APPLICABILITY OF MEASURING HEALTH RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE IN HEALTH CARE DECISION MAKING

Brno, 18 April 2024

Assoc.Prof. András Inotai

1

SEMMELWEIS University Center for Health Technology Assessment

CV András Inotai





Paradigm shift in medicine The emerging role of PROs

- Lower incidence of acute high mortality diseases (infectious diseases) increase life expectancy on developed (and) developing) countries
- Higher prevalence of chronic conditions with disability along with increasing life longevity
- Improving quality of life is becoming increasingly important besides improving life longevity
- Patient reported outcomes (PROs) information coming directly from patients on their own health status
 - Valuing health states based on PROs is relatively new and gaining increasing relevance in the field of Medicine
 - Psychometrics: Discipline in psychology to measure PROs new application in clinical trials
 MELVEIS University * András Inotai: Applicability of measuring IRQot in health care decision making //remedveis. hu

5





András Inotai

6



Applicability of measuring HRQoL in health care decision making Brno, 2024 April 18



Classification of measures									
	Profile	Index							
Generic measures	NHP, SF-36, SF-12	EQ-5D, SF-6D, HUI2, HUI3, QWB							
Specific measures	Kidney disease questionnaire	RAQoL, SGRQ							
SEMMELWEIS University © András In http://semmelweis.hu	notai: Applicability of measuring HRQoL in Brno, 2024 April 18	health care decision making							
0									

The best health Under each heading, please tick the ONE box that best describes your health TODAY. We would like to know how good or bad your This scale is numbered from 0 to 100. 100 98 90 85 100 85 80 80 80 80 80 45 MOBILITY 100 means the best health you can imagin EQ-5D-3L I have no problems in walking about 0 means the worst health you can imagine I have some problems in walking about Mark an X on the scale to indicate how your index I am confined to bed Now, please writ how below SELE-CARE I have no problems with self-care I have some problems washing or dressing myself EQ-VAS I am unable to wash or dress myself USUAL ACTIVITIES (e.g. work, study, hou I have no problems with performing my usual activities I have some problems with performing my usual activities humhmmhmmhmmh I am unable to perform my usual activities 35 30 PAIN / DISCOMFORT 25 I have no pain or discomfort 20 I have moderate pain or discomfort I have extreme pain or discomfort 10 ANXIETY / DEPRESSION 5 I am not anxious or depressed I am moderately anxious or depressed The worst health you can imagine I am extremely anxious or depressed András Inotai: Applicability of r Brno, 2024 April EuroQoL © EuroQol Group. EQ-5D[™] is a trade mark of the EuroQol Group



Value sets

- Health states can be described by combination of statements of health-related quality of life measures.
- 'Value sets' are numerical expressions of how preferred a health state is.
- Reference points used in value sets:

András Inotai:

- 0.0 death (health states considered worse than death have negative weights) 1.0 full health
- The provision of population-level health-related quality of life estimates (also known as 'population norms') is expected to improve the preciseness of patient-level clinical decision making, health economic and public health studies.
- However, preference towards these health states is influenced by culture, resulting in differences across populations.

Applicability of measuring HRQoL in health care decision making Brno, 2024 April 18

13

Dimension	Level	Coefficient (UK)	Coefficient (HU)	Liss the Chatson 14222 Life					
	Constant	0.081	0.020	Health Status: 11223 UK					
Mobility	1. level	0	0						
	2. level	0.069	0.022	calculated index value (utility):					
	3. level	0.314	0.648	1.0 - 0.081 - 0.036					
Self-care	1. level	0	0	0.122 0.226 0.260 = 0.255					
	2. level	0.104	0.051	- 0.123 - 0.236 - 0.269 = 0.255					
Lieuel estivities	1 level	0.211	0.555						
Usual activities	2 level	0.036	0.025	Health Status: 11223 HU					
	3. level	0.094	0.246						
Pain / discomfort	1. level	0	0	calculated index value (utility):					
	2. level	0.123	0.080	calculated index value (dtility).					
	3. level	0.386	0.338	1.0 - 0.020 - 0.025					
Anxiety /	1. level	0	0	- 0.080 – 0.258 = 0.617					
depression	2. level	0.071	0.078						
	3. Level	0.236	0.258	Drummond et. al. Methods for economic evaluation of health care programs Oxford University Press, 199					
	N3	0.269	-	Fanni Rencz et al (2020) Parallel valuation of EQ-5D-3L and EQ-5D-5L by time					
Meas. interval		-0.594 to 1	-0.865 to 1	trade-off in Hungary. VALUE IN HEALTH 23(9):1235-1245					

