Barriers and facilitators of adherence to the use of ASICA, a digital app designed to support people previously treated for melanoma: concise report of a qualitative study
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Abstract

We developed the Achieving Self-directed Integrated Cancer Aftercare (ASICA) in melanoma app to support monthly total-skin self-examinations (TSSEs) to enable the earliest detection of recurrence or new primaries, but only 20–25% report doing so. We developed the Achieving Self-directed Integrated Cancer Aftercare (ASICA) app with patients and clinicians to support monthly TSSE by people previously treated for melanoma. Briefly, ASICA is an app-based digital intervention prompting and guiding TSSEs and enabling users to send descriptions and photographs of any skin concerns to a remote dermatology nurse practitioner.

After refinement, ASICA was subject to a 12-month randomized controlled trial (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03328247). Overall, the intervention group reported increased TSSE and improved quality of life. Most (57%) of the intervention group submitted details of a concern with most resolved without face-to-face consultation. We concluded that ASICA could support increased TSSE by people previously treated for melanoma, a view endorsed by a parallel qualitative study.

It has been observed, however, that digital healthcare adherence is subject to attrition where a proportion of users stop using the intervention over time, and nonadoption where users do not engage with the intervention at all. Adherence data from the ASICA trial supported this, identifying three distinct trajectories. An ‘adherent’ group of participants (41%) who consistently completed monthly TSSEs for 12 months; a ‘drop-off’ group of participants (36%) who adhered initially but with declining use over 2–6 months and a ‘nonadherent’ group of participants (24%) who failed to engage with the intervention despite enrolling.

This qualitative study explored the perceptions of ASICA users of adherence barriers and facilitators.

Report

Qualitative data derived from three sources. Previous trial participants participated in a facilitated focus group (3 attended) or semistructured telephone interviews (11 conducted) and were texted a link to a smartphone ‘mock-up’ of ASICA to view beforehand. The focus group lasted 98 min and interviews 14–58 min. We also conducted secondary analysis of 13 semistructured interviews (10–45 min) conducted with ASICA users to capture their experiences during the trial. These participants used the tablet version of ASICA and did not view the smartphone ‘mock-up’. The age range for the 27 participants was 29–86 years of age.

Transcripts were uploaded to NVIVO 1.6.1 and subject to thematic analysis. Five themes emerged: technology; role of others; tailoring; disease journey and competing priorities (see Appendix S1 in the Supporting Information for some illustrative quotes).
The first theme was technology. Several suggested the current interface had limitations that could hinder engagement and suggested improvements, especially developing a smartphone version. Some participants did not use technology routinely and others were unfamiliar with different operating systems. Our current prototype does not include artificial intelligence (AI); however, general concerns about emergent AI technology were viewed as a barrier to engaging with digital healthcare, particularly the robustness of diagnosis and a preference for human contact when worried. Conversely, one younger participant thought AI would enhance future adherence. One user expressed concerns about how personal data could be harvested while using digital healthcare. Other ideas to improve adherence included virtual small group sessions, an easy-to-navigate instructional video, and integrating social media functionality.

The second theme was the role of others. A few participants suggested engaging others would improve motivation and adherence. More than half were helped by other people to perform TSSEs, to check and photograph hard to see body areas or compare between current and previous skin images. Some participants said they were strongly motivated to adhere to the trial to help others in future. Several participants mentioned speaking to the dermatology nurse practitioner by phone and thought this subsequently sustained their adherence.

The third theme was tailoring. Participants thought adherence could improve if the app provided individually salient information but recognized that different people would want different things. Some felt a reminder of why skin checking was important would help. Other participants suggested news about research, information about skin protection products and ultraviolet weather reports would provide motivation. Tailoring monthly prompts and the importance of a reminder that worked for individuals featured prominently. Phone calls, email, autosyncing with calendars, an app-based prompt like food delivery apps, even a physical postcard, were all mentioned. It was also suggested that a prompt could arrive at the wrong time for participants (for example during work, on holiday). One participant felt regular prompts may be off-putting for some users and suggested individuals should be able to set their own schedule of TSSEs.

The fourth theme was disease journey. A third of participants suggested that adherence would likely drop as skin checking became less salient as time went on. They suggested that individuals may have heightened concern in the first few months but would accommodate to their condition over time and feel less need to check. It was noted that ongoing traditional face-to-face follow-up contributed to this process. On the other hand, it was acknowledged that individuals differed and that some may be motivated by ongoing concerns about recurrence, the belief that one annual check was insufficient and a sense of wellbeing produced by having completed the skin check.

The final theme was competing priorities. Two-thirds of the participants noted that busy lives, for example work commitments affected adherence. They mentioned that other things take precedence and reduce the priority of skin checking. One participant had disengaged with TSSE during a bereavement. The burden of the task (i.e. having more moles to check) also contributed to disengagement.

