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Validating assessments of cNF size

• A major limitation to evaluating either novel interventions or drugs is the inability to assess cNF size with a reliable and reproducible measurement tool.

• Prospective, single center study.

• Eligibility: NF1 diagnosis, ≥ 18 years old, at least 6 visible cNFs, ability to read English, able to tolerate imaging

• Tumor measurements were acquired using digital calipers, 3D photography, and high frequency ultrasound (HFUS) in a single session.
Validating assessments of cNF size

• **Aims:**
  - Determine the intra-rater and inter-rater reliability of HFUS measurements of cNF volume at baseline
  - Determine the accuracy of HFUS measurements by comparing them to digital caliper measurements and 3D photography

• **Statistical analysis**
  - Linear and volumetric assessments were compared using *intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)* to determine the intra- and inter-rater reliability of each technique.
Demographics of reliability set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants (n)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (median, years)</td>
<td>53 (range 36-67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One response omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutaneous neurofibromas (n)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median diameter (range) – mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 mm</td>
<td>4.2 (2.4-11.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5 mm</td>
<td>24 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Assessment

• Baseline visit details (N=10)
  • 3 researchers acquiring images (acquisition) – inter-rater
    • 1 researcher acquiring 3 images per tumor – intra-rater
  • 3 researchers assessing images (measurement)
    • 1 researcher measuring 3 times per tumor
  • 60 scans per patient x 10 patients = 600 scans
  • 300 measurements per patient x 10 patients = 3000 measurements
Reliability of HFUS, 3D camera, and calipers
Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Image Acquisition Reliability</th>
<th>Image Analysis Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-rater ICC</td>
<td>Inter-rater ICC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D Camera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width Manual</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width Script</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length Manual</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length Script</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calipers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICC measures reproducibility
Shrout-Fleiss reliability: random set
- 57 Tumors total:
  - 33 small tumors (<5mm)
  - 24 large tumors (≥5mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-.75</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75-0.9</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9-1.0</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Observations

• ICC “excellent” for all 3D photography and HFUS observations
• ICC least strong for inter-rater caliper measurements (particularly height), however still in “moderate” range
Determining the minimal detectable change

- The **coefficient of variation** (CV) is defined as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean: It shows the extent of variability in relation to the mean of the population.

- Study Participants 1-10

- 57 Tumors total:
  - 33 small tumors (<5mm)
  - 24 large tumors (≥5mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HFUS COV (mean)</th>
<th>3D Camera COV (mean)</th>
<th>Calipers COV (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume Width Depth</td>
<td>Volume Width Length Max width (script) Length (script) Surface area</td>
<td>Volume Length Width Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>35.7% 13.4% 11.6%</td>
<td>57.2% 11.8% 10.7% 10.2% 10.9%</td>
<td>18.7% 63.2% 17.8% 19.0% 38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>17.8% 5.9% 5.2%</td>
<td>18.6% 7.0% 6.6% 7.6% 9.9%</td>
<td>12.2% 33.4% 13.0% 10.6% 25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>29.5% 10.4% 9.2%</td>
<td>43.2% 9.7% 8.9% 9.1% 10.3%</td>
<td>16.3% 51.8% 15.8% 15.8% 33.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- COV
  - ≥35%: Worse
  - 30-34%
  - 26-29%
  - 21-25%
  - 16-20%
  - 11-15%
  - ≤11%: Better
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small COV</th>
<th>Large COV</th>
<th>All COV</th>
<th>Proposed threshold for clinical response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calipers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D Camera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (manual)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (script)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (manual)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (script)</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing measurement tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Best use</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Calipers</td>
<td>~ $100</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Few tumors, Large tumors, Limited budget</td>
<td>30% (linear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Camera</td>
<td>~$14K</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Multiple tumors, assessing color, Local or systemic rx</td>
<td>20% (linear), 33% (area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFUS</td>
<td>&gt; $225K</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Few tumors, Small tumors, Prevention trials, Visualize beneath skin</td>
<td>20% (linear)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

• Establish criteria for measurement of cutaneous neurofibromas in clinical trials

• Longitudinal assessment of cNF to determine natural history of tumor growth/shrinkage

• Apply measurement criteria in a treatment trial (e.g., selumetinib for cNF, NCT02839720, PI: Bruce Korf)
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Process

Review the literature for existing PROs that are specific for assessing the skin.
• Review of the literature: Skin specific PRO instruments identified
  • Skindex & teen-skindex
  • Dermatology life quality index (DLQI) & CDLQI
  • Adjusted NF QOL (Hilda Crawford)
  • Itch scales
  • Pain scales
Rate PROs

1. Patient characteristics:
   Age range (e.g., child, adolescent, adult)
   Normative groups (e.g., general, NF, oncology, other, # subjects)

