Adherence issues in Diabetes Treatment: How can Acceptance Measurement Help Understanding Patients' Concerns and Working on Solutions?

Wiederkehr Sandra¹, PhD, de Bock Elodie¹, PhD, Chekroun Michael², Arnould Benoit¹, PhD ¹Patient-Centered Outcomes, Mapi, Lyon, France, ²Carenity, Paris, France

BACKGROUND

- Management of most chronic conditions requires the patients to take long-term treatments.
- Lack of adherence and persistence are major barriers to treatment efficacy.
- Patients' behaviour and attitude toward their treatment are hypothesised to result from their complex evaluation of the risk-benefit ratio of their treatment.
- Measuring patients' acceptance of their medication can help better understand and predict patients' behaviour towards treatment.

OBJECTIVES

This study aimed at evaluating the levels of acceptance and adherence of type 1 and type 2 diabetes patients (T1D and T2D) in real life using a patient online European community.

METHODS

Study design

- An observational, cross-sectional study was conducted through the French, English, German, Spanish and Italian Carenity platforms between Oct 2015 and Feb 2016¹.
- The Carenity platform is a global online patient community in which both patients and carers, concerned by a chronic disease, can share their experience, find basic tools for health follow-up and contribute to medical research by participating in online RWE studies.
- Patients included in this analysis were adults suffering from T1D or T2D and currently receiving treatment.

Assessments

- All patients connecting to the Carenity platform were invited to complete an online questionnaire including:
- Questions on demographics, chronic disease and medication.
- The ACCEptance by the Patients of their Treatment (ACCEPT®) questionnaire^{2,3}:
- o 25 items covering six dimensions corresponding to treatment-attributes.
- o Scores range from 0 to 100 with higher score indicating greater acceptance.
- The Morisky Medication Adherence Scale (MMAS-8®)⁴:
- o 8-item scale with a score ranging from 0 to 8 with the following interpretation: 0 to <6 (low adherence),
 6 to <8 (moderate adherence) and 8 (high adherence).

Statistical analysis

- Descriptive statistics were used to describe the patient population and the ACCEPT® and MMAS-8® scores.
- The distribution of adherence and acceptance scores across T1D and T2D treatments was analysed.
- Pearson correlations between the Acceptance General score, MMAS-8® adherence score and ACCEPT® treatment-attributes scores were calculated.

RESULTS

Population (Figure 1 and Table 1)

Among the 1,213 diabetic patients included in the analysis, 267 had T1D and 946 had T2D.

~ 93,000 patients registered on

Level of acceptance: Per diabetes type (Figure 3)

- T1D patients showed better general acceptance than T2D.
- T2D patients showed better scores than T1D patients indicating better acceptance in Medication Inconvenience, Regimen Constraints and Long Term treatment-attributes.
- T2D and T1D were comparable in terms of Acceptance of their treatment Side Effects.
- The domain where patients reported lowest scores was:
- o Acceptance/Long-term treatment for T1D and T2D



Box = interquartile (Q3-Q1); + = mean; - = median; upper and lower bars = min and max values. Red stars indicate significance (p<0.05).

Figure 3: Acceptance General score and ACCEPT treatment-attributes scores per diabetes type (N=1,213)

Level of acceptance: Per treatment class (Figure 4)

- Patients taking blood glucose lowering drugs showed lower general acceptance and lower effectiveness acceptance than
 patients taking insulins or analogues.
- In contrast, they showed better Acceptance of their Medication Inconvenience, Long Term, Regimen Constraints and Side Effect than those taking insulins or analogues.





Figure 1: Patient disposition

Table 1: Description of the population (N=1,213)

| T1D | | T2D | Total | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | (N=267) | (N=946) | (N=1,213) | |
| Gender (% male) | 39% | 53% | 50% | |
| Mean age (years) | 48.7 | 61.4 | 58.6 | |
| Time since diagnosis (%< 5 years) | 19% | 31% | 28% | |
| Blood glucose lowering drugs (%) / Insulins & analogues (%) | 15% / 85% | 79% / 21% | 65% / 35% | |

Level of adherence: Per diabetes type and treatment class (Figure 2)

• Similar adherence level regardless of diabetes type or class of treatment was observed.



Box = interquartile (Q3-Q1); middle bar= median; upper and lower bars= observed min and max values

Figure 2 : MMAS-8 adherence scores in diabetic patients (N=1,213)

An ICON plc Company

For more information, please contact

Elodie de Bock, edebock@mapigroup.com, www.mapigroup.com

| General | Medication Inconvenience | Long Term | Regimen Constraints | Side Effects | Effectiveness |
|---------|------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Blood alucose lowering drugs | (n=788) | | 25) | |

Box = interquartile (Q3-Q1); + = mean; - = median; upper and lower bars = min and max values. Red stars indicate significance (p<0.05).

Figure 4: Acceptance General score and ACCEPT treatment-attributes scores per treatment class (N=1,213)

Link between general acceptance, adherence and ACCEPT treatment-attributes (Table 2)

- General Acceptance was primarily correlated with Acceptance/Effectiveness (r=0.61).
- Adherence was more correlated with the practical attributes (i.e. Regimen Constraints) than by the perception of a treatment's effectiveness.
- Correlation between General Acceptance and Adherence was found to be significant, but low (r=0.30).

Table 2: Key Pearson correlation coefficients (N=1,213)

| | Acceptance/Medication | Acceptance/ | Acceptance/Regimen | Acceptance/Side | Acceptance/ | Acceptance/ | Adherence |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|
| | Inconvenience | Long Term | Constraints | Effects | Effectiveness | General Score | Score |
| Acceptance/General Score | R = 0.06 | R = 0.26 | R = 0.24 | R = 0.29 | R = 0.61 | 1 | R = 0.30 |
| | p=0.04 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | | p<0.0001 |
| Adherence Score | R = 0.21 | R = 0.37 | R = 0.46 | R = 0.15 | R = 0.28 | R = 0.30 | 1 |
| | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | p<0.0001 | |

Notes: Correlations were based on a sample that varied between 1,201 and 1,213 patients. The dimension Acceptance/Numerous Medication is not represented since an ordinal variable.

| Correlation between 0 and 0.2 |
|---------------------------------|
| Correlation between 0.2 and 0.4 |
| Correlation between 0.4 and 0.7 |

CONCLUSIONS

- Acceptance and adherence levels were relatively high in diabetic patients but far from ideal.
- General Acceptance level was higher in patients receiving Insulin and analogues than in patients receiving blood glucose lowering drugs.
- o But no significant difference in Adherence levels.
- Insulin and analogues treatments were better than blood glucose lowering drugs in Acceptance/Effectiveness.
- Blood glucose lowering drugs were better than Insulin and analogues in Acceptance/other attributes (Medication inconvenience, Long-Term, Regimen constraints, Side Effects).
- Acceptance and Adherence are two related but different constructs.
- o Acceptance levels showed more contrasts than Adherence levels.
- o In diabetes, general acceptance was driven by efficacy, while current adherence was driven by regimen constraints.

REFERENCES

- 1. de Bock E et al. ISPOR 19th Annual European Congress. 2016
- 2. Marant C et al. Patient. 2012;5:239-249.
- 3. Arnould B et al. Patient. 2017;10(1):81-92
- 4. Morisky DE et al. J Clin Hypertens. 2008;10(5):348-54

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all patients who participated in this study.

