

**OPEN**

# Neurology® Clinical Practice



A peer-reviewed clinical neurology journal for the practicing neurologist  
An Official Journal of the American Academy of Neurology

**Neurology: Clinical Practice Publish Ahead of Print**  
**DOI: 10.1212/CPJ.000000000200095**

## Humanistic Burden of Huntington Disease: Evidence From the Huntington Disease Burden of Illness Study

**Author(s):**

Idaira Rodriguez Santana, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Samuel Frank, MD<sup>2</sup>; Maria Doherty, MSc<sup>1</sup>; Rosa Willock, MSc<sup>1</sup>; Jamie Hamilton, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Hayley Hubberstey, PhD<sup>4</sup>; Cath Stanley<sup>5</sup>; Louise Vetter, BA<sup>6</sup>; Michaela Winkelmann<sup>7</sup>; Ricardo E Dolmetsch, PhD<sup>8</sup>; Nanxin Li, PhD<sup>8</sup>; Sarah Ratsch, PhD<sup>8</sup>; Talaha M Ali, MD<sup>8</sup>

**Corresponding Author:**

Idaira Rodriguez Santana, [idaira.rodriquez@hcdconomics.com](mailto:idaira.rodriquez@hcdconomics.com)

**Affiliation Information for All Authors:** 1.HCD Economics; 2. Harvard Medical School/Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center; 3. CHDI Foundation; 4. Huntington's Disease Youth Organization (HDYO); 5. Huntington's Disease Association; 6. Huntington's Disease Society of America; 7. Deutsche Huntington-Hilfe e.V; 8. uniQure, Inc, Lexington, MA.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND), which permits downloading and sharing the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

*Neurology*® Clinical Practice Published Ahead of Print articles have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication. This manuscript will be published in its final form after copyediting, page composition, and review of proofs. Errors that could affect the content may be corrected during these processes.

**Equal Author Contribution:****Contributions:**

Idaira Rodriguez Santana: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Samuel Frank: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Maria Doherty: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Rosa Willock: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Jamie Hamilton: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Hayley Hubberstey: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Cath Stanley: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Louise Vetter: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Michaela Winkelmann: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Study concept or design

Ricardo E Dolmetsch: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Nanxin Li: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Sarah Ratsch: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

Talaha M Ali: Drafting/revision of the manuscript for content, including medical writing for content; Major role in the acquisition of data; Study concept or design; Analysis or interpretation of data

**Figure Count:**

0

**Table Count:**

4

**Search Terms:**

[ 337 ] Burden of disease, [ 113 ] Quality of life, [ 164 ] Huntington's disease, Humanistic Burden, Work Impairment

**Acknowledgment:**

The authors would like to thank the HDBOI Expert Review Group (ERG), consisting of clinicians, allied health professionals, academics, and patient advocacy representatives who provided expert input into the study. The wider HDBOI study was conducted in collaboration with the Huntington's Disease Association, Huntington's Disease Society of America, European Huntington Association, Huntington's Disease Youth Organization and LIRH Foundation.

**Study Funding:**

This research article was sponsored by uniQure. The wider HDBOI study was supported by research funding from uniQure and Roche.

**Disclosures:**

I. Rodriguez-Santana, M. Doherty, R. Willock are salaried employees of HCD Economics. S. Frank receives compensation from

uniQure as a steering committee member, Huntington Study Group for DSMB contract work and Sage Therapeutics for consulting. C. Stanley received funding from Roche for awareness campaign in the UK and Ireland. R.E. Dolmetsch, N. Li, S. Ratsch and T.M. Ali are salaried employees of uniQure. J. Hamilton, H. Hubberstey, L. Vetter and M. Winkelmann report no disclosures relevant to the manuscript.

**Preprint DOI:**

**Received Date:**

2021-12-23

**Accepted Date:**

2022-09-13

**Handling Editor Statement:**

Submitted and externally peer reviewed. The handling editor was Deputy Editor Kathryn Kvam, MD.

**ABSTRACT [346/ 350 words]**

**Background and Objectives:** Huntington's Disease (HD) is a rare, inherited and highly complex neuro-degenerative disorder with no currently approved disease modifying treatments. We investigated the impact of HD on health-related quality of life (HRQoL) and other patient-reported outcomes in the Huntington's Disease Burden of Illness (HDBOI) study.

**Methods:** The HDBOI study is a retrospective, cross-sectional study conducted between September 2020 and May 2021 in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. People with symptomatic onset HD (PwHD) were recruited by their HD-treating physicians and categorized as early (ES), mid (MS) or advanced stage (AS) HD. Physicians provided sociodemographic and clinical information from the participant's medical records in electronic case report forms (eCRF); participants or their proxies completed online Patient Public Involvement Engagement questionnaires (PPIE-P). Patient-reported outcomes included the EQ-5D-5L, SF-36 v2 (and SF-6D utility), Huntington Quality of Life Instrument (H-QoL-I), and the Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Specific Health Problem (WPAI-SHP). All outcomes were summarized using descriptive statistics, differences between disease stages were assessed by Kruskal-Wallis tests.

