

# A smartphone application supporting patients with psoriasis improves adherence to topical treatment: a randomized controlled trial\*

M.T. Svendsen <sup>1,2,3,4</sup> F. Andersen,<sup>1,5</sup> K.H. Andersen,<sup>5</sup> A. Pottegård,<sup>6,7</sup> H. Johannessen,<sup>8</sup> S. Möller,<sup>3,4</sup> B. August,<sup>9</sup> S.R. Feldman <sup>1,10</sup> and K.E. Andersen<sup>1,2,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Dermatology and Allergy Centre, <sup>3</sup>Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN) and <sup>7</sup>Hospital Pharmacy, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

<sup>2</sup>Centre for Innovative Medical Technology (CIMT), Clinical Institute, <sup>4</sup>Department of Clinical Research, <sup>5</sup>Dermatological Investigations Scandinavia, <sup>6</sup>Clinical Pharmacology and Pharmacy and <sup>8</sup>Research Unit of User Perspectives, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

<sup>9</sup>LEO Pharma, Ballerup, Denmark

<sup>10</sup>Department of Dermatology (Center for Dermatology Research), Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, U.S.A.

**Linked Comment:** Howland and Dellavalle. *Br J Dermatol* 2018; **179**:1025–1026.

## Summary

### Correspondence

Mathias Tiedemann Svendsen.

E-mail: mathias.tiedemann.svendsen@rsyd.dk

### Accepted for publication

28 March 2018

### Funding sources

This study was supported by LEO Pharma, and Kirsten and Volmer Rask Nielsen's Foundation.

### Conflicts of interest

Conflicts of interest statements are listed in the Appendix.

The authors had independent publication rights. Representatives from LEO Pharma had no influence on collecting and analysing data, however, they were allowed to comment on the manuscript. The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not reflect those of LEO Pharma. LEO Pharma provided the medication (calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate cutaneous foam), app and electronic monitor used in the trial.

\*Plain language summary available online

DOI 10.1111/bjd.16667

**Background** Adherence to topical psoriasis treatments is low, which leads to unsatisfactory treatment results. Smartphone applications (apps) for patient support exist but their potential to improve adherence has not been systematically evaluated.

**Objectives** To evaluate whether a study-specific app improves adherence and reduces psoriasis symptoms compared with standard treatment.

**Methods** We conducted a randomized controlled trial (RCT, clinicaltrials.gov registration: NCT02858713). Patients received once-daily medication [calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate (Cal/BD) cutaneous foam] and were randomized to no app (n = 66) or app intervention (n = 68) groups. In total, 122 patients (91%) completed the 22-week follow-up. The primary outcome was adherence, which was defined as medication applied  $\geq 80\%$  of days during the treatment period and assessed by a chip integrated into the medication dispenser. Secondary outcomes were psoriasis severity measured by the Lattice System Physician's Global Assessment (LS-PGA) and quality of life, measured using the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) at all visits.

**Results** Intention-to-treat analyses using regression was performed. More patients in the intervention group were adherent to Cal/BD cutaneous foam than those in the nonintervention group at week 4 (65% vs. 38%,  $P = 0.004$ ). The intervention group showed a greater LS-PGA reduction than the nonintervention group at week 4 (mean 1.86 vs. 1.46,  $P = 0.047$ ). A similar effect was seen at weeks 8 and 26, although it did not reach statistical significance.

**Conclusions** This RCT demonstrates that the app improved short-term adherence to Cal/BD cutaneous foam treatment and psoriasis severity.

### What's already known about this topic?

- Psoriasis affects 2–4% of the Western adult population, has detrimental socio-economic effects and negatively affects quality of life.
- Topical corticosteroid/calcipotriol combinations are recommended first-line treatments for mild-to-moderate psoriasis, but poor adherence to topical treatments result in low efficacy.
- Several smartphone applications (apps) are available to patients with psoriasis, but the adherence-improving potential of this technology has not been evaluated in a randomized controlled setting.

**What does this study add?**

- This randomized controlled trial investigates the effects of a supporting app on adherence to a once-daily topical calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate cutaneous foam preparation over a 28-day period.
- The app provided daily reminders and informed patients whether they had applied their treatment. Information on adherence was obtained with a chip attached to the dispenser that synchronized to the app.
- The app significantly improved adherence rates and reduced psoriasis severity in the short term.

Psoriasis is a chronic inflammatory disease affecting 2–4% of the Western population.<sup>1</sup> Psoriasis has a severe impact on quality of life<sup>2,3</sup> and creates a large socioeconomic burden.<sup>4,5</sup> Mild-to-moderate psoriasis can be treated with topical corticosteroid preparations,<sup>6–8</sup> but adherence rates to these treatments are generally low and present a barrier for treatment success.<sup>9</sup>

