Decision aids for patients with primary openangle glaucoma: abridged secondary publication

BNK Choy *, MM Zhu, WWT Lam, JWH Shum

$K \to Y \quad M \to S \ S \ A \ G \to S$

- 1. Decision aids can improve disease knowledge, increase patient confidence in medication adherence, and reduce decisional conflict among patients with primary open-angle glaucoma in Hong Kong.
- 2. Shared decision-making should be emphasised in the management of primary open-angle glaucoma because empowering patients to participate in their care can result in better decision-making outcomes.

Hong Kong Med J 2024;30(Suppl 5):S14-6

HMRF project number: 15161691

¹ BNK Choy, ¹ MM Zhu, ² WWT Lam, ³ JWH Shum

- ¹ Department of Ophthalmology, School of Clinical Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
- ² School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
- ³ Department of Ophthalmology, Caritas Medical Centre, Hong Kong SAR, China
- * Principal applicant and corresponding author: bonniechoynk@gmail.com

Introduction

Glaucoma is the leading cause of blindness in Hong Kong, representing 23% of new registrations of permanent blindness in 2001-2002. The prevalence of primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) in Asia is approximately 5%.¹ POAG is a chronic disease requiring long-term treatments that include eyedrops, laser, and surgery; all of which aim to reduce intraocular pressure.

Management decisions are usually made by clinicians. The choice of treatment primarily depends on clinicians' preferences, which may not be most appropriate for patients' needs. Shared decisionmaking emphasises patient autonomy, informed consent, and patient empowerment. Patient decision aids (PDAs) are tools designed to promote shared decision-making when multiple treatment options are available, each displaying benefits and harms that patients may value differently.² We developed a PDA in accordance with the International Patient Decision Aid Standards. We hypothesised that use of the PDA would be beneficial for patients with POAG.³

Methods

This was a single-centre randomised controlled trial. Consecutive patients were recruited from the outpatient glaucoma clinic at Lo Fong Shiu Po Eye Centre, Grantham Hospital. Eligible patients were randomly assigned to either the PDA group or the control group. Patients in the PDA group received a copy of the Chinese POAG PDA; they were briefly introduced its content and instructed to read the PDA at home.

The primary outcome measures included control group at 3 months (1.15, 95% CI=0.5-1.8, disease knowledge (measured by a 16-item disease F=12.6, P=0.001) and at 6 months (0.9, 95% CI=0.3-

knowledge questionnaire), patient self-confidence in overcoming barriers to medication adherence (measured by the 10-item Glaucoma Medication Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale [GMASS-10]), and decisional conflict (measured by the 16-item Decisional Conflict Scale [DCS]). Patients were evaluated face-to-face at baseline, 3 months, and 6 months.

Differences in outcome changes between the two groups were analysed using one-way analysis of covariance, with baseline fitted data as a covariate. Estimated mean group differences and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were reported. The Holm-Bonferroni method was used to adjust the P values of DCS subscores between the PDA and control groups. A P value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

At baseline, 160 patients aged 25 to 82 (mean, 59.3 ± 9.5) years were recruited. At the end of the study, 156 patients remained: 77 in the control group (60 at 3 months and 73 at 6 months) and 79 in the PDA group (72 at 3 months and 77 at 6 months). The main reason for loss to follow-up was cancellation of clinic appointments during the COVID-19 pandemic. The two groups were comparable in terms of baseline demographic and clinical data (Table 1).

Disease knowledge scores were higher in the PDA group than in the control group at 3 months (12.0 ± 2.3 vs 10.9 ± 2.5) and 6 months (11.9 ± 1.7 vs 11.1 ± 2.6). After adjustment for baseline values, improvements in disease knowledge scores were significantly greater in the PDA group than in the control group at 3 months (1.15, 95% CI=0.5-1.8, F=12.6, P=0.001) and at 6 months (0.9, 95% CI=0.3-

TABLE I. Baseline demographic and clinical data for all recruited patients

Demographic	Patient decision aid group (n=79)*	Control group (n=77)*	t or χ^{2}	P value
Age, y	59.5±9.4	59±9.9	-0.4	0.77
No. of women:men	36:43	32:45	0.1	0.71
Duration of glaucoma, y	7.9±7.2	7.2± 6.1	-0.51	0.61
Disease knowledge score	10.2±2.9	10.3±2.6	0.25	0.80
Glaucoma Medication Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale	22.8±6.5	22.3±7.0	-0.37	0.71
Decisional Conflict Scale	45.3±18.4	40.8±17.0	-1.6	0.11
Informed subscore	54.5±22.7	49.4±22.3	-1.7	0.5
Values clarity subscore	48.0±23.3	42.2±25.5	-1.7	0.5
Support subscore	38.3±20.3	33.8±18.2	-1.5	0.42
Uncertainty subscore	47.8±22.0	43.4±22.1	-1.4	0.36
Effective decision subscore	38.2±19.9	36.5±17.7	-0.7	0.54