2. Used in published studies:
   Number and types of studies (e.g., descriptive, clinical trials)

3. Domains assessed/Item content:
   Number/description (e.g., physical, social, emotional, cognitive)

4. Scores available:
   Item response format (e.g., Likert scale, visual analog scale)
   Types of scores (e.g., raw, standardized, domain, total)

5. Psychometric Data:
   Reliability (e.g., internal consistency, test/retest)
   Validity (e.g., construct, discriminative)
   Factor analysis

6. Feasibility:
   Cost
   Length (number of items)
   Ease of administration
   Recall period assessed (e.g., 1 week, 24 hours)
   Availability in different languages; International use

Overall Impression for use in NF Clinical Trials (Pros/Cons):

Level of Acceptance (Committee decision):
- Primary outcome measure
- Secondary outcome measure
- Not acceptable at this time; further information needed (specify)
- Not acceptable (no further review)

Committee notes/comments/additional information needed/plans:
How often during the past four weeks do these statements describe you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>ALL THE TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My skin hurts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My skin condition affects how well I sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I worry that my skin condition may be serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My skin condition makes it hard to work or do hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My skin condition affects my social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My skin condition makes me feel depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My skin condition burns or stings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I tend to stay at home because of my skin condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry about getting scars from my skin condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My skin itches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My skin condition affects how close I can be with those I love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am ashamed of my skin condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I worry that my skin condition may get worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I tend to do things by myself because of my skin condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am angry about my skin condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Water bothers my skin condition (bathing, washing hands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My skin condition makes showing affection difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I worry about side-effects from skin medications / treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My skin is irritated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My skin condition affects my interactions with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOW OFTEN DURING THE PAST 4 WEEK DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. I am embarrassed by my skin condition</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My skin condition is a problem for the people I love</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am frustrated by my skin condition</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My skin is sensitive</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My skin condition affects my desire to be with people</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am humiliated by my skin condition</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My skin condition bleeds</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am annoyed by my skin condition</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My skin condition interferes with my sex life</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My skin condition makes me tired</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skindex PRO RATE

Overall impression: 2.54/3.0

PROS
- Ages 12-17, ≥18
- Used widely in general dermatology
- Qs appropriate for cNFs
- Feasibility

CONS
- No interventional trial data
- Questions not relevant to NF1
- “my skin” or “my skin condition”
Effect of Treatment on Skin and NF related Symptoms

Skindex domains

Crawford NF adjusted QOL domains
Skindex Scores

**Emotion**

**Symptoms**

**Functioning**
1. Over the last week, how itchy, sore, painful or stinging has your skin been?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐

2. Over the last week, how embarrassed or self conscious have you been because of your skin?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐

3. Over the last week, how much has your skin interfered with you going shopping or looking after your home or garden?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

4. Over the last week, how much has your skin influenced the clothes you wear?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

5. Over the last week, how much has your skin affected any social or leisure activities?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

6. Over the last week, how much has your skin made it difficult for you to do any sport?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

7. Over the last week, has your skin prevented you from working or studying?  
   Yes ☐  
   No ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

   If "No", over the last week how much has your skin been a problem at work or studying?  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐

8. Over the last week, how much has your skin created problems with your partner or any of your close friends or relatives?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

9. Over the last week, how much has your skin caused any sexual difficulties?  
   Very much ☐  
   A lot ☐  
   A little ☐  
   Not at all ☐  
   Not relevant ☐

10. Over the last week, how much of a problem has the treatment for your skin been, for example by making your home messy, or by taking up time?  
    Very much ☐  
    A lot ☐  
    A little ☐  
    Not at all ☐  
    Not relevant ☐
The aim of the questionnaire is to measure how much your skin problem has affected you OVER THE LAST WEEK. Please tick one box for each question.

**OVER THE LAST WEEK**

1. How itchy, scratchy, sore or painful has your skin been?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all

2. How upset or embarrassed, self conscious or sad have you been because of your skin?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all

3. How much has your skin affected your friendships?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all

4. How much have you changed or worn different or special clothes/shoes because of your skin?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all

5. How much has your skin trouble affected going out, playing or doing hobbies?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all

6. How much have you avoided swimming or other sports because of your skin trouble?
   - Very much
   - Quite a lot
   - A little
   - Not at all
(C)DLQI PRO RATE

Overall impression: 2.5/3.0 (2.65/3)

**PROS**
- Ages 4-16, ≥16
- Used widely in derm. (>1000 pub)
- Qs appropriate for cNFs
- Feasibility

**CONS**
- No interventional trial data
- Multiple domains in single question
- Raw score, interpretation is not validated
Recommendations:

