TIME USAGE AND HCP SATISFACTION AND PREFERENCE FOR SUBCUTANEOUS (SC) VERSUS INTRAVENOUS (IV) NATALIZUMAB: A MULTI-COUNTRY TIME AND MOTION (T&M) STUDY



Oliver-Smith P1, Acosta C1, Jomaa K2, Menon J3, Sandor R4, De Cock E5

1Biogen, Baar, Switzerland, 2Former employee of Biogen, Baar, Switzerland, 3Former employee of Syneos Health, Aarhus, Denmark, 4Former employee of Syneos Health, Hungary, 5Syneos Health, Barcelona, Spain

Objective

- To quantify active healthcare professional (HCP) time, patient time, HCP satisfaction and preference for natalizumab subcutaneous (SC) compared to intravenous (IV) in treating relapsingremitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS) patients.
- Conclusions
 This study showed substantial reductions in active HCP time, drug administration time, and chair time for natalizumab SC compared to IV in 7 sites across 3 countries
- HCPs who participated in the survey reported an increase in their level of satisfaction with SC and showed a clear preference for SC over IV.
 - Utilizing natalizumab SC instead of IV could lead to substantial savings in HCP time, which could be redeployed to other patient care activities. In centers operating at capacity, chair time being freed up could be used to treat new patients and therefore improve the efficiency of healthcare delivery.

Introduction

- Multiple sclerosis (MS) is a chronic autoimmune disease leading to inflammation, demyelination, development of lesions and progressive disability (Zuvich et al., 2009).
- In 2020, estimated prevalence of MS in Europe was 143 per 100,000 population (Walton et al. 2020), of which ~85% have RRMS (Ziemssen et al., 2020).
- Natalizumab SC, with efficacy and safety similar to natalizumab intravenous (IV) (Trojano et al.,2021), is expected to reduce preparation/administration duration and may increase convenience for patients and HCPs.
- Though prior research estimated reduced patient and HCP time associated with natalizumab SC vs. IV (Filippi et al, 2024), a lack of real-world data on time efficiencies associated with its use in Europe remains

Methods

Study Design

- Observational T&M study at 7 sites across 3 countries: France (3), Spain (3), and the United Kingdom (1).
- At each site, 1 HCP experienced in natalizumab IV and SC preparation and administration workflows completed a semi-structured interview and sitespecific Case Report Forms (CRFs) were built (Figure 1).
- Staff received standardized training, collected data using stopwatches, recorded data on paper CRFs, and transferred data to electronic CRFs (Excel).
- A generalized linear mixed model was used to analyse pooled data of total active HCP time and patient time and explore impact of administration route on both endpoints.
- HCPs who were involved in observed IV and SC preparation and/or administration processes (i.e., pharmacy staff, nursing staff) were eligible to complete a one-time satisfaction and preference survey (25 surveys completed).

Results

- In total, 102 IV observations were collected:
 - 38 in France (3 sites).
 - 49 in Spain (3 sites).
 - 15 in the UK (1 site).
- In total, 111 SC observations were collected:
- o 22 in France (3 sites).
- o 44 in Spain (3 sites).
- 15 in the UK (1 site).
- Mean total active HCP time (minutes) per visit was reduced by 42.5% across all sites (15.83 for IV vs. 9.11 for SC, p<0.0001); -29.3% (Spain), -48.1% (France), and -56.5% (UK); annual reduction in active HCP time per patient was 87.4 minutes (Figures 2 and 3).
- Mean patient chair time (minutes) per visit was reduced by 64.9% (95.18 for IV vs. 33.45 for SC, p<0.0001);
 -60.4% (Spain), -67.3% France), and -69.2% (UK); annual reduction in patient infusion chair time was 13 hours (21.4 for IV vs. 8.4 for SC) (Figure 4).
- riburs (21.4 loi 10 vs. 8.4 loi 3C) (Figure 4).
- Time for administration only (infusion or injection) was reduced by 93% (54.06 for IV vs. 3.66 for SC, <0.0001).
- Mean HCP satisfaction score for administration was higher for SC compared to IV (9.21 vs. 8.17; p=0.0256) (Figure 5). No statistical difference was seen for
- preparation (8.44 for IV vs. 9.17 for SC; p=0.1034). • 70% stated a preference for SC (30% "no preference") of which 56% "your strenge" and 10% "fair
- preference"), of which 56% "very strong" and 19% "fairly strong".
- "Ease of drug preparation" (2.86) and "Time needed for drug preparation" (3.29) are the most important reasons for HCP's preference of natalizumab SC preparation over IV.
- "Ease of drug administration" (2.31) and "Time needed for drug administration" (3.38) are the most important reasons for HCP's preference of natalizumab SC administration over IV (Figure 6).

Limitations

 This study was conducted in a small number of countries and centres and not meant to generate generalizable results. As with all T&M studies, results are only valid for the sites/settings where the study is conducted but can offer valuable insights into what may be expected at a broader country level.

igure 1. Natalizumab IV and SC Preparation a	nd Administration Tasks	
IV		SC
Preparation	Administration	Administration*
Collect natalizumab IV vial for preparation	Collect natalizumab infusion bag and consumables	Collect natalizumab SC and consumables
Prepare natalizumab infusion bag	Install venous catheter/ line flush/ blood draw	Natalizumab SC administration (2 injections)
Waste disposal after preparation	Infusion initiation	Waste disposal after administration
Record-keeping after preparation	Patient check-ups during infusion	Record-keeping related to natalizumab SC administration
Leave natalizumab infusion bag ready for collection	Infusion completion	Patient post-injection observation
	Waste disposal after administration	*SC preparation workflow is not applicable.
	Record-keeping related to natalizumab IV administration	
	Patient post-infusion observation	









Infusion initiation



*Assuming that natalizumab administration frequency is 13 times/year Arithmetic mean (from SAS output).







SA71 | ISPOR-EU (2024) International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research | November 17–20, 2024