Previous studies including patients with psoriasis treated with topical corticosteroids in Western dermatology outpatient clinics have reported nonadherence rates from 8 to 88%.<sup>10</sup> Patients tend to self-report higher adherence rates than those obtained by objective measurements,<sup>11,12</sup> therefore it is recommended to measure adherence objectively by using either an electronic monitor (gold standard) or medication weight.<sup>13,14</sup> Two studies have reported interventions improving adherence to topical corticosteroid treatment. One study tested the effects of weekly self-reporting of psoriasis status to a webpage for 1 year.<sup>15</sup> That intervention improved adherence to topical fluocinonide ointment in the intervention group relative to the control group. The other study did not use a control group and reported that 2 months of an individualized multifactorial patient-supporting intervention provided at dermatology clinics led to improved adherence rates relative to baseline.<sup>16</sup> There is a new and growing field of eHealth interventions for adherence improvement;<sup>17</sup> however, there is a little evidence for their effectiveness.<sup>18</sup>

The aim of this study is to test whether the use of a study-specific smartphone application (app, Table 1) for 4 weeks improves short-term adherence to a recommended standard topical treatment regimen with calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate (Cal/BD) cutaneous foam (LEO Pharma, Ballerup, Denmark). As secondary outcomes, we also evaluated (i) short (week 4) and long-term (week 8 and 26) psoriasis severity [Lattice System Physician's Global Assessment (LS-PGA)<sup>19,20</sup>] and (ii) quality of life [Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI)<sup>21</sup>].

**Patients and methods**

A 6-month investigator-initiated single-site, parallel-group, phase-IV superiority block randomized controlled trial (RCT)

**Table 1** Available functions in the 28-day adherence-supporting smartphone application (app)

Function	Compulsory	Optional
Daily treatment reminder	X	
Daily information on amount of treatment and number of treatment applications <sup>a</sup>	X	
Symptom rating <sup>b</sup> on an interval scale, i.e. itching, pain, inflammation, dryness, scaling, stress and social discomfort		X

<sup>a</sup>Foam dispensers had an electronic monitor with a chip registering each time the patient used the dispenser. Information from the electronic monitor synchronized via Bluetooth® to the app.

<sup>b</sup>Optional daily or weekly symptom rating reminder.

with an allocation ratio of 1 : 1 was conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki as revised in 1983, the International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice Guideline E6 (R2), and Danish national laws (clinicaltrials.gov registration NCT02858713). The protocol was approved by the Regional Ethics Committees on Health Research Ethics for Southern Denmark and the Danish Medicines Agency (EudraCT 2016-002143-42).<sup>22</sup> The study was conducted between 9 January 2017 and 29 August 2017 at an outpatient clinic for dermatology at Odense University Hospital. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients at inclusion and prior to randomization.

Potential study patients were recruited at the dermatology outpatient clinic and by advertisement. We included legally competent patients between 18 and 75 years of age who owned a smartphone or had skills for the use of a smartphone provided by the investigator (if the study-specific app was not supported by the patient's smartphone's operating system), who were diagnosed with mild-to-moderate psoriasis, and who were candidates for topical treatment with Cal/BD cutaneous foam.

Individuals were excluded if they: (i) had a known sensitivity to topical Cal/BD, (ii) were unable to complete all study-

related visits, (iii) had inadequate internet access or skills for use of a smartphone with an English-language app, (iv) had extensive disease not amenable to topical treatment, (v) were reluctant to be treated with a foam product, (vi) were breastfeeding or pregnant women, or (vii) were fertile women who did not use reliable contraception.

Patients were block randomized in eight blocks based on sex and age and the investigator was masked to allocation sequence using a computer-generated sequence in a 1 : 1 ratio. Patients were not paid for participating in the study. They received study medication free of charge (estimated market value £33 after reimbursement from the National Health Service). The medication was prescribed for once-daily application in a 28-day treatment period, excluding body sites for which treatment with topical Cal/BD cutaneous foam is contraindicated (face, axillae and genitals).

Cal/BD cutaneous foam was delivered in canisters with foam dispensers containing an electronic monitor with a chip registering the day and time the patient used the dispenser. Patients were given Cal/BD cutaneous foam in the canister with attached dispenser at the initial study visit, the canister could be replaced whenever empty. Patients were told to bring their medication canisters and dispensers for destruction at the week 4 return visit, but were not told in advance about the use of the data obtained by the electronic monitor or that each medication canister was weighed before and after use [on a precision balance Mettler Toledo PR802 (Mettler Toledo Ltd, Leicester) weight with 0.01 g accuracy] until the final study visit (week 26). The appropriate quantity for each application on diseased skin was calculated by determining the involved area expressed as body surface area (BSA) and multiplying by 0.5 g foam per 1% BSA. This dosage was then multiplied by 28 for once-daily application during the 28-day treatment period. The intervention group additionally received a supporting app, which provided once-daily compulsory treatment reminders and information on number of treatment applications and amount of prescribed Cal/BD cutaneous foam applied. The information was obtained by the electronic monitor chip synchronized to the app via Bluetooth® (Table 1). A laboratory assistant provided guidance on how to install and synchronize the app to the electronic monitor. The patients were also entitled to telephone support provided by the laboratory assistant, who answered any questions regarding use of the supporting app and electronic monitor. The app design was informed by previous research published by members of this research team,<sup>10,18,22–24</sup> and the tested prototypes were MyPso SmarTop™ Version 1.0 (the app, LEO Pharma, Ballerup, Denmark) (see Fig. S1 in the Supporting Information for a detailed description of the app) and SmarTop™ number 053776 (the electronic monitor, LEO Pharma) (Fig. 1). After 28 days, use of the app was terminated and no further adherence data were obtained. From week 4 to 26 all patients were provided with Cal/BD cutaneous foam to be used once daily when needed.

