



## Limited health literacy is associated with reduced access to kidney transplantation

Journal:	<i>Kidney International</i>
Manuscript ID	KI-06-18-0846.R2
Article Type:	Clinical Investigation
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Taylor, Dominic; Southmead Hospital, Richard Bright Renal Service; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences          Bradley, Andrew; Department of Surgery, Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge University          Bradley, Clare; Royal Holloway, University of London, Health Psychology Research Unit          Draper, Heather; University of Warwick Warwick Medical School          Dudley, christopher; Southmead Hospital, Richard Bright Renal Unit          Fogarty, Damian; Queen's University of Belfast,          Fraser, Simon; University of Southampton, Academic Unit of Primary Care and Population Sciences          Johnson, Rachel; NHS Blood and Transplant,          Leydon, Geraldine; Southampton University, Primary Care and Population Sciences, Faculty of Medicine          Metcalfe, Wendy; Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Renal Medicine          Oniscu, Gabriel; Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Transplant Unit          Robb, Matthew; NHS Blood and Transplant Organ Donation and Transplantation Directorate          Tomson, Charles; Newcastle upon Tyne NHS Foundation Trust, Renal Medicine          Watson, Chris; University of Cambridge, Surgery          Ravanan, Rommel; Southmead Hospital, Richard Bright Renal Unit          Roderick, Paul; university of southampton, public health and medical statistics group</p>
Subject Area:	Epidemiology and Statistics, Transplantation, Dialysis
Keywords:	chronic kidney disease, hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**[QUERY TO AUTHOR: title and abstract rewritten by Editorial Office – not subject to change]**

## Title

**Limited health literacy is associated with reduced access to kidney transplantation**

## Authors

Dominic M Taylor MD,<sup>a,b</sup> J Andrew Bradley PhD,<sup>c</sup> Clare Bradley PhD,<sup>d</sup> Heather Draper PhD,<sup>e</sup> Christopher Dudley MD,<sup>b</sup> Damian Fogarty MD,<sup>f</sup> Simon Fraser MD,<sup>a</sup> Rachel Johnson MSc,<sup>g</sup> Geraldine M Leydon PhD,<sup>a</sup> Wendy Metcalfe MD,<sup>h</sup> Gabriel C Oniscu MD,<sup>i</sup> Matthew Robb PhD,<sup>g</sup> Charles Tomson MD,<sup>j</sup> Christopher J.E. Watson MA,<sup>c</sup> Rommel Ramanan MD,<sup>b\*</sup> Paul Roderick MD<sup>a\*</sup> on behalf of the ATTOM investigators

## Affiliations

**a** Academic Unit of Primary Care and Population Sciences, University of Southampton, UK

**b** Richard Bright Renal Service, North Bristol NHS Trust, UK

**c** Department of Surgery, University of Cambridge, and NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre, UK

**d** Health Psychology Research Unit, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK

**e** Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

**f** Belfast Health and Social Care Trust, Belfast, UK

**g** NHS Blood and Transplant, Bristol, UK

**h** Scottish Renal Registry, UK

**i** Transplant Unit, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, UK

**j** Department of Renal Medicine, Freeman Hospital, Newcastle-upon Tyne, UK

\* These supervising authors contributed equally.

**Running title:** Health Literacy and access to transplantation; **Word count:** 2816

## Corresponding Author

Dr Dominic Taylor, Richard Bright Renal Service, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, BS10 5NB, United Kingdom, [dominic.taylor@nbt.nhs.uk](mailto:dominic.taylor@nbt.nhs.uk)

## Funding

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) under the Programme Grants for Applied Research scheme (RP-PG-0109-10116). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

**Abstract**

Limited health literacy is common in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD), and has been variably associated with adverse clinical outcomes. The prevalence of limited health literacy is lower in kidney transplant recipients than in individuals starting dialysis, suggesting selection of patients with higher health literacy for transplantation. We investigated the relationship between limited health literacy and clinical outcomes, including access to kidney transplantation, in a prospective UK cohort study of 2,274 incident dialysis patients aged 18-75 years. Limited health literacy was defined by a validated Single Item Literacy Screener (SILS). Multivariable regression was used to test for association with outcomes after adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status (educational level and car ownership), ethnicity, first language, primary CKD diagnosis, and comorbidity. In fully-adjusted analyses, limited health literacy was not associated with mortality, late presentation to nephrology, dialysis modality, haemodialysis vascular access, or pre-emptive kidney transplant listing, but was associated with reduced likelihood of listing for a deceased-donor transplant (hazard ratio, HR 0.68; 95% CI 0.51-0.90), receiving a living-donor transplant (HR 0.41; 95% CI 0.19-0.88), or receiving a transplant from any donor type (HR 0.65; 95% CI 0.44-0.96). Limited health literacy is associated with reduced access to kidney transplantation, independent of patient demographics, socioeconomic status, and comorbidity. Interventions to ameliorate the effects of low health literacy may improve access to kidney transplantation.

**Keywords:** Health Literacy; Kidney transplantation; Socioeconomic Status; Chronic Kidney Disease; Dialysis.

## Introduction

Patients with advanced chronic kidney disease (CKD) who start dialysis are required to cope with the demands of a high-intensity treatment, often with a burden of increasing symptoms.<sup>1</sup> When medically appropriate, kidney transplantation offers superior clinical outcomes compared to dialysis,<sup>2,3</sup> and leads to improvements in self-reported health.<sup>4</sup> Over 80% of UK transplanted patients receive dialysis prior to transplantation,<sup>5</sup> so are required to participate in investigations, discussions (including with potential living kidney donors) and shared decisions to prepare for transplantation at a time when their capacity to do so may be diminished.

Patients' capacity to cope with these communication challenges may be enhanced by adequate health literacy,<sup>6</sup> which can aid understanding, appraisal and use of health-related information, as distinct from general literacy, language fluency or patient activation.<sup>7</sup> 'Limited' health literacy (a below-adequate level defined by health literacy measures<sup>8</sup>) is common, affecting 20-25% of the dialysis population, but a significantly lower proportion of transplant recipients (14%), suggesting that patients with higher health literacy are more likely to be transplanted.<sup>9,10</sup> Limited health literacy is associated with low socioeconomic status, so has been implicated as a mediator of socioeconomic inequity in health outcomes.<sup>11</sup> There is some evidence of independent associations between lower health literacy and adverse clinical events, increased healthcare use and mortality in CKD,<sup>8</sup> but a lack of larger, prospective studies evaluating the effects of lower health literacy on renal replacement therapy and kidney transplant pathways.<sup>8</sup>

We aimed to identify independent associations between health literacy and clinical outcomes including access to kidney transplantation in UK patients starting dialysis.

## Results

Figure 1 shows the processes of patient recruitment and data collection. In total, 2274 of 2432 patients eligible for inclusion responded to the Single Item Literacy Screener (SILS) health literacy question. Table 1 summarises patient demographics, clinical and socioeconomic characteristics, by limited vs adequate health literacy, and results of univariate analyses. Table 2 shows results of multivariable analyses.

### *Baseline characteristics*

As in the baseline analysis of this group,<sup>10</sup> patients with limited health literacy were more likely to have higher levels of comorbidity and lower socioeconomic status, including a lower level of educational attainment and reduced likelihood of car ownership.

### *Presentation, dialysis modality, and haemodialysis vascular access*

Limited health literacy was associated with reduced likelihood of late presentation to nephrology care, but not after adjustment for primary renal diagnosis and comorbidity (Odds Ratio, OR: 0.70; 95% CI: 0.39-1.27). A lower proportion of patients with limited health literacy had peritoneal dialysis as their first dialysis modality, but this difference was not significant in multivariable models (unadjusted OR for peritoneal dialysis 0.73; 95% CI: 0.52-1.03). Limited health literacy was not associated with haemodialysis catheter use (unadjusted OR: 1.07, 95% CI: 0.86-1.33).

