**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

A psychosocial intervention for individuals with advanced chronic kidney disease: a feasibility randomised controlled trial

Jenkins, Z. M., Tan, E. J., O'Flaherty, E., Knowles, S., Thompson, D. R., Ski, C. F., Rossell, S. L., Coco, C., Ierino, F. L., Gock, H., & Castle, D. J. (2021). A psychosocial intervention for individuals with advanced chronic kidney disease: a feasibility randomised controlled trial. *Nephrology*, 26(5), 442-453.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nep.13850>

Published in:
Nephrology

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2021 Wiley. This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

NEPHROLOGY

A psychosocial intervention for individuals with advanced chronic kidney disease: a feasibility randomised controlled trial

Journal:	<i>Nephrology</i>
Manuscript ID	NEP-2020-0808.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Jenkins, Zoe; St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne Pty Ltd, Mental Health; University of Melbourne, Psychiatry Tan, Eric; Swinburne University of Technology, Centre for Mental Health; St Vincent's Hospital, Department of Psychiatry O'Flaherty, Emmet; St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne, Nephrology Knowles, Simon; Swinburne University of Technology, Psychology Thompson, David; Queen's University Belfast, Nursing and Midwifery Ski, Chantal; University of Suffolk, Integrated Care Academy Rossell, Susan; Swinburne University of Technology, Centre for Mental Health Coco, Carolee; St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne Pty Ltd, Mental Health Ierino, Francesco; Austin Health, The University of Melbourne, Nephrology Gock, Hilton; St. Vincent's Hospital, Nephrology Castle, David; St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne Pty Ltd, Mental Health
Subject Category:	Chronic Kidney Disease
Keywords:	Psychosocial, Randomised controlled trial, chronic kidney disease (CKD), Depression, Anxiety

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

1 A psychosocial intervention for individuals with advanced chronic kidney disease: a
2 feasibility randomised controlled trial

3 Short running head: Psychosocial intervention for advanced CKD

4 Zoe M Jenkins^{1,2}, Eric J Tan^{1,3}, Emmet O’Flaherty⁴, Simon Knowles^{1,2,5}, David R
5 Thompson^{2,6}, Chantal F Ski^{2,9}, Susan L Rossell^{1,3}, Carolee Coco¹, Francesco L Ierino^{7,8},
6 Hilton Gock⁷, David J Castle^{1,2}

8 ¹Mental Health Service, St. Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

9 ²Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

10 ³Centre for Mental Health, Swinburne University, Melbourne, Australia

11 ⁴Department of Nephrology, St. Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

12 ⁵Department of Psychology, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia

13 ⁶School of Nursing and Midwifery, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, UK

14 ⁷Department of Nephrology, St Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

15 ⁸Department of Nephrology, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

16 ⁹University of Suffolk, Integrated Care Academy, Ipswich, UK

18 Corresponding author: Zoe Jenkins, St. Vincent’s Mental Health Services, PO Box 2900,
19 Fitzroy, VIC 3065, Australia. Email: zoe.jenkins@svha.org.au Telephone: +613 9231 3426

1 Trial registrations:

2 Australia and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR): ACTRN12615000810516
3 (05.07.15).

4 <http://anzctr.org.au/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?ACTRN=12615000810516>

5 Keywords

6 Psychosocial; randomised controlled trial; chronic kidney disease; depression; anxiety

7 Funding and declarations of interest

8 This work was supported through the Australian Government's Collaborative Research
9 Networks (CRN; Grant ID: 2012013000549) program and Kidney Health Australia (Grant
10 ID: KHA2018-DC). EJT and SLR are in receipt of Early Career (GNT1142424) and Senior
11 Research (GNT1154651) Fellowships respectively from the National Health and Medical
12 Research Council of Australia. DJC has received grant monies for research from Eli Lilly,
13 Janssen Cilag, Roche, Allergan, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Pfizer, Lundbeck, Astra Zeneca,
14 Hospira; Travel Support and Honoraria for Talks and Consultancy from Eli Lilly, Bristol-
15 Myers Squibb, Astra Zeneca, Lundbeck, Janssen Cilag, Pfizer, Organon, Sanofi-Aventis,
16 Wyeth, Hospira, Servier, Seqirus; and is a current Advisory Board Member for Lu AA21004:
17 Lundbeck; Varenicline: Pfizer; Asenapine: Lundbeck; Aripiprazole LAI: Lundbeck;
18 Lisdexamfetamine: Shire; Lurasidone: Servier; Brexpiprazole: Lundbeck; Treatment
19 Resistant Depression: LivaNova. He is founder of the Optimal Health Program, currently
20 operating as Optimal Wellness. He is on the board of The Mental health Foundation of
21 Australia. He does not knowingly have stocks or shares in any pharmaceutical company. No
22 other authors report any conflicts of interest.

Abstract

Aim: The current study evaluated the feasibility and preliminary efficacy of a psychosocial intervention, the Kidney Optimal Health Program, in reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety in individuals with advanced chronic kidney disease.

Methods: Patients with stage 4 or 5 chronic kidney disease were randomised to either a nine-session psychosocial intervention program or usual care. Feasibility was assessed through recruitment and retention rates and program acceptability. Participants completed assessments of depression, anxiety and psychosocial health at baseline and at 3-, 6- and 12-month follow-up. A repeated-measures ANOVA was used to compare groups on outcomes over time.

