#### KU LEUVEN



## New tools to detect medication non-adherence

*The hospital pharmacist and the e-health revolution* 

Jasper Vanhoof, MScN, PhD-student

Department of Public Health and Primary Care Academic Centre for Nursing and Midwifery





## I have no disclosures related to this presentation



# The important thing is not to stop questioning...



KU LEUVEN

- 1. Modern tools are able to reveal non-adherence in all patients: **True False**
- Skipping medication doses is a more prevalent problem than patients stopping the medication regimen completely: True - False
- 3. Adherence measurement should become part of standard practice of all pharmacists: **True False**

#### Increasing prevalence of chronic diseases



Projected Growth In Population With Chronic Conditions, 2013-25

### Treatment after chronic disease onset: A complex regimen



#### The hidden healthcare system



health care system. The other 8755 hours are my responsibility"

### Medication taken by kidney Tx patient during one year (>4000 pills)



Ambühl P. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2005; 20:1267

#### **Overview** of presentation





<u>Medication Adherence</u>: The process by which patients take their medications as prescribed



# Non-persistence: more common than implementation problems!

200 Time (days) 300

16,907 participants from 95 clinical studies

Blaschke. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol 2012;52:275 - 301

### **Overview** of presentation



#### Some questions to be considered

- 1. Which aspect of medication adherence do you want to assess?
- 2. In which context do you want to assess adherence?
  - Routine clinical care
  - Trial setting: Phase 1 → 4 5
  - Cohort studies / Registries
- 3. What is the purpose of the adherence assessment?
  - Observational
  - Intervention ... or a combination?
- 4. What type of data is most suitable?
  - Objective or subjective data
  - Rich or sparse data
- 5. Which tools does the patient want to use?
- 6. Which resources do you have available?

#### **Overview** of presentation



#### Adherence measurement methods





#### **Electronic** Monitoring (EM)

PHARMACOLOGY	ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE published: 13 March 2013 doi: 10.0396/fphic.2013.000.31	-

Polymedication Electronic Monitoring System (POEMS) – a new technology for measuring adherence



#### Medminder (multiple dosing system)



<complex-block>

Eisenberger. Transplantation 2013;96(3):245 - 250



#### iPhones with capsule photo application



First pilot work to test reliability and accuracy in small samples

Galloway. J Addict Med. 2011;5:170-174; Dayer. J Am Pharm Assoc. 2003;53(2):172-181 Pal. Drug and Alcoh Depend. 2015; 146,e60 KU LEUVEN



#### **Pharmacy Refill Data**

- Usability/Feasibility issues • Did the patient visit the • Gives objecti overall adhere patient disc Patient discont. Collecting medication ≠ ingestion
- → Patient visit can be ideal situation for follow-up conversation (and adherence intervention)
- → Pharmacist as adherence manager!?

Importance of open and non-judgemental communication!

Osterberg. New Eng J Med 2005;353:487-497



#### What are good self-report instruments?





# The important thing is not to stop questioning...

- Modern tools are able to reveal non-adherence in all patients: 11/2e(-False)
- Skipping medication doses is a more prevalent problem than patients stopping the medication regimen completely:
   False
- 3. Adherence measurement should become part of standard practice of all pharmacists: True Fise

**KU LEUVEN** 

#### Take home messages!

- Monitoring medication adherence is crucial in chronically ill patients
- The choice of measurement method should depend on context, purpose, type of data, resources AND user perspective
- Many (electronic) measurement methods are available, yet need to be further tested
- Communication with patients should always be open and non-judgemental
- To get a comprehensive view on medication adherence, a combination of methods is recommended



#### jasper.vanhoof@med.kuleuven.be

KU LEUVEN



#### Home fingerprick sampling



Illness	Mean (%)	Random effects 95% Cl
HIV	88.3	(78.9; 95.2)
Arthritis	81.2	(71.9; 89.0)
Cancer	79.1	(75.9; 84.2)
Cardiovascular diseases	76.6	(73.4; 79.8)
End-stage kidney disease	70.0	(56.8; 81.6)
Lung disease	68.8	(61.1; 76.2)
Diabetes	67.5	(58.5; 75.8)

#### Mean adherence across diseases

#### Mean adherence to medication across 17 illnesses: 79.4%

DiMatteo. Med Care. 2004;42(3):200-209

tion time for distillation (distant) duplayed in the still times 02-00 htt 12 (\*\*\* ÷ 0 22:00 hrs 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 18:00 htt 0 0 0 0 1 54 100 lins  $\odot$ 12 am 4 10100 hts 00:00 hm 0 0 02:00 hts 日常 ę 훞 ż ŝ Fri 6 Tue 10 Fri 13 Aug. Sat 7 Sun 8 Mon 9 Wed 11 Thu 12 \* 00:18 O 15:17 O 16:47 \* 01:47 O 19:33 O 21:25 O 05:06 O 23:54 O 18:40 \* 01:58 O 13:08 \* 21:13 O 15:48 O 17:31 O 02:55 O 14:00 O 18:40 0 18:36 \* 22:27 \* 22:09 \* 23:47

FIGURE 2 | Adherence report over 1 week after inclusion (August 2010). The electronic panels and was handwal out on Friday moming, with the finat cavity to be opened on the Finaly exercise). The spots based graph reflect a pushing through of all drugs contained in one distinct cavity as recorded with date and time (see table) by the electronic wires in the film. Morring and evening does are highlighted. Bedtime does could be taken when needed. Key:  $\odot \circ$ , morning dorse;  $\odot \circ$ , evening doese;  $\circ *$ . Bedtime doese.



