

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/173858/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Ingram, John R. , Bettoli, Vincenzo, Espy, Jasmine I., Kokolakis, Georgios, Martorell, Antonio, Villani, Axel P., Wallinger, Hayley, Truman, Isabel, Coak, Emily, Kasperek, Torben, Muscianisi, Elisa, Richardson, Craig and Kimball, Alexa B. 2024. Treatment satisfaction in patients with hidradenitis suppurativa: A real-world survey from the EU5 and US. *Dermatology* 10.1159/000542343

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000542343>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Title

Treatment satisfaction in patients with hidradenitis suppurativa: A real-world survey from the EU5 and US

Authors

John R. Ingram MD, PhD¹, Vincenzo Bettoli MD², Jasmine I. Espy MA³, Georgios Kokolakis MD, PhD⁴, Antonio Martorell MD, PhD⁵, Axel P. Villani MD, PhD⁶, Hayley Wallinger BA (Hons)⁷, Isabel Truman BSc (Hons)⁷, Emily Coak BSc (Hons)⁷, Torben Kasperek PhD⁸, Elisa Muscianisi MD⁹, Craig Richardson BSc (Hons)⁸, Alexa B. Kimball MD, MPH¹⁰

Affiliations

¹Department of Dermatology & Academic Wound Healing, Division of Infection and Immunity, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK; ²Department of Oncology and Specialistic Medicine, O.U. of Dermatology, Azienda Ospedaliera - University of Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy; ³Hidradenitis Suppurativa Patient Advocate, Multimedia Journalist, and Filmmaker, Los Angeles, USA; ⁴Psoriasis Research and Treatment Center, Department of Dermatology, Venereology and Allergology Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany; ⁵Department of Dermatology, Hospital de Manises, Valencia, Spain; ⁶Hospices Civils de Lyon, Claude Bernard Lyon I University, Department of Dermatology – Edouard Herriot Hospital, Lyon, France; ⁷Adelphi Real World, Bollington, UK; ⁸Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland; ⁹Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation,

East Hanover, USA; ¹⁰Harvard Medical School and Clinical Laboratory for Epidemiology and Applied Research in Skin (CLEARs), Department of Dermatology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, USA

Short title

Treatment satisfaction in hidradenitis suppurativa

Corresponding author

Dr John Ingram,

Department of Dermatology & Academic Wound Healing,

Division of Infection and Immunity, Cardiff University,

Cardiff, UK

ORCID No. 0000-0002-5257-1142

Email: ingramjr@cardiff.ac.uk

Phone: +44 (0)29 2184 5377

Keywords

Hidradenitis suppurativa; HS; barriers to biologics; management; acne inversa; surgery; cross-sectional

Key message

In addition to a high disease burden, in a large, real-world population, patients with hidradenitis suppurativa may be undertreated. Integrating the patient voice into treatment decisions may lead to better outcomes and improved treatment satisfaction.

Tables: 3 (main manuscript) and 3 (supplement)

Figures: 3 (main manuscript) and 4 (supplement)

Word count: 2906 words

Abstract

Introduction

Hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) is a debilitating, inflammatory skin disorder. Treatment strategies in patients with HS are challenging; real-world evidence in a HS population is warranted for greater disease understanding. The objective of this analysis was to describe real-world treatment patterns and treatment satisfaction in patients with HS.

Methods

This was a cross-sectional market research survey with retrospective data collection in patients with HS from the United States and five European countries (France, Germany, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom) between November 2020 and April 2021, using physician- and patient-reported surveys. Eligible physicians were general dermatologists actively managing patients with HS; dermatologists were required to have consulted with ≥ 2 patients with HS in the previous 12 months. Adult (≥ 18 years) and adolescent (10–17 years) HS patients visiting a participating dermatologist were included. Outcomes included treatment patterns, flare status, treatments prescribed in response to flares, previous surgeries, barriers to biologics, and patient- and physician-reported satisfaction with the disease control provided by treatment.

Results

Survey data from 1787 patients were collected from 312 dermatologists. The most frequently prescribed treatments were topicals, oral antibiotics, and antiseptic washes/creams at diagnosis and sampling. At sampling, biologics were more frequently prescribed in patients with more severe disease (prescribed in 26.6%, 31.0% and

52.4% of patients with mild, moderate, and severe disease, respectively); oral antibiotics (48.8%), topicals (37.4%), and biologics (34.3%) were the most frequently prescribed treatment classes in response to a flare. Of patients currently not receiving a biologic, dermatologists reported that 18.9% of patients' condition warranted their use. Approximately one quarter of dermatologists (24.5%) and patients (27.4%) were not satisfied with current treatment; of patients who were dissatisfied, 12.8% reported they would never raise their dissatisfaction with their doctor.