Results: 128 patients were screened for eligibility; 84 consented to participant and were randomised to receive the intervention ($N=42$) or usual care ($N=42$). 27 (32.1%) participants withdrew prior to baseline assessment. Of those who completed the baseline assessment ($N=57$), trial retention was high (75.4% at 3-months, 80.7% at 6-months and 70.2% at 12-months follow-up). Participants reported high levels of program acceptability. The patients who completed the intervention ($N=17$) demonstrated significantly decreased depression at 12-month follow-up compared to the usual care group ($N=13$).

Conclusion: The results support the feasibility of the Kidney Optimal Health Program intervention in recruitment, retention and program acceptability with an improved screening protocol. Preliminary support is provided for improvement in depressive symptoms in patients with advanced chronic kidney disease. Further investigation through a fully powered randomised controlled trial is warranted.

Introduction

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a global healthcare problem. The Global Burden of Disease study estimated that between 5-10 million people worldwide die from kidney disease each year, with incidence steadily increasing ¹. Approximately 10% of Australians present with at least one biomedical indicator of CKD ² and over 40% of people aged 75 or older are living with the disease ³. Moreover, CKD is a risk factor for developing other illnesses including cardiovascular disease, dementia and stroke, often resulting in a profound disease burden for patients and accounting for 2-3% of the annual healthcare budget in developed countries ⁴. Symptoms of kidney disease are often not evident until up to 90% of kidney function is lost ²; consequently, many people remain unaware of their condition until an advanced stage, often requiring treatment in the form of dialysis or kidney transplantation to prevent fatality.

The transition to dialysis treatment from stage 4 to stage 5 CKD requires substantial lifestyle adjustments including dietary and scheduling restrictions and physiological monitoring; balancing of which can prove stressful for patients. In addition, stage 5 CKD (also referred to as end stage kidney disease (ESKD)), is often associated with unpleasant symptoms such as fatigue, pruritus, constipation, sleep disturbance and swelling of the feet and ankles which contribute to an overall reduction in quality of life (QoL) ⁵. The impact of ESKD on QoL is detrimental to the extent that an average patient would be willing to give up 10 years of life on dialysis in exchange for 4 years with normal kidney function ⁴. Patients with advanced CKD, who are not yet dependent on dialysis, experience a comparable overall burden of symptoms and low QoL, which may be related to their anxiety about the condition including possibility of renal replacement therapy.

Self-management is a pertinent concept for patients with advanced CKD, given the active participation in treatments necessary to control the signs and symptoms of their

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

1 condition. As such, patients with advanced CKD need to be confident in their capability of
2 managing their long-term health condition. Self-efficacy, a mediator of self-management, has
3 been associated with enhanced QoL in patients with ESKD ⁶. Another important protective
4 factor in how patients self-manage and adjust to a diagnosis of advanced CKD is perceived
5 social support. Low levels of social support have been associated with decreased treatment
6 compliance ⁷ and higher mortality rate in patients with advanced CKD ⁸, with suggestions
7 that social factors are relevant to ‘personalised renal medicine’ ⁹. Just as self-efficacy and
8 perceived social support have been identified as health determinants for patients with CKD; a
9 patient’s perception of how the disease interferes with their lives, defined as illness
10 perception, is also an important indicator of wellbeing and QoL. Previous investigations into
11 illness perceptions in patients with CKD found that poorer illness perceptions increased
12 maladaptive coping strategies, which in turn increased both depression and anxiety ¹⁰.

13 The disease management burden of advanced CKD and its impact on QoL, social
14 support and illness perceptions means that patients often experience psychological distress,
15 with depression and anxiety affecting a large proportion of patients with ESKD, at higher
16 incidence than other chronic diseases ¹¹. Depression has been associated with an array of
17 negative prognostic outcomes including impaired functional capacity and higher rates of
18 hospitalisation ¹², as well as greater dialysis withdrawal resulting in earlier mortality ¹³.
19 Though less investigated, anxiety is also common in patients with CKD ¹⁴, with similar
20 prevalence across predialysis and patients undergoing dialysis ¹⁵. Elevated anxiety has been
21 demonstrated to negatively impact QoL ¹⁵, and may arise in predialysis patients as a result of
22 a loss of control over reduced abilities, sexual dysfunction, frequent hospital visits and/or the
23 threat of dialysis in the near future ^{16,17}. In renal units, most psychiatric services remain
24 reactive, treating those who are referred with obvious symptoms, representing only a small
25 proportion of those affected.

Given the significant impact depression, anxiety and psychosocial factors have on QoL and treatment prognosis in this population, there is a critical and under-recognised need for a specialised intervention for management and treatment of psychological comorbidities in individuals with advanced CKD, especially during the challenging transition to life on dialysis. Moreover, there is a dearth of research into management and prevention of depression and anxiety in individuals with advanced CKD. Previous studies have demonstrated that psychosocial interventions (an intervention that combines both psychological and social components within its framework ¹⁸ have been effective in decreasing depression and anxiety in other chronic disease populations, yet a recent systematic review found that there are few studies investigating psychosocial interventions in individuals with advanced CKD ¹⁹.