### *Access to transplantation and mortality*

There was no significant difference between patients with limited vs adequate health literacy in pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing in univariate or multivariable analyses (Table 1 and Table 2). Figure 2 shows the specification of time-to-event variables for transplantation and mortality. In univariate analyses, patients with limited health literacy had a significantly lower likelihood of transplant listing after starting dialysis, living-donor transplantation and transplantation from any donor type, but no difference in mortality (Table 2, Figure 3). In fully-adjusted models (Table 2),

1  
2  
3 patients with limited health literacy had a reduced likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant  
4  
5 (n=1833; Hazard ratio; HR: 0.68; 95% CI: 0.51-0.91), living-donor transplantation (n=2180; HR: 0.41;  
6  
7 95% CI: 0.21-0.80), and transplantation from any donor type (n=2178 HR: 0.65; 95% CI: 0.45-0.92).  
8  
9

10  
11 There was no difference between patients with limited vs adequate health literacy in likelihood of  
12  
13 deceased-donor transplantation after listing (Supplementary results 1). There were no significant  
14  
15 violations of the proportional hazards assumptions. (Supplementary results 2). Including patients  
16  
17 with lower English fluency (Supplementary results 3; Table S1, Table S2), using Townsend  
18  
19 deprivation index in place of socioeconomic status markers as covariates in multivariable models  
20  
21 (Supplementary results 4; Table S3), or removing adjustment for clustering by renal centre  
22  
23 (Supplementary results 5; Table S4) did not change overall results.  
24  
25

26  
27 For the three transplant outcomes, missing data affected 6-8% of cases, affected more Asian  
28  
29 patients and those with diabetes as primary renal diagnosis, and largely related to missing SILS  
30  
31 response. There was no difference in the significance of results when effect sizes were estimated  
32  
33 after multiple imputation of missing data (Supplementary results 6; Tables S5, S6 and S7).  
34  
35

36  
37 Supplementary information is available at Kidney International's website  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 Discussion

43  
44  
45 In this UK cohort study of 2274 patients starting dialysis, limited health literacy was independently  
46  
47 associated with reduced access to deceased-donor transplant listing, transplantation from a living-  
48  
49 donor or transplantation from any donor type. Health literacy was not shown to affect protocol-  
50  
51 driven systems for offering deceased-donor kidneys after listing.<sup>12</sup> The effect of limited health  
52  
53 literacy in reducing access to transplantation is therefore likely to relate to patients' preparation for  
54  
55 deceased or living-donor transplantation. Health literacy was not independently associated with  
56  
57 dialysis modality, haemodialysis vascular access, pre-emptive transplant listing or mortality. The  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 pathway to deceased-donor transplant listing could not be captured in a single variable because  
4  
5 patients were recruited when starting dialysis, so those listed pre-emptively were considered in a  
6  
7 separate analysis to those listed after starting dialysis. The absence of a significant association with  
8  
9 pre-emptive listing may relate to loss of statistical power.  
10

11  
12 Pathways to deceased-donor transplant listing and living-donor transplantation depend on adequate  
13  
14 clinician-patient communication and understanding to enable effective shared decision-making.  
15

16 Patients with limited health literacy may have reduced understanding of CKD, its consequences,<sup>8</sup>  
17  
18 and the benefits of transplantation. They may feel less able or comfortable speaking and asking  
19  
20 questions during clinical interactions<sup>6</sup> let alone driving discussions about transplantation. Current  
21  
22 shared decision-making resources may be unsuitable for patients with limited health literacy.<sup>13</sup>  
23

24 Limited health literacy is hypothesised to reduce patients' capacity to cope with the burden of  
25  
26 chronic disease and its treatment,<sup>1</sup> and associations with low socioeconomic status and  
27  
28 comorbidity<sup>10, 11</sup> may further impede effective care. Patients with limited health literacy may lack  
29  
30 understanding, so be less likely to discuss transplantation with family and friends, while social  
31  
32 support mechanisms (providing opportunities for discussion) may be reduced by low socioeconomic  
33  
34 status. Patients may be over-burdened by the process of dialysis preparation, preferring a 'short-  
35  
36 term focus':<sup>14</sup> deferring preparations for transplantation until established on dialysis. The associated  
37  
38 reduction in time accrued on the transplant list may reduce the likelihood of transplantation.<sup>12</sup> The  
39  
40 recruitment of living donors presents a specific communication challenge, as a potential recipient  
41  
42 needs to engage a potential donor. Potential donors, most commonly family members, may also  
43  
44 have lower health literacy and health contraindications because of shared social disadvantages.<sup>11</sup>  
45  
46 Lastly, the process of preparing for a kidney transplant may invoke considerable psychological stress.  
47  
48 Patients with lower health literacy, less able to rationalise and understand pathways to  
49  
50 transplantation, may find this process more frightening, limiting their ability to engage with it.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 In studies from the USA, health literacy is inconsistently associated with transplantation, dialysis  
4 catheter use, healthcare service use including emergency department attendance, and mortality.<sup>8</sup>  
5  
6 Low health literacy has strong associations with low socioeconomic status,<sup>9,10</sup> and there are  
7  
8 persistent socioeconomic disparities in CKD, its complications,<sup>15,16</sup> and in access to kidney  
9  
10 transplantation.<sup>17,18</sup> As such, limited health literacy may lie on the causal pathway between low  
11  
12 socioeconomic status and reduced transplant access, acting as a mediator in this relationship. If this  
13  
14 relationship exists, interventions which successfully ameliorate the effects of low health literacy in  
15  
16 clinical practice may have potential to improve outcomes, but also to reduce socioeconomic  
17  
18 inequity. Possible interventions include health literacy-sensitive decision-making resources,<sup>19</sup> specific  
19  
20 communication techniques,<sup>20</sup> enhanced educational programmes with direct support,<sup>21,22</sup> patient  
21  
22 advocacy,<sup>23</sup> or supported navigation of care pathways.<sup>24</sup> Further investigation with mediation  
23  
24 analysis may be appropriate, and has been used to investigate the role of health literacy in other  
25  
26 patient pathways.<sup>25</sup>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 The ATTOM study benefits from a large representative sample of the UK incident dialysis  
34  
35 population,<sup>26</sup> 2-years follow-up, high data completeness, robustness to missing data and detailed  
36  
37 comorbidity adjustment. Limitations include use of the SILS to measure health literacy. Health  
38  
39 literacy is a multifaceted concept,<sup>6</sup> so no measure can fully describe its different aspects, but longer  
40  
41 comprehension tests such as STOFHLA (which tests comprehension of health related terms in  
42  
43 sample medical information) do directly test different health literacy skills such as reading  
44  
45 comprehension and numeracy. The SILS instead measures patient-reported perceived need for help  
46  
47 when reading health-related material. The use of the SILS with limited health literacy defined as  
48  
49 responses 'Sometimes', 'Often' or 'Always' as in this study has moderate accuracy in detecting  
50  
51 limited health literacy defined by STOFHLA in patients with diabetes (sensitivity 54%; specificity  
52  
53 83%),<sup>27</sup> and on haemodialysis (Sensitivity 39%, Specificity 93%).<sup>28</sup> However, no health literacy  
54  
55 measure can be relied on to provide a 'true' measure of health literacy because of the complexity of  
56  
57 health literacy as a concept. Using a comprehension-based measure in studies with a large number  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of participants risks increasing research burden, reduced response rates (arguably more likely to be  
4 reduced among those with health literacy), and non-response bias. These factors influenced our  
5 choice of health literacy measure. Further, the simplicity of the SILS perhaps makes it more relevant  
6 to use in clinical practice, where patients who report difficulty understanding written information  
7 could quickly and easily be identified as at risk of reduced access to transplantation. Longer follow-  
8 up would have increased statistical power with more events accrued. Recruitment was not universal,  
9 but we estimate that over 50% of incident dialysis patients were recruited (based on comparison  
10 with registry data from 2012), and comparison of patients recruited vs not recruited showed no  
11 significant differences in demographics. We could not prospectively capture the processes of pre-  
12 emptive transplantation or pre-emptive listing because patients were recruited when starting  
13 dialysis. The baseline variable for pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant wait-listing does not  
14 capture patients who were listed then transplanted before starting dialysis. Baseline comorbidity  
15 data, while comprehensive, do not record severity of comorbidities or changes in comorbidity over  
16 time, so residual confounding is possible. No data were available on whether transplant work-up  
17 was performed or the results of this process, so any reasons for delay in transplant listing or  
18 transplantation (whether clinical or related to other factors) were not known. The highest  
19 proportion of missing data in complete-case analysis (Supplementary material 6) resulted from  
20 missing exposure (SILS) data. For the transplantation variables, a low proportion (under 8%) had any  
21 missing data in fully-adjusted analyses, and there was no significant difference in these outcomes  
22 between incomplete and complete cases. In analyses of baseline data, multiple imputation did not  
23 significantly change measured associations between health literacy and patient factors.<sup>10</sup> Imputation  
24 is unlikely to change results if the proportion of missing data is low.<sup>29</sup> Individual clinicians and renal  
25 centres may vary in their practice of deeming a patient suitable for transplant listing.<sup>30</sup> Centre-level  
26 differences in clinical practice are accounted for in our analysis by using robust standard errors,  
27 similar to methodology used elsewhere.<sup>18</sup> However, these methods do not investigate the reasons  
28 for centre variation, which lies outside the scope of this study but is investigated by our research  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 group in a current study. Lastly, these findings from observational data provide evidence of  
4  
5 independent associations but do not prove causation.  
6  
7

