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ABSTRACT

Objective Standard treatment of neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nAMD) is intravitreal injections (IVI) of antivascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) according to treat-and-extend (TnE). Observe-and-plan (OnP), a new regimen based on each individual’s relapse interval, was shown to be safe in treatment-naïve patients. In this study, we explore patient satisfaction and safety in nAMD when switching from TnE to OnP.

Methods and analysis 38 participants treated according to TnE for ≥12 months were included and switched from TnE to OnP with their last stable interval. Main outcome was patient satisfaction (Leeds Satisfaction Questionnaire). Secondary outcomes were best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA), central retinal thickness (CRT) before and 12 months after switch and number of monitoring visits and injections of anti-VEGF 12 months prior to and following switch.

Results Mean patient satisfaction was higher (3.7±0.5 SD) at 12 months after switch from TnE to OnP than before (3.6±0.5 SD, p=0.009, response rate 76%). BCVA and CRT were unchanged. Number of monitoring visits and injections were lower in the 12 months following than prior to switch (p<0.001).

Conclusion A switch from TnE to OnP in a non-treatment-naïve population resulted in higher patient satisfaction, while maintaining stable BCVA. This indicates that OnP may be applicable in the large group of nAMD patients that have received IVI for several years. OnP may alleviate the treatment burden on both individual and society of frequent clinical visits while increasing patient satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Current standard treatment of neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nAMD) is intravitreal injections (IVIs) of antivascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) according to treat-and-extend (TnE) protocol.1 Following 3 monthly doses of anti-VEGF TnE elongates treatment interval as the patient remains in a stable phase of the disease. The interval is subsequently augmented in 2-week increments up to 12 weeks interval. This protocol requires one clinical visit to an eye doctor per injection, leading to approximately eight visits/year in the first year of treatment.2 Observe-and-plan (OnP) is a protocol where the 3 monthly IVIs are followed by an observation phase where patients are controlled every month until disease relapse.3 The regimen is based on findings that propose the individual need for retreatment is stable over time.4 5 Treatment interval is determined by the number of weeks from loading dose until relapse minus 2 weeks and the patient then receives treatment three times prior to a new clinical visit. It is conceivable that such a treatment plan represent an improvement for the patient because of less demand for clinical visits and a treatment plan that is predictable beyond their next appointment. However, patient-related outcome measures such as satisfaction in patients switching from TnE to OnP has not earlier been described. In treatment-naïve patients OnP protocol reduces clinical...
visits in the first 2 years following treatment by a half while number of IVI and best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA) is unchanged compared with TnE.\textsuperscript{3,6} OnP, therefore, may reduce the clinical burden while maintaining patient safety in treatment-naïve nAMD patients. Furthermore, the application of OnP in a Nordic healthcare setting has not earlier been described. We hypothesised that OnP would lead to increased patient satisfaction, fewer clinical visits and comparable clinical outcomes in a population of nAMD patients that have been receiving IVI ≥12 months.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

To investigate this, we recruited participants with nAMD from the Department of Ophthalmology, St.Olav hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Norway to perform a switch in treatment protocol from TnE to OnP. The study took place between 2 January 2017 and 31 May 2018. The participants were consecutively included from January to May 2017 and followed for a year in a prospective study. Data from previous years were collected retrospectively from patient medical records. The Norwegian national health insurance scheme has near-universal coverage of the population, and this tertiary clinic covers the population in Sør-Trøndelag County in Central Norway; about 300,000 inhabitants. The inclusion criteria were having received IVI of anti-VEGF for ≥12 months (±4 weeks) prior to switch. Exclusion criteria were non-ability to give an informed consent. At time point 1, patients switched TnE to OnP protocol and were followed prospectively with their last stable interval between IVI (figure 1). According to the OnP strategy, treatment was given with three injections with the same interval they had before the switch. If their interval was 10, 12 or 16 weeks, they received two injections before new evaluations to avoid a too long period between clinical visits. They were then evaluated by a physician to determine if their macula was dry or wet on a clinical visit. The patients who presented with a relapse of intraretinal or subretinal fluid had their interval shortened by 2 weeks.