**Results:** A total of 2,094 PwHD were enrolled with completed eCRFs (100%) and PPIE-P forms (n=482, 23%). Participants mean age was 47.3 years, they were generally evenly distributed across countries, with the majority being ES (40%) followed by MS (33%) and LS (26%). Mean EQ-5D-5L (n=336) utility scores was 0.59 (SD, 0.27), with the highest mean utility scores [SD] in ES (0.72 [0.22]) followed by MS (0.62 [0.18]) and AS (0.37 [0.30]),  $p < 0.001$ . Mean SF-6D score (n=482) was 0.57 (SD, 0.10), with mean values decreasing with advanced disease (ES, 0.61;

MS, 0.56; AS, 0.50,  $p < 0.001$ ). H-QoL-I mean scores ( $n=482$ ) also worsened with more advanced disease, from 0.58 for ES to 0.49 for MS and 0.37 for AS,  $p < 0.001$ . Impairment in daily activities and in work productivity. Overall proxy-respondents reported on average worse outcomes than PwHD (self-reported) across all outcomes and disease stages suggesting a possible unawareness of deficits by PwHD.

Conclusion: The HDBOI study provides new insights into the characteristics and humanistic burden of PwHD, and offers a meaningful contribution to this underserved research area.

## INTRODUCTION

Huntington's Disease (HD) is a rare, inherited and highly complex neuro-degenerative disorder, affecting all aspects of an individual's life. Over time, HD has a substantial impact on physical, cognitive and behavioral processes<sup>1</sup> and universally leads to disability and death<sup>2</sup>. The estimated prevalence of HD in North America and Europe ranges from approximately 6 to 14 cases per 100,000 people and has been shown to be increasing in the Western world following the provision of diagnostic testing<sup>3</sup>. Life expectancy from HD onset varies, but typically ranges from approximately 15-20 years after diagnosis of motor symptoms<sup>4</sup>.

HD is caused by a DNA expansion of repeating cytosine, adenine and guanine (CAG) triplets in the huntingtin gene (Htt). CAG repeats of more than 39 will result in a person developing HD in a normal lifespan, reduced penetrance is seen between 36 and 39 repeats and longer repeats are associated with earlier disease onset<sup>5-7</sup>. CAG repeats are also correlated with the progression of motor and cognitive deficits<sup>8</sup>. Several studies have contributed to the understanding of predictors disease progression<sup>9-12</sup>. Symptoms can vary widely: early signs and symptoms often include personality changes, mood swings, chorea, irritability, and dementia<sup>13</sup>. Progressive neurological damage can affect movement, cognition (perception, awareness, thinking, judgement) and behavior, leading to PwHD becoming dependent on caregivers for activities of daily living<sup>2</sup>. As such, the mean annual costs of care for PwHD have been shown to increase dramatically with disease progression, particularly those related to informal care services, hospital/residential and nursing home care, and outpatient services<sup>13,14</sup>.

There are currently no approved disease modifying treatments to slow, halt, or reverse the course of HD. Clinical management aims to reduce the burden of symptoms, maximize functionality, improve health-related quality of life (HRQoL), and prevent complications<sup>15</sup>. In recent years, promising research exploring molecular regulation of gene expression via anti-

sense oligonucleotides, small molecules and gene therapies has offered the potential for meaningful, durable clinical response, and clinical trials are ongoing.

In the context of novel emerging therapeutic pathways for PwHD, it is important to understand the burden of HD and unmet needs of existing management options. HD is known to have a substantial impact on both PwHD and their families, but little tangible information is available on the humanistic burden on PwHD<sup>16</sup>. and very few studies have assessed HRQoL in HD using validated instruments<sup>17</sup>. The Huntington's Disease Burden of Illness Study (HDBOI) was conducted to characterize the clinical, humanistic, and economic burden of disease on PwHD and their caregivers. In this manuscript we report findings from the HDBOI study related to humanistic burden on PwHD across disease stages within six countries, including the impact of HD on participant's quality of life (HRQoL) and work productivity as well as activity impairment measured by means of validated instruments.

## METHODS

HDBOI is a retrospective, cross-sectional, international burden of illness study of people with diagnosed HD in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. The study was overseen by an Expert Reference Group consisting of key stakeholders, including clinicians (neurologists, psychiatrists, allied health professionals), patient advocates, and health economists. The study collected information related to the clinical, humanistic, and economic burden of HD on participants and caregivers; this analysis focused on patient-focused humanistic burden outcomes. HDBOI data was collected between September 2020 and May 2021.

### *Physician participants*

HD-treating physicians were invited via a fieldwork agency to recruit eligible PwHD during routine clinical consultations. Eligible physicians included neurologists, psychiatrists, general practitioners, internists, geriatricians and geneticists; they had to be the main point of contact for HD patients and to had access into the patient's medical records. Sampling also considered the geographical distribution of physicians within each country to ensure a mix of metropolitan and rural areas.

### *Participants*

Eligible participants were adults ( $\geq 18$  years) clinically diagnosed with symptomatic motor HD disease  $\geq 12$  months prior to the date of clinical consultation that was used for study recruitment

(defined as the index date). Participants who participated in a clinical trial for an HD treatment in the 12 months prior to the index date were not eligible.

PwHD were categorized as early (ES), mid (MS) or advanced (AS), as per Wild and Tabrizi 2014<sup>18</sup>, manifest HD disease stage at the consultation date (index date) based on the opinion of the treating physician.