8 In conclusion, access to transplantation appears to be impeded by limited health literacy in a  
9  
10 significant proportion of UK incident dialysis patients. These effects are unlikely to be unique to  
11  
12 kidney transplantation processes, and may be applicable to other healthcare settings and disease  
13  
14 pathways.<sup>31</sup> The impact of limited health literacy on the actions and interactions of patients,  
15  
16 relatives and clinicians require further investigation. Examination of current practice and available  
17  
18 support mechanisms, routine assessment for limited health literacy and development and testing of  
19  
20 interventions to reduce its unwanted consequences would be helpful steps to improving equity of  
21  
22 access to transplantation.<sup>32, 33</sup>  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **Methods**

30  
31  
32 This prospective, multicentre cohort study was part of the Access to Transplant and Transplant  
33  
34 Outcome Measures (ATTOM) programme. Patients starting dialysis aged 18-75 years, recruited  
35  
36 December 2011 through September 2013 from all 72 UK renal centres provided informed, written  
37  
38 consent for data collection. ATTOM methodology,<sup>26</sup> and baseline associations between limited  
39  
40 health literacy, demographics and socioeconomic status<sup>10</sup> are published elsewhere. See **Figure 1** for  
41  
42 the process of patient selection.  
43  
44  
45

### 46 *Baseline data*

47  
48  
49 Within 90 days of starting dialysis, patients completed a questionnaire including demographics,  
50  
51 individual-level indicators of socioeconomic status, and the Single Item Literacy Screener (SILS), a  
52  
53 validated health literacy measure.<sup>27, 28</sup> The SILS is 'How often do you need to have someone help you  
54  
55 when you read instructions, pamphlets or other written material from your doctor or pharmacy',  
56  
57 with responses 1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often and 5-Always. Responses 'Sometimes',  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 'Often' and 'Always' were taken to represent limited health literacy, informed by validation against  
4 the Short Test of Functional Health Literacy in Adults (STOFHLA, a 7-minute comprehension  
5 assessment).<sup>27, 28</sup> Primary renal diagnosis comorbidities, dialysis modality, vascular access and date  
6 of first contact with nephrology services were collected by structured review of clinical notes.  
7  
8 Comorbidity was quantified using a Charlson comorbidity index modified for CKD populations  
9  
10 (Supplementary methods 1, Table S8). Patients with self-reported English fluency below 'good' were  
11  
12 excluded from primary analyses, but included in a sensitivity analysis.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 *Prospective data*

21  
22 Date of deceased-donor transplant listing and transplantation were received from National Health  
23 Service Blood and Transplant (NHSBT), and mortality data from the UK Renal Registry (UKRR),  
24 censored two years after recruitment. 'Time to event' variables included time from starting dialysis  
25 to listing for deceased-donor transplant, to transplantation from a living donor, to transplantation  
26 from any donor type (living or deceased), and to death (Figure 2). As patients were recruited after  
27 starting dialysis, those listed 'pre-emptively' (before starting dialysis) were not included in the time-  
28 to-event variable for transplant listing, but considered in a separate binary variable. Patients  
29 transplanted 'pre-emptively' were not included.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 *Analysis*

42  
43 Univariate analysis examined associations between limited health literacy and: 'late presentation' to  
44 nephrology (within 90 days of starting dialysis); initial dialysis modality; haemodialysis vascular  
45 access; pre-emptive listing for deceased-donor transplant; time to listing for deceased-donor  
46 transplant; time to living-donor transplantation; time to transplantation from any donor type and all-  
47 cause mortality. After listing for transplant, deceased-donor kidney offers are governed by organ  
48 allocation algorithms,<sup>12</sup> so are not influenced by health literacy, confirmed by analysis of time from  
49 listing to deceased-donor transplantation (Supplementary results 1).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Multivariable analyses were performed for all outcome measures, with sequential adjustment for  
4 potential confounders known to be associated with the outcomes and with health literacy.<sup>9, 10, 17, 18, 34</sup>  
5  
6 These were defined *a priori* and included age and sex, ethnicity and first language, comorbidity and  
7  
8 primary renal diagnosis, and indicators of socioeconomic status<sup>35</sup> (highest educational qualification  
9  
10 and car ownership). Effect ratios with robust standard errors were calculated in order to account for  
11  
12 clustering within renal centres.<sup>36</sup>  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Sensitivity analyses were performed. First, the models were re-fitted including patients who  
18  
19 reported English fluency below 'very fluent', adjusted for fluency level in multivariable models.  
20  
21 Second, multivariable analyses were repeated with adjustment for 2011 area-level deprivation score  
22  
23 (Townsend)<sup>37</sup> in place of individual markers of socioeconomic status. Third, results were compared  
24  
25 with and without robust standard errors to account for clustering by renal centre.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Data were described as mean (95% confidence interval), median [interquartile range], or number  
31  
32 (percentage). Univariate analyses used t-tests,  $\chi^2$  test, and Kaplan-Meier analysis, and multivariable  
33  
34 analysis used logistic regression, linear regression or Cox regression as appropriate. Statistical  
35  
36 significance was defined *a priori* as  $p < 0.05$ . Proportional hazards assumptions were tested using  
37  
38 Schoenfeld residuals. Analyses presented used complete-case analysis. For each analysis, the  
39  
40 proportion of missing data was calculated and results after multiple imputation of missing data are  
41  
42 shown in the supplementary material. Patient characteristics and outcomes were compared  
43  
44 between patients with missing vs complete data. All analyses used Stata 14.1 (StataCorp, USA).  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Supplementary information is available at Kidney International's website  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Author Contributions**

54  
55  
56 Dominic M Taylor performed the analyses, produced the figures and tables and wrote the  
57  
58 manuscript under the supervision of Rommel Ravanan, Paul Roderick and Simon Fraser. All other  
59  
60 authors are members of the Access to Transplant and Transplant Outcome Measures (ATTOM)

1  
2  
3 research group, and along with Rommel Ramanan and Paul Roderick, designed and ran the ATTOM  
4 study as a whole, and gave editorial and methodological advice during manuscript preparation.  
5  
6  
7

### 8 **Supplementary material headings**

9

10  
11 **Supplementary results 1:** Analysis of time from deceased-donor transplant listing to deceased-donor  
12 transplantation.  
13

14 **Supplementary results 2:** Tests of the proportional hazards assumption  
15

16 **Supplementary results 3:** Analysis including patients with moderate English fluency (or lower)  
17

18 **Table S1:** Analysis including patients with moderate, low or no English fluency. Patient  
19 characteristics and univariable analysis by limited vs adequate health literacy  
20

21 **Table S2:** Repeated multivariable analysis including patients with moderate, low or no English  
22 fluency.  
23

24 **Supplementary results 4:** Townsend deprivation score  
25

26 **Table S3:** Repeated multivariable analysis using Townsend deprivation score as a covariate  
27

28 **Supplementary results 5:** Clustering by renal centre  
29

30 **Table S4:** Effect ratios for each model before and after adjustment for clustering by renal centre  
31