Conclusion

These real-world data suggest a high disease burden and potential undertreatment in patients with HS. Patients received multiple treatments, and a notable proportion underwent surgery. Robustly integrating the patient voice in HS treatment decisions may lead to better outcomes and improved treatment satisfaction.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Philip O’Gorman, PhD and Trudy McGarry, PhD (Novartis Ireland Ltd, Dublin, Ireland), and Rosalind Bonomally, MSc (Novartis UK Ltd, London, UK) for providing medical writing support and assistance, which was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP 2022) guidelines (<https://www.ismpp.org/gpp-2022>).

Statement of Ethics

Using a check box, patients provided written informed consent for use of their anonymized and aggregated data for research and publication in scientific journals. Data collection was undertaken in line with European Pharmaceutical Marketing Research Association (1) guidelines. Each survey was performed in full accordance with relevant legislation at the time of data collection, including the US Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act 1996, (2) and Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act legislation (3). This research also obtained ethics approval from the Western IRB, study protocol number AG8836.

1. European Pharmaceutical Market Research Association (EphMRA) Code of Conduct. Updated September 2019. Available from: <https://www.ephmra.org/standards/code-of-conduct/>. Accessed on 7th June 2023

2. US Department of Health and Human Services. Summary of the HIPAA Privacy Rule; 2003. Available from: <http://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/privacysummary.pdf>. Accessed on 7th June 2023

3. Health Information Technology. Health Information Technology Act. Available from: https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/hitech_act_excerpt_from_arra_with_index.pdf. Accessed on 7th June 2023

Conflicts of Interest Statement

John Ingram has acted as a consultant and/or advisory board member for AbbVie, Boehringer Ingelheim, ChemoCentryx, Citryll, Insmmed, Kymera Therapeutics, MoonLake, Novartis, UCB, Union Therapeutics, and Viela Bio. **John Ingram** also receives an editorial stipend from the British Journal of Dermatology and an author honorarium from UpToDate. **John Ingram** is co-copyright holder of HiSQOL and Investigator and Patient Global Assessment instruments for hidradenitis suppurativa. **Vincenzo Bettoli** has acted as a consultant, advisory board member, and investigator, and received honoraria from AbbVie, Beiersdorf, Bioderma, Biogena, Difa-Cooper, Galderma, GSK, ICF, LEO Pharma, L'Oreal, Meda, Menarini-Relife, Mylan, Novartis, Pharcos-Biodue, and UCB; and has received research support from AbbVie. **Jasmine Espy** has nothing to disclose. **Georgios Kokolakis** has received honoraria for participation in advisory boards, in clinical trials and/or as a speaker from AbbVie Deutschland & Co. KG, Abbott, Actelion Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Basilea Pharmaceutica Ltd., Bayer AG, Biogen IDEC, Celgene GmbH, Hexal AG, Janssen-Cilag, LEO Pharma, Lilly Deutschland, MSD Sharp & Dohme, Novartis Pharma GmbH, Parexel International, Pfizer Deutschland, Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland, and UCB Pharma. **Antonio Martorell** has acted as a consultant, advisory board member, and investigator and received honoraria from Novartis, AbbVie, Janssen Cilag, UCB, Lilly, LEO Pharma, L'Oreal, Sanofi, Sandoz, and Amgen. **Axel Villani** has acted as a consultant for AbbVie, Amgen, Janssen, LEO

Pharma, Lilly, MSD, Novartis, and UCB. **Craig Richardson** and **Torben Kasperek** are employed by Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland. **Elisa Muscianisi** is an employee and shareholder of Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, East Hanover, USA. **Hayley Wallinger**, **Isabel Truman**, and **Emily Coak** are employed by Adelphi Real World, Bollington, UK. **Alexa Kimball** is a consultant and investigator for AbbVie, Bristol Meyers Squibb, Janssen, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, and UCB; investigator for Incyte and Anapyts Bio; consultant for Alumis, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Ventyx, Moonlake, Concert, Sonoma Bio, Sanofi; and receives fellowship funding from Janssen and Abbvie; and serves on the Board of Directors for Almirall.

Funding Sources

This study was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland. The sponsor subscribed to Adelphi Real World to access the data. The sponsor did not influence the original survey through either contribution to the design of questionnaires or data collection.

Author Contributions

Hayley Wallinger was involved in the survey design, data collection, and data analysis. **Isabel Truman** and **Emily Coak** were involved in data analysis. **John Ingram**, **Vincenzo Bettoli**, **Jasmine Espy**, **Georgios Kokolakis**, **Antonio Martorell**, **Axel Villani**, **Craig Richardson**, **Torben Kasperek**, **Elisa Muscianisi**, and **Alexa Kimball** provided substantial contributions to the interpretation of the data. **John Ingram**, **Vincenzo Bettoli**, **Jasmine Espy**, **Georgios Kokolakis**, **Antonio Martorell**, **Axel Villani**, **Craig Richardson**, **Torben Kasperek**, **Elisa Muscianisi**, **Hayley Wallinger**,

Isabel Truman, Emily Coak and Alexa Kimball revised and reviewed the manuscript, approved the final version of the manuscript for submission, and agreed to be accountable for the accuracy of the work.