### *Variables and outcomes*

Data were collected from an electronic Case Record Form (eCRF) completed by the HD-treating physician, and from a voluntary Patient Public Involvement Engagement (PPIE-P) questionnaire completed by the PwHD. For participants with a severe cognitive deficit, the caregiver was asked to provide consent and to complete the PPIE-P on the participant's behalf as proxy respondents. All questionnaires were administered via an online platform.

Physicians retrospectively extracted sociodemographic and clinical information related to diagnosis, disease history and symptomatology from the participants' medical records to complete the CRF. In parallel, PwHD and caregivers completed sociodemographic and clinical information as well as lifestyle changes and cross-sectional self-reported outcomes in the PPIE-P questionnaire.

Cross-sectional participant-reported outcomes in the PPIE-P and analyzed in this piece included: the SF-36 v2, EQ-5D-5L, the Huntington Quality of Life Instrument (H-QoL-I), [Clay 2012] and the Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Specific Health Problem (WPAI-SHP)<sup>19</sup>.

- The SF-36 v2 is a standardized instrument used to measure physical and mental health<sup>20</sup>. From this, preference-based utility scores can be calculated using an algorithm specifically developed for this purpose (Short-Form-Six-Dimension, SF-6D). Utility scores range from 0.291 to 1.000, where a score of 1 represents full health.
- The EQ-5D-5L is a generic measure of self-reported health comprised of five dimensions: mobility, usual activities, self-care, pain and discomfort, and anxiety and depression. Each dimension has five levels of severity (from no problems to extreme problems)<sup>21</sup>. A health state index utility score based on country-specific value sets is derived through an amalgam of the five responses, in this case the England value set was used for all participants for comparability purposes. Scores generally range from 0

(equivalent to 'dead') to 1 ('perfect health'), though scores of less than zero ('worse than dead') can also be derived.

- The H-QoL-I is a disease-specific tool that assesses the humanistic and clinical burden of living with HD. It comprises 11 items that are divided into three dimensions: motor functioning, psychology, and socializing. The H-QoL-I index is calculated by summing all the item scores, which are then normalized to a scale ranging from 0 to 100, with 100 indicating the best possible health and 0 indicating the worst<sup>22</sup>.
- The Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Specific Health Problem (WPAI-SHP) is a validated and widely-used instrument for measuring the impact of a condition on an individual's work and activities during the previous seven days<sup>19</sup>. It consists of six questions, from which four main outcomes can be generated: percent work time missed due to health, percent impairment while working due to health, percent overall work impairment due to health, and percent activity impairment due to health.

### *Statistical analysis*

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic and clinical characteristics for the overall study population and by subgroups based on HD stage. Humanistic burden data were analyzed descriptively overall and by disease stage and by country using measures of central tendency. Univariate comparisons were conducted when appropriate. No imputation of missing data was performed. Differences between outcomes were explored by disease stage and the statistical significance of these differences were assessed by Kruskal-Wallis tests. All data were analyzed using STATA<sup>®</sup> 16 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas; [www.stata.com](http://www.stata.com)) and R ([www.r-project.com](http://www.r-project.com)).

### *Standard protocol approvals, registrations, and participant consents*

The study protocol and materials were approved by the University of Chester Ethics Committee. Electronic informed consent was obtained from all participants (or proxies for participants) in the study.

### *Data availability*

The data that support the findings of this study may be available from HCD Economics, Ltd but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data may be available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of HCD Economics Ltd.

## RESULTS

A total of 2,094 PwHD were enrolled in the study, with completed eCRFs for all 2,094 (100%) participants and completed optional PPIE-P forms from 482 (23%) patients. Forty-two (9%) of the PPIE-P responses were completed by proxy-respondents (of these, 29% ES, 21% MS, 50% AS). The total sample was generally evenly distributed across participating countries, with adequate representation across disease stages (Table 1). The greatest proportions of participants were from Italy and the US (n=492, 24% each), and the majority of participants had ES HD (40%) followed by MS (33%) and AS (26%).

Table 2 shows the distribution of PwHD sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. The mean age of the overall sample was 47.3 years (SD, 13.7).

### *Impact of HD on HRQoL*

As HD is a chronic and degenerative disease, standardized tools measuring HRQoL are important to provide information on PwHD personal everyday experiences and to assess the burden of disease<sup>22,23</sup>. Of the 482 PwHD completing the PPIE-P, 336 (70%) completed the EQ-5D-5L and 482 (100%) completed the SF-36 and the H-QoL-I. Results are displayed in Table 3.

### **HRQoL measured by the EQ-5D**

After normalization to the England value set, the total mean EQ-5D-5L utility score for the overall PPIE-P sample of 336 responders was 0.59 (SD, 0.27). Total mean normalized scores were highest (indicating more favorable HRQoL) among the subgroup of ES disease (mean, [SD]) (0.72 [0.22]) compared to MS (0.62 [0.18]) and AS (0.37 [0.30]),  $p < 0.001$ . The observed trend of decreasing score with disease progression was found for self-reported and proxy-reported responses. However, proxy-responders reported on average worse EQ-5D-5L scores versus self-reported scores. In the AS group the mean utility score for proxy-respondents was just 0.13 (SD 0.31) compared to self-reported score of 0.42 (SD 0.27),  $p < 0.001$ .