14



Population health survey 2000

- N=5503 (age 18+)
- Instrument: EQ-5D-3L
- Value set used to quantify EQ-5D-3L dimensional responses: UK
- Small sample size for age 65+

András Inotai:

• Update was necessary

MMELWEIS Universi :p://semmelweis.hu

Applicability of measuring HRQoL in health care decision making Brno, 2024 April 18





Dimensional responses											
dimension	mobility	self-care	usual activities	pain/ discomf	anxiety/ depr		mobility self-care		usual activities	pain/ discomf	anxiety/ depr
male 12-15	98.3	98.6	97.8	98.6	99.2	emale 12-15	99.6	99.8	99.1	97.3	97.4
male 16-17	99.2	97.9	97.9	99.2	92.6	female 16-17	100	100	100	99.2	94.9
male 18-24	97.7	98.3	96.9	96.8	93.5	female 18-24	97.7	97.9	98	95.1	94.7
male 25-34	98.4	99	98.3	94.1	94.2	female 25-34	98.3	99	97.9	94.8	94.2
male 35-44	96.8	99.8	98.6	92.7	94.2	female 35-44	98.2	99.1	98.2	91.8	93.2
male 45-54	92.9	98.2	94.6	86	90.2	female 45-54	92.8	98.2	94.9	84.8	87.5
male 55-64	83.1	96.6	88.6	71.7	85.1	female 55-64	81	95.2	87.1	69.3	81.2
male 65-74	63.1	90.3	79.9	55	80.2	female 65-74	60.7	90.5	76	46.6	70.1
male 75-84	41.5	75.4	56.8	34.3	68.3	female 75-84	35.8	76.3	54.8	26.8	58
male 85+	24.3	55.6	36.5	25.9 🗸	51.3	female 85+	18.7	48.9	31.8	16.9 🗸	50.9
% reporting no problems in each dimension Inotai et al. Population-level norm values by EQ-SD-3L in Hungary -											
SEMMELWE	IS University	٥	András Inc	otai:	Applicability	of measuring HRQoL i	n health care de	cision making			





Dimensional changes 2000 vs 2022												
	dimension	mobility	self-care	usualad	ual acpain/discanx/depr				self-care	usual ac	pain/disc	anx/dep
	level	L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3		L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3	L2+L3
2000	men 18-34	2.5	0.9	1.8	14.8	15	men 18-34	0.6	-0.4	-0.4	9.9	9
	men 35-64	17	4.8	13.2	35.8	30	men 35-64	8.6	3.1	L 	20.3	20.2
	men 65+	38.9	17.1	30.9	55.9	40.5	men 65+	-6.6	1	1.5	3.2	15.5
	women 18-34	3.2	0.3	2.8	18.2	26.1	women 18-34	1.3	-1.1	0.7	13.1	20.5
	women 35-64	20.7	5.3	15.6	48	44.5	women 35-64	11.8	2.9	L	> 30.5	32.1
	women 65+	49.4	19	35.5	68.4	54.3	women 65+	-2.1	1.1	0.4	5.6	18.6
2022	men 18-34	1.9	1.3	2.2	4.9	6						
	men 35-64	8.4	1.7	5.6	15.5	9.8						
	men 65+	45.5	16.1	29.4	52.7	25						
	women 18-34	1.9	1.4	2.1	5.1	5.6						
	women 35-64	8.9	2.4	6.3	17.5	12.4						
	women 65+	51.5	17.9	35.1	62.8	35.7						
% reporting any L2 or L3 problems in each dimension Red: improvement over 22 year, Blue: deterioration over 22 years a comparison of survey results from 2022 with 2000. Manuscript under review												
SEMMELWEIS University ° András Inotai: Appli http://semmelweis.hu Brno,						icability of me , 2024 April 1	easuring HRQoL in healt 8	h care decisio	n making			





