Data Availability Statement

Data collection was undertaken by Adelphi Real World as part of an independent survey, entitled the Hidradenitis Suppurativa Disease Specific Programme (DSP™), subscribed to by multiple pharmaceutical companies, of which, one was Novartis Pharma AG. Novartis Pharma AG did not influence the original survey through either contribution to the design of questionnaires or data collection. All data that support the findings of this study are the intellectual property of Adelphi Real World. All reasonable requests for access to data should be addressed directly to Hayley Wallinger at hayley.wallinger@adelphigroup.com.

Introduction

Hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) is a systemic, chronic, debilitating, inflammatory skin condition. It is characterized by painful dermal inflammatory nodules and abscesses, which can cause follicular occlusion and lead to malodorous discharge and draining tunnel formation, resulting in irreversible scarring. [1-4] HS is associated with a high disease burden, and patients can experience significant morbidity and a substantial impact on quality of life (QoL). [2, 3, 5-10] HS is a relatively common disorder; the exact prevalence is unknown but estimates range between 0.03–1.2% in the United States (US) and Europe. [5, 11-13] However, HS may be misdiagnosed or under-diagnosed; an average delay of 7–10 years between symptom onset and HS diagnosis has been reported. [14-16] Diagnostic methods are not clearly defined, with accurate and timely diagnoses relying on the ability of the consulting physician to accurately recognize HS signs and symptoms. [15, 17].

HS is a hard-to-treat disease that requires a multifaceted treatment approach. The overall goal of HS treatment is to manage existing lesions while minimizing pain and drainage, decrease the frequency of lesion recurrence, and prevent disease progression and scarring, thereby improving patient QoL. [18] Medical treatments for patients can include topicals, oral antibiotics, retinoids, hormonal therapies, immunosuppressants, and biologic therapies [19, 20]; while common surgical procedures include local excisions, derroofing of draining tunnels and radical wide excision. [19-22] Definitive treatment algorithms for HS are challenging to develop due to the heterogeneity of the disease and complexity of its pathogenesis. [23] Existing

treatment algorithms are strongly based on expert opinion and consensus, [24] which differ between guidelines, potentially due to regional differences. [19-21, 25] Depending on disease severity, current guidelines recommend a combination of both medical and surgical treatment for HS. [18, 20, 21, 26, 27] However, patient-reported data have indicated that current pain management modalities are only moderately effective at improving pain due to HS. [28] This is relevant because pain is reported as the most troublesome symptom of HS and is associated with the greatest impact on patient QoL. [29, 30] Furthermore, a large proportion of patients report that they are not satisfied with current treatments. [16, 31]

Due to the evolving treatment landscape for patients with HS, [32] and the challenges to integrate various treatment modalities, current real-world data describing treatment patterns in this population are warranted. This study aimed to describe treatment patterns and satisfaction with treatment in a large, real-world population of patients with HS using physician- and patient-reported data.

Materials and Methods

Study design

This was a cross-sectional market research survey with retrospective data collection to assess the clinical unmet need, burden of disease, and treatment patterns in patients with HS. We have previously reported on the unmet clinical needs and disease burden in this population including patients from the EU5 (France, Germany, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom) and US. [33] Here, we report on the treatment patterns and treatment satisfaction in patients with HS. Further methods are detailed in the **Supplementary Methods** and in Ingram et al 2022. [33]

Data sources and questionnaires

All participating physicians were requested to complete a Patient Record Form (PRF) for the subsequent 5–7 patients with HS attending their practice. The PRF, which has been previously described, [33] consisted of 11 sections covering multiple topics. Patients were also invited to complete a voluntary self-completion questionnaire relating to their condition; data from physicians and patients were linked at data processing where applicable.

Disease severity

Disease severity was physician-judged and categorized as mild, moderate, or severe, with no clinical definition applied. Importantly, physician-judged severity was previously reported to be closely aligned with Hurley staging in this patient population. [33]

Physician-judged disease severity was recorded retrospectively through chart review at

the time of first HS diagnosis and at the time of sampling. The retrospective assessment (severity at first HS diagnosis) was recorded by a physician other than the dermatologist participating in the survey in 47.0% of patients. In these cases, severity was derived from the patient's case notes by the participating physician.

Study objectives

The primary objective of this manuscript was to evaluate treatment patterns in a large population of patients with HS with a particular focus on patient and physician satisfaction with treatment, and treatment goals, overall and based on physician-judged severity.

Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were assessed using StataCorp 2019 (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16.1, College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC). Alignment between patient- and physician-reported satisfaction with current disease control was determined using a kappa (κ) statistic. The kappa statistic indicates the level of agreement between two outcomes that are measured on the same scale, which ranges from a score of 0 (level of agreement equivalent to chance) to 1 (perfect agreement). Cut-offs for values between 0 and 1 have been previously suggested. [34] Continuous data are reported as mean (standard deviation [SD]) unless otherwise stated; categorical data are presented as a percentage and n/N (n=number of patients with outcome; N=number of patients with available data).