32 **Supplementary results 6:** Data completeness  
33

34 **Table S5:** Missing data for each outcome variable.  
35

36 **Table S6:** Comparison of demographics between patients with complete vs incomplete records for  
37 three transplant outcome analyses  
38

39 **Table S7:** Comparison of results of multivariable analysis using complete cases only vs estimates  
40 from multiple imputation  
41

42 **Supplementary methods 1:** Modified Charlson comorbidity index  
43

44 **Table S8:** Score weightings for modified Charlson index based on Hemmelgarn et al  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. Shippee ND, Shah ND, May CR, *et al.* Cumulative complexity: a functional, patient-centered model of patient complexity can improve research and practice. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012; **65**: 1041-1051.
2. Wolfe RA, Ashby VB, Milford EL, *et al.* Comparison of mortality in all patients on dialysis, patients on dialysis awaiting transplantation, and recipients of a first cadaveric transplant. *N Engl J Med* 1999; **341**: 1725-1730.
3. Oniscu GC, Brown H, Forsythe JL. Impact of cadaveric renal transplantation on survival in patients listed for transplantation. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2005; **16**: 1859-1865.
4. Neipp M, Karavul B, Jackobs S, *et al.* Quality of life in adult transplant recipients more than 15 years after kidney transplantation. *Transplantation* 2006; **81**: 1640-1644.
5. NHS Blood and Transplant. Activity Report 2015/16. <http://odt.nhs.uk/uk-transplant-registry/annual-activity-report>, 2016.
6. Sorensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, *et al.* Health literacy and public health: a systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health* 2012; **12**: 80.
7. Smith SG, Curtis LM, Wardle J, *et al.* Skill set or mind set? Associations between health literacy, patient activation and health. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**: e74373.
8. Taylor DM, Fraser SD, Oniscu GC, *et al.* Health literacy and patient outcomes in chronic kidney disease: a systematic review. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation* 2017: gfx293-gfx293.
9. Taylor DM, Fraser SDS, Bradley JA, *et al.* A Systematic Review of the Prevalence and Associations of Limited Health Literacy in CKD. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017; **12**: 1070-1084.
10. Taylor DM, Bradley JA, Bradley C, *et al.* Limited health literacy in advanced kidney disease. *Kidney Int* 2016; **90**: 685-695.

- 1  
2  
3 11. Mantwill S, Monestel-Umaña S, Schulz PJ. The Relationship between Health Literacy and  
4 Health Disparities: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**: e0145455.  
5  
6  
7
- 8 12. NHS Blood and Transplant. Policy POL186/7: Kidney Transplantation: Deceased Donor Organ  
9 Allocation. [http://www.odt.nhs.uk/pdf/kidney\\_allocation\\_policy.pdf](http://www.odt.nhs.uk/pdf/kidney_allocation_policy.pdf), Accessed 2017.  
10  
11  
12
- 13 13. Muscat DM, Shepherd HL, Morony S, *et al.* Can adults with low literacy understand shared  
14 decision making questions? A qualitative investigation. *Patient Educ Couns* 2016; **99**: 1796-  
15 1802.  
16  
17
- 18 14. Bailey PK, Ben-Shlomo Y, Tomson CR, *et al.* Socioeconomic deprivation and barriers to live-  
19 donor kidney transplantation: a qualitative study of deceased-donor kidney transplant  
20 recipients. *BMJ Open* 2016; **6**: e010605.  
21  
22
- 23 15. Fraser SDS, Roderick PJ, Aitken G, *et al.* Chronic kidney disease, albuminuria and  
24 socioeconomic status in the Health Surveys for England 2009 and 2010. *Journal of Public*  
25 *Health* 2013; **36**: 1-10.  
26  
27
- 28 16. Fraser SDS, Roderick PJ, McIntyre NJ, *et al.* Socio-economic disparities in the distribution of  
29 cardiovascular risk in chronic kidney disease stage 3. *Nephron Clinical Practice* 2012; **122**: 58-  
30 65.  
31  
32
- 33 17. Udayaraj U, Ben-Shlomo Y, Roderick P, *et al.* Social deprivation, ethnicity, and uptake of  
34 living kidney donor transplantation in the United Kingdom. *Transplantation* 2012; **93**: 610-  
35 616.  
36  
37
- 38 18. Udayaraj U, Ben-Shlomo Y, Roderick P, *et al.* Social deprivation, ethnicity, and access to the  
39 deceased donor kidney transplant waiting list in England and Wales. *Transplantation* 2010;  
40 **90**: 279-285.  
41  
42
- 43 19. Patzer RE, Basu M, Larsen CP, *et al.* iChoose Kidney: A Clinical Decision Aid for Kidney  
44 Transplantation Versus Dialysis Treatment. *Transplantation* 2016; **100**: 630-639.  
45  
46
- 47 20. Griffey RT, Shin N, Jones S, *et al.* The impact of teach-back on comprehension of discharge  
48 instructions and satisfaction among emergency patients with limited health literacy: A  
49 randomized, controlled study. *J Commun Healthc* 2015; **8**: 10-21.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
21. Lopez-Vargas PA, Tong A, Howell M, *et al.* Educational Interventions for Patients With CKD: A Systematic Review. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2016; **68**: 353-370.
22. Boulware LE, Hill-Briggs F, Kraus ES, *et al.* Effectiveness of educational and social worker interventions to activate patients' discussion and pursuit of preemptive living donor kidney transplantation: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2013; **61**: 476-486.
23. Garonzik-Wang JM, Berger JC, Ros RL, *et al.* Live donor champion: finding live kidney donors by separating the advocate from the patient. *Transplantation* 2012; **93**: 1147-1150.
24. Sullivan C, Leon JB, Sayre SS, *et al.* Impact of navigators on completion of steps in the kidney transplant process: a randomized, controlled trial. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2012; **7**: 1639-1645.
25. Stormacq C, Van den Broucke S, Wosinski J. Does health literacy mediate the relationship between socioeconomic status and health disparities? Integrative review. *Health Promot Int* 2018.
26. Oniscu GC, Ravanan R, Wu D, *et al.* Access to Transplantation and Transplant Outcome Measures (ATTOM): study protocol of a UK wide, in-depth, prospective cohort analysis. *BMJ Open* 2016; **6**: e010377.
27. Morris NS, MacLean CD, Chew LD, *et al.* The Single Item Literacy Screener: evaluation of a brief instrument to identify limited reading ability. *BMC Fam Pract* 2006; **7**: 21.
28. Brice JH, Foster MB, Principe S, *et al.* Single-item or two-item literacy screener to predict the S-TOFHLA among adult hemodialysis patients. *Patient Educ Couns* 2014; **94**: 71-75.
29. Langkamp DL, Lehman A, Lemeshow S. Techniques for Handling Missing Data in Secondary Analyses of Large Surveys. *Acad Pediatr* 2010; **10**: 205-210.
30. Tonkin-Crine S, Pruthi R, Taylor DM, *et al.* Assessing Consensus Between UK Renal Clinicians on Listing for Kidney Transplantation: A Modified Delphi Study. *Transplantation Direct* 2018; **Online Now**.
31. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, *et al.* Low health literacy and health outcomes: an updated systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011; **155**: 97-107.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 32. NHS Scotland. Making it Easier: a Health Literacy Action Plan for Scotland. 2017.  
6  
7  
8  
9 33. Public Health England. Improving health literacy to reduce health inequalities. 2015.  
10  
11  
12  
13 34. Taylor DM, Fraser S, Dudley C, *et al.* Health literacy and patient outcomes in chronic kidney  
14 disease: a systematic review. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation* 2017; gfx293-gfx293.  
15  
16  
17  
18 35. Galobardes B, Shaw M, Lawlor DA, *et al.* Indicators of socioeconomic position (part 1). *J*  
19 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2006; **60**: 7-12.  
20  
21  
22  
23 36. Kirkwood B, Sterne JC. Chapter 31: Analysis of Clustered Data. *Essential Medical Statistics*.  
24 Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Oxford, 2003.  
25  
26  
27  
28 37. Townsend P, Phillimore P, Beatie A. Health and Deprivation: inequality and the North. *Croom*  
29 *Helm Ltd*, 1988.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Tables

**Table 1: Summary statistics and univariate analysis by limited vs adequate health literacy**

Shown as frequency (%), mean (95% CI) or median [IQR]. Subgroup percentages may not total 100% because of rounding. Significant p values shown in bold. Detailed baseline characteristics and associations with limited health literacy have been published separately.<sup>10</sup> Modified Charlson comorbidity index is described in supplementary material 1. Primary Renal Diagnoses were categorised according to UK Renal Registry (UKRR) criteria.