The anxiety and depression dimension was the main driver of poor EQ-5D-5L scores in ES and MS participants. In AS, mobility, followed by the self-care and usual activities dimensions were the main drivers of lower scores (see Table 3).



### ***HRQoL measured by the SF-6D***

After normalization to the England value set, the mean SF-6D utility score (all participants) was 0.57 (SD, 0.10), with mean values appearing to decrease with advanced disease. The mean (SD) SF-6D scores for participants with ES (n=204), MS (n=164), and AS HD (n=114), respectively, were 0.61 (0.12), 0.56 (0.07), and 0.50 (0.08),  $p < 0.001$  (Table 3). A similar trend was observed for self-reported responses, however as with EQ-5D, proxy-responders reported on average worse SF-6D scores, in particular for the AS group (0.51 vs. 0.44,  $p < 0.001$ ).

### ***HRQoL measured by the H-QoL-I***

The total H-QoL-I scores also reflected worse participant-reported HRQoL with advanced disease, as the mean (SD) overall scores decreased from 0.58 (0.21) for those with ES HD, to 0.49 (0.15) with MD, and 0.37 (0.17) with AS,  $p < 0.001$ . As with the other HRQoL outcomes, there are large disparities between self-reported and proxy-reported responses across the three disease stages.

Results for the motor, psychology and socializing dimensions display a similar trend to the observed for the total score: mean H-QoL-I motor scores were 0.61, 0.49, and 0.34, psychology scores were 0.52, 0.45, and 0.35, and socializing scores were 0.63, 0.54, and 0.46 for ES, MS and AS respectively.

### ***Impact of HD on activity impairment and work productivity***

The symptoms associated with HD have a strong impact on functional capacity and affect a person's ability to perform daily activities, work functions and maintain employment and may lead to reduced work hours or cessation of work<sup>24,25</sup>. Impact on work and productivity was captured in the WPAI-SHP. Overall **impairment in daily activities** increased with disease severity for both PwHD ( $p < 0.001$ ) and proxy-respondents ( $p < 0.05$ ), as displayed in Table 4. Proxy-respondents reported worse impairment in daily activities for PwHD than self-reported (79% versus 58% respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ). A total of 134 PwHD (28%) reported being employed for pay (all self-reported). Of these (n=134) PwHD, overall **work productivity loss** increased with disease severity: 43% in ES, 55% in MS, and 57% in AS..

## **DISCUSSION**

The HDBOI study provides new insights into the patient characteristics and humanistic burden, by means of a set of patient-reported outcomes that aim at capturing the impact of living with HD. Moreover, the HDBOI study contributes to the literature providing insight on participant's

HRQoL across all stages of disease and from a multinational perspective. To our knowledge, the HDBOI is one of largest studies capturing quality of life using general and specifically validated HRQoL tools for PwHD.

Overall results show that PwHD bear a substantial humanistic burden, that increases with disease advancement. For each tool (EQ5D-5L, SF-6D and H-QoL-I), results in general show poor HRQoL scores which worsen with disease progression. Standardized tools are important for capturing HRQoL as they allow us to compare the experience of PwHD to other populations. For example, results for EQ-5D-5L utility scores highlight how PwHD experience a much worse HRQoL (ES 0.72; MS 0.62 and AS 0.37) than that observed for the general population (general population 45-54 age group average EQ-5D-5L utility is 0.84)<sup>26</sup>. For SF-6D (ES 0.61; MS 0.56 and AS 0.50), similar results are observed (0.79 general population 45-54 age group)<sup>27</sup>. To our knowledge, this is the first study that explores EQ5D-5L utility scores across disease stages for a multinational population.

The HRQoL tools used in this study were able to capture the impact of both physical and psychological decline on HRQoL. For example, PwHD experienced worse scores on each dimension of the EQ5D-5L however, anxiety and depression dimension were the main driver of poor utility scores in ES and MS participants. In AS the main drivers were mobility, followed by the self-care and usual activities. Likewise, the HD specific tool, H-QoL-I, the psychology dimension for ES and MS displayed the worst outcomes, whilst for AS, motor was the dimension with the lowest score. Our results for EQ5D-5L, H-QoL-I and SF-6D fall within the ranges reported by other studies;<sup>17,22,27,28</sup> although, due to differences in the version of the tool used (EQ5D-3L vs. 5L) and the composition of the study populations, they are not directly comparable.

Although this study demonstrates the substantial impact of HD on HRQoL, it is also important to highlight the observed discrepancies between self-reported and proxy-respondent outcomes, as the latter group reported on average worse outcomes across all disease stages. Our findings are consistent with previously published studies for HD<sup>29</sup> and for other chronic diseases<sup>30</sup>. One rationale for this discrepancy could be due to PwHD who were able to complete the self-reported forms have higher level of HRQoL than those who had a proxy-respondent completing the survey on their behalf. However, this discrepancy may be due to the well-documented lack of insight, unawareness of deficits and overestimation of abilities often displayed by PwHD<sup>31,32</sup>. In particular, Hoth et al. find that PwHD have higher self-ratings of their own competency (i.e., behavioural control, emotional control, activities of daily living) than the ratings provided by the

PwHD when asked to measure the competence of another person not affected by HD. This is important as although overall the HDBOI study reports a substantial impact on HRQoL for PwHD, taking only into account the self-reported HRQoL might have underestimated the HRQoL and therefore the humanistic burden of HD.