This study aimed to evaluate the feasibility of the Kidney Optimal Health Program (KOHP) to improve the psychosocial health of advanced CKD patients, compared to usual care. KOHP is an adaptation of a psychosocial support program, the Optimal Health Program (OHP) ²⁰, tailored to patients with kidney disease. The OHP uses a collaborative therapy framework designed to address psychosocial and physical dimensions of health that has demonstrated effectiveness in improving mental health outcomes in psychiatric populations ²⁰.

The primary objective of the current study was to determine the feasibility of conducting an 8-week psychosocial intervention in patients with advanced CKD through the following objectives to determine the appropriateness of the intervention for a definitive RCT:

- i) Explore trial recruitment and retention rates.
- ii) Assess the acceptability of the KOHP intervention.

The secondary objectives were to evaluate preliminary efficacy of KOHP in improving depression, anxiety, QoL, self-efficacy, social and workplace functioning, and illness perceptions in individuals with advanced CKD. It was hypothesized that:

i) Recruitment and retention rates would demonstrate feasibility and that participants would report KOHP as acceptable.

ii) KOHP would demonstrate preliminary efficacy in improving depression, anxiety and psychosocial outcomes in individuals with advanced CKD.

Methods

Research design and setting

This was a parallel pilot randomised controlled trial (RCT) to evaluate the feasibility of delivering the KOHP to individuals with advanced CKD. The KOHP was delivered as a nine- (8+1) week individualised support program using health promotion strategies and was compared to usual care. Recruitment was conducted between January 2015 to December 2018 at the nephrology unit of St Vincent's Hospital, a large metropolitan teaching hospital in Melbourne, Australia.

An executive steering committee consisting of a nephrologist, a specialist renal nurse, psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses and a health economist oversaw project planning, procedures and ongoing data collation. The study protocol was approved by the St Vincent's Hospital Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC-A 019/14) and written informed consent was obtained from all participants. The trial was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Participants

Participants were recruited from the nephrology department through out-patient clinic attendance or clinician referral. Eligible participants met the following inclusion criteria: 1) Stage 4 or 5 CKD, evidenced by an eGFR of <30ml/min confirmed from medical records; 2) 18 years or older; 3) able to converse in English without an interpreter or professional assistance; and 4) absence of established cognitive deficits impairing their ability to learn from the intervention. Exclusion criteria included: 1) presence of developmental disability or amnesic syndrome impairing their ability to learn from the intervention; 2) participants returning to dialysis following a failed renal transplant; and 3) comorbid serious illness as defined by the treating physician. Individuals who were seeking a mental health professional or taking psychotropic medications were not excluded from participating.

Randomisation, allocation and blinding

Following the initial screening and gaining of consent, participants were allocated to either intervention or control group via a computer-generated block randomisation sequence created by an independent person not directly involved in the study. Participants were randomised immediately after consent and before baseline assessments. Due to the nature and length of the intervention, it was not possible to blind either patient or investigator to the intervention allocation.

Intervention: The Kidney Optimal Health Program (KOHP)

The KOHP was delivered in nine (8 + 1 booster session) sequential sessions based on a structured workbook (see Table 1.). Sessions were approximately one hour in duration and held weekly, apart from the ‘booster’ session, which was held three months after session eight. Each participant was allocated to one KOHP trained facilitator who conducted the intervention.

In summary, session 1 introduced the KOHP within the six domains of ‘optimal health’; considering the balance of mental, emotional, social, occupational, physical and

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

1 spiritual needs of a person. Sessions 2 and 3 initiated development of a health plan exploring
2 the implications and potential complications of advanced CKD and dialysis in terms of
3 strengths and vulnerabilities in session 2 and understanding and monitoring disease impact in
4 session 3. The focus of session 4 was on metabolic monitoring and medication management.
5 Session 5 expanded the health plan to include key CKD treatment partnerships and supports
6 in the community and online. Session 6 focused on change enhancement in terms of
7 understanding past events and establishing new proactive avenues for change. The aim of
8 session 7 was goal setting via creative problem solving and planning around the complexities
9 of renal failure and dialysis. Session 8 strategised wellbeing maintenance and sustainability
10 related to the CKD treatment and management. The objective of the ‘booster session’
11 (session 9) was to consolidate progress via reviewing health plans and reflecting on
12 achievements made toward health-related goals.

13 A health professional (e.g. nurse, psychologist) trained in the collaborative therapy
14 approach (2-day workshop plus regular supervision and fidelity checks) facilitated each
15 session. The facilitator drew on advanced CKD-specific information in concordance with
16 individual circumstances. Further, if a participant identified severe anxiety and/or depression
17 or suicidal ideation at any time during the study, they were referred to an appropriate mental
18 health service. Patient participation was discontinued based upon self-request and/or
19 feedback from the referred treating mental health service. Participants had the option of
20 participating in sessions via face to face meeting, telephone or video call.

21 *Standard care*

22 The participants allocated to the control group received care as usual by the nephrology team
23 at St. Vincent’s Hospital which included education by the doctors, nurses, social worker
24 and/or CKD educator on topics such as dietary management, fluid intake and medication
25 management.