	Health Literacy		p
	Adequate 1915 (84)	Limited 359 (16)	
<b>Total: 2463</b>			
<u>Demographics</u>			
Male	1243 (65)	231 (64)	0.84
Age	58 [47, 67]	58 [47, 66]	0.67
Ethnicity:			
White	1651 (86)	304 (85)	
Asian	113 (6)	22 (6)	
Black	126 (7)	27 (8)	0.42
Chinese	9 (0.5)	0 (0)	
Mixed-race	10 (1)	4 (1)	
First language:			
English	1800 (94)	338 (94)	0.94
Other (but with good English fluency)	114 (6)	21 (6)	
<u>Clinical features</u>			
Primary renal diagnosis			
Diabetes	398 (21)	166 (47)	
Glomerulonephritis	305 (16)	40 (11)	
Pyelonephritis	124 (7)	18 (5)	
Hypertension	127 (7)	18 (5)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Polycystic Kidney Disease	173 (9)	18 (5)	
Renovascular Disease	62 (3)	10 (3)	
Other	430 (23)	37 (10)	
Uncertain	275 (15)	46 (13)	
Modified Charlson Comorbidity index:			
0	881 (46)	77 (21)	
1-2	668 (35)	182 (51)	
3-4	233 (12)	66 (18)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
>4	133 (7)	34 (9)	

		Health Literacy		
		Adequate	Limited	
<u>Socioeconomic status indicators</u>				
Highest educational qualification:				
	None	551 (29)	179 (50)	
	High School level	836 (44)	119 (33)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	University level	331 (17)	22 (6)	
	Other qualification	189 (10)	39 (11)	
	Car owner	1440 (75)	198 (55)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<u>Outcome measures</u>				
	Late presentation (<90 days before dialysis initiation)	291 (17)	32 (10)	<b>0.003</b>
	Peritoneal Dialysis as first dialysis modality	417 (22)	61 (17)	<b>0.043</b>
	Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality)	809 (55)	164 (56)	0.68
	Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing	241 (13)	35 (10)	0.09
At 2 years from dialysis initiation:				
	Listed for deceased-donor transplant	750 (42)	96 (27)	
	Transplanted (living-donor)	162 (9)	7 (2)	
	Transplanted (any donor type)	337 (18)	31 (9)	
	Mortality	271 (14)	67 (19)	

**Table 2: Analysis of outcome measures by limited vs adequate health literacy, with sequential adjustment for demographics, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity (modified Charlson index) and socioeconomic status (highest educational qualification and car ownership)**

Measures of effect shown for limited vs adequate health literacy depend on the regression model used (Logistic: Odds ratio, OR; Linear:  $\beta$  coefficient; Cox: Hazard ratio, HR). Categorical variables for Ethnicity, first language, primary renal diagnosis, Comorbidity (modified Charlson index) and highest educational qualification are specified as shown in Table 1; Significant p-values are shown in bold. Patients with missing data for any variable in model 6 are excluded from all models, such that models 1-6 include the same sample.

		Model					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Unadjusted	+ Age/Sex	+ Ethnicity, first language	+ Primary renal diagnosis, Comorbidity	+ Highest educational qualification	+ Car ownership
Late presentation (<90 days) n=2001	OR (95% CI) p	0.55 (0.33,0.94) <b>0.027</b>	0.55 (0.32,0.93) <b>0.026</b>	0.55 (0.33,0.94) <b>0.028</b>	0.70 (0.39,1.27) 0.2	0.71 (0.39,1.28) 0.3	0.68 (0.37,1.24) 0.2
Peritoneal dialysis as first dialysis modality (vs haemodialysis) n=2214	OR (95% CI) p	0.73 (0.52,1.03) 0.08	0.73 (0.51,1.03) 0.08	0.73 (0.52,1.03) 0.08	0.76 (0.53,1.08) 0.1	0.84 (0.59,1.19) 0.3	0.93 (0.65,1.35) 0.7
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality) n=1741	OR (95% CI) p	1.07 (0.86,1.33) 0.6	1.06 (0.85,1.32) 0.6	1.05 (0.84,1.32) 0.6	1.12 (0.87,1.43) 0.4	1.12 (0.87,1.43) 0.4	1.09 (0.84,1.41) 0.5
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing n=2092	OR (95% CI) p	0.73 [0.52,1.02] 0.07	0.72 [0.52,1.01] 0.06	0.73 [0.52,1.02] 0.06	0.86 [0.60,1.21] 0.4	0.98 [0.68,1.41] 0.9	1.03 [0.71,1.49] 0.9
Likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant after starting dialysis n=1833	HR (95% CI) p	0.54 (0.41,0.73) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.53 (0.39,0.72) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.53 (0.40,0.71) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.61 (0.45,0.82) <b>0.001</b>	0.66 (0.49,0.88) <b>0.004</b>	0.68 (0.51,0.91) <b>0.010</b>
Likelihood of living-donor transplantation after starting dialysis n=2180	HR (95% CI) p	0.23 (0.11,0.51) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.24 (0.12,0.49) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.24 (0.12,0.48) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.32 (0.16,0.63) <b>0.001</b>	0.38 (0.20,0.75) <b>0.005</b>	0.41 (0.21,0.80) <b>0.009</b>
Likelihood of transplantation from any donor type after starting dialysis n=2178	HR (95% CI) p	0.47 (0.32,0.67) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.47 (0.33,0.67) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.47 (0.33,0.66) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.54 (0.38,0.77) <b>0.001</b>	0.62 (0.43,0.89) <b>0.009</b>	0.65 (0.45,0.92) <b>0.016</b>
Mortality n=2186	HR (95% CI) p	1.27 (0.88,1.85) 0.2	1.29 (0.90,1.85) 0.2	1.30 (0.91,1.86) 0.2	1.13 (0.79,1.63) 0.5	1.07 (0.75,1.54) 0.7	1.05 (0.73,1.49) 0.8

## Figure Legends

### Figure 1: Recruitment process

\* The proportion of UK incident dialysis patients recruited to ATTOM is difficult to quantify because of differing start and end dates for each renal centre, although comparison with 2012 UK Renal Registry data showed that over 50% of incident dialysis patients under 75 years were recruited to ATTOM. A comparison of the characteristics of incident dialysis patients recruited to ATTOM and those registered with the UK Renal Registry (UKRR) showed no significant differences in age, sex or ethnicity after adjustment for missing ethnicity data in the UKRR record (data not shown).

† These patients were recruited after transplantation and re-recruited as incident dialysis patients after transplant failure

‡ Multi-organ transplants are subject to different organ allocation policies (compared to single-organ)

§ This is to account for the practice in some centres of listing before immediate suspension while investigations are performed to ensure fitness for transplantation

ATTOM: Access to Transplant and Transplant Outcome Measures

### Figure 2: Specification of time-to-event variables

\* This adjustment accounts for the practice of preparing patients for living-donor transplantation without adding them to the deceased-donor transplant waiting list, and assumes that the recipient is fit for transplantation 6 months before living-donor transplantation.

### Figure 3: Univariate analysis of 'time to event' outcomes, with unadjusted Hazard Ratios (HRs) for limited vs adequate health literacy (HL)

Time-to-event outcomes specified as in Figure 2




Figure 1: Recruitment process

\* The proportion of UK incident dialysis patients recruited to ATTOM is difficult to quantify because of differing start and end dates for each renal centre, although comparison with 2012 UK Renal Registry data showed that over 50% of incident dialysis patients under 75 years were recruited to ATTOM. A comparison of the characteristics of incident dialysis patients recruited to ATTOM and those registered with the UK Renal Registry (UKRR) showed no significant differences in age, sex or ethnicity after adjustment for missing ethnicity data in the UKRR record (data not shown).