**KU LEUVEN** 

Arnet. Front in Pharmac. 2013;4(26):1-6

16

#### Packing interventions to increase medication adherence: systematic review

- 52 Reports (N=22 858)
- Selection criteria
  - Pill-boxes or blister packaging interventions
  - · Primary study characteristics reliably coded
  - Outcomes reliably coded
- Results

71% adherent in treatment- 63% adherent among control grou

Interventions most effective with blister packs and when were delivered in pharmacies. Intervention less effective with elder and those with cognitive impairment.

Conn et al. Current Medical Research & Opinion 2014; 31: 145-160.

### Segmental hair analysis of hair samples

Analysis of Cyclosporin A in Hair Samples From Liver Transplanted Patients

Alexander Müller, Dr. rer. nat.,\* Hilke Jungen,\* Stefanic Iwersen-Bergmann, Dr. rer. nat.,\* Martina Sterneck, Prof. Dr. med.,† and Hilke Andresen-Streichert, Dr. rer. nat.\*



#### **Definition** of adherence

Adherence =

"The extent to which the person's behavior (taking medications, following a

recommended diet and/or executing lifestyle changes) corresponds with the

agreed recommendations from a health care provider"1

Medication nonadherence =

"Deviation from the prescribed medication regimen sufficient to influence

adversely the regimen's intended effect"<sup>2</sup>

1. Sabate. World Health Organization, 2003; 2. Fine. Am J Transplant. 2009;9:35-41

# Intentional vs non-intentional non-adherence

• Intentional non-adherence:

Refers to patients consciously choosing not to skip or alter dosages or stop taking the medication overall driven often by inadequate health beliefs such as conviction that drugs are toxic or beliefs that medications are not effective.

• Un-intentional non-adherence: Refers to situations where non-adherence it is not deliberate and is mostly related to forgetfulness

> Clifford et al. <u>J Psychosom Res</u> 2008; 64: 41–46 Wroe A. <u>J Behav Med</u> 2001; 25(4): 355–372 Griva et al. <u>Ann. Behv. Med. 2012 Au SW 158865</u>

**KU LEUVEN** 

### Automatic Compilation of Dosing History Data (Electronic Monitoring)



#### **Meta analysis: EM Adherence Studies**

Difference in adherence outcome measures by intervention component						, 	Percent number of studi with significant intervention effect		
TRT simpl	n=18	H	•	]			p =0.37	Ē.	70.6% of 17 studies that reported p-value
Coon-Educ	11#36	F		1	- 7	8	o p=0.14	8	64.3% of 28 studies
dhere	nce	19.89 if EM	<mark>%</mark> [95 was	% CI:1 part c	0.7– of in <sup>:</sup>	28.9 terv	] increa ention	ise i VS	in control group
dhere Tech rem	nce	19.89 if EM	% [95 was	% CI:1 part c	0.7– of in <sup>:</sup>	28.9 terv	] increa ention	ise i VS	in control group 46.7% of 15 studies
dhere Tech rem Tech equip	nce **20	19.8 if EM	% [95 was p	% CI:1 part c	0.7– of in	28.9 terv	] increa rention p=0.22 p=0.59	ise i VS	in control group 46.7% of 15 studies 66.7% of 9 studies

	MEMS cap	Helping Hand	Dosepak Reusable electronic	Cerepak
Device	8	-	<b>etter 4</b> 0 m	
Recorded events	Package monitors and tracks the open/close of the drug container	Package monitors and tracks the removal of the blister from Helping Hand	Package monitors and tracks the open/close of the inner card fold over panel	Package monitors and tracks the removal of pill from the blister
Logistics Production	Manufacturing, distribution, inventory remains exact same Standard HDPE bottles	Manufacturing, distribution, inventory remains exact same Initiation cost to adapt the device to the blister	Manufacturing, distribution, inventory remains exact same Electronics are integrated with package downstream of manufacturing	Electronics and traces are integrated during manufacturing Drastic Increase in manufacturing complexity and costs
Logistics Delivery and use	Caps and packaging are shipped separately Typically: One cap is used during the monitored period. Specialty Pharmacy, Clinical Site staff, patient instructed to screw the MEMS cap on the drug container	Helping Hands and packaging are shipped separately Typically : One Helping Hand is used during the monitored period. Specialty Pharmacy, Clinical Site staff, patient instructed to slip the bilster in the Helping Hand and to replace it when the blister is empty	Electronics and Packaging are shipped separately Typically : One reusable electronic is used during the monitored period. Staff attaches Electronic Module to Dosepak Staff instructs patients on how to detach electronics from "old" Dosepak after last dose taken and reattach it o "new" Dosepak	Electronically enabled packages are shipped Several electronically enabled blister are used during the monitored period. Staff instructs patients to keep the blisters after their use Need to merge data from several devices
Cost	+	+	++	++++
NeirIdIKS				added value. Adapted to complex regimens (e.g. Hep C) or titration in clinical trial