Insert Table 1. here

Outcome measures

Primary outcomes: feasibility and acceptability

i) Recruitment and retention rates were recorded at baseline, 3, 6, and 12 months follow-up.

Reasons for withdrawal were recorded as one of the following: 1) Illness/death; 2) Drop-

out/relocation; 3) Loss of contact; 4) Failure to return questionnaire; 5) Kidney

transplant/recovery of kidney function.

ii) Perceived acceptability of the KOHP was assessed at 3-months post-baseline after

completion of the KOHP using the Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form (TEI-SF) ²¹.

Secondary outcomes: preliminary efficacy

Secondary outcome assessments took place at baseline, 3, 6, and 12 months' post-baseline.

All assessments were conducted by mailing out the questionnaires to participants and

providing them with reply-paid envelopes to return the completed questionnaires.

Depression and anxiety (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, HADS) ²².

The HADS consists of 14 items with a 4-point scale producing two subscales: anxiety and

depression. Higher scores on the anxiety and depression subscales (made up of 7 items each)

reflect increased levels of anxiety and depression ²². The HADS is a reliable self-report

instrument with sufficient internal validity ²³.

Kidney Disease Quality of Life Instrument -Short Form (KDQoL-SF) ²⁴.

The KDQoL consists of the generic SF-36 health status survey ²⁵ as well as 11 multi-item

scales focused on QoL issues specific to patients with kidney disease, with higher

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

transformed scores reflecting better quality of life to produce a summary score for general QoL (SF-36) and a Kidney Disease Component Summary (KDCS). General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) ²⁶. Self-efficacy is defined as the belief of a person in his or her ability to organize and execute certain behaviours that are necessary in order to produce given attainments. The GSE consists of 10 items with responses marked on a 4-point scale, with higher scores indicative of higher self-efficacy. Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS) ²⁷. The WSAS consists of 5 questions related to various areas of impairment, with responses made on a 0 to 8 scale and higher scores indicating poorer functional impairment ²⁷. Brief Illness Perception Questionnaire (Brief-IPQ) ²⁸ The Brief-IPQ assesses the cognitive and emotional representations of illness and consists of 8 items that assess cognitive and emotional elements of illness representation including; identity, consequences, cause, time, cure or control, and emotional representations ²⁸, with higher scores indicating a poorer representation of illness.

Statistical analyses

Data analyses were performed using SPSS (IBM, SPSS Statistics Version 25). Means and standard deviations were calculated for continuous variables, and frequencies were measured for categorical variables. Demographic characteristics and baseline scores on assessments outcomes were compared between groups using chi-squared analysis for categorical variables and independent samples *t*-tests for continuous variables.

There were a large amount of cases with unreturned follow-up questionnaires for at least one assessment time point (47.4%), resulting in incomplete required data for the secondary outcomes, the complete case analysis approach was adopted²⁹. Therefore, only the data and results from the 30 full completion cases are reported for preliminary efficacy. Prior to analysis, data was screened for missing variables and univariate and multivariate normality. Normality was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilks test and examination of skewness/kurtosis values. All continuous variables were found to be normally distributed with no missing values. Differences in assessment outcomes between the control and intervention groups were tested by a 2 x 4 way analysis of variance (ANOVA) [group (KOHP, control) x assessment (BL, 3m, 6m, 12m)] for each assessment outcome. Greenhouse-Geisser [epsilon] corrections were used to correct for violations of sphericity in the data. Differences between groups and across time were established and post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustments. All significances were set at $p < .05$.

Results

128 patients were screened for eligibility; 84 consented to participant and were randomised to receive the KOHP intervention or usual care (see Figure 1.). The demographic and clinical characteristics of those who completed the baseline assessment ($n=57$) in each group are detailed in Tables 2 and 3. There were no differences between groups on demographic characteristics or kidney function, as measured by eGFR or the proportion of patients on either haemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis. Moreover, there were similar proportions of individuals in each group receiving pharmacological treatment for depression or anxiety at baseline assessment and the proportion of participants with a ~~with~~ previous psychiatric

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

- 1 diagnosis ~~or a~~ and history of treatment by a MH professional did not differ between groups
- 2 (see Table 3.).-

For Peer Review

1

Insert Figure 1 here: Participant flow chart.

For Peer Review

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

1

Insert Table 2 here.

For Peer Review

Insert Table 3. here

Primary outcomes: feasibility

i) Recruitment and retention rates

In individuals who were eligible and able to participate in the intervention, 77.1% consented to participate and were randomised to either receive the KOHP or usual care (see Figure 1.). Of those randomised to receive KOHP, 64.3% received the intervention and completed the baseline assessment. Reasons for withdrawal prior to baseline for KOHP and control groups included illness/death (33.3% vs 25.0%), self-withdrawal/relocation (33.3% vs 25.0%), loss of contact (20% vs 33.3%), failure to return the baseline assessment in the mail (13.3% of KOHP group) or kidney transplant (16.6% of control group), respectively. Follow-up assessment completion rates by the KOHP and control groups were similar at the 3-month (70.4% vs 80.0%), 6-month (70.4% vs 90.0%) and 12-month (62.9% vs 76.7%) time points. Reasons for withdrawal post-baseline were also comparable between KOHP and control groups; failure to return questionnaire (41.7% vs 42.9%), illness/death (50.0% vs 42.9%), relocation (8.3% of KOHP group) or kidney transplant (14.3% of control group).