Results

Patient population and baseline characteristics

A full description of the sample population, including the number of patients and physicians included by country, has been previously described. [33] In brief, data from 1787 patients with HS (EU5, N=1305 [73.0%]; US, N=482 [27.0%]) were collected by 312 dermatologists (EU5, N=231 [74.0%]; US, N=81 [26.0%]). The mean±SD age was 34.4±12.2 years and most patients were female (57.6%, 1029/1787) and White (77.7%, 1388/1787). Full demographic and disease characteristics have been described previously. [33] At the time of HS diagnosis, 26.4% (472/1787), 53.7% (959/1787), and 19.9% (356/1787) of patients were classified as having mild, moderate, or severe disease, respectively, based on physician-judged severity. At the time of sampling, 66.0% (1179/1787), 29.3% (523/1787), and 4.7% (85/1787) of patients were classified as having mild, moderate, or severe disease, respectively, based on physician-judged severity. Overall, 142 and 128 patients were not receiving any treatment at the time of diagnosis and sampling, respectively.

Medical treatment at HS diagnosis and current treatment patterns

The most prescribed treatments at the time of diagnosis were topicals (59.5%, 978/1645), oral antibiotics (58.1%, 955/1645), and antiseptic washes/creams (37.1%, 611/1645) (**Fig S1**). At the time of sampling, the most prescribed treatments were oral antibiotics (40.3%, 669/1659), topicals (38.7%, 642/1659), antiseptic washes/creams (34.0%, 564/1659), and biologics (29.2%, 484/1659) (**Fig 1**). Patients with severe disease were more frequently receiving biologics at the time of sampling versus patients

with mild or moderate disease (**Fig 1**). The individual treatments within each treatment class ($\geq 2\%$) are detailed in **Table S1**.

Barriers to biologics

Despite currently not receiving biologics, based on physician interpretation, 18.9% (243/1287) of patients' condition warranted the use of biologics; this was higher with increasing disease severity (mild, 8.5%, 75/882; moderate, 37.5%, 136/363; severe, 76.2%, 32/42). The most common physician-reported reason for not being prescribed a biologic in patients who warranted the use of one (N=243) was '*I prefer to exhaust all other treatment options first*' (41.6%, 101/243) (**Table 1**).

Treatment satisfaction

Figures describing treatment satisfaction are presented as matched data from physicians and patients together and are represented as overall patients (**Fig 2A**), mild patients only (**Fig 2B**), moderate patients only (**Fig 2C**), and severe patients only (**Fig 2D**). Overall, approximately three-quarters of physicians (75.5%, 392/519) and patients (72.6%, 377/519) reported that they were satisfied with the level of HS disease control achieved (**Fig 2A**). However, some physicians and patients (physicians: 14.3%, 74/519; patients: 12.3%, 64/519) reported they were '*not satisfied and believe better control can be achieved*' (**Fig 2A**).

Physician and patient satisfaction with disease control was poor in patients with severe disease; 0.0% (0/15) and 13.3% (2/15) of physicians and patients, respectively, reported that they were '*satisfied with the disease control achieved*', but 40.0% (6/15) and 46.7% (7/15) of physicians and patients, respectively, reported that they '*were not*

satisfied but believe this is the best disease control that could be realistically achieved' (**Fig 2D**). The overall agreement between physician- and patient-reported satisfaction was 78.2% (N=519), with a Cohen's kappa value of 0.4797, indicating a moderate agreement.

The most common reason for physician and patient dissatisfaction with disease control overall was *'not effective enough at reducing patient's symptoms'* (43.3%, 55/127) and *'it hasn't helped the HS on certain areas of my body'* (30.3%, 43/142), respectively (**Table 2**).

Overall, most patients (88.3%, 468/530) would recommend their current treatment to a fellow patient with HS, however, this willingness to endorse current treatment was reduced in patients with more severe disease (mild, 95.4% [349/366]; moderate, 74.7% [112/150]; severe, 50.0% [7/14]). Most patients who were satisfied with their current treatment would also recommend it to a fellow patient with HS (97.4%, 376/386).

Despite reduced satisfaction levels, over half of patients reported that they would still recommend their current treatment to a fellow patient with HS (*'not satisfied, but I believe this is the best control that can be expected for my HS'*, 68.4% [54/79]; *'not satisfied and I believe better control can be achieved'*, 57.9% [33/57]).

Of the patients who were dissatisfied with current treatment overall, 39.8% (53/133) said they have not yet but will raise their dissatisfaction with their doctor while 12.8% (17/133) said they will never raise their dissatisfaction with their doctor. Additionally, of those who had/would raise it with their doctor, they reported they waited/would wait a mean (SD) time of 3.5 (2.7) months to do so.

Satisfaction with treatment control was also assessed by current treatment with topicals (**Figure 3A**), antibiotics (**Figure 3B**), conventional systemics (**Figure 3C**), and biologics (**Figure 3D**). Physicians were most satisfied with the disease control provided by treatment in patients prescribed biologics (82.4%, 103/125), followed by those prescribed topicals (73.9%, 176/238), antibiotics (64.2%, 122/190), and conventional systemics (59.5%, 22/37).

