

1 **Study Protocol**

2  
3 **Title:** Quality of life following interpolated flap repair of post-Mohs surgical defects of the  
4 nose: a multi-center prospective observational cohort study

5  
6 **Short Title:** Flaps SCI

7  
8 **Study Principal Investigator:**

9 Jeremy Etzkorn, MD  
10 University of Pennsylvania, Department of Dermatology  
11 100 Floral Vale Blvd #100  
12 Yardley, PA 19067  
13 Phone: 215-316-5151  
14 Email: jeremy.ETZKORN@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

15  
16 **Other Investigators:**

17 Donald Neal, Clinical Research Fellow

18  
19 **Key Study Personnel & Research Collaborators:**

20 Ian Maher, MD  
21 Assistant Professor, Department of Dermatology  
22 University of Minnesota School of Medicine

23  
24 Christopher Miller, MD  
25 Director, Penn Dermatology and Oncology Center

26  
27 Heather Harnett  
28 Clinical Studies Unit, Penn Dermatology

29  
30 **Other Participating Mohs Surgeons:**

31 Thuzar M Shin, MD PhD  
32 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania

33  
34 Joseph F Sobanko, MD  
35 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania

36  
37 H. William Higgins, MD  
38 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania

39  
40 Justin J Leitenberger, MD  
41 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, Oregon Health Sciences University

42  
43 Anna A Bar, MD  
44 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, Oregon Health Sciences University

45  
46 Christine H. Weinberger, MD

47 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, University of Vermont College of Medicine  
48  
49 Todd E Holmes, MD  
50 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, University of Vermont College of Medicine  
51  
52 David Li-Kang Chen, MD  
53 University of Vermont College of Medicine  
54  
55 Ashley Wysong, MD  
56 Founding Chair and Residency Program Director, Dept. of Dermatology, Univ. Nebraska  
57  
58 Adam Sutton, MD  
59 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, University of Nebraska  
60  
61 Nicholas J Golda, MD  
62 Associate Professor of Dermatology, University of Missouri  
63  
64 Adam Mattox, DO  
65 Assistant Professor of Dermatology, University of Minnesota  
66  
67 S Tyler Hollmig, MD  
68 Clinical Associate Professor of Dermatology, Stanford University  
69  
70 Sumaira Z Aasi, MD  
71 Clinical Associate Professor of Dermatology, Stanford University  
72  
73 John Albertini, MD  
74 The Skin Surgery Center, Greensboro, NC  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

93

94 **STUDY TITLE, PARTICIPANTS.....1,2**

95 **TABLE OF CONTENTS.....3**

96 **ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.....4**

97 **ABSTRACT.....5**

98 **1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RATIONALE.....6**

99 **2 STUDY OBJECTIVES.....6**

100 **3 INVESTIGATIONAL PLAN.....6,7**

101     STUDY POPULATION.....6,7

102     STUDY DESIGN.....7

103     STUDY DURATION.....7,8

104     SUBJECT COMPLETION/WITHDRAW.....8

105 **4 STATISTICAL METHODS.....8**

106 **5 STUDY ADMINISTRATION .....8,9**

107 **6 REFERENCES.....10**

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

|     |                                 |
|-----|---------------------------------|
| 139 | <b>Abbreviations</b>            |
| 140 | MMS – Mohs micrographic surgery |
| 141 | SCI – Skin Cancer Index         |
| 142 | QOL – quality of life           |
| 143 |                                 |
| 144 |                                 |
| 145 |                                 |
| 146 |                                 |
| 147 |                                 |
| 148 |                                 |
| 149 |                                 |
| 150 |                                 |
| 151 |                                 |
| 152 |                                 |
| 153 |                                 |
| 154 |                                 |
| 155 |                                 |
| 156 |                                 |
| 157 |                                 |
| 158 |                                 |
| 159 |                                 |
| 160 |                                 |
| 161 |                                 |
| 162 |                                 |
| 163 |                                 |
| 164 |                                 |
| 165 |                                 |
| 166 |                                 |
| 167 |                                 |
| 168 |                                 |
| 169 |                                 |
| 170 |                                 |
| 171 |                                 |
| 172 |                                 |
| 173 |                                 |
| 174 |                                 |
| 175 |                                 |
| 176 |                                 |
| 177 |                                 |
| 178 |                                 |
| 179 |                                 |
| 180 |                                 |
| 181 |                                 |
| 182 |                                 |
| 183 |                                 |
| 184 |                                 |

185 **Abstract**

186 Context: Address the limited knowledge regarding patient well-being and quality of life (QOL)  
187 after interpolated flap repair of post-Mohs surgical defects on the nose.