To make the visits similar to a normal visit, the investigator and laboratory assistant were not masked to the intervention



Fig 1. The smartphone application (app) and electronic monitor.

and data. Data were reviewed by a nonmasked Good Clinical Practice-experienced person. All sociodemographic and clinical data<sup>10</sup> were obtained by the investigator through interviews and medical chart reviews at baseline visits prior to randomization (Table S1; see Supporting Information).

Return visits were scheduled for weeks 4, 8 and 26. The primary outcome variables for adherence rates over 28 days were collected at week 4 by the chip in the electronic monitor measuring number of treatment applications, an electronic balance at the clinic and by patient self-reporting on a study-specific scale (four-point ordinal scale). The secondary variables were collected using the validated measurements for psoriasis severity (LS-PGA, eight-point ordinal scale<sup>25</sup>). The LS-PGA was chosen as a measurement of psoriasis severity, as it takes less time than, for example, the Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI) score and, unlike the PASI, is consistent with the European Medicines Agency's recommendations for psoriasis scoring in clinical trials.<sup>19</sup>

Data on the LS-PGA and DLQI (30-point ordinal scale<sup>21</sup>) were obtained at baseline and weeks 4, 8 and 26. Secondary long-term variables were obtained long term after termination of the intervention, as recommended by the Cochrane Group.<sup>26</sup>

### Sample size calculation

The study was powered assuming that use of the app would increase treatment applications by at least 8% in the intervention group compared with the nonintervention group. Based on findings from Alinia *et al.*,<sup>15</sup> the mean number of treatment sessions in the nonintervention group was assumed to be 63% of the recommended number of applications/28 days, the mean number of applications in the intervention group was assumed to be 71% of the recommended number of applications/28 days and the standard deviation in the nonintervention and intervention groups was assumed to be 15% of the recommended number of applications/28 days. We required a

power of 80%, a two-sided significance of 95%, 1 : 1 treatment allocation, and expected dropout of 12.5%. We applied a sample size calculation for an unpaired t-test as we modelled the mean adherence of each patient (numerically on a percentage scale, expected to be normally distributed due to the Central Limit Theorem). This calculation resulted in a planned sample size of 128 participants (Stata-script provided in File S1; see Supporting Information).

### Statistical analyses

Normality assumptions were checked by quantile plots. No adjustments for baseline covariates were considered relevant in the main analyses.<sup>27,28</sup> P-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant,<sup>29</sup> and we conducted all analyses using Stata 15 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, U.S.A.). Baseline characteristics for the two treatment groups are presented as counts and percentages.

### Analyses of the primary outcome: adherence

For chip data, all registered applications within 1 h were regarded as a single treatment session. We set chip adherence as binary, defined as treated or nontreated each day, to avoid errors related to multiple treatments in 1 day. Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat approach.

For the main analysis of adherence we dichotomized adherence rates obtained by chip and medication weight with a selected cut-off of 80%, with adherence rates above 80% considered adherent (a cut-off typically used when studying adherence in other chronic diseases<sup>30</sup>). We compared the dichotomized adherences by using logistic regression.

For the sensitivity analysis of adherence the adherence measures or their natural logarithm (if necessary to ensure normality of model residuals) were compared between treatment groups using linear regression. The analyses were carried out excluding missing data and after 100 multiple imputations by multivariate normal regression on the logarithms of the three adherence measures, without included covariates in addition to with an imputation including treatment, age, sex and smoking as covariates.<sup>10</sup>

### Analysis of secondary outcomes

Changes in LS-PGA and DLQI measurements from baseline to week 4 and from baseline to weeks 8 and 26 were compared between the two treatments by linear regression. LS-PGA and DLQI measurements including means are presented in box plots.

## Results

In total, 134 patients with mild-to-moderate psoriasis and a mean age of 48 years (21–75 years) were enrolled (Table S1; see Supporting Information). The study participants were mostly men under 50 years of age, who were married,

nonsmokers and employed full-time in a vocational or academic profession. The majority of patients had been diagnosed with psoriasis for more than 20 years and only a few had a history of using systemic antipsoriatic treatments (Table S1).

The included patients were randomized into nonintervention ( $n = 66$ ) and intervention ( $n = 68$ ) groups at the baseline visit. The two groups were comparable based on measured baseline covariates (Table S1). Smartphones were borrowed from the investigator for the intervention period for 21 of 68 (31%) of the patients in the intervention group. In total, 122 of 134 (91%) of all patients returned for the week 26 visit (Fig. 2), and the numbers of patients lost to follow-up were equally divided between the nonintervention and intervention groups. Missing data on primary outcome measurements obtained at week 4 were comparable for both groups (nonintervention vs. intervention group), whether they were chip-registered applications [6/66 (9%) vs. 8/68 (12%)], canister weight [1/66 (2%) vs. 4/68 (6%)] or patient-reported non-adherence rates [1/66 (2%) vs. 3/68 (4%)] (Fig. 2). Comparisons between missing data for the three adherence measurements in the two groups are provided in Tables S2–S4 (see Supporting Information) and considered missing at random. No serious adverse reactions were observed.