Patients prescribed biologics were most satisfied with the disease control provided by their treatment (77.6%, 97/125), followed by those prescribed topicals (71.4%, 170/238), conventional systemics (70.3%, 26/37), and antibiotics (62.1%, 118/190).

Treatment goals and attitudes towards treatment

Physician- and patient-reported treatment goals are detailed in **Table 3**. Based on matched physician- and patient-reported data overall (N=522), the most frequently reported treatment goals for physicians were '*improves appearance of skin*' (57.1%, 298/522), '*relieves pain*' (54.6%, 285/522), and '*works for a long time*' (53.8%, 281/522). Similarly, the most frequently reported treatment goals for patients were '*improves appearance of my skin*' (70.9%, 370/522), '*reduces my pain/discomfort*' (68.8%, 359/522), and '*get rid of the disease*' (68.8%, 359/522).

Based on a 1 (completely disagree) to 10 (completely agree) scale, patients ranked several attitudinal statements regarding treatments. Overall, the mean (SD) score for '*I am always keen to try the next new treatment for HS and will ask my doctor about anything new*' was 6.4 (2.6) (mild, 6.3 [2.7]; moderate, 6.6 [2.2]; severe, 6.5 [2.3]), for '*I would change my doctor if I felt he/she was not willing to try new treatments*' was 5.2 (3.0) (mild, 4.9 [3.0]; moderate, 5.9 [2.7]; severe, 5.7 [2.6]), for '*I am very concerned*

about the possible side effect of my HS treatment and prefer to stop taking it for a while if possible' was 4.5 (2.7) (mild, 4.2 [2.7]; moderate, 5.0 [2.6]; severe, 7.1 [2.4]), and for *'I feel that the current treatments for HS are not appropriate or very effective*' was 4.0 (2.6) (mild, 3.5 [2.4]; moderate, 5.0 [2.6]; severe, 5.4 [2.4]).

Additional results

Additional results related to order of treatment classes prescribed, treatment classes ever received, concomitant treatment, surgical treatment, and HS flares are detailed in **Table S2, Table S3, Figure S2, Figure S3** and **Figure S4** in the **Supplementary Results**.

Discussion

This study primarily aimed to describe the treatment patterns of patients with HS, with a particular focus on satisfaction with treatment, in a large, real-world population from the EU5 and US, and is a follow-up to a 2022 publication describing the unmet clinical needs and burden of disease in the same patient population. [33] Due to the relative lack of large, randomized trials in HS, the evidence supporting treatment guidelines is weak [26], and real-world evidence on treatment patterns is lacking.

At HS diagnosis, regardless of disease severity, patients were most frequently prescribed topicals and oral antibiotics, which aligns with first line treatment guideline recommendations for HS. [26, 32] At sampling, oral antibiotics and topicals remained the most prescribed treatments. Furthermore, oral antibiotics and topicals were most frequently prescribed in response to patients experiencing a flare. Long-term use of antibiotics causes known concerns, including antibiotic resistance, and has been reported to be undesirable by patients with HS. [35]

Despite a large proportion of patients being diagnosed with moderate or severe disease at diagnosis, and many patients being prescribed multiple treatments concurrently, few patients were prescribed biologics (4.8%) or conventional systemics (2.5%) at diagnosis. As highlighted in previous studies, a long diagnostic delay with HS can result in disease progression and subsequently more severe disease. [14, 15] Therefore, effective treatments should be implemented during the 'window of opportunity' to lessen the disease burden experienced by patients. [36] Although 28.4% of patients had received a biologic at some point during their HS management, a large proportion of

patients with moderate or severe disease had never received a biologic, highlighting that this patient cohort may be undertreated. Furthermore, over 40% of dermatologists who reported that a patient's condition warranted use of a biologic, said they did not prescribe one as they wanted to '*exhaust all other treatment options first*'. Further, dermatologists cited '*very recent diagnosis*' as a reason for not prescribing a biologic, indicating that biologics are generally not considered a first line therapy in HS, in keeping with current treatment guidelines. [19, 20, 37] The attitudes towards biologic prescription warrants a paradigm shift given that they have the most mature evidence base, [32] and the potential importance of early appropriate treatment in skin diseases. [38]

HS treatment guidelines recommend that only patients with moderate to severe disease are eligible for biologic treatments, potentially contributing to the low use of biologics in this current study. [25] Lack of practitioner knowledge about HS, difficulty accessing HS specialists, lack of patient input in treatment plans, and treatment costs have been identified as barriers to HS patient care, leading to inadequate disease control and pain management. [39-42]

