Does better adherence to growth hormone (GH) treatment using jet rather than needle delivery translate into improved growth outcomes?

Michaelidou M^{1,4}, Whitten S³, Bajaj P³, Spoudeas HA^{1,2}

¹Paediatric Endocrinology, Great Ormond Street Hospital, London ²Adolescent Endocrinology, University College London Hospitals, London ³Ferring Pharmaceuticals, London ⁴The University of Manchester Medical School

Great Ormond Street MAS Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust

University College London Hospitals

NHS Foundation Trust

This study was sponsored by Ferring Pharmaceuticals

Background

Aim

We previously reported improved adherence with growth hormone treatment in children using jet rather than needle delivery devices, in a large nationwide cohort [1]. We wanted to assess whether this also translated into significant improvement in growth outcomes.

To retrospectively audit growth markers in our local split-site (GOSH / UCLH) cohort of children, starting GH using ZomaJet[®] between 01.01.2010 and 31.12.2012, for whom we had previous adherence (PDC) scores.

Methods

•75 local patients were identified from the national cohort
•55 met the eligibility criteria for indication (GHD) and age (<16 years).
• Adherence was evaluated using the PDC index which was calculated using the following equation.

 $PDC = \frac{\text{Number of days with access to viable heads}}{\text{Number of days receiving treatment}}$

•Patients with PDC score >0.8 were considered adherent.

Standard deviation scores for the following auxology parameters were compared:

Height (HTSDS)Height velocity (HVSDS)

	Adherent	Non-adherent	Overall
	N=33	N=22	N=55
Sex n (%)			
Male	21 (64)	16 (73)	37 (67)
Female	12 (36)	6 (27)	18 (33)
Starting age, years*			
Median	9.31	6.80	7.76
Range	0.93-15.57	2.93-15.89	0.93-15.89
Treatment duration (days)*			
Median	1179	1279	1209
Range	243-1814	166-1820	166-1820
PDC Score**			
Median	1.08	0.65	0.92
Range	0.82-1.71	0.24-0.75	0.24-1.71
Switch			

Table 1. Baseline characteristics show no significant difference

•IGF-1 (IGF1SDS)

•Comparisons were made using non parametric statistics, within and between adherent and non adherent groups

1 year after the start of jet-delivered GH

At end of the assessment period

Results

- A large proportion of patients (67%) are classed as adherent (Table 1).
- Adherent (n33) and non-adherent (n22) patients demonstrated comparable increments in HTSDS, HVSDS and IGF1SDS, both at 1 year and end treatment (p>0.05).
- Significant longitudinal intragroup improvements occurred in adherent patients (n33) in all three auxology parameters, both at 1 year and at end treatment. (p<0.05) (fig 1)

n (%)	8 (24)	1 (5)	9 (16)
Baseline Auxology	median(range)		
HTSDS*	-1.73 (-3.88-2.43)	-2.04 (-3.83-0.69)	-1.79 (-3.88-2.43)
HVSDS*	-1.92 (-6.70-4.68)	-3.07 (-5.07-5.63)	-1.96 (-6.70-5.63)
IGF1 SDS*	-2.70 (-2.80-3.40)	-2.20 (-4.10-1.30)	-2.55 (-4.10-3.40)
* p>0.05 **p<0.05			

Changes in auxology parameters according to adherence



- Non adherent patients (n22) showed significant improvement in HVSDS at 1 year and at end treatment (p<0.05), but not in HTSDS or IGF-1SDS at any point in time. (fig 1)
- 9 patients have reached their final height (6 adherent, 3 non adherent), all with adult HTSDS close to individual target MPHSDS (p<0.05).

-3 -3.5 * p>0.05 ** p<0.05 (intragroup improvement from treatment start) -1 year treatment start + 1 year end period Figure 1. Patients using ZomaJet [®] show significant improvement in HVSDS, regardless of adherence. Significant improvement in HTSDS and IGF-1SDS over time is only seen in adherent patients.

Conclusions

- > Jet-delivered growth hormone seems to significantly improve height velocity SDS in this cohort, regardless of adherence.
- Improved adherence with ZomaJet [®] may translate into better height outcomes.
- > This hypothesis will be explored in a larger local dataset comparing jet with needle devices.

References: 1. Spoudeas et al 2014. Maintaining persistence and adherence with subcutaneous growth hormone therapy in children: comparing jet-delivery and needle-based devices. Patient Preference and Adherence 2014:8 (1255-1263)