In the main analysis of chip adherence data (data were coded for adherent patient rates, defined as medication applied  $\geq 80\%$  of days in the treatment period), more patients in the intervention group were adherent than patients in the nonintervention group (65% vs. 38%,  $P = 0.004$ ) (Table 2). The sensitivity analysis of chip adherence data revealed that patients in the intervention group were more adherent to number of treatment sessions compared with patients in the nonintervention group (82% vs. 69%,  $P = 0.001$ ) (Table 2), similar results were obtained when allowing for multiple treatments sessions on the same day (data not shown), and imputing for missing data did not change the results (Table 2).

Adherence to amount of cutaneous foam in the main analysis showed that more patients in the intervention group were adherent compared with patients in the nonintervention group, although not reaching statistical significance (14% vs. 8%) (Table 2). Also, in the sensitivity analysis, adherence to amount of cutaneous foam used revealed that patients in the intervention group were more adherent than those in the nonintervention group (43% vs. 33%,  $P = 0.026$ ) (Table 2); data imputed for missing values revealed similar results (Table 2).

Adherence rates reported by patients were higher than those objectively obtained by weight, but there was no significant difference between the nonintervention and intervention groups (59% vs. 67%), or when imputed for missing values (Table 2).

### Impact of the intervention on severity of psoriasis and quality of life

Improved adherence was associated with a greater change in LS-PGA from baseline to week 4 between the intervention and




Fig 2. Participant flowchart. <sup>a</sup>Adherence rates obtained by chip, number of days with at least one treatment session were divided by number of days in the treatment period. <sup>b</sup>Adherence rates obtained by weight, weight of returned canisters were divided by weight of estimated amount of use for the treatment period. Cal/BD, calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate cutaneous foam; app, smartphone application; SAE, serious adverse event; LS-PGA, Lattice System Physician’s Global Assessment; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index.

**Table 2** Primary outcomes: adherence rates and rate of adherent patients in a 28-day treatment period<sup>a</sup>

	Patients, n		Rate of adherent patients, n (%)		Adherence rates for patients, mean (95% CI)		P-value
	Nonintervention	Intervention	Nonintervention	Intervention	Nonintervention	Intervention	
<b>Main analysis</b>							
Rate of adherent patients, based on dichotomized adherence rates (without imputation)							
Adherent to treatment sessions <sup>b</sup>	61	59	<b>23 (38)</b>	<b>26-51</b>	<b>39 (65)</b>	<b>53-77</b>	<b>0.004*</b>
Adherent to amount of foam <sup>c</sup>	65	64	5 (8)	1-14	9 (14)	5-23	0.251
<b>Sensitivity analysis</b>							
Adherence rates for patients, numerical outcomes (without imputation)							
Adherence rates obtained by chip <sup>d</sup>	61	59	<b>0.686</b>	<b>(0.629-0.742)</b>	<b>0.822</b>	<b>(0.764-0.879)</b>	<b>0.001*</b>
Adherence rates obtained by weight <sup>e</sup> (log) <sup>f</sup>	65	64	<b>0.325</b>	<b>(0.265-0.385)</b>	<b>0.427</b>	<b>(0.353-0.501)</b>	<b>0.026*</b>
Adherence rates reported by patients <sup>g</sup>	65	65	0.591	(0.530-0.652)	0.665	(0.613-0.716)	0.069
Adherence rates for patients, numerical outcomes (with multiple imputations on adherence outcomes)							
Adherence rates obtained by chip <sup>d</sup>	66	68	<b>0.691</b>	<b>(0.625-0.757)</b>	<b>0.824</b>	<b>(0.749-0.898)</b>	<b>0.008*</b>
Adherence rates obtained by weight <sup>e</sup> (log) <sup>f</sup>	66	68	<b>0.327</b>	<b>(0.264-0.391)</b>	<b>0.429</b>	<b>(0.350-0.508)</b>	<b>0.029*</b>
Adherence rates reported by patients <sup>g</sup>	66	68	0.592	(0.530-0.655)	0.666	(0.608-0.723)	0.083
Adherence rates for patients, numerical outcomes (with extended multiple imputations) <sup>h</sup>							
Adherence rates obtained by chip <sup>d</sup>	66	68	<b>0.684</b>	<b>(0.620-0.749)</b>	<b>0.833</b>	<b>(0.753-0.913)</b>	<b>0.004*</b>
Adherence rates obtained by weight <sup>e</sup> (log) <sup>f</sup>	66	68	<b>0.324</b>	<b>(0.264-0.385)</b>	<b>0.426</b>	<b>(0.348-0.505)</b>	<b>0.029*</b>
Adherence rates reported by patients <sup>g</sup>	66	68	0.590	(0.528-0.652)	0.667	(0.609-0.725)	0.070