Data are presented as mean± standard deviation unless otherwise indicated *

Scale	Mean change (95% confidence interval)		Mean group	F	P value
	Patient decision aid group	Control group	 difference (95% confidence interval) 		
Glaucoma Medication Adherence Self- Efficacy Scale					
Change from baseline to 3 months	-1.6 (-2.7 to -0.5)	0.9 (-0.2 to 2.0)	-2.5 (-4.1 to -1.0)	10.1	0.02
Change from baseline to 6 months	-1.7 (-2.9 to -0.5)	0.2 (-1.0 to 1.5)	-1.9 (-3.7 to -0.2)	4.8	0.03
Decisional Conflict Scale					
Change from baseline to 3 months					
Total score	-13.9 (-16.8 to -11.0)	-5.1 (-8.0 to -2.1)	-8.8 (-12.9 to -4.6)	17.4	<0.001
Informed subscore	-20.3 (-24.0 to -16.6)	-8.9 (-12.6 to -5.1)	-11.4 (-16.7 to -6.1)	18.3	< 0.001
Values clarity subscore	-18.5 (-22.3 to -14.7)	-9.2 (-13.1 to -5.4)	-9.3 (-14.7 to -3.9)	11.4	0.004
Support subscore	-10.0 (-13.3 to -6.7)	-2.6 (-6.0 to 0.7)	-7.4 (-12.1 to -2.7)	9.6	0.006
Uncertainty subscore	-12.8 (-16.6 to -9.0)	-5.1 (-9.0 to -1.2)	-7.7 (-13.2 to -2.2)	7.7	0.006
Effective decision subscore	-8.6 (-11.6 to -5.5)	-1.7 (-4.7 to 1.4)	-6.9 (-11.3 to -2.6)	9.8	0.004
Change from baseline to 6 months					
Total score	-18.3 (-21.4 to -15.2)	-4.6 (-7.8 to -1.3)	-13.5 (-18.0 to -8.9)	36.0	<0.001
Informed subscore	-26.4 (-30.4 to -22.5)	-8.4 (-12.5 to -4.4)	-18.0 (-23.7 to -12.3)	39.0	<0.001
Values clarity subscore	-23.2 (-27.5 to -18.9)	-5.7 (-10.0 to -1.4)	-17.5 (-23.6 to -11.5)	32.1	<0.001
Support subscore	-11.5 (-15.1 to -7.9)	-2.1 (-5.7 to 1.5)	-9.4 (-14.5 to -4.3)	13.5	<0.001
Uncertainty subscore	-18.9 (-22.6 to -15.2)	-5.8 (-9.5 to -2.0)	-13.1 (-18.4 to -7.8)	23.8	<0.001
Effective decision subscore	-12.5 (-15.9 to -9.2)	-3.4 (-6.8 to -0.01)	-9.1 (-13.9 to -4.4)	14.4	<0.001

1.5, F=9.8, P=0.02).

medication adherence were lower in the PDA group the PDA group than in the control group at 3 and 6 than in the control group at 3 months (20.1±6.6 vs months (Table 2). 23.3±6.1) and at 6 months (20.9±6.7 vs 22.6±7.0).

After adjustment for baseline values, improvements The GMASS-10 scores for self-confidence in in GMASS-10 scores were significantly greater in

Total DCS scores for decisional conflict were

lower in the PDA group than in the control group at 3 months (30.2 ± 13.9 vs 37.0 ± 16.0) and at 6 months (25.6 ± 13.3 vs 37.4 ± 17.5). After adjustment for baseline values, reductions in DCS scores were significantly greater in the PDA group than in the control group at 3 and 6 months (Table 2).

Discussion

The PDA resulted in significant improvement in disease knowledge, but the small magnitude of this improvement may not be clinically significant. Therefore, we recommend additional patient education, especially regarding glaucoma treatments and outcomes, delivered through multiple formats (eg, lectures or videos) in addition to the PDA.

Improved medication adherence can lead to better disease outcomes and reduce drug wastage.^{4,5} We observed significantly greater improvements in self-confidence in medication adherence (measured by the GMASS-10) in the PDA group than in the control group: 2.5 and 1.9 points better at 3 and 6 months, respectively. These results indicated that patients in the PDA group had greater selfconfidence in adhering to their daily medication regimen.

The greatest improvement was observed in the DCS score. The PDA effectively helped patients to make confident decisions that best suited their needs. It enabled patients to make informed decisions while considering their own values. It is important for clinicians to empower patients with sufficient knowledge about their diseases and available treatment options to facilitate shared decision-making.

Conclusions

Our PDA can improve disease knowledge, increase patient confidence in medication adherence, and reduce decisional conflict among patients with POAG in Hong Kong. We recommend distributing

the PDA to patients who may need to decide among different treatment options. The PDA can help patients to make an informed decision while considering their own values, rather than simply following clinicians' suggestions.

Funding

This study was supported by the Health and Medical Research Fund, Health Bureau, Hong Kong SAR Government (#15161691). The full report is available from the Health and Medical Research Fund website (https://rfs2.healthbureau.gov.hk).

Disclosure

The results of this research have been previously published in:

1. Zhu MM, Choy BNK, Lam WWT, Shum JWH. Randomized control trial of the impact of patient decision aid developed for Chinese primary open-angle glaucoma patients. Ophthalmic Res 2023;66:846-53.

References

- 1. He M, Foster PJ, Ge J, et al. Prevalence and clinical characteristics of glaucoma in adult Chinese: a population-based study in Liwan District, Guangzhou. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2006;47:2782-8.
- O'Connor A. Using patient decision aids to promote evidence-based decision making. ACP J Club 2001;135:A11-2.
- 3. Shum JWH, Lam WWT, Choy BNK, Chan JCH, Ho WL, Lai JSM. Development and pilot-testing of patient decision aid for use among Chinese patients with primary openangle glaucoma. BMJ Open Ophthalmol 2017;2:e000100.
- Conn VS, Ruppar TM, Enriquez M, Cooper PS. Patientcentered outcomes of medication adherence interventions: systematic review and meta-analysis. Value Health 2016;19:277-85.
- Ho PM, Bryson CL, Rumsfeld JS. Medication adherence: its importance in cardiovascular outcomes. Circulation 2009;119:3028-35.