

HRQL and REGULATORY ISSUES

Status Comparison of US and European Initiatives : *similarities and differences*

Dr. Kunle Adesina, *MAPI Values, UK;*
Dr Patrick Marquis, *MAPI Values, France*
ISOQOL Satellite meeting
Barcelona, 3 November 1999

OBJECTIVES

- 1 To compare existing supporting documents/guidances/recommendations proposed by different initiatives for appraisal and use of HRQL assessment for regulatory purposes
- 1 To highlight issues in need of further deliberation
- 1 To identify scope for collaboration between different initiatives

CURRENT INITIATIVES

EUROPE *(main target: EMEA + CS agencies)*

1 ERIQA

USA *(main target: FDA)*

1 PhRMA-HOWG

1 ISPOR

1 ISOQOL

COMPARISON CRITERIA (1)

1 **7 groups of topics**

- n Concept (terminology, definition)

- n Rationale for HRQL Evaluation

- n **Instruments**

- n Study design

- n Data Analysis

- n Interpretation

- n Conditions for HRQL Claims

COMPARISON CRITERIA (2)

1 2 CATEGORIES

n Issues addressed
by all initiatives

n Issues addressed
by only some
initiatives



–**with consistent**
recommendations

–**with different**
recommendations

–**with no**
recommendations

PRINCIPAL DATA SOURCES

1 **ERIQ**

Reference Document 6/10/99 (Int. doc.)

1 **ISOQOL**

*Recommendations on HRQL Research
Manuscript (Revicki et al.). 09/99 (Int. doc.)*

1 **PhRMA-HOWG**

*Summary/report 09/99
(following Washington Workshop 24-25/3/99 - Int. doc.)*

1 **ISPOR**

*Quality of Life Regulatory Guidance Supporting
Document 20/9/99 (Website doc.)*

DATA EXTRACTION CRITERIA

1 RECOMMENDATION =

n information found under the caption
“recommendation”

n information preceded by “..should/not be” or
“..must/not be” or “..is/is not recommended”

***information in phrases such as “could be”
or “may be” or “is desirable...” considered
as observations or opinions rather than
recommendations or guidelines

TOPIC 3 - INSTRUMENTS:

Summary of Issues

INSTRUMENTS	ERIQQA	PHRMA HOWG	ISPOR	ISOQOL
Requirements for instrument development <i>(steps, sequence and stages)</i>	x	✓✓	✓✓	x
Choice of questionnaire	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Psychometric requirements - generic statement	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
- minimal acceptable standards of evidence	✓✓	✓✓ (+/-)	✓	✓✓
Administrative requirements <i>(self- or interviewer; proxy, postal or phone Use of alternative versions or formats of instruments)</i>	✓✓	x	x	✓✓
Linguistic/cultural requirements <i>(recommended procedure)</i>	✓✓	x	x	x

Legend

✓✓ addressed with recommendations; ✓ addressed with no recommendations;

x not addressed at all

INSTRUMENTS

issue addressed by all /consistent recommendations

- 1 Need to justify the choice of questionnaire
- 1 Psychometric properties of instruments for use in QoL must be provided

INSTRUMENTS

issue addressed by all /different recommendations



1 Choice of measures

- would depend on trial objectives (*ISOQOL*)
- should be determined by the disease, the population, duration of trial and feasibility of use of instruments (*PhRMA-HOWG*)

1 Choice of specific rather than generic measures

- in trials where expected HRQoL gains are small (*ERIQA*)
- depending on adequate coverage of impact of disease and treatment (*ISPOR*)

INSTRUMENTS: Issues addressed by only some initiatives/+recommendations

- 1 Need to provide information on stages of instrument development
(*PhRMA-HOWG* and *ISPOR*)
- 1 Joint use of generic and specific instruments
(*PHRMA HOWG*)  *should not be mandatory*
- 1 List of “recommended” instruments
(*PHRMA HOWG*)  *should not be provided*

INSTRUMENTS: Issues addressed by only some initiatives/+recommendations

- 1 Minimal acceptable standards of evidence for validity and reliability given (*ERIQA and ISOQOL*)
 - n BUT different (see Cronbach alpha)
- 1 Administration of instruments (*ISOQOL and ERIQA*)
- 1 Need and criteria for linguistic validity (*ERIQA*)

INSTRUMENTS: CONCLUSIONS

- 1 Agreement on only few crucial issues, e.g. psychometric properties: generic statement on the need to provide evidence BUT discrepancy in minimal standards given (Cronbach alpha)
- 1 Several recommendations by only 1 or 2 groups

QUESTIONS RAISED

1 **Definitions:**

n recommendation/guidance/reference/
guidelines... ?

1 **Wording:**

n Level of clarity

n Level of precision

1 **Consensus** (soft?hard?)

SOME DEFINITIONS.....

1 **Guidance:**

n help and advice (*Collins Cobuild Dictionary*)

n act of guiding ==> guide: a person who directs another in his way (*Webster's*)

1 **Reference:**

n information or advice about a particular subject
(*Collins Cobuild Dictionary*)

n standard for reckoning (*Webster's*)

SOME DEFINITIONS.....

1 Recommendation:

- n advice which is given to someone as to what is the best thing to do (*Collins Cobuild Dictionary*)
- n a commendatory statement about as being fit or worthy (*Webster's*)

1 Guidelines:

- n piece of official advice about how to do something (*Collins Cobuild Dictionary*)
- n an indication or outline of future policy or conduct (as of a government) (*Webster's*)

A PATH...

GUIDANCE

REFERENCE



help/advice



GUIDELINES
Recommendations

OFFICIAL Step

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES (1)

- 1 Harmonisation (! cultural differences)
- 1 Increased collaboration between researchers in order to better define, agree and focus on the more crucial issues
- 1 Keep in mind main target: Regulators

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES (2)

Organisation of a HRQL
Consensus Conference
(October 2000 / 2 days)