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval. <sup>a</sup>Nonintervention and intervention groups measurements were compared by regression analyses. <sup>b</sup>Patients adherent to number of treatment sessions, defined as having applied foam treatment ≥ 80% of days in the treatment period. <sup>c</sup>Patients adherent to prescribed amount of foam, defined as having used ≥ 80% weight of estimated amount of foam for the treatment period. <sup>d</sup>Adherence rates obtained by chip, number of days with at least one treatment session were divided by number of days in the treatment period. <sup>e</sup>Adherence rates obtained by weight, weight of returned canisters were divided by weight of estimated amount of use for the treatment period. <sup>f</sup>Mean of the original (nonlogarithmized) observations presented in the table. <sup>g</sup>Adherence rates were reported by patients on a study-specific ordinal scale from 0 to 4, from 0 (did not use treatment) to 4 (used all prescribed medication). <sup>h</sup>Multiple imputations by multivariate normal regression on the logarithms of the three adherence measures with an imputation including treatment, age, sex and smoking as covariates. \*Statistically significant results (significant results are in addition highlighted in bold).

Table 3 Secondary outcomes: quality of life and psoriasis severity during the 26-week treatment period<sup>a</sup>

	Patients, n		Mean (95% CI)		Coefficient (95% CI)	P-value
	Nonintervention	Intervention	Nonintervention	Intervention		
<b>LS-PGA</b>						
Change 0 to 4 weeks	65	65	<b>1.46 (1.17–1.75)</b>	<b>1.86 (1.59–2.13)</b>	<b>0.400 (0.005 to 0.795)</b>	<b>0.047*</b>
Change 0 to 8 weeks	63	64	2.16 (1.86–2.46)	2.25 (1.96–2.54)	0.091 (–0.321 to 0.504)	0.662
Change 0 to 26 weeks	61	61	1.80 (1.49–2.11)	1.98 (1.66–2.31)	0.180 (–0.264 to 0.625)	0.424
<b>DLQI</b>						
Change 0 to 4 weeks	65	65	4.54 (3.47–5.61)	4.12 (3.27–4.98)	–0.415 (–1.770 to 0.939)	0.545
Change 0 to 8 weeks	63	64	5.17 (3.92–6.43)	4.59 (3.71–5.48)	–0.581 (–2.099 to 0.938)	0.450
Change 0 to 26 weeks	61	61	5.00 (3.69–6.31)	4.23 (3.25–5.21)	–0.770 (–2.389 to 0.848)	0.348

CI, confidence interval; LS-PGA, Lattice System Physician's Global Assessment; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index. <sup>a</sup>Nonintervention and intervention group measurements were compared by regression analyses. \*Statistically significant results (significant result are additionally highlighted in bold).




Fig 3. Box plot of Lattice System Physician's Global Assessment (LS-PGA) measurements. During treatment with calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate cutaneous foam, LS-PGA decreased for the nonintervention and intervention groups from baseline to week 4 and week 8. The LS-PGA had slightly increased for both the nonintervention and intervention groups at week 26. \*Significant differences in favour of use of the smartphone application is noticed between intervention and nonintervention groups at week 4 (mean 1.86 vs. 1.46,  $P = 0.047$ ). + represents the mean. The median values are marked by a horizontal line inside the box, but as the median in seven of the eight groups equals either the third quartile/upper border of the box (nonintervention group at baseline in addition to the nonintervention and the intervention groups for week 4) or first quartile/lower border of the box (nonintervention groups and the intervention groups for week 8 and week 26), it is not distinguishable as a separate line in those cases. The dots represent outliers.


nonintervention groups (mean 1.86 vs. 1.46,  $P = 0.047$ ) (Table 3). A similar trend was seen at weeks 8 and 26, although it did not reach statistical significance (Fig. 3).

DLQI initially changed from baseline to week 4 in the non-intervention vs. intervention group (4.54 vs. 4.12) (Table 3), which is considered a reduction above the minimal clinically important difference (MCID).<sup>31</sup> DLQI was further reduced at week 8, followed by a minor relapse at week 26 (Fig. 4 and Table 3).

## Discussion

This RCT demonstrates that an app designed to support daily topical treatment by patients with psoriasis improved treatment adherence (as measured by electronic monitors or medication canister weight) and reduced psoriasis severity (as measured by LS-PGA).

The app improved adherence rates to topical treatment during a 28-day intervention period, in agreement with one



**Fig 4.** Box plot of Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) measurements. During treatment with calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate cutaneous foam, DLQI decreased for nonintervention and intervention groups from baseline to week 4 and week 8, although it did not reach statistical significance in favour of use of the smartphone application. DLQI had slightly increased for nonintervention and intervention groups at week 26. + represents the mean. The median values are designated by the horizontal lines inside the boxes. The dots represent outliers.

study reporting improved adherence rates when patients reported their psoriasis status weekly.<sup>15</sup> Another study reported improved adherence rates for use of systemic treatment in patients with psoriasis when they received daily text messages.<sup>32</sup> The app used in this study also improved severity of psoriasis, in agreement with reports of adherence-improving interventions for psoriasis<sup>32</sup> and other chronic diseases.<sup>33,34</sup> Inspired by previous adherence studies, we dichotomized adherence rates obtained by chip and canister weight with a cut-off of 80%, and classified adherence rates above 80% as adherent.<sup>29</sup> The optimal cut-off should be based on the adherence level necessary for the drug to work.<sup>30</sup> In this case we do not know how forgiving the drug is to missed doses, which represents a weakness of the study.