#### **Proteus Raisin System for Adherence Monitoring**

- PRS is a novel technology for monitoring treatment adherence in transplant patients.
  - It uses a tiny ingestible micro-sensor (IEM) of 1x1x 0.45 mm that can be combined with a drug.
  - The IEM consists of an integrated circuit coated with thin layers of Cu and Mg forming a biogalvanic battery in presence of water.
  - After ingestion the IEM becomes activated for a few minutes once in contact with gastric electrolyte and communicates within the body fluids to a battery-powered, unmedicated adhesive skin patch sensor (process similar to EKG)







#### How to "catch" non-adherent patients?

# Starting point: **Measurement** of non-adherence (medication as example)



Osterberg. New Eng J Med 2005;353:487-497

Directly observed therapy	Most accurate	- Patient can discard pills - Impractical for routine use
Level of medicine or metabolite in blood	Objective	<ul> <li>Variations in metabolism</li> <li>"White coat" adherence</li> <li>Depending on half-life of drug and drug-drug interactions</li> <li>No info on timing of intake</li> <li>Expensive</li> </ul>
Biological marker in blood	Objective	- Expensive

## **Direct** methods of measuring

Osterberg. New Eng J Med 2005; 353:487-497

Os

**Indirect** methods of measuring

NO LEOVE

Test	Advantages	Disadvantages		
Pill count	Easy to perform	- Pill dumping		
Prescription refill	Easy to obtain	<ul> <li>Not equivalent of ingestion</li> <li>Closed pharmacy system</li> <li>required</li> </ul>		
Clinical judgement	Easy to perform	- Covert behavior not easy to detect		
Electronic monitoring	Precise, continuous Tracks dynamics of taking medication (taking, timing, dosing)	<ul><li>Expensive</li><li>Ingestion not proven</li></ul>		
Self-report	Simple Inexpensive	- Overestimates adherence - Recall bias		
erberg. New Eng J Med 2005; 353:4	KU LEUVEN			

### What are good self-report instruments?

Systematic review on questionnaires that are:

- ✓ Easy to complete
- Easy to score and interpret
- Showing good reliability and validity
  - 1) Measuring both taking and regularity of medication intake
  - 2) Able to detect minor deviations from the prescribed regimen taking less than 95% of the tablets deviation of > 2 hours from the prescribed timing
  - 3) Sensitive to change (e.g. over time; after intervention)

Basel Assessment of Adherence Scale for Immunosuppressants (BAASIS)
 Transplant Adherence Questionnaire (TAQ)

Available for free after registering at transplant360.com

Dobbels. Transplantation. 2010;90:205-219





## Understanding the drivers of non-adherence: a multifaceted problem



#### **Examples of risk factors**



#### Take home messages!

- Actively involving patients and focusing on skills development, rather than on passively educating them, is a promising pathway
- Self-management support should be needs-driven and contain a 'system approach', involving patients, partners and an interdisciplinary team
- Still a lot of room for improvement with regard to Tx selfmanagement intervention research
- Self-management support training should become part of the core curriculum of all healthcare professionals!

	Electronic detection of package entry	Smart ingestible sensor (pill)	Photographic documentation of drug intake	Electro
Requires drug reformulation	No	Yes; need to reestablish acceptable stability parameters	No	No
Level of patient involvement	Low; requires the patient to take medications out of the package	High: requires skin patch maintenance	High: requires the patient to take and transmit a picture of each drug intake	High; requir to timely re
Safety-related issues	No	Yes: skin reactions to transdermal patch <sup>36–38</sup> , unresolved long-term safety	No	No
Applicable to a wide variety of formulations	Yes; oral medications, injectables, pumps, topical formulations; and so on	No; limited to solid oral medications	Yes; may become challenging if administration requires two hands	Yes; oral me injectables, formulation
Reliability	High; susceptible to false- positive detection (<3%)	High; susceptible to false- negative detection (3-5%)	Medium; makes patient's routine more complex	Medium; m routine mor
Patient intrusiveness	Low	High	High	High
Patient acceptability	High	Low <sup>37</sup> to medium <sup>36</sup>	Medium	Medium

#### Table 1 Comparison of different electronic monitoring methods