† These patients were recruited after transplantation and re-recruited as incident dialysis patients after transplant failure

‡ Multi-organ transplants are subject to different organ allocation policies (compared to single-organ)

§ This is to account for the practice in some centres of listing before immediate suspension while investigations are performed to ensure fitness for transplantation

ATTOM: Access to Transplant and Transplant Outcome Measures

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

176x212mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Figure 2: Specification of time-to-event variables

\* This adjustment accounts for the practice of preparing patients for living-donor transplantation without adding them to the deceased-donor transplant waiting list, and assumes that the recipient is fit for transplantation 6 months before living-donor transplantation.

204x177mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3: Univariate analysis of 'time to event' outcomes, with unadjusted Hazard Ratios (HRs) for limited vs adequate health literacy (HL)  
Time-to-event outcomes specified as in Figure 2

203x40mm (300 x 300 DPI)

## Supplementary results

### 1: Analysis of time from deceased-donor transplant listing to deceased-donor transplantation.

Patients were included if wait-listed prior to two years after dialysis start, and followed for two years from listing, until death or until removal from the transplant list, whichever was earlier. The proportional hazards assumption was not violated. The analysis included 802 patients. Hazard of deceased donor transplantation after listing for limited vs adequate health literacy was 0.92 (95% CI: 0.7, 1.25),  $p=0.6$ .

### 2: Tests of the proportional hazards assumption

Global tests of the proportional hazards (PH) assumption for the survival models shown in Table 2 were non-significant (no global violation of PH assumption). Individual-variable tests of the PH assumption were significant for some covariates in the model for time from dialysis start to transplant listing (one level of each of the categorical variables for ethnicity and primary renal diagnosis), the model for time to living-donor transplant (two levels of the categorical variable for ethnicity), and the model for time to any transplant (one level of the categorical variable for education and three levels of the categorical variable for primary renal diagnosis). Re-fitting each model with stratification of by these variables did not change the overall results.

### 3: Analysis including patients with moderate English fluency (or lower)

This analysis included 2463 patients, and included patients with moderate, poor or no English fluency. English fluency was then added as a categorical covariate in multivariable and mediation

1  
2  
3 models (categories as in Table S1). Results of univariate analyses are shown in Table S1, and results  
4  
5 of multivariable analyses are in Table S2.

6  
7  
8 There were no differences in the significance of results when compared to the primary analysis.  
9

#### 10 11 12 13 **4: Townsend deprivation score**

14  
15  
16 Townsend deprivation scores<sup>S1</sup> for each patient were derived from patient postcode and the UK  
17  
18 census online Geoconvert service (<http://geoconvert.mimas.ac.uk>). These were used as covariates in  
19  
20 multivariable models in place of individual-level markers of socioeconomic status. This did not  
21  
22 change the overall significance of results compared to the primary analysis (Table S3).  
23  
24  
25

#### 26 27 28 **5: Clustering by renal centre**

29  
30  
31 Multivariable analyses were repeated with and without adjustment for clustering by renal centre  
32  
33 (using robust standard errors). This adjustment did not significantly change results, shown in Table  
34  
35 S4  
36

#### 37 38 39 **6: Data completeness**

40  
41 Table S5 shows the proportion of missing data for multivariable analysis of each outcome variable.  
42  
43 The largest proportion of missing data was for analysis of 'late presentation' (18%). The  
44  
45 transplantation and mortality variables had a far lower proportion of missing data (6-8%). The  
46  
47 majority of missing data for these analyses is from missing exposure data (no answer to SILS  
48  
49 question). Comparison of patient characteristics between those with complete cases vs missing data  
50  
51 for the three transplant variables is shown in Table S6. Patients with Asian ethnicity or with diabetes  
52  
53 as primary renal diagnosis are over-represented in the missing data group.  
54  
55

56  
57 Multiple imputation was performed to check for bias from the use of complete-case analysis, using  
58  
59 'imputation by chained equations' to generate 30 imputed datasets. As there were differences in the  
60

1  
2  
3 subjects included in different analyses (see figure 1), four sets of imputed datasets were generated:  
4  
5 one for baseline analyses of late presentation, dialysis modality, pre-emptive transplant listing, one  
6  
7 for analysis of dialysis access, one for analyses of time to living-donor transplantation, any transplant  
8  
9 or death, and one for analysis of time to transplant wait-listing. Estimated effect-sizes after full-  
10  
11 adjustment for each outcome using 30 imputed datasets are shown in Table S7. There were no  
12  
13 major differences in the significance of the results from these analyses compared to complete-case  
14  
15 analysis.  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **References**

20  
21  
22  
23 S1. Townsend P, Phillimore P, Beatie A. Health and Deprivation: inequality and the North. *Croom*  
24  
25 *Helm Ltd*, 1988.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Supplementary methods: Modified Charlson comorbidity index

This index was developed from Hemmelgarn et al (2003),<sup>S2</sup> who adapted the original Charlson index<sup>S3</sup> to more accurately predict outcomes in patients in End-Stage Renal Disease. Some changes were made to allow for the data available from the ATTOM study. Scoring for the Hemmelgarn modified Charlson index, and the scoring used for this study are shown in Table S8

Presence of rheumatological or peptic ulcer disease were not recorded in the ATTOM study, so were excluded from the scoring. Score weightings were unchanged from the Hemmelgarn modified Charlson index. Some definitions were altered to allow for subtle differences in the way comorbidities were recorded. The small number of patients (92; 1.3%) with missing data for one or more diagnoses included in the Charlson index were scored at 'zero' for that diagnosis, but their total score was still included in analyses.

### References

- S2. Hemmelgarn B, Manns B, Quan H, et al. Adapting the Charlson Comorbidity index for use in patients with ESRD. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2003; 42: 125-132.
- S3. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, et al. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis* 1987; 40: 373-383.

**Table S1: Analysis including patients with moderate, low or no English fluency. Patient characteristics and univariable analysis by limited vs adequate health literacy**

Shown as frequency (%), mean (95% CI) or median [IQR]. Subgroup percentages may not total 100% because of rounding. Significant p values shown in bold. Modified Charlson comorbidity index is described in supplementary material 1. Primary renal diagnoses were categorised according to UK Renal Registry (UKRR) criteria.

	Health Literacy		p
	Adequate	Limited	
Total: 2463	1982 (80)	481 (20)	
Male	1294 (65)	311 (65)	0.80
Age	58 [47, 67]	58 [47, 66]	0.64
Ethnicity:			
White	1,665 (84)	319 (67)	
Asian	152 (8)	111 (23)	
Black	135 (7)	39 (8)	<0.001
Chinese	12 (1)	5 (1)	
Mixed-race	12 (1)	4 (1)	
Language:			
English First Language	1,800 (91)	338 (70)	
Other first language, self-reported English			
Fluency:			
Good	114 (6)	21 (4)	<0.001
Moderate	54 (3)	58 (12)	
Poor or no English	13 (1)	64 (13)	
Modified Charlson Comorbidity index			
0	913 (46)	124 (26)	
1-2	692 (35)	230 (48)	
3-4	240 (12)	89 (19)	<0.001
>4	137 (7)	38 (8)	
Primary Renal Diagnosis			
Diabetes	417 (21)	216 (46)	
Glomerulonephritis	314 (16)	59 (13)	
Pyelonephritis	128 (7)	20 (4)	
Hypertension	128 (7)	24 (5)	<0.001
Polycystic Kidney Disease	178 (9)	21 (4)	
Renovascular Disease	65 (3)	11 (2)	
Other	444 (23)	53 (11)	
Uncertain	286 (15)	68 (14)	

	Health Literacy		
	Adequate	Limited	
Highest educational qualification:			
None	568 (29)	245 (51)	
High School level	858 (43)	156 (33)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
University level	355 (18)	39 (8)	
Other qualification	193 (10)	40 (8)	
No educational qualifications (vs any)	568 (29)	245 (51)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Car owner	1479 (75)	272 (57)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Late presentation (<90 days before dialysis initiation)	299 (17)	41 (10)	<b>0.001</b>
Peritoneal Dialysis as initial dialysis modality	424 (21)	81 (17)	<b>0.028</b>
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality)	839 (55)	223 (57)	0.39
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing	247 (13)	44 (10)	<b>0.030</b>
At 2 years from dialysis initiation:			
Listed for deceased-donor transplant	777 (42)	145 (31)	
Transplanted (living-donor)	167 (9)	15 (3)	
Transplanted (any donor type)	346 (18)	45 (10)	
Mortality	277 (14)	82 (17)	



**Table S1: Repeated multivariable analysis including patients with moderate, low or no English fluency.**

Measures of effect shown for limited vs adequate health literacy depend on the regression model used (Logistic: Odds ratio, OR; Cox: Hazard ratio, HR).