Adherence was measured by the number of treatment sessions, and patients in the nonintervention group had a 69% adherence rate, meaning that they used medication on 69% of days. This result is in agreement with Alinia *et al.*,<sup>15</sup> who measured adherence to topical fluocinonide ointment by number of treatment days in patients with psoriasis over 1 year and reported that adherence among patients receiving standard treatment of care was 63% during the first month.

Adherence was also measured by canister weight, and we found that patients in the nonintervention group used 33% of the prescribed amount of medication. This is in agreement with a report by Storm *et al.*,<sup>35</sup> who found that patients seen at a dermatology clinic used 35% of the expected doses of topical treatments over a 2-week treatment period.<sup>35</sup> The low rate of patients who were adherent to amount of medication in both the nonintervention and intervention group (8% vs. 12%) suggest that the estimated amount of cutaneous foam used during the 4 weeks was too high. Measuring adherence

by weight is challenging and requires that the prescriber first estimate the amount of topical treatment to be used during a treatment period. One limitation of the study is that we do not know the amount of medication that should be applied to get the full benefits of treatment. The majority of the patients in this study had been diagnosed with psoriasis for over 20 years and may be less inclined to follow a dosing instruction that would pose a risk of side-effects<sup>36</sup> (mainly pain, erythema and pruritus).<sup>37,38</sup> The generally low rates of adherence as measured by weight might also indicate a need for clinicians to provide patients with specific advice and motivation for the appropriate quantity of medication to be used.

A strength of the study is the collection and comparison of adherence measurements by number of treatment sessions, applied medication weight and patient self-report.<sup>39</sup> It is important that adherence studies reflect what is considered to be clinically relevant; that is we consider it more important for patients to apply the topical product regularly than in large amounts.

The LS-PGA and DLQI improved considerably over the study period as an effect of the topical treatment (Figs 3 and 4), in agreement with the international literature.<sup>7,38,40</sup> The PASI as a tool for measuring severity of psoriasis was not applied in this study, because the European Medicines Agency recommended the use of LS-PGA in clinical trials. The reduction in DLQI for both groups was caused by the Cal/BD foam treatment.<sup>8</sup> The DLQI measurement should be interpreted with caution: the DLQI is unidimensional and under-represents the emotional aspects of dermatological patients' lives.<sup>41</sup> In order to capture the full range of the quality of life aspect, we could have combined the DLQI measurement with one of the available psoriasis-specific quality of life instruments.<sup>42</sup> It is a

limitation of the study that we did not obtain outcomes on patient-perceived severity and patient–physician relationship as reported in other adherence-improving interventions,<sup>32</sup> as an improved patient–physician relationship may motivate patients and improve treatment adherence and outcome.<sup>43</sup> We did not report patients’ use of the optional diary functions or patients’ satisfaction with the app, which is a limitation for interpreting the results for app designers and medical device engineers.

The patients received study drugs, which may provide better results than those obtained in real-life settings, such as that reported by Storm *et al.* in which a third of prescriptions were never redeemed.<sup>44</sup> Our study patients were partly recruited by advertisement, which poses a risk of including patients who are more motivated to adhere to prescribed topical treatment than the background psoriasis population.<sup>35,45</sup>

The local ethics committee would not approve masking patients to the fact they were in a trial until the end of the study, a method used in other adherence studies.<sup>46</sup> The assessors were not masked, which introduced a risk of attrition and observer bias.<sup>47</sup> This study was performed simultaneously with the introduction of the new Cal/BD cutaneous foam on the Danish market. The patient information session at the initial study visit was focused on the new drug reformulation<sup>48</sup> and to a lesser degree on the adherence measurement, which partially concealed that the primary outcome of the study was adherence.

In conclusion, this RCT demonstrated that a study-specific patient-supporting app improved adherence rates and psoriasis severity in a statistically and clinically significant manner. There is potential for implementing patient-supporting apps in the dermatology clinic.