ii) Acceptability of the KOHP intervention

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

1	
2	
3	
4	1
5	
6	
7	2
8	
9	3
10	Of the 27 participants who completed the intervention, 18 (66.6%) returned the TEI-SF
11	
12	4 assessments in the mail. Table 4. provides a summary of the perceived acceptability (TEI-SF)
13	
14	5 as reported by the participants. After completion of the program, 77.8% of participants
15	
16	6 believed that KOHP was an <i>acceptable</i> way to improve their wellbeing, 81.5% of participants
17	
18	7 were <i>willing</i> to engage in the program to improve their wellbeing, 83.4% believe that the
19	
20	8 program was <i>effective</i> , 66.7% believe KOHP was likely to result in <i>permanent</i> improvement
21	
22	9 and 83.3% had a <i>positive reaction</i> to KOHP (see Table 4.).
23	
24	
25	
26	10 <i>Secondary outcomes: preliminary efficacy of KOHP</i>
27	
28	
29	11 The results between groups and over time are detailed in Table 5. The two-way repeated-
30	
31	12 measures ANOVA yielded a significant group by time interaction, $F(2.07, 58.05) = 4.74, p =$
32	
33	13 0.012, and a significant main effect of time, $F(2.03, 58.05) = 4.52, p = 0.014$, on levels of
34	
35	14 depression.
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	

Insert Table 5. here

Post-hoc pairwise comparisons between time points in the KOHP group revealed a significant reduction in depression between baseline to 3-months [$p=.042$, 95% CI (.10, 4.52)], baseline to 12-months [$p=.002$, 95% CI (1.71, 5.98)] and between 6-months to 12-months [$p=.033$, 95% CI (.19, 3.66)] (see Figure 2.), but not between 3-months to 6-months [$p=.51$, 95% CI (-1.61,.84)]. There were no other significant interactions between group and time on assessment outcomes over the intervention or follow-up period.

Additionally, one participant who received the KOHP intervention group reported discontinuation of their anxiety medication (pregabalin) over the course of the trial (at the 6-month time point). There were no other changes to pharmacological treatments for depression or anxiety by participants in either group.

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

1 Insert Figure 2 here: Depression scores of participants in KOHP and control groups over
2 time. Data are expressed as mean (SD). $*p < .05$, $**p < .005$ from baseline for KOHP group;
3 $\#p < .05$ from 6-months for KOHP group (post hoc Tukey's test).

4

For Peer Review

Discussion

The current study reports on the evaluation of the feasibility and preliminary efficacy of a novel psychosocial intervention, the KOHP, which aimed to improve the mental health of individuals living with advanced CKD. Assessment of recruitment and retention rates and acceptability of the KOHP intervention support our primary hypothesis and confirm the feasibility of a future definitive RCT. Our secondary hypothesis that KOHP would provide preliminary efficacy was partly supported. There was a reduction depressive symptoms in advanced CKD patients, however there were no improvements in anxiety or psychosocial factors.

Feasibility

The recruitment rate from eligible participants was high yet we identified a disproportionately large withdrawal rate prior to baseline assessment. The reasons for withdrawal prior to baseline did not differ between the intervention and controls groups, with a large proportion due to illness and patient mortality. However, there were a substantial proportion of patients who electively withdrew or were lost to follow-up. This could be due to participants being provided an inadequate description of the study requirements during screening. This highlights a need to enhance the screening protocol of patients to confirm willingness to complete the extensive outcome assessments. Intervention and control group study adherence was high post-baseline assessment, with the most common reason for withdrawal being either illness or death.

Acceptability of the KOHP intervention was high, with the majority of participants reporting willingness to engage, belief in efficacy of the program and an overall positive reaction to KOHP. Approximately half of the participants expressed that discomfort would be experienced during the program, which is an expected process of the KOHP intervention. The

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

1 program utilises elements of both motivational interviewing and self-determination theory in
2 order to improve identified aspects of wellbeing, which draw on cognitive dissonance as a
3 form of motivation. Cognitive dissonance may arise if a participant becomes aware that their
4 beliefs do not align with their behaviours, resulting in feelings of discomfort ³⁰. Furthermore,
5 there were no unintended effects or potential harms found during the pilot study. Given the
6 limited research on interventions targeted towards psychosocial health in advanced CKD, the
7 current findings support the feasibility and acceptability of a definitive RCT of KOHP in
8 individuals with advanced CKD.

9 *Preliminary efficacy*

10 Over the course of the trial, individuals randomised to the intervention demonstrated a
11 significantly greater reduction in the primary outcome of depression, as compared to those
12 allocated to the usual care group. Depressive symptoms in the KOHP group significantly
13 decreased between baseline assessment and post-intervention (3-month assessment), and
14 decreased further at the 12-month follow-up. This supports the potential utility of
15 psychosocial interventions, and specifically KOHP, for the reduction of depressive symptoms
16 in this population. While some immediate benefit as a result of direct facilitator-related
17 influence cannot be ruled out, particularly given similar indications in other intervention
18 studies ³¹⁰, there was a significant difference in depressive symptoms between groups
19 following the booster session held at 6-months. This indicated a beneficial effect from the
20 follow-up session which may have reinforced implementation of health management
21 strategies developed throughout the intervention.