Patient-related outcome measures was measured with the Leeds Satisfaction Questionnaire (LSQ).\textsuperscript{7} The LSQ was sent to participants via regular mail to fill out in their home and return in an enclosed prepaid envelope prior to time points 1 and 2. Mean overall patient satisfaction score (from 1 to 5) averaged from six subgroups (A–F); (A) general satisfaction, (B) Provision of information, (C) empathy towards the patient, (D) technical quality and competence, (E) attitude towards the patient and (F) access and continuity. Scores >3 represent satisfaction, while <3 represent dissatisfaction. The LSQ has been translated and validated for a Norwegian population.\textsuperscript{8} Some of the questions were rephrased to fit an ophthalmological setting. Number of visits and IVI during 12 months (±4 weeks) prior to and following switch were obtained from patient medical records. BCVA was measured using the Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) chart\textsuperscript{9} at inclusion (time point 1) and at 12 months (time point 2) using an ETDRS-chart at 2 m distance by the same examiner. The central retinal thickness (CRT) was automatically generated by a Cirrus HD-OCT (High definition - Optical Coherence Tomography; Carl Zeiss Meditec AG, Jena, Germany).

**Patient involvement**

Patients were involved in the design and conduct of our research. A group of 10 patients with nAMD were asked to evaluate the questionnaire (online supplemental attachment 1). In general, they thought that the questions were relevant for their situation and did not have much to add.

**Statistical analyses**

Data are presented as mean±SD. Statistical analyses were performed using student’s paired t-test for normally distributed datasets. A \( p<0.05 \) was chosen as level of significance. With an estimated SD of 0.67 and a minimal clinical important difference of LSQ of 0.5, a minimum of 28 patients in each group would be needed to detect an improvement of 0.5 on LSQ with 80\% power (type II error) at the 5\% significance level (type I error).\textsuperscript{8}

**RESULTS**

The study enrolled 38 participants and 38 eyes (all caucasian, 23 women and 15 men). The mean age was 81.2±7.4 years. Prior to protocol switch participants had been treated according to TnE for a mean amount of 3.5±2.0 years. The average treatment interval on study inclusion was 7.34 weeks±3.95. The average treatment interval after 1-year follow-up was 7.34±4.23. We had two patients on 16-week interval, six patients on 12-week interval, one patient on 10-week interval, eight patients on 8-week interval, eight patients on 6-week interval, one patient on 5-week interval and 12 patients on 4-week interval.

Twenty-nine participants (76\%) answered the LSQ at both time point 1 and 2. The CRT and BCVA were obtained from all participants at both time points. Number of clinical visits and IVI in both year 1 and year 2 were obtained from 35 participants because 3 participants terminated treatment with anti-VEGF during year 2. Participants received either bevacizumab (n=12), ranibizumab (n=1) or aflibercept (n=25). In our study, only one of the patients switched drug during the follow-up time of 1 year. Overall patient satisfaction improved following switch from TnE to OnP protocol (\( p=0.009 \), table 1). There was no change in CRT or BCVA between time points 1 and 2 (table 2). The number of IVI was lower in year 2 (7.8±3.2) than in year 1 (9.1±2.8),
Table 1  Primary outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSQ (1-5, 1=lowest score, n=29)</th>
<th>Time point 1</th>
<th>Time point 2</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General satisfaction</td>
<td>3.8±0.8</td>
<td>4.0±0.6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provision of information</td>
<td>3.1±0.8</td>
<td>3.3±0.8</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Empathy towards the patient</td>
<td>3.2±0.8</td>
<td>3.4±0.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Technical quality and competence</td>
<td>4.3±0.6</td>
<td>4.3±0.6</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Attitude towards the patient</td>
<td>3.4±0.6</td>
<td>3.5±0.6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Access and continuity</td>
<td>3.6±0.6</td>
<td>3.8±0.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall score</td>
<td>3.6±0.2</td>
<td>3.7±0.2</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSQ; attachment 1 at time point 1 and time point 2. LSQ measures mean overall patient satisfaction score (from 1 to 5, 1=lowest score) averaged from six subgroups (A–F); (A) general satisfaction, (B) provision of information, (C) empathy towards the patient, (D) technical quality and competence, (E) attitude towards the patient and (F) access and continuity. Scores >3 represent satisfaction, while <3 represent dissatisfaction. Each subgroup was unchanged while the overall sum of subgroups was increased when measured at 12 months following a switch from treat-and-extend to observe and plan protocol. Results are presented as mean±SD.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study reporting patient reported outcome measures in a population of nAMD switching treatment regimen from TnE to OnP. The response rate in this study was high, at 76%. Limitations are that data from year 1 was collected retrospectively and that participants received all three available anti-VEGFs (bevacizumab, ranibizumab or aflibercept) which does not represent a uniform data material, but that nevertheless reflects the real-world setting of a clinical practice.