Categorical variables for ethnicity, English fluency, first language, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity (modified Charlson index) and highest educational qualification are specified as in Table 1; Significant p-values are shown in bold.

		Model					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Unadjusted	+ Age/Sex	+ Ethnicity, first language	+ Primary renal diagnosis, Comorbidity	+ Highest educational qualification	+ Car ownership
Late presentation (<90 days) n=2147	OR (95% CI) p	0.55 (0.36,0.83) <b>0.005</b>	0.54 (0.36,0.83) <b>0.005</b>	0.56 (0.34,0.92) <b>0.023</b>	0.69 (0.39,1.21) 0.2	0.71 (0.40,1.25) 0.2	0.67 (0.38,1.19) 0.2
Peritoneal dialysis as first dialysis modality (vs haemodialysis) n=2395	OR (95% CI) p	0.73 (0.56,0.96) <b>0.025</b>	0.73 (0.55,0.96) <b>0.024</b>	0.75 (0.55,1.03) <b>0.07</b>	0.78 (0.57,1.08) 0.1	0.87 (0.63,1.19) 0.4	0.96 (0.69,1.34) 0.8
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality) n=1892	OR (95% CI) p	1.11 (0.92,1.33) 0.3	1.10 (0.92,1.33) 0.3	1.04 (0.84,1.30) 0.7	1.09 (0.84,1.40) 0.5	1.09 (0.85,1.39) 0.5	1.05 (0.82,1.35) 0.7
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing n=2275	OR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.51,0.92) <b>0.013</b>	0.68 (0.50,0.92) <b>0.013</b>	0.73 (0.53,0.99) <b>0.046</b>	0.86 (0.63,1.16) 0.3	0.97 (0.71,1.34) 0.9	1.03 (0.75,1.41) 0.9
Likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant after starting dialysis n=1994	HR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.54,0.85) <b>0.001</b>	0.67 (0.52,0.87) <b>0.002</b>	0.59 (0.47,0.74) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.64 (0.50,0.82) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.68 (0.53,0.88) <b>0.003</b>	0.70 (0.54,0.91) <b>0.008</b>
Likelihood of living-donor transplantation after starting dialysis n=2361	HR (95% CI) p	0.35 (0.21,0.57) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.36 (0.23,0.56) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.32 (0.21,0.51) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.39 (0.24,0.63) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.46 (0.28,0.75) <b>0.002</b>	0.48 (0.30,0.78) <b>0.003</b>
Likelihood of transplantation from any donor type after starting dialysis n=2358	HR (95% CI) p	0.50 (0.38,0.66) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.51 (0.40,0.66) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.51 (0.39,0.67) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.58 (0.44,0.77) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.65 (0.47,0.89) <b>0.007</b>	0.68 (0.50,0.93) <b>0.016</b>
Mortality n=2367	HR (95% CI) p	1.17 (0.82,1.68) 0.4	1.19 (0.84,1.69) 0.3	1.32 (0.93,1.87) 0.1	1.15 (0.81,1.63) 0.4	1.08 (0.76,1.53) 0.6	1.06 (0.75,1.49) 0.8

**Table S3: Repeated multivariable analysis using Townsend deprivation score as a covariate**

Measures of effect shown for limited vs adequate health literacy depend on the regression model used (Logistic: Odds ratio, OR; Cox: Hazard ratio, HR). Categorical variables for ethnicity, English fluency, first language, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity (modified Charlson index) and highest educational qualification are specified as in **Error! Reference source not found.**; Significant p-values are shown in bold.

		Model				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Unadjusted	+ Age/Sex	+ Ethnicity, first language	+ Primary renal diagnosis, Comorbidity	+ Townsend deprivation score
Late presentation (<90 days) n=1993	OR (95% CI) p	0.56 (0.33,0.95) <b>0.032</b>	0.56 (0.33,0.95) <b>0.030</b>	0.56 (0.33,0.95) <b>0.033</b>	0.71 (0.39,1.29) 0.3	0.68 (0.37,1.25) 0.2
Peritoneal dialysis as first dialysis modality (vs haemodialysis) n=2209	OR (95% CI) p	0.75 (0.53,1.06) 0.1	0.75 (0.53,1.06) 0.1	0.75 (0.53,1.06) 0.1	0.78 (0.55,1.10) 0.2	0.84 (0.59,1.21) 0.4
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality) n=1739	OR (95% CI) p	1.07 (0.86,1.34) 0.6	1.07 (0.85,1.33) 0.6	1.06 (0.85,1.33) 0.6	1.13 (0.88,1.44) 0.4	1.09 (0.84,1.42) 0.5
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing n=2087	OR (95% CI) p	0.73 (0.52,1.02) 0.06	0.72 (0.51,1.01) 0.06	0.72 (0.52,1.01) 0.06	0.85 (0.60,1.20) 0.3	0.94 (0.66,1.36) 0.8
Likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant after starting dialysis n=1828	HR (95% CI) p	0.56 (0.42,0.75) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.55 (0.41,0.73) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.54 (0.41,0.72) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.62 (0.47,0.84) <b>0.002</b>	0.66 (0.48,0.89) <b>0.007</b>
Likelihood of living-donor transplantation after starting dialysis n=2175	HR (95% CI) p	0.24 (0.11,0.52) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.24 (0.12,0.50) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.24 (0.12,0.48) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.32 (0.16,0.63) <b>0.001</b>	0.35 (0.18,0.70) <b>0.003</b>
Likelihood of transplantation from any donor type after starting dialysis n=2173	HR (95% CI) p	0.48 (0.34,0.69) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.49 (0.35,0.69) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.48 (0.34,0.68) <b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.56 (0.39,0.79) <b>0.001</b>	0.60 (0.42,0.86) <b>0.006</b>
Mortality n=2181	HR (95% CI) p	1.26 (0.87,1.83) 0.2	1.28 (0.89,1.83) 0.2	1.29 (0.90,1.85) 0.2	1.12 (0.78,1.61) 0.5	1.11 (0.77,1.58) 0.6

**Table S4: Effect ratios for each model before and after adjustment for clustering by renal centre**

Measures of effect shown for limited vs adequate health literacy depend on the regression model used (Logistic: Odds ratio, OR; Cox: Hazard ratio, HR). Categorical variables for ethnicity, English fluency, first language, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity (modified Charlson index) and highest educational qualification are specified as in **Error! Reference source not found.**; Significant p-values are shown in bold. Adjustment for clustering by renal centre used robust standard errors.

		Effect ratios, after adjustment for age, sex, ethnicity, first language, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity, education and car ownership	
		Before adjustment for clustering	After adjustment for clustering
Late presentation (<90 days) n=2001	OR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.44, 1.03) 0.07	0.68 (0.37, 1.24) 0.2
Peritoneal dialysis as first dialysis modality (vs haemodialysis) n=2214	OR (95% CI) p	0.93 (0.67, 1.29) 0.7	0.93 (0.65, 1.35) 0.7
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality) n=1741	OR (95% CI) p	1.09 (0.83, 1.43) 0.6	1.09 (0.84, 1.41) 0.5
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing n=2092	OR (95% CI) p	1.03 (0.68, 1.57) 0.9	1.03 (0.71, 1.49) 0.9
Likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant after starting dialysis n=1833	HR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.51, 0.90) <b>0.007</b>	0.68 (0.51, 0.91) <b>0.010</b>
Likelihood of living-donor transplantation after starting dialysis n=2180	HR (95% CI) p	0.41 0.19, 0.88) <b>0.023</b>	0.41 0.21, 0.80) <b>0.009</b>
Likelihood of transplantation from any donor type after starting dialysis n=2178	HR (95% CI) p	0.65 (0.44, 0.96) <b>0.032</b>	0.65 (0.45, 0.92) <b>0.016</b>
Mortality n=2186	HR (95% CI) p	1.05 (0.79, 1.39) 0.8	1.05 (0.73, 1.49) 0.8

**Table S5: Missing data for each outcome variable.**

The first column shows the total number of patients eligible for inclusion in each analysis after the exclusions shown in Figure 1. For each analysis, number of patients with missing data for the outcome, exposure (SILS) and covariates are shown, and the proportion of eligible patients included in complete case analysis are shown in the right-hand column. In the fully-adjusted model for initial dialysis modality, 13 further observations were excluded because in one category of ethnic group, no patients were treated with peritoneal dialysis.