## References

- 1 Parisi R, Symmons DP, Griffiths CE *et al.* Global epidemiology of psoriasis: a systematic review of incidence and prevalence. *J Invest Dermatol* 2013; **133**:377–85.
- 2 Feldman SR. Disease burden and treatment adherence in psoriasis patients. *Cutis* 2013; **92**:258–63.
- 3 Atwan A, Piguat V, Finlay AY *et al.* Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) as a psoriasis referral triage tool. *Br J Dermatol* 2017; **177**: e136–7.
- 4 Yu AP, Tang J, Xie J *et al.* Economic burden of psoriasis compared to the general population and stratified by disease severity. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2009; **25**:2429–38.
- 5 Schaefer CP, Cappelleri JC, Cheng R *et al.* Health care resource use, productivity, and costs among patients with moderate to severe plaque psoriasis in the United States. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2015; **73**:585–93.e3.
- 6 Mason AR, Mason J, Cork M *et al.* Topical treatments for chronic plaque psoriasis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013; **3**:CD005028.
- 7 Koo J, Tyring S, Werschler WP *et al.* Superior efficacy of calcipotriene and betamethasone dipropionate aerosol foam versus ointment in patients with psoriasis vulgaris – a randomized phase II study. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2016; **27**:120–7.
- 8 Leonardi C, Bagel J, Yamauchi P *et al.* Efficacy and safety of calcipotriene plus betamethasone dipropionate aerosol foam in patients with psoriasis vulgaris—a randomized phase iii study (PSO-FAST). *J Drugs Dermatol* 2015; **14**:1468–77.
- 9 Carroll CL, Feldman SR, Camacho FT *et al.* Better medication adherence results in greater improvement in severity of psoriasis. *Br J Dermatol* 2004; **151**:895–7.
- 10 Svendsen MT, Andersen F, Hansen J *et al.* Medical adherence to topical corticosteroid preparations prescribed for psoriasis: a systematic review. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2017; **28**:32–9.
- 11 Thorneloe RJ, Bundy C, Griffiths CEM *et al.* Adherence to medication in patients with psoriasis: A systematic literature review. *Br J Dermatol* 2013; **168**:20–31.
- 12 Thorneloe RJ, Nelson P, Bundy C *et al.* Existing self-report tools are not suitable for measuring adherence to topical therapies in psoriasis. *J Invest Dermatol* 2014; **134**:S55–S55.
- 13 Greenlaw SM, Yentzer BA, O’Neill JL *et al.* Assessing adherence to dermatology treatments: a review of self-report and electronic measures. *Skin Res Technol* 2010; **16**:253–8.
- 14 Koehler AM, Maibach HI. Electronic monitoring in medication adherence measurement. Implications for dermatology. *Am J Clin Dermatol* 2001; **2**:7–12.
- 15 Alinia H, Moradi Tuchayi S, Smith JA *et al.* Long-term adherence to topical psoriasis treatment can be abysmal: a 1-year randomized intervention study using objective electronic adherence monitoring. *Br J Dermatol* 2017; **176**:759–64.
- 16 de Korte J, Van Onselen J, Kownacki S *et al.* Quality of care in patients with psoriasis: an initial clinical study of an international disease management programme. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2005; **19**:35–41.
- 17 World Health Organization. Atlas of eHealth Country Profiles: The Use of eHealth in Support of Universal Health Coverage: Based on the Findings of the third Global Survey on eHealth 2015. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2016.
- 18 Svendsen MT, Andersen F, Andersen KE. eHealth technologies as an intervention to improve adherence to topical antipsoriatics: a systematic review. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2018; **29**:123–8.
- 19 Chow C, Simpson MJ, Luger TA *et al.* Comparison of three methods for measuring psoriasis severity in clinical studies (Part 1 of 2): change during therapy in Psoriasis Area and Severity Index, Static Physician’s Global Assessment and Lattice System Physician’s Global Assessment. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2015; **29**:1406–14.
- 20 Simpson MJ, Chow C, Morgenstern H *et al.* Comparison of three methods for measuring psoriasis severity in clinical studies (Part 2 of 2): use of quality of life to assess construct validity of the Lattice System Physician’s Global Assessment, Psoriasis Area and Severity Index and Static Physician’s Global Assessment. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2015; **29**:1415–20.
- 21 Zachariae R, Zachariae C, Ibsen H *et al.* Dermatology life quality index: data from Danish inpatients and outpatients. *Acta Derm Venereol* 2000; **80**:272–6.
- 22 Svendsen MT, Andersen F, Andersen KH *et al.* Can an app supporting psoriasis patients improve adherence to topical treatment? A single-blind randomized controlled trial. *BMC Dermatolog* 2018; **18**:2.
- 23 Svendsen MT, Jeyabalan J, Andersen KE *et al.* Worldwide utilization of topical remedies in treatment of psoriasis: a systematic review. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2017; **28**:374–83.
- 24 Svendsen MT, Andersen KE, Andersen F *et al.* Psoriasis patients’ experiences concerning medical adherence to treatment with topical corticosteroids. *Psoriasis (Auckl)* 2016; **6**:113–9.
- 25 Puzenat E, Bronsard V, Prey S *et al.* What are the best outcome measures for assessing plaque psoriasis severity? A systematic review of the literature. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2010; **24**(Suppl. 2):10–6.
- 26 Nieuwlaat R, Wilczynski N, Navarro T *et al.* Interventions for enhancing medication adherence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; **11**:CD000011.