Similarly, the WPAI tool also shows significant impact of HD on the work and productivity of PwHD. Overall impairment in daily activities is large and increases with disease severity. Impairment in daily activities for all participants were 59% and 79% for self and proxy reported groups, respectively, highlighting discrepancies between patient and proxy groups. For work productivity loss, we observe higher than anticipated employment levels among MS and AS groups in the self-reported group (none in employment in the proxy-reported) which may be associated with impaired awareness often displayed by PwHD. Our results for proxy-reported impairment in daily activities are similar to those report by Goh et al. 2020<sup>33</sup>; however, they do not include advance stage PwHD in their analysis. This further supports the hypothesis about PwHD overestimating their abilities as we would expect the WPAI results from this study to be higher considering that AS PwHD were included. WPAI-SHP may not be the most appropriate tool for assessing productivity outcomes, due to the self-reported nature of this tool and the difficulties with insight in the HD population, hence it may not reflect the actual work productivity loss at later stages of disease.

Findings of this study should be interpreted in the context of certain strengths and limitations. To minimize bias and to provide representative estimates of the burden of HD, we aimed to enroll a generalizable sample with adequate proportions of patients in each disease stage; however, these proportions were not available in the published literature. Since recruitment was driven through the clinician office visits, very advanced stage patients may have been underrepresented if they were admitted to long-term residential or nursing care homes. As such, the HRQoL in AS participants may be overestimated. In addition, the assessment of participants' disease stage was based on the opinion of the treating physicians. As such, we cannot be certain that our disease stage classification fully corresponds with standardized measures. Further, while patient-reported outcomes are particularly valuable in the context of burdensome, lifelong conditions such as HD, data collection may have been influenced by a selection bias in participation and completion of the questionnaires. In addition, given that the number of proxy-respondents account for less than 10% of the total PPIE-P responses, findings for this group might not be generalizable. Finally, there may have been a potential recall bias

for self/proxy-respondents completing the PPIE-P, though the recall periods were relatively recent (e.g., past 7 days).

This HDBOI study offers an up-to-date picture of the large burden of HD across disease stages. Moreover, it increases the evidence base for the international HD community by capturing a large set of patient-reported outcomes and improving the knowledge about the course of disease, information that will enable stakeholders to make fully informed decisions and can lead to improvements in the management of HD. Results show a substantial humanistic burden that increases as diseases progresses, emphasizing the need for intervention at earlier stages of HD. Overall, it is difficult to contextualize these findings as there is little information available on the humanistic burden of HD in the literature. As such, the HDBOI study offers a meaningful contribution to this underserved research area by offering a detailed description of the burden of HD by severity levels.

Future work should further explore the source of differences between self-reported and proxy-reported outcomes and the unawareness of deficits displayed by PwHD as solely focusing on self-reported measures might be underestimating the true burden of HD.

## REFERENCES

1. Novak MJ, Tabrizi SJ. Huntington's disease. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c3109. doi:10.1136/bmj.c3109
2. Wheelock VL, Tempkin T, Marder K, et al. Predictors of nursing home placement in Huntington disease. *Neurology*. 2003;60(6):998-1001. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000052992.58107.67
3. Baig SS, Strong M, Quarrell OW. The global prevalence of Huntington's disease: a systematic review and discussion. *Neurodegener Dis Manag*. 2016;6(4):331-343. doi:10.2217/nmt-2016-0008
4. Nance M, Paulsen JS, Rosenblatt A, Wheelock V. *A Physician's Guide to the Management of Huntington's Disease (3rd Edition)*. Huntington's Disease Society of America; 2011. <https://hdsa.org/product/a-physicians-guide-to-the-management-of-huntingtons-disease-3rd-edition/>
5. Johnson AC, Paulsen JS. *Understanding Behavior In Huntington's Disease: A Guide For Professionals*. Huntington's Disease Society of America; 2014.

<https://hdsa.org/product/understanding-behavior-in-huntingtons-disease-a-guide-for-professionals/>