	<b>Total eligible for inclusion (excluding moderate/low English fluency)</b>	<b>Missing data for outcome variable</b>	<b>Missing SILS data (if outcome data not missing)</b>	<b>Missing covariate data (If SILS/outcome data not missing and multivariable analysis performed)</b>	<b>Complete cases (% of total eligible)</b>
<b>Late presentation</b>	<b>2432</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2001 (82)</b>
<b>Initial dialysis modality</b>	<b>2432</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2227 (92) *</b>
<b>Dialysis access (if initial dialysis modality was haemodialysis)</b>	<b>1909</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1741 (91)</b>
<b>Transplant listing</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1833 (92)</b>
<b>Living-donor transplantation</b>	<b>2382</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2180 (92)</b>
<b>Transplantation (any donor)</b>	<b>2380</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2178 (92)</b>
<b>Survival</b>	<b>2387</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2186 (92)</b>

**Table S6: Comparison of demographics between patients with complete vs incomplete records for three transplant outcome analyses**

	Transplant listing			Living-donor transplantation			Transplantation (any donor)		
	Complete cases n=1835	Missing data n=160	p	Complete cases n=2182	Missing data n=200	p	Complete cases n=2180	Missing data n=200	p
Median age [IQR]	59 [48-68]	60 [49-67]	0.90	58 [47-67]	58 [45-66]	0.34	58 [47-67]	58 [45-66]	0.33
Male	1204 (66)	99 (62)	0.34	1413 (65)	123 (62)	0.36	1411 (65)	123 (62)	0.36
Ethnicity:									
White	1585 (86)	109 (71)		1884 (86)	142 (74)		1882 (86)	142 (74)	
Asian	103 (6)	30 (20)		131 (6)	32 (17)		131 (6)	32 (17)	
Black	128 (7)	9 (6)	<0.001	146 (7)	13 (7)	<0.001	146 (7)	13 (7)	<0.001
Chinese	8 (0.4)	2 (1)		8 (0.4)	2 (1)		8 (0.4)	2 (1)	
Mixed-race	11 (1)	2 (1)		13 (1)	2 (1)		13 (1)	2 (1)	
English first language	1726 (94)	33 (94)	0.96	2050 (94)	44 (96)	0.63	2048 (94)	44 (96)	0.63
Modified Charlson index									
0	707 (39)	64 (40)		914 (42)	86 (43)		915 (42)	86 (43)	
1-2	694 (38)	70 (44)		813 (37)	85 (43)		810 (37)	85 (43)	
3-4	279 (15)	18 (11)	0.16	294 (13)	20 (10)	0.16	294 (13)	20 (10)	0.15
>_5	155 (8)	8 (5)		161 (7)	9 (5)		161 (7)	9 (5)	
Primary renal diagnosis: Diabetes	478 (26)	54 (39)	0.002	312 (14)	12 (7)	0.001	549 (25)	65 (38)	0.001
No educational qualifications (vs any)	1194 (65)	20 (71)	0.48	1475 (68)	29 (74)	0.37	1472 (68)	29 (74)	0.37

**Table S7: Comparison of results of multivariable analysis using complete cases only vs estimates from multiple imputation**

All results after adjustment for age, sex, ethnicity, first language, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity, education and car ownership, with robust standard errors to account for clustering by renal centre. Results from imputed data are estimated from 30 imputed datasets.


		Unimputed	Imputed
Late presentation (<90 days) n=2001 (complete-case analysis); n= 2432 (multiple imputation estimate)	OR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.37,1.24) 0.2	0.66 (0.39,1.14) 0.136
Peritoneal dialysis as first dialysis modality (vs haemodialysis) n=2214 (complete-case analysis); n=2432 (multiple imputation estimate)	OR (95% CI) p	0.93 (0.65,1.35) 0.7	0.93 (0.66,1.32) 0.7
Dialysis catheter as first vascular access (vs fistula; if haemodialysis was first modality) n=1741 (complete-case analysis); n=1909 (multiple imputation estimate)	OR (95% CI) p	1.09 (0.84,1.41) 0.5	1.08 (0.83,1.41) 0.5
Pre-emptive deceased-donor transplant listing n=2092 (complete-case analysis); n=2432 (multiple imputation estimate)	OR (95% CI) p	1.03 [0.71,1.49] 0.9	1.04 (0.71,1.49) 0.9
Likelihood of listing for deceased-donor transplant after starting dialysis n=1833 (complete-case analysis); n= ____ (multiple imputation estimate)	HR (95% CI) p	0.68 (0.51,0.91) <b>0.010</b>	0.70 (0.52,0.94) <b>0.016</b>
Likelihood of living-donor transplantation after starting dialysis n=2180 (complete-case analysis); n=2377 (multiple imputation estimate)	HR (95% CI) p	0.41 (0.21,0.80) <b>0.009</b>	0.40 (0.20,0.80) <b>0.009</b>
Likelihood of transplantation from any donor type after starting dialysis n=2178 (complete-case analysis); n=2373 (multiple imputation estimate)	HR (95% CI) p	0.65 (0.45,0.92) <b>0.016</b>	0.64 (0.44,0.93) <b>0.019</b>
Mortality n=2186 (complete-case analysis); n=2378 (multiple imputation estimate)	HR (95% CI) p	1.05 (0.73,1.49) 0.8	1.05 (0.75,1.47) 0.8

Table S8: Score weightings for modified Charlson index based on Hemmelgarn et al

Comorbidity variables from Hemmelgarn et al.	Weight	Corresponding variable from ATTOM	Weight
Myocardial infarction	2	Myocardial infarction	2
Congestive heart failure	2	Heart failure	2
Peripheral vascular disease (includes Aortic aneurysm >6cm)	1	Peripheral vascular disease or aortic aneurysm repair	1
Cerebrovascular disease	2	Cerebrovascular disease	2
Dementia	1	Dementia	1
Chronic lung disease	1	Respiratory disease	1
Rheumatological /Connective tissue disease	1	Excluded	-
Peptic ulcer disease	1	Excluded	-
Diabetes without complications	2	Diabetes, excluding those with diabetes as primary renal disease	2
Diabetes with complications	1	Diabetes as primary renal disease	1
Leukaemia	2	Leukaemia	2
Lymphoma (includes myeloma)	5	Lymphoma or myeloma	5
Moderate/severe liver disease	2	Liver cirrhosis	2
Metastatic cancer	10	Metastatic cancer	10
	<b>33</b>		<b>31</b>

# Limited health literacy is associated with reduced access to kidney transplantation

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41



Over 2000 UK adults:  
 • starting dialysis  
 • with good English fluency  
 • aged 18-75 years...

**Limited health literacy**

was independently associated with reduced chance  
 (adjusted for demographics, primary renal diagnosis, comorbidity and socioeconomic status)

- Transplant listing**  
(HR: 0.68; 95% CI: 0.51-0.91)
- Living-donor transplantation**  
(HR: 0.41; 95% CI: 0.21-0.80)
- Transplantation from any donor type**  
(HR: 0.65; 0.45-0.92)

**CONCLUSION:**  
 Limited health literacy is associated with reduced access to transplantation.  
 Health literacy-related interventions may improve transplant access



Dominic Taylor et al 2018