22 In contrast, no associated changes were observed in overall assessment of anxiety.
23 Given the comorbid nature of depression and anxiety, it was hypothesised that both
24 depression and anxiety would be significantly improved. This hypothesis was not supported

by the current findings, despite evidence that previous psychosocial interventions have reported some beneficial effect on anxiety symptoms in advanced CKD populations¹⁹. Similarly, there was no significant improvement in the secondary psychosocial measures of QoL (both general and disease-specific), self-efficacy, work and social adjustment or illness perceptions. Possible reasons for the disparity in our pilot include the progressive impact of lifestyle adjustments on anxiety and QoL that may accumulate over time, the burden of medications that can have side effects and inadequate sample size. The ideal time to demonstrate the intervention effect on anxiety and QoL may be after 12 months when medical management and physical symptoms are optimised, stabilised, and synergised with the reduction in depression. Therefore, further evaluation of these outcomes in a larger sample size and possibly for a longer duration is required.

Limitations

As this was a feasibility evaluation, our analyses were not statistically powered to detect clinically meaningful change in outcomes, which could have also precluded the emergence of significant outcomes of KOHP on other assessed variables (e.g. QoL). Feasibility and acceptability of the KOHP may have also varied between the different delivery modalities (i.e. phone vs face-to-face) which we were unable to compare in the current study. Moreover, baseline levels of cognition were also not assessed, which could have impacted on feasibility of the KOHP, particularly with noted cognitive deficits in CKD patients³²⁴. Future work should consider inclusion of an explicit measure of level of disease activity or associated disease-related demands (e.g. number and duration of dialysis visits). Moreover, future investigations should investigate potential differences in program efficacy between patients undergoing dialysis and those not undergoing dialysis, given the substantial lifestyle adjustments that accompany dialysis treatment.

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

1 *Conclusion and future directions*

2 Overall, despite these limitations, this evaluation confirms the feasibility and acceptability of
3 a psychosocial intervention RCT in individuals with advanced CKD. Moreover, it provides
4 preliminary and important support for its efficacy, and the expansion of this research with a
5 broader and larger sample size. The prevalence of psychological distress in advanced CKD
6 populations is profound, negatively impacts prognostic outcomes and is a key intervention
7 target. Management of mental and psychosocial health is of utmost clinical importance for
8 individuals with CKD, given the high rates of comorbid depression ¹¹ that are associated with
9 poorer quality of life and treatment outcomes ^{13,15}. The research team is currently conducting
10 an expanded RCT, with an additional hospital as a recruitment site-, which will provide an
11 evaluation of efficacy of the KOHP intervention in improving psychosocial health and an
12 assessment of healthcare utilisation of individuals with advanced CKD. -This is the next step
13 towards obtaining the necessary evidence to support the translation of KOHP into renal
14 services to be offered to patients as standard care.

References

1. Wang H, Naghavi M, Allen C, et al. Global, regional, and national life expectancy, all-cause mortality, and cause-specific mortality for 249 causes of death, 1980–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The lancet*. 2016;388(10053):1459-1544.
2. Australian Institute of Health & Welfare. *Cardiovascular disease, diabetes and chronic kidney disease: Australian facts mortality*. Canberra: AIHW;2014.
3. Australian Institute of Health & Welfare. *Diabetes and chronic kidney disease as risks for other diseases: Australian Burden of Disease Study 2011*. Canberra: AIHW;2016.
4. Couser WG, Remuzzi G, Mendis S, Tonelli M. The contribution of chronic kidney disease to the global burden of major noncommunicable diseases. In. United States: Nature Publishing Group; 2011:1258.
5. Murtagh FEM, Addington-Hall J, Higginson IJ. The Prevalence of Symptoms in End-Stage Renal Disease: A Systematic Review. *Advances in Chronic Kidney Disease*. 2007;14(1):82-99.
6. Tsay S-L. Self-efficacy training for patients with end-stage renal disease. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2003;43(4):370-375.
7. Kimmel PL. Psychosocial factors in adult end-stage renal disease patients treated with hemodialysis: Correlates and outcomes. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2000;35(4, Supplement):S132-S140.
8. Christensen AJ, Wiebe JS, Smith TW, Turner CW. Predictors of survival among hemodialysis patients: effect of perceived family support. *Health Psychol*. 1994;13(6):521.