DISCUSSION

Participants had overall higher patient satisfaction following 12 months of OnP compared with 12 months of treatment according to TnE. Furthermore, clinical visits and IVI were fewer in the year after switch of treatment regimen while clinical outcomes were unchanged, indicating that the disease remains in a stable phase despite reduced surveillance. Our findings suggest that a switch to OnP is safe not only in treatment-naive nAMD as earlier reported but also in patients that have already received anti-VEGF because of nAMD for years. The latter group represent the largest proportion of AMD patients and the relevance of these results are therefore considerable.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study reporting patient satisfaction questionnaire. Each subgroup was unchanged while the overall sum of subgroups was increased when measured at 12 months following a switch from treat-and-extend to observe and plan protocol. Results are presented as mean±SD.

Table 2 Secondary outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time point 1 (n=38)</th>
<th>Time point 2 (n=38)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCVA</td>
<td>62.3±15.1</td>
<td>61.6±16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>227.5±47.7</td>
<td>233.1±55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (n=35)</td>
<td>Year 2 (n=35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical visits</td>
<td>5.5±1.7</td>
<td>3.5±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVI</td>
<td>9.1±2.8</td>
<td>7.8±3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best-corrected ETDRS visual acuity (BCVA) and CRT did not change from time point 1 to time point 2. During the 12 months prior to switch from TnE to OnP number of clinical visits and IVI was higher than during 12 months after switch of protocols. Results are presented as mean±SD.

A concern in OnP is the possibility of late recurrence following the long initial observation period. Gianniou et al reported two such late recurrence during a 2-year observation period of 115 eyes, while Parvin et al reported no study-regimen related complications during their 2-year observation of 112 eyes following an OnP regimen. In this study design, an initial observation period is not applied since the switch was performed using the participants last stable interval. A randomised controlled trial is needed to answer whether there is an increased risk of late recurrence in OnP compared with TnE.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that a switch from TnE to OnP regimen results in higher patient satisfaction, with stable functional results. This implies that OnP is applicable not only in treatment-naive patients, but also in the large group of patients that have received IVI for years. OnP may alleviate the burden on both individual and society of frequent clinical visits while increasing patient satisfaction.
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Skjema er utfylt ved besøknr:

TILFREDSHET MED BEHANDLING OG OPPFØLGING

Dette spørreskjemaet er utviklet for at du kan gi oss en helhetsvurdering om den behandlingen og oppfølgingen du får ved Øye poliklinikk. Det er ikke noe rett eller galt svar. Vi er interessert i dine meninger og oppfatninger enten de er GODE eller DÅRLIGE.


Sett et kryss i den boksen du synes stemmer mest overens med din oppfatning. Sett kun et kryss for hver påstand.

Ha i tankene at det er dine meninger vi ønsker å finne ut av, så du bør fylle ut skjemaet på egen hånd, evt med hjelp av en pårørende hvis du har behov for det. Vennligst tenk på den nåværende behandling og oppfølging, og gi oss dine meninger om den.
Påstand

Det virker ikke som de hører på noe av det jeg har å si under konsultasjonen.