An interesting finding in the current study is that, even for patients with moderate and severe disease, a proportion of dermatologists and patients indicated that they were satisfied with the control provided by treatment. Furthermore, in patients with moderate and severe disease who were not satisfied with the disease control achieved, some dermatologists and patients believed that this was the best disease control that could be achieved. This finding may indicate that dermatologists and patients acknowledge the difficulty in achieving acceptable disease control when managing HS; this concept is

further exemplified by the finding that over half of patients had not raised their treatment dissatisfaction concerns with their doctor, and of those who did/would raise it, they waited/would wait an average of three and a half months to do so. Moreover, a positive interaction with health-care professionals may influence patients' treatment decisions, highlighting the importance of shared treatment decisions between patients and health-care professionals. [35, 43]

Previous reports have highlighted that poor efficacy, adverse events, and increasing flare frequency are factors that negatively impact treatment satisfaction in patients with HS, [16, 31] while positive attributes of treatment satisfaction include effectiveness, pain reduction, and treatment with biologic medication. [31, 41, 42, 44] These findings align with the physician- and patient-reported treatment goals and patient attitudes towards treatment reported in this current study. The relatively low use of biologics in this current analysis, especially in patients with more severe disease, may explain some of the low levels of treatment satisfaction reported. This is further highlighted by the fact that most patients who were prescribed biologics were satisfied with their treatment.

In parallel with these findings, patients with more severe disease were less likely to recommend their current treatment to other patients with HS. However, even in patients who were not satisfied with their current treatment, over half of patients would still recommend the treatment to other patients with HS, reinforcing the low expectations patients with HS have regarding treatment potential for improving HS symptoms. This further speaks to involving the patient voice in HS treatment paradigms. [41, 44]

Limitations

The use of survey-based data may have been biased and influenced by individual experience. The accuracy of survey-based data also depends on the quality of data collection which may be subject to recall bias. The selection of patients and dermatologists in this survey may also be subject to selection bias. Only patients whose HS was currently being affected and physicians who commonly treat patients with HS would be most likely included. Patient's disease classification was physician-reported, potentially having a degree of subjectivity. The survey was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in several consultations occurring virtually and may have biased assessments and led to treatment-independent dissatisfaction in some patients. [45] Further, this survey was cross-sectional which means causality in outcomes cannot be determined or inferred.

Conclusion

Consistent with the known diagnostic delay and previous findings, this large, real-world cohort study, provides evidence that patients with HS are often undertreated. Patients with HS were primarily prescribed topicals or oral antibiotics to help manage their HS, with biologics and conventional systemics prescribed in relatively few patients, despite around a third of patients having moderate or severe disease. This approach may miss the optimal therapeutic window for biologic therapy, [36] and under incorporate the patient perspective in shared treatment decision making. There remains an unmet need for disease modifying therapies in HS that can effectively manage HS and prevent disease progression.

References

1. Zouboulis CC, Del Marmol V, Mrowietz U, Prens EP, Tzellos T, Jemec GB. Hidradenitis Suppurativa/Acne Inversa: Criteria for Diagnosis, Severity Assessment, Classification and Disease Evaluation. *Dermatology*. 2015;231(2):184-90.
2. Dufour DN, Emtestam L, Jemec GB. Hidradenitis suppurativa: a common and burdensome, yet under-recognised, inflammatory skin disease. *Postgrad Med J*. 2014 Apr;90(1062):216-21; quiz 20.
3. Sabat R, Jemec GBE, Matusiak L, Kimball AB, Prens E, Wolk K. Hidradenitis suppurativa. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2020 Mar 12;6(1):18.
4. Jemec GB, Kimball AB. Hidradenitis suppurativa: Epidemiology and scope of the problem. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2015 Nov;73(5 Suppl 1):S4-7.
5. Nguyen TV, Damiani G, Orenstein LAV, Hamzavi I, Jemec GB. Hidradenitis suppurativa: an update on epidemiology, phenotypes, diagnosis, pathogenesis, comorbidities and quality of life. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2021 Jan;35(1):50-61.
6. Montero-Vilchez T, Diaz-Calvillo P, Rodriguez-Pozo JA, Cuenca-Barrales C, Martinez-Lopez A, Arias-Santiago S, et al. The Burden of Hidradenitis Suppurativa Signs and Symptoms in Quality of Life: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021 Jun 22;18(13).
7. Cartron A, Driscoll MS. Comorbidities of hidradenitis suppurativa: A review of the literature. *Int J Womens Dermatol*. 2019 Dec;5(5):330-4.
8. Tzellos T, Zouboulis CC. Review of Comorbidities of Hidradenitis Suppurativa: Implications for Daily Clinical Practice. *Dermatol Ther (Heidelb)*. 2020 Feb;10(1):63-71.
9. von der Werth JM, Jemec GB. Morbidity in patients with hidradenitis suppurativa. *Br J Dermatol*. 2001 Apr;144(4):809-13.
10. Schneider-Burrus S, Tsaousi A, Barbus S, Huss-Marp J, Witte K, Wolk K, et al. Features Associated With Quality of Life Impairment in Hidradenitis Suppurativa Patients. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:676241.
11. Garg A, Kirby JS, Lavian J, Lin G, Strunk A. Sex- and Age-Adjusted Population Analysis of Prevalence Estimates for Hidradenitis Suppurativa in the United States. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2017 Aug 1;153(8):760-4.
12. Kirsten N, Petersen J, Hagenström K, Augustin M. Epidemiology of hidradenitis suppurativa in Germany – an observational cohort study based on a multisource approach. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*. 2020;34(1):174-9.
13. Ingram JR, Jenkins-Jones S, Knipe DW, Morgan CLI, Cannings-John R, Piguet V. Population-based Clinical Practice Research Datalink study using algorithm modelling to identify the true burden of hidradenitis suppurativa. *Br J Dermatol*. 2018 Apr;178(4):917-24.
14. Saunte DM, Boer J, Stratigos A, Szepletowski JC, Hamzavi I, Kim KH, et al. Diagnostic delay in hidradenitis suppurativa is a global problem. *Br J Dermatol*. 2015 Dec;173(6):1546-9.
15. Kokolakis G, Wolk K, Schneider-Burrus S, Kalus S, Barbus S, Gomis-Kleindienst S, et al. Delayed Diagnosis of Hidradenitis Suppurativa and Its Effect on Patients and Healthcare System. *Dermatology*. 2020;236(5):421-30.
16. Garg A, Neuren E, Cha D, Kirby JS, Ingram JR, Jemec GBE, et al. Evaluating patients' unmet needs in hidradenitis suppurativa: Results from the Global Survey Of Impact and Healthcare Needs (VOICE) Project. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2020 Feb;82(2):366-76.
17. Duran C, Baumeister A. Recognition, diagnosis, and treatment of hidradenitis suppurativa. *Jaapa*. 2019 Oct;32(10):36-42.
18. van Straalen KR, Schneider-Burrus S, Prens EP. Current and future treatment of hidradenitis suppurativa. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2020;183(6):e178-e87.