6. McColgan P, Tabrizi SJ. Huntington's disease: a clinical review. *Eur J Neurol*. 2018;25(1):24-34. doi:10.1111/ene.13413
7. Paulsen JS, Nehl C, Hoth KF, et al. Depression and stages of Huntington's disease. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2005;17(4):496-502. doi:10.1176/jnp.17.4.496
8. Rosenblatt A, Kumar B v, Mo A, Welsh CS, Margolis RL, Ross CA. Age, CAG repeat length, and clinical progression in Huntington's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2012;27(2):272-276. doi:10.1002/mds.24024
9. Huntington Study Group CI, Dorsey E. Characterization of a large group of individuals with huntington disease and their relatives enrolled in the COHORT study. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(2):e29522. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029522
10. Huntington Study Group PI. At risk for Huntington disease: The PHAROS (Prospective Huntington At Risk Observational Study) cohort enrolled. *Arch Neurol*. 2006;63(7):991-996. doi:10.1001/archneur.63.7.991
11. Orth M, Handley OJ, Schwenke C, et al. Observing Huntington's Disease: the European Huntington's Disease Network's REGISTRY. *PLoS Curr*. 2010;2:RRN1184. doi:10.1371/currents.RRN1184
12. Tabrizi SJ, Scahill RI, Owen G, et al. Predictors of phenotypic progression and disease onset in premanifest and early-stage Huntington's disease in the TRACK-HD study: analysis of 36-month observational data. *Lancet Neurol*. 2013;12(7):637-649. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70088-7
13. Jones C, Busse M, Quinn L, et al. The societal cost of Huntington's disease: are we underestimating the burden? *Eur J Neurol*. 2016;23(10):1588-1590. doi:10.1111/ene.13107
14. Divino V, Dekoven M, Warner JH, et al. The direct medical costs of Huntington's disease by stage. A retrospective commercial and Medicaid claims data analysis. *J Med Econ*. 2013;16(8):1043-1050. doi:10.3111/13696998.2013.818545
15. Fritz NE, Rao AK, Kegelmeyer D, et al. Physical Therapy and Exercise Interventions in Huntington's Disease: A Mixed Methods Systematic Review. *J Huntingtons Dis*. 2017;6(3):217-235. doi:10.3233/JHD-170260
16. Arnesen A. A systematic literature review on quality of life and economic burden in Huntington's Disease (PART OF THE SEEING-HD STUDY). *International Society of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*. Published online 2020. [https://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015\(20\)33678-0/fulltext](https://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015(20)33678-0/fulltext)
17. Dorey J, Clay E, Khemiri A, Belhadj A, Cubillo PT, Toumi M. The quality of life of Spanish patients with Huntington's disease measured with H-QoL-I and EQ-5D. *J Mark Access Health Policy*. 2016;4. doi:10.3402/jmahp.v4.27356
18. Wild EJ, Tabrizi SJ, Bates G, Jones L. Huntington's disease. Published online 2014.

19. ReillyAssociates. Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Questionnaire: Specific Health Problem V2.0 (WPAI:SHP). Published 2021. [http://www.reillyassociates.net/WPAI\\_SHP.html](http://www.reillyassociates.net/WPAI_SHP.html)
20. Brazier JE, Harper R, Jones NM, et al. Validating the SF-36 health survey questionnaire: new outcome measure for primary care. *BMJ*. 1992;305(6846):160-164. doi:10.1136/bmj.305.6846.160
21. Devlin NJ, Brooks R. EQ-5D and the EuroQol Group: Past, Present and Future. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. 2017;15(2):127-137. doi:10.1007/s40258-017-0310-5
22. Clay E, de Nicola A, Dorey J, et al. Validation of the first quality-of-life measurement for patients with Huntington's disease: the Huntington Quality of Life Instrument. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2012;27(4):208-214. doi:10.1097/YIC.0b013e3283534fa9
23. Hocaoglu MB, Gaffan EA, Ho AK. The Huntington's Disease health-related Quality of Life questionnaire (HDQoL): a disease-specific measure of health-related quality of life. *Clin Genet*. 2012;81(2):117-122. doi:10.1111/j.1399-0004.2011.01823.x
24. Paulsen JS, Langbehn DR, Stout JC, et al. Detection of Huntington's disease decades before diagnosis: the Predict-HD study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2008;79(8):874-880. doi:10.1136/jnnp.2007.128728
25. van Duijn E, Kingma EM, Timman R, et al. Cross-sectional study on prevalences of psychiatric disorders in mutation carriers of Huntington's disease compared with mutation-negative first-degree relatives. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2008;69(11):1804-1810. doi:10.4088/jcp.v69n1116
26. Janssen B, Szende A. Population Norms for the EQ-5D. In: Szende A, Janssen B, Cabases J, eds. *Self-Reported Population Health: An International Perspective Based on EQ-5D*. ; 2014:19-30. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7596-1\_3
27. Hawton A, Green C, Goodwin E, Harrower T. Health state utility values (QALY weights) for Huntington's disease: an analysis of data from the European Huntington's Disease Network (EHDN). *Eur J Health Econ*. 2019;20(9):1335-1347. doi:10.1007/s10198-019-01092-9
28. van Walsem MR, Howe EI, Ruud GA, Frich JC, Andelic N. Health-related quality of life and unmet healthcare needs in Huntington's disease. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2017;15(1):6. doi:10.1186/s12955-016-0575-7
29. Hocaoglu MB, Gaffan EA, Ho AK. Health-related quality of life in Huntington's disease patients: a comparison of proxy assessment and patient self-rating using the disease-specific Huntington's disease health-related quality of life questionnaire (HDQoL). *J Neurol*. 2012;259(9):1793-1800. doi:10.1007/s00415-011-6405-2
30. Sneeuw KC, Sprangers MA, Aaronson NK. The role of health care providers and significant others in evaluating the quality of life of patients with chronic disease. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2002;55(11):1130-1143. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(02)00479-1

31. Ho AK, Robbins AO, Barker RA. Huntington's disease patients have selective problems with insight. *Mov Disord.* 2006;21(3):385-389. doi:10.1002/mds.20739
32. Hoth KF, Paulsen JS, Moser DJ, Tranel D, Clark LA, Bechara A. Patients with Huntington's disease have impaired awareness of cognitive, emotional, and functional abilities. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2007;29(4):365-376. doi:10.1080/13803390600718958
33. Goh AM, You E, Perin S. Alcohol use, mental health, and functional capacity as predictors of workplace disability in a cohort with manifest Huntington's Disease. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2020;32(3):235-243.

