Implementation of oral anticancer early monitoring using electronic questionnaires

Brooke D. Looney, PharmD, CSP¹ | Tiffany Bui, Pharm D² | Josh DeClercq, MS³ | Kristen W. Whelchel, PharmD, CSP¹ | Autumn D. Zuckerman, PharmD, BCPS, CSP¹

¹Vanderbilt Specialty Pharmacy, ²Northwestern, ³Vanderbilt University Medical Center



Evaluate the effectiveness of implementing early oral anticancer medication monitoring questionnaires sent through an electronic patient portal at identifying adverse effects that require pharmacist intervention.

METHODS



Study Design

Single-center, randomized, pragmatic, cohort study. 1:1 stratified randomization based on age and sex



Study Setting

Vanderbilt Ingram Cancer Center, Integrated Health System Specialty Pharmacy

Study Sample

*Pharmacist interventions are provided based on patient new during an assessment or by contacting the pharmacy directly

ŶŶŶ **ÅÅÅÅÅÅ**

Adults with an active patient portal filling new oral anticancer medications at Vanderbilt Specialty Pharmacy at least once between August 15, 2023 and February 29, 2024

To evaluate differences in timing and frequency of adverse effect identification resulting in a pharmacist intervention during the first 45 days of treatment between intervention and usual care (control).

Aim 1

*Electronic questionnaire implementation evaluation and results were previously presented at SERC 2024 and published in AJHP (see QR code)

Figure 1. Study Procedures and Attrition

Specialty pharmacist Control Arm documents new medication Intervention Arm n=182 counseling triggering n=205 Characteristic randomization. 111 Sex: Male, n (%) Patient starts medication 123 Age group: >= 60, n (%) 7-14 days after medication start 7 (CCI*, Median (IQR) Drug class category, n (%) Patients populate Anti-androgens/HRAs* Patient does not on electronic health respond to record (EHR) report for Anti-neoplastic agents questionnaire review Diagnosis category, n (%) n=97 (53%) Pharmacist reviews EHR Breast × × report and assigns Central nervous system questionnaire through Patient responds to GI EHR patient portal questionnaire GU n=85 (47%) Other** Pharmacist reviews Cancer stage, n (%) 7 days before refill is due 7 days before refill is due responses populated Stage I or II in the EHR Stage III Patient contacted for Patient contacted for monthly refill Stage IV monthly refill assessment assessment Staging not available

*Pharmacist interventions are provided based on patient need and could occur



To evaluate the difference in medication changes and clinical outcomes at 90 days after initial medication dispense between intervention and usual care (control).

Aim 2

Table 1. Demographics

ervention n=182	Usual care n=205
(61)	116 (57)
3 (68)	144 (70)
5 - 9)	8 (5 - 9)
0 (38)	59 (29)
12 (62)	146 (71)
32 (18)	30 (15)
24 (13)	20 (10)
18 (10)	40 (20)
83 (46)	81 (40)
25 (14)	34 (17)
36 (20)	30 (15)
36 (20)	30 (15)
107 (59)	142 (69)
3 (2)	3 (1)

*Abbreviations: CCI (Charlson Comorbidity Index), IQR: interquartile rangeHRAs (hormone receptor antagonists), GI: gastrointestinal, GU: genitourinary ** Other: Gynecologic, Head/neck, Lung, Melanoma/sarcoma

- addressing adverse events from newly initiated oral anticancer therapy.
- Patients in the usual care arm were 2x more likely to have healthcare utilization than intervention patients.



Figure 4. Time to Pharmacist Interventions

Intervention vs. Usual Care

Strata 🕂 Intervention 🕂 Usual Care



No significant difference between groups Time to first AE-related intervention (HR 1.2, p=0.347)



Non-Responders: intervention patients who did not complete the questionnaire + control patients

CONCLUSIONS

Patients who responded to the early monitoring questionnaire had a higher rate and faster time to pharmacists identifying and

Increasing response rate to the electronic early monitoring questionnaire is needed to optimize its impact on outcomes.

RESULTS

have multiple categories of alert, actions, and intervention outcomes