19. Ingram JR, Collier F, Brown D, Burton T, Burton J, Chin MF, et al. British Association of Dermatologists guidelines for the management of hidradenitis suppurativa (acne inversa) 2018. *Br J Dermatol*. 2019 May;180(5):1009-17.
20. Zouboulis CC, Desai N, Emtestam L, Hunger RE, Ioannides D, Juhasz I, et al. European S1 guideline for the treatment of hidradenitis suppurativa/acne inversa. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2015 Apr;29(4):619-44.
21. Alikhan A, Sayed C, Alavi A, Alhusayen R, Brassard A, Burkhart C, et al. North American clinical management guidelines for hidradenitis suppurativa: A publication from the United States and Canadian Hidradenitis Suppurativa Foundations: Part I: Diagnosis, evaluation, and the use of complementary and procedural management. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2019 Jul;81(1):76-90.
22. Saunte DML, Jemec GBE. Hidradenitis Suppurativa: Advances in Diagnosis and Treatment. *Jama*. 2017 Nov 28;318(20):2019-32.
23. Goldburg SR, Strober BE, Payette MJ. Hidradenitis suppurativa: Current and emerging treatments. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. 2020 2020/05/01;82(5):1061-82.
24. Gulliver W, Zouboulis CC, Prens E, Jemec GB, Tzellos T. Evidence-based approach to the treatment of hidradenitis suppurativa/acne inversa, based on the European guidelines for hidradenitis suppurativa. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord*. 2016 Sep;17(3):343-51.
25. Bertolotti A, Sbidian E, Join-Lambert O, Bourgault-Villada I, Moyal-Barracco M, Perrot P, et al. Guidelines for the management of hidradenitis suppurativa: recommendations supported by the Centre of Evidence of the French Society of Dermatology. *Br J Dermatol*. 2021 May;184(5):963-5.
26. Orenstein LAV, Nguyen TV, Damiani G, Sayed C, Jemec GBE, Hamzavi I. Medical and Surgical Management of Hidradenitis Suppurativa: A Review of International Treatment Guidelines and Implementation in General Dermatology Practice. *Dermatology*. 2020;236(5):393-412.
27. Manfredini M, Garbarino F, Bigi L, Pellacani G, Magnoni C. Hidradenitis Suppurativa: Surgical and Postsurgical Management. *Skin Appendage Disord*. 2020 Jul;6(4):195-201.
28. Fernandez JM, Thompson AM, Borgstrom M, Orenstein LAV, Hsiao JL, Shi VY. Pain management modalities for hidradenitis suppurativa: a patient survey. *J Dermatolog Treat*. 2020 Sep 20:1-4.
29. Patel ZS, Hoffman LK, Buse DC, Grinberg AS, Afifi L, Cohen SR, et al. Pain, Psychological Comorbidities, Disability, and Impaired Quality of Life in Hidradenitis Suppurativa [corrected]. *Curr Pain Headache Rep*. 2017 Nov 1;21(12):49.
30. Smith HS, Chao JD, Teitelbaum J. Painful hidradenitis suppurativa. *Clin J Pain*. 2010 Jun;26(5):435-44.
31. Midgette B, Strunk A, Akilov O, Alavi A, Ardon C, Bechara FG, et al. Factors associated with treatment satisfaction in patients with hidradenitis suppurativa: results from the Global VOICE project. *Br J Dermatol*. 2022 Dec;187(6):927-35.
32. Hendricks AJ, Hsiao JL, Lowes MA, Shi VY. A Comparison of International Management Guidelines for Hidradenitis Suppurativa. *Dermatology*. 2021;237(1):81-96.
33. Ingram JR, Bettoli V, Espy JI, Kokolakis G, Martorell A, Villani AP, et al. Unmet clinical needs and burden of disease in hidradenitis suppurativa: real-world experience from EU5 and US. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2022 Apr 21.
34. Landis JR, Koch GG. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*. 1977;33(1):159-74.
35. Kirby JS, Martorell A, Sayed CJ, Alarcon I, Kasperek T, Frade S, et al. Understanding the real-world patient journey and unmet needs of people with hidradenitis suppurativa through social media research. *Br J Dermatol*. 2023 Jul 17;189(2):228-30.
36. Marzano AV, Genovese G, Casazza G, Moltrasio C, Dapavo P, Micali G, et al. Evidence for a 'window of opportunity' in hidradenitis suppurativa treated with adalimumab: a