Table 1. Participants with completed eCRFs and PPIE-Ps by country and disease stage

Participants, n (%)	All participants	ES	MS	AS
<b>Completed eCRFs</b>				
Total	2094 (100)	846 (40)	701 (34)	547 (26)
Total by Country				
Italy	492 (24)	190 (22)	182 (26)	120 (22)
United States	492 (24)	213 (25)	154 (22)	125 (23)
Spain	354 (17)	152 (18)	107 (15)	95 (17)
United Kingdom	272 (13)	91 (11)	111 (16)	70 (13)
Germany	264 (13)	96 (11)	85 (12)	83 (15)
France	220 (11)	104 (12)	62 (9)	54 (10)
Total	2094 (100)	846 (100)	701 (100)	547 (100)
<b>Completed PPIE-P questionnaires</b>				
Total	482 (100)	204 (42)	164 (34)	114 (24)
Participant (PwHD)	440 (91)	192 (94)	155 (95)	93 (82)
Proxy-Respondent	42 (9)	12 (6)	9 (5)	21 (18)
Total by Country				
Spain	207 (43)	103 (50)	58 (35)	46 (40)
Italy	126 (26)	55 (27)	49 (30)	22 (19)
United Kingdom	56 (12)	6 (3)	26 (16)	24 (21)
France	43 (9)	20 (10)	14 (9)	9 (8)
United States	37 (8)	15 (7)	12 (7)	10 (9)
Germany	13 (3)	5 (2)	5 (3)	3 (3)
Total	482 (100)	204 (100)	164 (100)	114 (100)

eCRF, electronic Case Report Form; PPIE-P, Patient Public Involvement Engagement Patient.

Table 2. Participant sociodemographic and clinical characteristics (eCRF population, n=2094)

<b>eCRF Population</b>				
<b>Participant, n (%) unless noted</b>	<b>All participants (n=2094)</b>	<b>ES (n=846)</b>	<b>MS (n=701)</b>	<b>AS (n=547)</b>
Sex				
Female	1,253 (60)	492 (58)	397 (57)	365 (67)
Male	799 (38)	334 (39)	288 (41)	177 (32)
Prefer not to answer	42 (2)	20 (2)	16 (2)	6 (1)
Age, mean (SD)	47.3 (13.7) <sup>a</sup>	43.2 (12.9) <sup>a</sup>	48.1 (13.6)	52.3 (13.3)
BMI, mean (SD)	23.9 (3.5) <sup>b</sup>	23.7 (3.5) <sup>b</sup>	24.1 (3.4) <sup>b</sup>	23.8 (3.7) <sup>b</sup>
<b>PPIE-P sample</b>				
<b>Participant, n (%) unless noted</b>	<b>All participants (n=482)</b>	<b>ES (n=204)</b>	<b>MS (n=164)</b>	<b>AS (n=114)</b>
Sex				
Female	164 (35)	76 (37)	63 (38)	30 (26)
Male	313 (65)	128 (63)	101 (62)	84 (74)
Age, mean (SD)	47.0 (12.4)	43.4 (12.2)	48.9 (11.6)	50.7 (12.3)
BMI, mean (SD)	24.2 (3.3) <sup>c</sup>	23.9 (3.2) <sup>c</sup>	24.3 (3.6) <sup>c</sup>	24.2 (3.3) <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Available responses in total sample, n=2093; Early stage, n=845.

<sup>b</sup> Available responses in total sample, n=1151; Early stage, n=487; Mid stage, n=376; Advanced stage, n=288.

<sup>c</sup> Available responses in total sample, n=337; Early stage, n=151; Mid stage, n=108; Advanced stage, n=78.

eCRF, electronic Case Report Form; SD, standard deviation.



Table 3. EQ-5D-5L, SF-6D and H-QoL-I utility scores overall and by HD disease stage

Participants, n (%)	All participants	ES	MS	AS
<b>EQ-5D-5L, mean (SD)</b>				
Sample Size (N) All participants/Self-reported/Proxy	336/ 309/ 27	129/ 122 / 7	119/ 115 / 4	88/ 72 / 16
All Participants*	0.59 (0.27)	0.72 (0.22)	0.62 (0.18)	0.37 (0.30)
Self-Reported (PwHD)*	0.62 (0.24)	0.74 (0.19)	0.62 (0.18)	0.42 (0.27)
Proxy-Respondent‡	0.26 (0.35)	0.34 (0.31)	0.66 (0.26)	0.13 (0.31)
<b>EQ-5D-5L, dimensions – All Participants (N= 336)</b>				
Mobility (1-5)	2.50 (1.11)	1.85 (0.81)	2.52 (0.87)	3.42 (1.11)
Self-care (1-5)	2.42 (1.11)	1.78 (0.89)	2.49 (0.85)	3.28 (1.10)
Usual activities (1-5)	2.49 (1.08)	1.94 (0.89)	2.51 (0.85)	3.28 (1.12)
Pain (1-5)	2.41 (0.87)	1.99 (0.81)	2.46 (0.75)	2.94 (0.79)
Anxiety/Depression (1-5)	2.66 (0.92)	2.37 (0.95)	2.62 (0.79)	3.13 (0.87)
<b>SF-6D, mean (SD)</b>				
Sample Size (N) All participants/Self-reported/Proxy	482/ 440 / 42	204/ 192 / 12	164/ 155 / 9	114/ 93 / 21
Utility score – All participants*	0.57 (0.10)	0.61 (0.12)	0.56 (0.07)	0.50 (0.08)
Self-Reported (PwHD)*	0.57 (0.10)	0.61 (0.11)	0.56 (0.07)	0.51 (0.08)
Proxy-Respondent‡	0.49 (0.10)	0.54 (0.11)	0.55 (0.06)	0.44 (0.09)
<b>H-QoL-I</b>				
Sample Size (N) All participants/Self-reported/Proxy	482/ 440/ 42	204/ 192 / 12	164/ 155 / 9	114/ 93/ 21
Total H-QoL-I Score – All Participants*	0.50 (0.20)	0.58 (0.21)	0.49 (0.15)	0.37 (0.17)
Self-Reported (PwHD)*	0.52 (0.19)	0.60 (0.20)	0.50 (0.15)	0.41 (0.15)

