

The Validity of A Novel Low-Cost, App-Enabled Patient-Operated Device For **Measuring Skin Barrier Function**

Erin E. Grinich,^{1,3} Anuja V. Shah^{2,3} and Eric L. Simpson^{2,3}

¹ School of Medicine, ² Department of Dermatology, ³ Oregon Health & Science University simpsone@ohsu.edu

Background

- Transepidermal water loss (TEWL) and • capacitance measure skin barrier permeability and hydration, respectively. TEWL and hydration are both abnormal in atopic dermatitis (AD) and frequently measured in AD clinical trials.¹
- Conventional devices used to measure TEWL and hydration are often costly, bulky and technically challenging.
- GPower GPSkin is capable of measuring both TEWL and skin hydration while being:
- Low-cost
- Compact



Discussion

- GPSkin device primarily has "moderate" correlation with established standard measures for measuring TEWL and skin hydration.
- GPSkin demonstrated "good" reliability when participants were provided some additional minimal instructions on device use.
- There were no differences between participant and investigator test-retest reliability for GPSkin.
- Suggests patients will be able to collect measurements in reliable way.

- Designed for patient operation
- Paired with a smartphone application

Purpose

This validation study investigated:

- 1. The correlation of GPSkin against current standards for TEWL and skin hydration, the Biox AquaFlux and Courage-Khazaka Corneometer, respectively.
- 2. The internal reliability of each device at a single institution.

Methods

A prospective, cross-sectional validation study was conducted within the Dermatology Department of Oregon Health & Science University.



Figure 1. Study Devices. A) Biox AquaFlux AF200, B) Courage-Khazaka Corneometer CM 825 and

Figure 2. Spearman correlation coefficients (r.) for GPSkin versus standards. GPSkin was tested against the AquaFlux to measure TEWL (top) and the Corneometer to measure hydration (bottom). In trial 1, only participants collected measurements with GPSkin

(A1 and B1). In trial 2, both participants (A2 and B2) and investigator (C2 and D2) collected measurements with GPSkin. Trial 2 TEWL data consisted of 1 outlier data point not contained within the above graph (B).

Table 2. Spearman r_s Interpretation⁴

r _s	0.00-0.19	0.20-0.39	0.40-0.59	0.60-0.79	0.80-1.0
Correlation	Very weak	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Very Strong



Device education is likely necessary for accurate measurement readings with GPSkin.

Conclusions

- GPower GPSkin barrier device may represent a useful patient-operated device to monitor skin barrier function with convenient at-home measurements.
- At-home skin barrier measurements may be used to monitor patient skin status, guide therapy decisions, and improve adherence.

Future Directions

- Repeat study in patients with atopic dermatitis
- Measure discriminative ability of device between known disease severity states
- Longitudinal device take-home study



References

C) GPower GPSkin.

- Study site: normal skin, volar forearm.²
- Macro- and microclimate controlled.²
- Room: 20-22°C, 30-50% humidity
- Participant: Acclimate for 10-15 minutes. No bathing or moisturizer for 6hrs prior to measurements.

Table 1. Data Collection Schematic³

Device	Measure	Trial 1 n=50	Trial 2 n=50
GPSkin	TEWL +	Participant	Participant +
	Hydration		Investigator
AquaFlux TEWL		Investigator	Investigator
Corneometer	Hydration	Investigator	Investigator

*Method modification: Participants were provided minimal device instruction for trial 1. In trial 2, participants were educated on device use and used the "stick & click" method. The investigator also used the "stick & click" method.

Figure 3. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) to Assess Device Test-Retest Reliability. ICCs were calculated for both TEWL (top) and hydration (bottom) measurements for GPSkin (A, C, E, G), the AquaFlux (B and F) and the Corneometer (D and H). TEWL ICCs improved from trial 1 to 2: GPSkin improved from 0.18 (A) to 0.89 in trial 2 (E) when comparing participant-collected measurements and the AquaFlux improved from 0.58 (B) to 0.86 (F). ICCs were calculated based on two-way mixed-effects models, with absolute agreement.

 α ICC for participant vs. participant β ICC for participant vs. investigator ^v ICC for investigator vs. investigator

Table 3. ICC Interpretation⁵

ICC Value	<0.5	0.5-0.75	0.75-0.9	>0.9
Reliability	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent

- 1. Fluhr JW, Feingold KR, Elias PM. Transepidermal water loss reflects permeability barrier status: validation in human and rodent in vivo and ex vivo models. Experimental dermatology. 2006;15(7):483-92.
- 2. Pinnagoda J, Tupker RA, Agner T, Serup J. Guidelines for transepidermal water loss (TEWL) measurement. A report from the Standardization Group of the European Society of Contact Dermatitis. Contact dermatitis. 1990;22(3):164-78.
- 3. Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, Alonso J, Stratford PW, Knol DL, et al. The COSMIN checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health status measurement instruments: an international Delphi study. Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation. 2010;19(4):539-49.
- 4. Weir I. Spearman's Rank Correlation. Loughborough University [Available from: http://www.statstutor.ac.uk/resources/ uploaded/spearmans.pdf.
- 5. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. Journal of chiropractic medicine. 2016;15(2):155-63.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to GPower for providing the GPSkin device, photos, as well as technical support throughout this study.