Digital technology can support regular TSSEs for people previously treated for melanoma, but more effectively for some than others. Our study sheds light on practical reasons why some people adhered more closely than others with corresponding implications for modification and tailoring. Our data, derived from 27 individuals at different stages of experience highlights several themes with the potential to be addressed in future, for example by simplifying the interface; introducing additional tailoring; encouraging engagement with others; and/or integrating smart scheduling. Participants who were socially deprived were underrepresented in the current sample, but urban and rural dwellers were included. Similarly, the sample included individuals from the adherent and drop-off groups but not any from the nonadherent group. Including individuals from the nonadherent group and other demographics, such as older people will be essential in future research to ensure digital healthcare does not increase health inequalities.

Overall, the information we have obtained from this study, in context with our other data, will inform the detailed modifications we are now making to ASICA.

Learning points

- Achieving Self-directed Integrated Cancer Aftercare (ASICA), an app-based digital intervention increased regular total-skin self-examination and improved quality of life in people previously treated for melanoma.
- However, adherence varied with a third who adhered optimally but with adherence dropping off in another third and the final third of recruits did not adopt the intervention at all.
- Barriers and facilitators were explored in interviews and a focus group with app users.
- Important barriers to adherence were interface problems, orientation towards technology, lack of support from others and competing priorities.
- Important facilitators of adherence were technology receptiveness, having support from others, tailoring to individual needs and being more recently diagnosed.
- These barriers and facilitators are now informing further development of the ASICA intervention.
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INTENDED FOR UK & IRELAND HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS WITH AN INTEREST IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PLAQUE PSORIASIS ONLY

SOTYKTU is indicated for the treatment of moderate to severe plaque psoriasis in adults who are candidates for systemic therapy

SOTYKTU is a novel, efficacious oral treatment that is generally well-tolerated*

- DURABLE EFFICACY
  - Demonstrated superior PASI 75 response rates, and rates of clear or almost clear skin (sPGA 0/1), vs. placebo at Week 16 (co-primary endpoints)\(^1,3\)
  - PASI 75 response rates were observed at Week 24 and maintained at Week 52\(^4\)

- ONCE DAILY, ORAL DOSING
  - Once-daily, oral treatment that can be taken with or without food, with no routine blood monitoring requirements after initiation and no identified DDIs\(^1\)

- GENERALLY WELL-TOLERATED
  - The most commonly reported adverse reaction is upper respiratory infections (18.9%)*\(^1\)
  - Less than 3% of patients discontinued treatment due to AEs between Weeks 0–16\(^1,4\)

Adverse events should be reported. Reporting forms and information can be found at: UK – via the yellow card scheme at: www.mhra.gov.uk/yellowcard, or search for MHRA Yellow Card in the Google Play or Apple App Store. Ireland – via HPRA Pharmacovigilance at www.hpra.ie. Adverse events should also be reported to Bristol-Myers Squibb via medical.information@bms.com or 0800 731 1736 (UK); 1 800 749 749 (Ireland)

*SOTYKTU was studied in two global, Phase 3, randomised, multi-arm clinical studies: POETYK PSO-1 and PSO-2. PASI 75 and sPGA 0/1 vs. placebo at Week 16 were co-primary endpoints. PASI 75 was defined as ≥75% reduction from baseline in the Psoriasis Area and Severity Index. sPGA was defined as sPGA score of 0 or 1 with ≥2-point improvement from baseline. N numbers: PSO-1: SOTYKTU (n=332); apremilast (n=168), placebo (n=166); PSO-2: SOTYKTU (n=511); apremilast (n=254), placebo (n=255). SOTYKTU delivered superior PASI 75 response rates vs placebo (PSO-1: 58.4% vs. 12.7%, p<0.0001; PSO-2: 53.0% vs. 9.4%, p<0.0001) at Week 16, and superior results achieving clear or almost clear skin (sPGA 0/1) vs. placebo (PSO-1: 53.6% vs. 7.2%, p<0.0001; PSO-2: 49.5% vs. 8.6%, p<0.0001) at Week 16 (co-primary endpoints)\(^2,3\)

†Via enzyme inhibition, enzyme induction, or transporter inhibition.

Abbreviations: AE, adverse event; DDI, drug–drug interaction; PASI, Psoriasis Area and Severity Index; sPGA, static Physician’s Global Assessment; TYK2, tyrosine kinase 2.
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treatment due to AEs between Weeks 0–16 is upper respiratory infections (18.9%). The most commonly reported adverse reaction is upper respiratory infections (18.9%), most frequently nasopharyngitis. The longer-term safety profile of deucravacitinib was similar and consistent with previous experience. Very common (≥ 1/10): Upper respiratory infections** (including nasopharyngitis, upper respiratory tract infection, viral upper respiratory tract infection, viral exanthem, sinusitis, acute sinusitis, rhinitis, tonsillitis, periorbital abscess, laryngitis, tracheitis, and rhinorhinitis). Common (≥ 1/100 to < 1/10): Herpes simplex infections*** (including oral herpes, herpes simplex, genital herpes, and herpes viral infection), oral and genital ulcer (including aphthous ulcer, mouth ulceration, tongue ulceration, and stomatitis), Acneform rash (including acne, dermatitis acneform, acne vulgaris, pustule, papule, and papula). Follitulosis and Blood creatine phosphokinase increased. Uncommon (≥ 1/1000 to < 1/100): Herpes zoster***. Refer to SmPC for full details on adverse reactions.

**serious adverse drug reaction

LEGAL CATEGORY: POM