retrospective, real-life multicentre cohort study*. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2021;184(1):133-40.

37. Alikhan A, Sayed C, Alavi A, Alhusayen R, Brassard A, Burkhart C, et al. North American clinical management guidelines for hidradenitis suppurativa: A publication from the United States and Canadian Hidradenitis Suppurativa Foundations: Part II: Topical, intralesional, and systemic medical management. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2019 Jul;81(1):91-101.

38. Kimball AB, Gieler U, Linder D, Sampogna F, Warren RB, Augustin M. Psoriasis: is the impairment to a patient's life cumulative? *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2010 Sep;24(9):989-1004.

39. Shukla N, Paul M, Halley M, Lowes MA, Hester V, Aguilar C, et al. Identifying barriers to care and research in hidradenitis suppurativa: findings from a patient engagement event. *The British journal of dermatology*. 2020;182(6):1490-2.

40. Bellei EA, de Carvalho AVE, Eng BM, Tozato C, de Barros DH, Tamashiro EY, et al. Navigating the Multidimensional Impact of Living with Hidradenitis Suppurativa: An In-Depth Netnographic Study on Social Media Platforms. *Dermatol Ther (Heidelb)*. 2023 Nov;13(11):2797-815.

41. Willems D, Hinzpeter EL, Van der Zee HH, Sayed CJ, Ingram JR, Beaudart C, et al. Patient Preferences in the Management of Hidradenitis Suppurativa: Results of a Multinational Discrete Choice Experiment in Europe. *Patient*. 2023 Mar;16(2):153-64.

42. Willems D, Hiligsmann M, van der Zee HH, Sayed CJ, Evers S. Identifying Unmet Care Needs and Important Treatment Attributes in the Management of Hidradenitis Suppurativa: A Qualitative Interview Study. *Patient*. 2022 Mar;15(2):207-18.

43. Marquez DG, Sadeghi NB, Westerkam LL, Blum FR, Dresselhaus A, Sayed CJ. A survey-based study on experiences with and perspectives toward medical providers among patients with hidradenitis suppurativa. *Br J Dermatol*. 2023 Sep 28.

44. Willems D, Sayed CJ, Van der Zee HH, Ingram JR, Hinzpeter EL, Beaudart C, et al. A discrete-choice experiment to elicit the treatment preferences of patients with hidradenitis suppurativa in the United States. *J Med Econ*. 2023 Jan-Dec;26(1):503-8.

45. Dovalovsky K, Puyana C, Tsoukas MM. Hidradenitis suppurativa perspectives during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clin Dermatol*. 2023 Sep-Oct;41(5):622-7.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Current treatment classes prescribed overall and based on physician-judged severity at the time of sampling.

Bar graphs illustrating the current treatment classes patients were prescribed at the time of sampling. Patients could be prescribed multiple treatment classes at the same time. 'Other' encompasses oral anti-diabetics and retinoids, 'advanced steroids' encompasses oral corticosteroids and corticosteroid injections, and 'advanced non-biologics' encompasses apremilast, tofacitinib, and baricitinib.

N, number of patients with available data.

Figure 2. Physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control overall and based on physician-judged severity at the time of sampling.

Bar graphs illustrating **(A)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control overall; **(B)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control in mild patients only; **(C)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control in moderate patients only; and **(D)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control in severe patients only.

N, number of patients with available data.

Figure 3. Physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control based on current treatment overall at the time of sampling.

Bar graphs illustrating **(A)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control with topicals; **(B)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control with antibiotics; **(C)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control with conventional systemics; and **(D)** physician- and patient-reported satisfaction with current treatment control with biologics.

Patients could be on multiple treatment classes.

N, number of patients with available data.