- Use a modified Skindex that changes the language of “my skin condition” to “my cutaneous neurofibromas”
  - Track sensitivity to change in an interventional study to determine if useful
  - If so, proceed with modified skindex, but if not modify the DLQI/CDLQI

- Add a Global Impression of Change
Global Impression of Change Scale - cNF

1. Think about your cutaneous neurofibromas now. Compare them to before you started taking the medicine for this study. Do you think your cutaneous neurofibromas are:

- □ 1 Very Much Improved
- □ 2 Much Improved
- □ 3 Minimally Improved
- □ 4 No Change
- □ 5 Minimally Worse
- □ 6 Much Worse
- □ 7 Very Much Worse

(Please check only one box)

2. Please describe any changes you have noticed:
Recommendations:

• Use a modified Skindex that changes the language of “my skin condition” to “my cutaneous neurofibromas”
  • Track sensitivity to change in an interventional study to determine if useful
  • If so, proceed with modified skindex, but if not modify the DLQI/CDLQI

• Add a Global Impression of Change
• Consider including NRS-11 (pain scale) for systemic trials
**NRS-11**

**Numeric Rating Scale (NRS-11)**
Below is a line with numbers from 0 to 10 where 0 means no pain and 10 means the worst pain you can imagine.

Please circle the one number that best describes your pain at its **worst** during the **past week**.
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Towards a global assessment of change for cNF
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The co-primary efficacy endpoints were the investigator’s rating of glabellar line severity at maximum frown and the subject’s global assessment of change in appearance of glabellar lines, both at Day 30 post-injection.

- For the investigator rating, using a 4-point grading scale (0=none, 3=severe) a responder was defined as having a severity grade of 0 or 1.
- For the subject’s global assessment of change, the ratings were from +4 (complete improvement) to -4 (very marked worsening).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>BOTOX Cosmetic</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>Difference *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82% 334/405</td>
<td>9% 12/132</td>
<td>73% (68, 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>89% 362/405</td>
<td>7% 9/132</td>
<td>83% (77, 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>82% 330/403</td>
<td>4% 5/130</td>
<td>78% (73, 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>63% 254/403</td>
<td>3% 4/128</td>
<td>60% (54, 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>39% 157/403</td>
<td>1% 1/128</td>
<td>38% (33, 43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 95% confidence intervals are shown in parenthesis.

b Day 30: Co-Primary Efficacy Time point, p<0.001
Creating a global assessment of change scale for cNF

- Decision NOT to use a severity scale given wide range of tumor burden (differing by 3 orders of magnitude)
- Recognizes that patients find benefit in less than 100% clearance (REiNS patient survey)
- Need to specify whether change is regional (e.g., due to local treatments) or whole body (e.g., due to systemic treatments)
- Attempt to correlate change in tumor size with assessment of GAC
- Validation is critical
Proposed global assessment of change scale for cNF size

For local treatment: “Compared to baseline, please rate global change in size within the field of treatment”

For systemic treatment: “Compared to baseline, please rate global change in size within the field of treatment”

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening

Clinical response

Stable

Clinical worsening
Index subject
S1. Simulation of whole body change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S2. Simulation of whole body change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S3. Simulation of whole body change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S4. Simulation of whole body change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S5. Simulation of regional change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S6. Simulation of regional change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening

Clinical response

Stable

Clinical worsening
S7. Simulation of regional change

Baseline

After treatment

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
S8. Simulation of regional change
Next steps

• Complete simulations of 10 subjects
• Assess agreement among large number of patients and physicians using NF registry or other mechanism
Next step: establishing GAC for cNF

- Assemble library of 50 images of cNF with different skin tones and severity
- Digital artist to take each source image and modify
  - Increase tumor size by 25%, 50%, 75%
  - Decrease tumor size by 25%, 50%, 75%
- Recruit online sample to rate photos: baseline with 1 modified image
  - Patients with NF1
  - Caregivers with NF1
  - Investigators who care for patients with NF1
- Rate pairs of images on GAC scale
- Attempt to obtain thousands of responses to establish link between change in tumor size and change in GAC scale
**For local treatment:** “Compared to baseline, please rate global change in size within the field of treatment”

**For systemic treatment:** “Compared to baseline, please rate global change in size within the field of treatment”

% change compared with baseline (generated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global assessment of change</th>
<th>-75%</th>
<th>-50%</th>
<th>-25%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges: phenotypic heterogeneity of cNF
Proposed global assessment of change scale for **cNF visibility (color)**

- +3: significant improvement
- +2: moderate improvement
- +1: minimal improvement
- 0: no change
- -1: minimal worsening
- -2: moderate worsening
- -3: significant worsening
Questions?