- 1
2
3 1 9. McClellan WM, Doran JJ. Friends, social networks, and progressive chronic kidney
4
5 2 disease. *Kidney Int.* 2015;87(4):682-684.
6
7
8 3 10. Knowles S, Swan L, Salzberg M, Castle D, Langham R. Exploring the relationships
9
10 4 between health status, illness perceptions, coping strategies and psychological
11
12 5 morbidity in a chronic kidney disease cohort. *The American journal of the medical*
13
14 6 *sciences.* 2014;348(4):271-276.
15
16
17 7 11. Palmer S, Vecchio M, Craig JC, et al. Prevalence of depression in chronic kidney
18
19 8 disease: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Kidney Int.*
20
21 9 2013;84(1):179-191.
22
23
24 10 12. Hedayati SS, Jiang W, O'Connor CM, et al. The association between depression and
25
26 11 chronic kidney disease and mortality among patients hospitalized with congestive
27
28 12 heart failure. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2004;44(2):207-215.
29
30
31 13 13. Lacson E, Jr., Li NC, Guerra-Dean S, Lazarus M, Hakim R, Finkelstein FO.
32
33 14 Depressive symptoms associate with high mortality risk and dialysis withdrawal in
34
35 15 incident hemodialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2012;27(7):2921-2928.
36
37
38 16 14. Feroze U, Martin D, Reinapaton A, Kalantarzadeh K, Kopple JD. Mental health,
39
40 17 depression, and anxiety in patients on maintenance dialysis. 2010.
41
42
43 18 15. Lee YJ, Kim MS, Cho S, Kim SR. Association of depression and anxiety with
44
45 19 reduced quality of life in patients with predialysis chronic kidney disease. *Int J Clin*
46
47 20 *Pract.* 2013;67(4):363-368.
48
49
50 21 16. Gyamlani G, Basu A, Geraci S, et al. Depression, screening and quality of life in
51
52 22 chronic kidney disease. *Am J Med Sci.* 2011;342(3):186-191.
53
54
55 23 17. Kimmel PL. Depression in patients with chronic renal disease: what we know and
56
57 24 what we need to know. *Journal of psychosomatic research.* 2002;53(4):951-956.
58
59
60

- 1 18. Thompson DR, Ski CF. Psychosocial interventions in cardiovascular disease—what are
2 they. *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* 2013;20:916-917.
- 3 19. Pascoe MC, Thompson DR, Castle DJ, McEvedy SM, Ski CF. Psychosocial
4 interventions for depressive and anxiety symptoms in individuals with chronic kidney
5 disease: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in psychology.* 2017;8:992.
- 6 20. Gilbert MM, Chamberlain JA, White CR, et al. Controlled clinical trial of a self-
7 management program for people with mental illness in an adult mental health service—
8 the Optimal Health Program (OHP). *Australian Health Review.* 2012;36(1):1-7.
- 9 21. Newton J, Sturmey P. Development of a short form of the Treatment Evaluation
10 Inventory for acceptability of psychological interventions. *Psychol Rep.* 2004;94.
- 11 22. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta psychiatrica*
12 *Scandinavica.* 1983;67(6):361-370.
- 13 23. Spinhoven P, Ormel J, Sloekers P, Kempen G, Speckens A, Van Hemert A. A
14 validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in different
15 groups of Dutch subjects. *Psychol Med.* 1997;27(2):363-370.
- 16 24. Hays RD, Kallich JD, Mapes DL, Coons SJ, Carter WB. Development of the kidney
17 disease quality of life (KDQOL TM) instrument. *Quality of life Research.*
18 1994;3(5):329-338.
- 19 25. Ware Jr JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): I.
20 Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical care.* 1992:473-483.
- 21 26. Jerusalem M, Schwarzer R. Generalized self-efficacy scale. *Measures in health*
22 *psychology: A user's portfolio Causal and control beliefs.* 1995:35-37.
- 23 27. Mundt J, Marks I, Shear K, Greist J. The work and social adjustment scale: a simple
24 measure of impairment in functioning. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2002;180.

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

1 28. Broadbent E, Petrie KJ, Main J, Weinman J. The brief illness perception
2
3 questionnaire. *Journal of psychosomatic research*. 2006;60(6):631-637.
4
5
6
7
8 29. Jakobsen JC, Gluud C, Wetterslev J, Winkel P. When and how should multiple
9
10 imputation be used for handling missing data in randomised clinical trials—a practical
11
12 guide with flowcharts. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2017;17(1):162.
13
14
15 30. Festinger L. *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Vol 2: Stanford university press; 1957
16
17 301. Contreras NA, Lee S, Tan EJ, Castle DJ, Rossell SL. How is cognitive remediation
18
19 training perceived by people with schizophrenia? A qualitative study examining
20
21 personal experiences. *Journal of Mental Health*. 2016;25(3):260-266.
22
23
24 342. Brodski J, Rossell SL, Castle DJ, Tan EJ. A Systematic Review of Cognitive
25
26 Impairments Associated With Kidney Failure in Adults Before Natural Age-Related
27
28 Changes. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*. 2019;25(1):101-
29
30 114.
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 Table 1. Kidney Optimal Health Program (KOHP) – contents and objectives

Session	Title	Contents	Objectives
One	What is health?	a) What is optimal health? b) Behaviour can influence our health c) The health wheel d) Introduction to health plans 1, 2, 3	Understand what is involved in KOHP Provide definition of optimal health Consider how their behaviour influences their health Complete self-assessment
Two	“I Can Do” model part 1 – strengths and vulnerabilities	a) Revision of session 1 b) Overview of “I Can Do” model c) Understanding our strengths and vulnerabilities d) Introduction to Health Plan 1	Understand the “I Can Do” Model Complete their “I Can Do” Model Attempt to identify their strengths and vulnerabilities Understand principles of Health Plan 1
Three	“I Can Do” model Part 2 – Stressors and Strategies	a) Revision of “I Can Do” model b) Stressors and stress c) Strategies and their effectiveness d) Introduction to Health Plan 2	Build understanding of “I Can Do” Model Identify stressors – positive and negative Explore and monitor early warning signs Understand strategies to manage stress Understand principles of Health Plan 2