188  
189 Objectives: Evaluate QOL after Mohs micrographic surgery (MMS) resection and interpolated  
190 flap reconstruction.

191  
192 Design: Multi-center prospective survey study using the Skin Cancer Index (SCI), a disease-  
193 specific, validated questionnaire.

194  
195 Setting: Academic and private outpatient MMS centers across the U.S. (Goal:  $\geq 5$  participating  
196 centers)

197  
198 Participants: Consenting adults  $\geq 18$  years old who undergo MMS of a nasal skin cancer with  
199 subsequent interpolated flap repair of the defect.

200  
201 Main outcomes and measures: The primary outcome will be skin cancer specific QOL queried  
202 with the SCI at the following time points: pre-operatively, 1 week after flap placement, 4 weeks  
203 after flap takedown, and 16 weeks after flap takedown.

204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230

231 **1 Background Information and Rationale**

232

233 **1.1 Introduction**

234 Previous research has shown improved QOL after MMS in the outpatient setting. However, the  
235 literature is limited to single-center studies and do not explore if improved QOL applies to  
236 MMS patients who also have complex reconstruction.

237

238 **1.2 Relevant Literature and Data**

239 Receiving a skin cancer diagnosis is stressful [1] and skin cancer surgery with  
240 subsequent scarring and changes in appearance can also decrease quality of life [2]. Patient  
241 satisfaction with skin cancer surgery is associated with the final cosmetic result of the surgery  
242 [3] and results interpreted as minimal scarring by a physician may still cause significant anxiety  
243 and self-consciousness to the patient [4]. One study found that in order to avoid disfigurement,  
244 the majority of adults surveyed would go to any lengths to minimize scarring, even if they  
245 resulted in only small improvements in scar appearance [5]. Perioperative use of patient  
246 reported outcomes tools such as the skin cancer index (SCI) may help practitioners identify  
247 patients with concerns about scarring and offer appropriate support if needed [6]. To date, no  
248 studies have systematically evaluated quality of life following interpolated flap repair in the  
249 outpatient setting.

250

251 **1.3 Compliance Statement**

252 This study will be conducted in full accordance of all applicable institution's research policies  
253 and procedures as defined by their IRBs. All episodes of non-compliance will be documented.

254

255 The investigators will perform the study in accordance with this protocol, will obtain consent  
256 and assent, and will report unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others in  
257 accordance with the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania's IRB Policies and Procedures  
258 and all federal requirements. Collection, recording, and reporting of data will be accurate and  
259 will ensure the privacy, health, and welfare of research subjects during and after the study.

260

261 **2 Study Objectives**

262 The purpose of this study is to determine skin-cancer specific QOL after MMS with interpolated  
263 flap repair of nasal defects.

264

265 **2.1 Primary Objective**

266 The primary objective of this study is to determine the mean difference in overall SCI scores  
267 between pre-MMS and 16 weeks after flap takedown. The study will be powered to detect a  
268 change of 5% from pre-MMS SCI, based upon an SCI validation study that previously reported  
269 a pre-MMS score of 60 and standard deviation of 12.8 [7].

270

271 **3 Investigational Plan**

272 **3.1 Study Population**

273 Patients age 18 years or greater who are capable of providing informed consent and who may  
274 require an interpolated flap repair of their post-Mohs surgical defect will be recruited. If  
275 they consent to the study, they will be asked to complete the SCI preoperatively. Patients who  
276 subsequently undergo interpolated flap repair will be followed. Patients who do not

277 undergo interpolated flap will not be followed, and their informed consent form and pre-  
278 operative surveys will be destroyed in accordance with HIPAA regulations. They will be asked  
279 to complete an SCI at 1 week after flap placement, 4 weeks after flap takedown, and 16 weeks  
280 after flap takedown. The target enrollment will be approximately 170 patients undergoing  
281 interpolated flap repair, in anticipation of loss of follow up. However, this may be adjusted  
282 during the study as the percentage of loss to follow-up becomes apparent. A final sample size of  
283 145 is needed to achieve 80% power to detect a mean of paired differences of 3.0, with an  
284 estimated standard deviation of differences of 12.8, with a significance level (alpha) of 0.05,  
285 using a two-tailed paired t-test between pre-MMS SCI and week 16 after flap takedown SCI  
286 scores.

