

**The importance of considering the patient's and treating physician's view to generate comprehensive und unbiased real-world evidence data.**

Schuh K.<sup>1</sup>, Gaul C.<sup>2</sup>, Straube A.<sup>3</sup>, Stude P.<sup>4</sup>, Israel-Willner H.<sup>5</sup>, Koch M.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Novartis Pharma GmbH, Germany; <sup>2</sup>Königstein, Germany; <sup>3</sup>LMU Munich, Germany; <sup>4</sup>Bochum, Germany; <sup>5</sup>Charité Berlin, Germany

**Background:** Real-world evidence (RWE) can be collected from different perspectives: the patients" and treating physicians" perspectives. Here, we describe the importance of considering both views as a way of gathering a comprehensive overview of real-life therapeutic effects.

**Methods**

Between July and December 2019, two independent online surveys were conducted in Germany to collect data from a) migraine patients regarding their experience with erenumab (PERISCOPE) and b) migraine-treating physicians regarding their therapy decisions and observations upon erenumab treatment (TELESCOPE). Results were compared regarding the overall therapy outcome, changes in quality of life and influence of quality of life parameters.

**Results**

The interim analyses of PERISCOPE (90 erenumab patients) and TELESCOPE (30 physicians overseeing 354 erenumab patients) showed that 75% of all physicians already detected improvement after the first injection (1 month), but only 49% of patients reported a response after their first treatment. Likewise, patients and physicians weighted quality of life parameters differently. Nevertheless, both patients and physicians reported a reduction of ~7 migraine days per month after 3 months of treatment. At EAN, the comparison of both full data sets will be presented including 155 erenumab patients (PERISCOPE) and 45 physicians/522 erenumab patients (TELESCOPE).

**Conclusion**

These analyses highlight the potential differences and overlaps in respect to patients" and physicians" perspectives of therapeutic outcomes under erenumab treatment. As both interviewed populations have a limited view on treatment outcome, only considering both sides will generate comprehensive real-world evidence for treatment options.