- 27 Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products. (CPMP): points to consider on adjustment for baseline covariates. *Stat Med* 2004; **23**:701–9.
- 28 Hauck WW, Anderson S, Marcus SM. Should we adjust for covariates in nonlinear regression analyses of randomized trials? *Control Clin Trials* 1998; **19**:249–56.
- 29 Greenland S, Senn SJ, Rothman KJ *et al.* Statistical tests, P values, confidence intervals, and power: a guide to misinterpretations. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2016; **31**:337–50.
- 30 Osterberg L, Blaschke T. Adherence to medication. *N Engl J Med* 2005; **353**:487–97.
- 31 Assawasuwannakit P, Braund R, Duffull SB. Quantification of the forgiveness of drugs to imperfect adherence. *CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol* 2015; **4**:e00004.
- 32 Balato N, Megna M, Costanzo L *et al.* Educational and motivational support service: a pilot study for mobile-phone-based interventions in patients with psoriasis. *Br J Dermatol* 2013; **168**:201–5.
- 33 Kalichman SC, Cherry C, Kalichman MO *et al.* Integrated behavioral intervention to improve HIV/AIDS treatment adherence and reduce HIV transmission. *Am J Public Health* 2011; **101**:531–8.
- 34 Janson SL, McGrath KW, Covington JK *et al.* Individualized asthma self-management improves medication adherence and markers of asthma control. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009; **123**:840–6.
- 35 Storm A, Benfeldt E, Andersen SE *et al.* A prospective study of patient adherence to topical treatments: 95% of patients underdose. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2008; **59**:975–80.
- 36 Ring L, Kettis-Lindblad A, Kjellgren KI *et al.* Living with skin diseases and topical treatment: patients' and providers' perspectives and priorities. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2007; **18**:209–18.
- 37 Enstilar [product resumé]. Copenhagen: Danish Medicines Agency, April 2016.
- 38 Menter A, Gold LS, Koo J *et al.* Fixed-combination calcipotriene plus betamethasone dipropionate aerosol foam is well tolerated in patients with psoriasis vulgaris: pooled data from three randomized controlled studies. *Skinmed* 2017; **15**:119–24.
- 39 Lam WY, Fresco P. Medication adherence measures: an overview. *BioMed Res Int* 2015; **2015**:217047.
- 40 Queille-Roussel C, Olesen M, Villumsen J *et al.* Efficacy of an innovative aerosol foam formulation of fixed combination calcipotriol plus betamethasone dipropionate in patients with psoriasis vulgaris. *Clin Drug Investig* 2015; **35**:239–45.
- 41 Basra M, Fenech R, Gatt R *et al.* The Dermatology Life Quality Index 1994–2007: a comprehensive review of validation data and clinical results. *Br J Dermatol* 2008; **159**:997–1035.
- 42 Ali FM, Cueva AC, Vyas J *et al.* A systematic review of the use of quality-of-life instruments in randomized controlled trials for psoriasis. *Br J Dermatol* 2017; **176**:577–93.
- 43 Patruno C, Ayala F, Megna M *et al.* Patient-physician relationship in patients with psoriasis. *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol* 2012; **78**:228.
- 44 Storm A, Andersen SE, Benfeldt E *et al.* One in 3 prescriptions are never redeemed: primary nonadherence in an outpatient clinic. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2008; **59**:27–33.
- 45 Svedbom A, Dalen J, Mamolo C *et al.* Treatment patterns with topicals, traditional systemics and biologics in psoriasis—a Swedish database analysis. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2015; **29**:215–23.
- 46 Patel NU, Moore BA, Craver RF *et al.* Ethical considerations in adherence research. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2016; **10**:2429.
- 47 Hrobjartsson A, Thomsen AS, Emanuelsson F *et al.* Observer bias in randomized clinical trials with measurement scale outcomes: a systematic review of trials with both blinded and nonblinded assessors. *CMAJ* 2013; **185**:E201–11.
- 48 Iversen L, Dauden E, Segaert S *et al.* Reformulations of well-known active ingredients in the topical treatment of psoriasis vulgaris can improve clinical outcomes for patients. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2017; **31**:1271–84.

## Appendix

Conflicts of interest: Part of M.T.S.' salary during the trial was paid by funding from LEO Pharma. A.P. has received funding from LEO Pharma. B.A. is an employee at LEO Pharma, which has the copyright for the calcipotriol/betamethasone dipropionate foam used as the study medication and is the owner of the electronic monitor and app used in this trial. S.R.F. is a speaker for Janssen and Taro; a consultant and speaker for Galderma, Stiefel/GlaxoSmithKline, Abbott Labs, LEO Pharma Inc.; has received grants from Galderma, Janssen, Abbott Labs, Amgen, Stiefel/GlaxoSmithKline, Celgene and Anacor; is a consultant for Amgen, Baxter, Caremark, Gerson Lehrman Group, Guidepoint Global, Hanall Pharmaceutical Co Ltd, Kikaku, Lilly, Merck & Co Inc., Merz Pharmaceuticals, Mylan, Novartis Pharmaceuticals, Pfizer Inc., Qurient, Suncare Research and Xenoport; is on an advisory board for Pfizer Inc.; is the funder of and holds stocks of Causa Research and holds stocks of and is majority owner of Medical Quality Enhancement Corporation; he receives royalties from UpToDate and Xlibris. K.E.A. has received funding from LEO Pharma for the trial.

## Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's website:

**Fig S1.** The smartphone application and instructions for its use.

**File S1** Sample size calculation, script from Stata 15.

**Table S1** Baseline characteristics.

**Table S2** Missing outcomes on chip-measured adherence rates.

**Table S3** Missing outcomes on weight-measured adherence rates.

**Table S4** Missing outcomes on patient-reported adherence rates.

**Powerpoint S1** Journal Club Slide Set.

**Video S1** Author video.