### 288 ***Inclusion Criteria***

- 289 • Males or females age 18-100
- 290 • Diagnosis of a nasal skin cancer
- 291 • Undergoing MMS under local anesthesia in the outpatient setting
- 292 • Receiving a 2-stage interpolated flap repair

### 294 ***Exclusion Criteria***

- 295 • Males or females  $\leq 18$  years old
- 296 • Patients undergoing MMS and repair under general anesthesia in the operating room
- 297 • Receiving a nasal defect repair that is not a 2-stage interpolated flap

## 300 **3.2 Study Design**

301 This will be a multicenter, prospective, observational, cohort study. Covariates collected for all  
302 cases will be use of sterile gloves during MMS/reconstruction, type of sterile preparation used,  
303 use of antibiotic prophylaxis, use of a hemostatic dressing or agent to the flap pedicle, number of  
304 stages of Mohs surgery, same day versus delayed repair, interpolated flap type, whether or not  
305 the defect was enlarged to conform to a cosmetic subunit, postoperative defect length and width,  
306 and pedicle width for interpolated flaps. Patient demographic and clinical covariates to be  
307 collected will include sex, age, anatomic location of the tumor, histologic type of the tumor,  
308 immunosuppression, anticoagulant use, tobacco use, and history of diabetes mellitus. Data will  
309 be recorded and imported into an online database (RedCap). Data collection will start  
310 preoperatively, with subsequent collections one week from the date of the interpolated flap  
311 placement, 4 weeks after flap takedown, and 16 weeks after flap takedown. Quality of life  
312 (QOL) will be assessed via a skin cancer specific QOL instrument, the skin cancer index (SCI).  
313 All data will be stored via a secure RedCap database. For collection of patient SCI scores,  
314 patients will complete a structured survey online. If patients do not complete the online  
315 questionnaire, they will be contacted via telephone for collection of this data. All telephone  
316 interviews for collection of patient SCI scores will occur via a structured interview questionnaire  
317 by a trained clinical research fellow.

## 319 **3.3 Study Duration**

320 The target enrollment goal will be for a total of 170 patients collected over a 2-year period. Time  
321 for enrollment is dependent upon the number of Mohs surgeons recruited, and the number of  
322 eligible interpolated flaps conducted by each. Active patient participation will last from day of

323 repair to final SCI, which will range from 18-20 weeks depending on how long the flap is inset  
324 prior to takedown. Total study duration is expected to be 3 years to complete enrollment, follow-  
325 up, data entry and analysis, and manuscript preparation. The proposed start date is June 1, 2018.  
326

### 327 **3.4 Subject Completion/Withdraw**

328 Subjects may withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice to their care. The  
329 investigator may also withdraw subjects who violate the study plan, or to protect the subject for  
330 reasons of safety or for administrative reasons. It will be documented whether or not each  
331 subject completes the study. Study completion will occur when/if patient fills out 16-week after  
332 flap takedown survey. The patient will be informed that their completion in the study is over at  
333 that time and thanked for their participation. If the investigator becomes aware of any serious,  
334 related adverse events after the subject completes or withdraws from the study, they will be  
335 recorded in the source documents.  
336

## 337 **4 Statistical Methods**

### 338 **4.1 Baseline Data**

339 Baseline and demographic characteristics will be summarized by standard descriptive summaries  
340 (e.g. means and standard deviations for continuous variables such as age and percentages for  
341 categorical variables such as gender). All covariate data for patients, surgeons, and case will be  
342 described and presented in this manner.  
343

344 Surveys will be summed and scored according to their instructions.  
345

### 346 **4.2 Analysis of Primary Outcome of Interest**

347 The primary analysis will include all subjects who have completed surveys in their entirety pre-  
348 MMS and at 16-weeks after flap placement. A two-tailed paired t-test will be used to compare  
349 mean SCI scores between pre-MMS and 16-weeks after flap placement.  
350

