trials, to optimize care on a population level, and to personalize heart failure care on a patient level. This thesis aims to investigate the use of patient-reported outcomes in patients with heart failure and the perception of these outcomes by the patients themselves.

The specific aims of this thesis are:

- (1) To explore the preferences of patients with heart failure regarding quality of life versus longevity and to research patients' most important treatment goals. This is studied in chapter 1 and 2.
- (2) To explore the impairments in patients with heart failure and their effects on health-related quality of life. This is reported in chapter 3.
- (3) To identify other potential outcomes that influence health-related quality of life in patients with heart failure and that can be measured by new interventions. This is studied in chapter 4 and 5.
- (4) To explore the measurement of patient satisfaction with non-invasive telemedicine and to describe how satisfaction can be measured within a specific framework. This is described in chapter 6.
- (5) To explore the effect of telemonitoring in addition to an ICT-guided disease management system in patients with worsening heart failure; results of the IN TOUCH study. This is described in chapter 7.

References

1. Rumsfeld JS, Alexander KP, Goff DC, Jr, et al. Cardiovascular health: The importance of measuring patient-reported health status: A scientific statement from the american heart association. *Circulation*. 2013;127(22):2233-2249.

 Zannad F, Garcia AA, Anker SD, et al. Clinical outcome endpoints in heart failure trials: A european society of cardiology heart failure association consensus document. *Eur J Heart Fail*.
2013;15(10):1082-1094.

3. Anker SD, Agewall S, Borggrefe M, et al. The importance of patient-reported outcomes: A call for their comprehensive integration in cardiovascular clinical trials. *Eur Heart J*. 2014;35(30):2001-2009.

4. US department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: Patient-reported outcome measures, use in medical product development to support labelling claims. http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatory Information/Guidances/UCM193282.pdf. Accessed 29 September, 2010.

5. Cleeland CS, Sloan JA, ASCPRO Organizing Group. Assessing the symptoms of cancer using patient-reported outcomes (ASCPRO): Searching for standards. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2010;39(6):1077-1085.

6. Brettschneider C, Luhmann D, Raspe H. Informative value of patient reported outcomes (PRO) in health technology assessment (HTA). *GMS Health Technol Assess*. 2011;7:Doc01.

7. Oliver A, Greenberg CC. Measuring outcomes in oncology treatment: The importance of patient-centered outcomes. *Surg Clin North Am*. 2009;89(1):17-25, vii.

8. PROMS. Patient-reported outcomes measurement group, department of public health and primary care, medical sciences division, university of oxford; http://phi.uhce.ox.ac.uk/about.php. Accessed 07 November, 2011.

9. Varma R, Richman EA, Ferris FL,3rd, Bressler NM. Use of patient-reported outcomes in medical product development: A report from the 2009 NEI/FDA clinical trial endpoints symposium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2010;51(12):6095-6103.

10. Rahimi K, Malhotra A, Banning AP, Jenkinson C. Outcome selection and role of patient reported outcomes in contemporary cardiovascular trials: Systematic review. *BMJ*. 2010;341:c5707.

11. McMurray JJ, Adamopoulos S, Anker SD, et al. ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012: The task force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012 of the european society of cardiology. developed in collaboration with the heart failure association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2012;14(8):803-869.

12. Braunwald E. Heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2013;1(1):1-20.

13. Wong CY, Chaudhry SI, Desai MM, Krumholz HM. Trends in comorbidity, disability, and polypharmacy in heart failure. *Am J Med*. 2011;124(2):136-143.

14. Jaarsma T, Stromberg A. Heart failure clinics in europe. *Prog Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2000;15(2):67-68.

15. Jaarsma T, Tan B, Bos RJ, van Veldhuisen DJ. Heart failure clinics in the netherlands in 2003. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2004;3(4):271-274.

16. Takeda A, Taylor SJ, Taylor RS, Khan F, Krum H, Underwood M. Clinical service organisation for heart failure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;9:CD002752.

17. Ellrodt G, Cook DJ, Lee J, Cho M, Hunt D, Weingarten S. Evidence-based disease management. *JAMA*. 1997;278(20):1687-1692.

18. McAlister FA, Lawson FM, Teo KK, Armstrong PW. A systematic review of randomized trials of disease management programs in heart failure. *Am J Med*. 2001;110(5):378-384.

19. McMurray JJ, Adamopoulos S, Anker SD, et al. ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012: The task force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012 of the european society of cardiology. developed in collaboration with the heart failure association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2012;14(8):803-869.

20. Packer M. Proposal for a new clinical end point to evaluate the efficacy of drugs and devices in the treatment of chronic heart failure. *J Card Fail*. 2001;7(2):176-182.

21. Lesman-Leegte I, Jaarsma T, Coyne JC, Hillege HL, Van Veldhuisen DJ, Sanderman R. Quality of life and depressive symptoms in the elderly: A comparison between patients with heart failure and age- and gender-matched community controls. *J Card Fail*. 2009;15(1):17-23.

22. Juenger J, Schellberg D, Kraemer S, et al. Health related quality of life in patients with congestive heart failure: Comparison with other chronic diseases and relation to functional variables. *Heart*. 2002;87(3):235-241.

23. Franciosa JA, Taylor AL, Cohn JN, et al. African-american heart failure trial (A-HeFT): Rationale, design, and methodology. *J Card Fail*. 2002;8(3):128-135.

24. Taylor AL, Cohn JN, Worcel M, Franciosa JA, A-HeFT Investigators. African-American Heart Failure Trial. The african-american heart failure trial: Background, rationale and significance. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 2002;94(9):762-769.

25. de Vries AE, de Jong RM, van der Wal MH, Jaarsma T, van Dijk RB, Hillege HL. The value of INnovative ICT guided disease management combined with telemonitoring in OUtpatient clinics for chronic heart failure patients. design and methodology of the IN TOUCH study: A multicenter randomised trial. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2011;11:167.

26. Vigen R, Maddox TM, Allen LA. Aging of the united states population: Impact on heart failure. *Curr Heart Fail Rep*. 2012;9(4):369-374.

27. Jaarsma T, Beattie JM, Ryder M, et al. Palliative care in heart failure: A position statement from the palliative care workshop of the heart failure association of the european society of cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2009;11(5):433-443.