Proxy-Respondent†	0.31 (0.19)	0.40 (0.20)	0.40 (0.15)	0.22 (0.17)
<b>H-QoL-I Domains- All Participants (N= 482)</b>				
Motor Scoring	0.51 (0.23)	0.61 (0.24)	0.49 (0.17)	0.34 (0.19)
Psych Scoring	0.45 (0.21)	0.52 (0.22)	0.45 (0.17)	0.35 (0.19)
Socializing Scoring	0.55(0.24)	0.63 (0.25)	0.54 (0.08)	0.46 (0.23)

eCRF, electronic Case Report Form; PPIE-P-P, Patient Public Involvement Engagement Patient; SD, standard deviation.

To assess the significance of differences between disease stages, Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted for the H-QoL-I total score as well as for the EQ-5D-5L and SF-6D utility scores: \*  $p < 0.001$ , †  $p < 0.01$ , ‡  $p < 0.05$ .

Table 4. Activity impairment and work productivity, overall and by disease stage

<b>Participants, n (%) unless noted</b>	<b>All participants</b>	<b>ES</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>AS</b>
<b>Completed PPIE-P, n (%)</b>	<b>482 (100)</b>	<b>204 (42)</b>	<b>164 (34)</b>	<b>114 (24)</b>
<b>PwHD Proxy- Respondent</b>	440 (91) 42 (9)	192 (94) 12 (6)	155 (95) 9 (5)	93 (82) 21 (18)
Percent overall activity impairment due to health, mean- <b>PwHD</b> (SD)*	58.1 (25)	46.4 (26)	63.6 (21)	72.9 (20)
Percent overall activity impairment due to health, mean- <b>Proxy Respondent</b> (SD) ‡	78.8 (19)	68.3 (23)	80 (12)	84.3 (16)
<b>Employed in the last 7 days, n (%)</b>				
<b>PwHD Proxy- Respondent</b>	<b>134 (28)</b> -	<b>83 (41)</b> -	<b>35 (21)</b> -	<b>16 (14)</b> -
Percent overall work productivity loss due to health (WPL), mean (SD)	47.6 (27)	42.8 (29)	54.8 (23)	56.9 (20)
Percent work time missed: Absenteeism, mean (SD) ‡	11.5 (0.2)	9.1 (0.1)	13.9 (0.3)	18.3 (0.2)
Percent impaired productivity at work: Presenteeism, mean (SD)	42.2 (0.2)	38.3 (0.3)	49.1 (0.2)	47.5 (0.2)

HD, Huntington's Disease; SD, standard deviation; PPIE-P, Patient Public Involvement Engagement; PwHD, Person with HD.

To assess the significance of differences between disease stages, Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted for the four WPAI outcomes: \*  $p < 0.001$ , ‡  $p < 0.05$ .

# Neurology® Clinical Practice

## Humanistic Burden of Huntington Disease: Evidence From the Huntington Disease Burden of Illness Study

Idaira Rodriguez Santana, Samuel Frank, Maria Doherty, et al.  
*Neurol Clin Pract* published online October 12, 2022  
DOI 10.1212/CPJ.0000000000200095

**This information is current as of October 12, 2022**

<b>Updated Information &amp; Services</b>	including high resolution figures, can be found at: <a href="http://cp.neurology.org/content/early/2022/10/12/CPJ.0000000000200095.full.html">http://cp.neurology.org/content/early/2022/10/12/CPJ.0000000000200095.full.html</a>
<b>Permissions &amp; Licensing</b>	Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at: <a href="http://cp.neurology.org/misc/about.xhtml#permissions">http://cp.neurology.org/misc/about.xhtml#permissions</a>
<b>Reprints</b>	Information about ordering reprints can be found online: <a href="http://cp.neurology.org/misc/addir.xhtml#reprintsus">http://cp.neurology.org/misc/addir.xhtml#reprintsus</a>

*Neurol Clin Pract* is an official journal of the American Academy of Neurology. Published continuously since 2011, it is now a bimonthly with 6 issues per year. Copyright Copyright © 2022 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. on behalf of the American Academy of Neurology.. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 2163-0402. Online ISSN: 2163-0933.