### 351 **4.3 Sample Size and Power**

352 This study will be powered to detect a 5% change from pre-MMS SCI, based upon a SCI  
353 validation study that previously reported a pre-MMS score of 60 and standard deviation of 12.8.  
354 [7]. A sample size of 145 is needed to achieve 80% power to detect a mean of paired differences  
355 of 3.0, with an estimated standard deviation of differences of 12.8, with a significance level  
356 (alpha) of 0.05, using a two-tailed paired t-test between pre-MMS SCI and week 16 after flap  
357 takedown SCI scores. Anticipating loss of follow up, the final target sample size will be inflated  
358 to ~170.  
359

## 360 **5 Study Administration**

### 361 **5.1 Data Collection and Management**

362 • Consent, patient demographic information, initial SCI study, and surgical details will  
363 be completed on paper as part of an intake packet. Intake packets will be faxed to  
364 Penn, where trained clinical research fellows will input information into the RedCap, a  
365 secure data collection platform. Intake packets will be printed and saved in a secure  
366 location at the University of Pennsylvania. Documents for those who completed intake  
367 packets but did not go on to receive interpolated flap repair will be destroyed in  
368 accordance with HIPAA.



- SCI surveys at 1-week following flap placement, 4-weeks following flap takedown, and 16-weeks following flap takedown will be emailed to patients using RedCap's secure survey administration platform. If a participant fails to complete a survey, they will be contacted via telephone. Trained clinical research fellows may perform the survey over the phone following a detailed script.
- Trained clinical research fellows and the primary investigator will be the only ones with access to RedCap data collection platform.

## 5.2 Respondent Privacy and Patient Protection

- Patients fulfilling the eligibility criteria for the study will be approached by a Mohs surgeon or clinical staff member (MA or Nurse) while in a private procedure room. The patient will be informed of the study and given the consent documents which they are free to peruse. If they agree to enroll in the study, a copy of the consent document will be given to them to keep.
- Patients will be asked to supply a reliable personal phone number at which they can be reached, and a personal email address. Both of these will be collected in the event that the patient does not wish to return to the office for one or more future follow up appointments. The quality of life surveys will be emailed to the patient, or filled out over the phone.
- We will use study codes on data documents at the data analysis portion of the project and keep a separate document that links the study code to subjects identifying information locked in a separate location and restrict access to this document (e.g., only allowing primary investigators access); Will encrypt identifiable data; Will properly dispose, destroy, or delete study data/ documents; Will limit access to identifiable information; Will securely store data documents within locked locations; Will assign security codes to computerized records. After being downloaded from the secure password-protected RedCap website, all data will be stored on Penn Dermatology's institutionally secured and managed server.

397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414

415 **6 References**

- 416 1. Sobanko, J.F., et al., *Patient-reported quality of life and psychosocial health prior to*  
417 *skin cancer treatment - A cross-sectional study.* J Am Acad Dermatol, 2016. **75**(1): p.  
418 217-218 e2.
- 419 2. Radiotis, G., et al., *Nonmelanoma skin cancer: disease-specific quality-of-life*  
420 *concerns and distress.* Oncol Nurs Forum, 2014. **41**(1): p. 57-65.
- 421 3. Dixon, A.J., M.P. Dixon, and J.B. Dixon, *Prospective study of long-term*  
422 *patient perceptions of their skin cancer surgery.* J Am Acad Dermatol, 2007. **57**(3): p.  
423 445-53.
- 424 4. Tebble, N.J., et al., *Anxiety and self-consciousness in patients with facial lacerations*  
425 *one week and six months later.* Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg, 2006. **44**(6): p. 520-5.
- 426 5. Young, V.L. and J. Hutchison, *Insights into patient and clinician concerns about*  
427 *scar appearance: semiquantitative structured surveys.* Plast Reconstr Surg, 2009. **124**(1):  
428 p. 256-65.
- 429 6. Sobanko, J.F., et al., *Importance of physical appearance in patients with skin cancer.*  
430 Dermatol Surg, 2015. **41**(2): p. 183-8.
- 431 7. Rhee JS, Matthews BA, Neuburg M, Logan BR, Burzynski M, Nattinger AB. Validation  
432 of a quality-of-life instrument for patients with nonmelanoma skin cancer. *Arch Facial*  
433 *Plast Surg.* 2006;8(5):314-318  
434  
435