Jeg føler at jeg er i gode hender når jeg kommer til poliklinikken.

Den personen jeg møter på poliklinikken er interessert i familien min.

Jeg får alltid en god forklaring på hvorfor jeg skal ta de ulike undersøkelsene.

Det er enkelte ting ved behandlingen og oppfølgingen som kunne vært forbedret.

Jeg blir fortalt alt jeg ønsker å vite om medicinene jeg får for min øyesykdom.

I løpet av konsultasjonen blir jeg gitt lite eller ingen medisinsk forklaring på min øyesykdom.

Bivirkninger av medisiner blir sjelden diskutert ved konsultasjonen.

Den personen som behandler meg på poliklinikken vet hva han/hun snakker om.

Å komme til poliklinikken er ikke en stressende situasjon.

Jeg får gode råd om hvordan jeg skal mestre min øyesykdom.

Uansett hvor lenge jeg må vente på poliklinikken, så er det verdt det.

Jeg er fornøyd med behandlingen og oppfølgingen jeg får ved poliklinikken.

Dersom jeg har et problem er det ingen å ta kontakt med på poliklinikken.

Jeg får sjelden beskjed om hvorfor det må nye undersøkelser av meg, for eksempel bildetaking.

Mine spørsmål blir besvart slik at det er vanskelig å forstå.

Jeg synes det er vanskelig å snakke om ting som bekymrer meg når jeg er på poliklinikken.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken viser ingen interesse for hvordan sykdommen påvirker familien min.
Påstand

Det er lett å få ny time hvis jeg trenger å komme tilbake til poliklinikken.

Jeg får så mye tid jeg trenger til konsultasjonen.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken virker av og til usikker på hva han/hun gjør.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken er ikke så grundig som han/hun burde være.

Jeg får veldig lite informasjon om hvordan jeg skal mestre sykdommen.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken forstår ikke hvordan det er å ha en øyesykdom.

Det virker som om personen jeg møter på poliklinikken skjønner hvordan det er å ha en øyesykdom.

Jeg føler at jeg blir behandlet som et menneske og ikke en sykdom.

Jeg har ikke tiltro til den personen som behandler meg.

Jeg er oppfordret til å stille spørsmål om sykdommen min.

Dersom jeg hadde et problem, ville det være vanskelig å få snakke med noen på telefonen.

Jeg får sjelden spørsmål om hvilken behandling jeg ville foretrekket.

Hvis jeg hadde problemer med sykdommen, ville det være lett å få råd over telefon.

Mine følelser rundt behandlingen blir tatt i betraktning.

Dersom jeg hadde et medisinsk problem, er jeg sikker på at det ville bli undersøkt når jeg kom på poliklinikken.

Det blir gjort endringer i behandlingen uten at jeg får noen forklaring.

Jeg får vanligvis beskjed om eventuelle bivirkninger av medisinene jeg bruker.

Hvis jeg har et problem med sykdommen min, blir jeg oppmunrtet til å ta kontakt med poliklinikken.

Absolutt enig | Litt enig | Vet ikke | Litt uenig | Absolutt uenig
---|---|---|---|---

Pas.nr. 45444
Påstand

Den behandlingen og oppfølgingen jeg får ved poliklinikken er omtrent perfekt.

Jeg møter sjelden den samme personen når jeg kommer til kontroll.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken virker dyktig i jobben sin.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken snakker ikke bestandig fornuftig.

Personen jeg møter på poliklinikken har det noen ganger for travelt til å bruke nok tid på meg.

Når jeg kommer på poliklinikken får jeg vite alt jeg ønsker om sykdommen min.

Det er vanskelig å få time hvis jeg trenger den raskt.

Stort sett møter jeg den samme personen på poliklinikken hver gang.

Vanligvis må jeg vente lenge utenfor behandlerens kontor før jeg får komme inn.