Four	Medication	a) Revision of session 3 b) Effective use of medication c) Monitoring medication d) Metabolic monitoring	Identify +/- aspects of medication Review medication monitoring Understand value of metabolic monitoring
Five	Collaborative partners (CP) and strategies	a) Revision of session 4 b) Collaborative partners c) Collaborative strategies d) Introduction to Health Plan 3	Understand importance of CPs Develop an “Eco Map” Identify roles of people/supports as CPs Identify strategies to develop CPs Understand principles of Health Plan 3
Six	Change enhancement	a) Revision of session 5 b) Timeline activity – understanding past events c) Revision of health wheel d) Visioning and goal setting	Understand the health time line Explore concept of Sub-optimal Health and Episode of Illness Revisit Health Wheel Explore what change means to them
Seven	Visioning and goal setting	a) Revision of session 6 b) Creative problem solving c) Goal setting d) Reflection and celebration	Identify a change and what it means Explore key steps in problem solving Understand principles of goal setting Plan to set a goal and acknowledge achievements
Eight	Maintaining wellbeing	a) Revision of session 7 b) Review of health plans	Understand Health Plans 1, 2 & 3 Revise and update plans

		c) Review health journal d) Introduce & plan booster session	Understand Health Journal Plan for booster session
Booster	What is my health like now?	a) Revision and catch up b) Where are you now? c) Review Health Plan 1, 2, & 3 d) Acknowledge achievements	Identify current health status Review and update Health Plans Understand how Health Plans maintain optimal health Celebrate achievements

1

2

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

1 Table 2. Participant demographic characteristics at baseline assessment.

Participant characteristic	Usual care (n=30)	KOHP (n=27)	p-value
Age	59.78 ± 13.19	60.8 ± 10.19	0.747
Gender			0.342
Female	16 (53.3%)	11 (40.7%)	
Male	14 (46.7%)	16 (59.3%)	
Ethnicity			0.749
Caucasian	24 (80.0%)	22 (81.5%)	
Other European	2 (6.7%)	3 (11.1%)	
Other/Missing	4 (13.3%)	2 (7.4%)	
Education			0.809
Primary school	1 (3.3%)	-	
Secondary school	14 (46.7%)	12 (44.4%)	
Undergraduate	3 (10.0%)	2 (7.4%)	
Postgraduate	7 (23.3%)	6 (22.2%)	
TAFE	4 (13.3%)	4 (14.8%)	
Other	1 (3.3%)	3 (11.1%)	
Employment			0.892
Full-time	6 (20.0%)	6 (22.2%)	
Part-time	4 (13.3%)	5 (18.5%)	
Home duties	3 (10.0%)	1 (3.7%)	
Unemployed	3 (10.0%)	2 (7.4%)	
Unable to work due to illness	4 (13.3%)	5 (18.5%)	
Retired/Other	10 (33.3%)	8 (29.6%)	

30

Marital Status			0.280
Married/Defacto	15 (50.0%)	17 (63.0%)	
Divorced/separated	7 (23.3%)	2 (7.4%)	
Single	4 (13.3%)	7 (25.9%)	
Widowed	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.7%)	
Accommodation			0.598
Own house	20 (66.7)	20 (74.1%)	
Rental	6 (20.0%)	4 (14.8%)	
Public housing	1 (3.3%)	-	
Lives with family/friends	2 (6.7%)	3 (11.1%)	
Other	1 (3.3%)	-	
Lives with			0.183
Partner	10 (33.3%)	11 (40.7%)	
Family/Friends	10 (33.3%)	8 (29.6%)	
Alone	10 (33.3%)	4 (14.8%)	
Other	-	4 (14.8%)	

Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation or frequencies and percentage. KOHP: Kidney Optimal

Health Program.

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

1 Table 3. Participant clinical characteristics at baseline assessment.

Participant characteristic	Usual care (n=30)	KOHP (n=27)	p-value
eGFR	9.97 ± 3.86	10.37 ± 3.67	0.688
Dialysis status			0.444
On Haemodialysis	11 (36.7%)	13 (48.1%)	
On Peritoneal dialysis	15 (50.0%)	9 (33.3%)	
Not on dialysis	4 (13.3%)	5 (18.5%)	
Smoking status			0.318
Never smoked	21 (70.0%)	17 (63.0%)	
Former smoker	9 (30.0%)	7 (25.9%)	
1-10 CPD	-	2 (7.4%)	
11-20 CPD	-	1 (3.7%)	
Alcohol consumption			0.979
Don't drink at all	15 (50.0%)	14 (51.9%)	
Drink once a week or less	13 (43.3%)	11 (40.7%)	
Drink every day in moderate amounts	2 (6.7%)	2 (7.4%)	
<u>Undergoing pharmacological treatment for depression or anxiety</u>	<u>8 (26.7%)</u>	<u>9 (33.3%)</u>	<u>0.773</u>
Previous psychiatric diagnosis	5 (16.7%)	6 (22.2%)	0.596
Depressive disorder	4 (13.3%)	3 (11.1%)	
Anxiety disorder	-	2 (7.4%)	
Bipolar disorder	1 (3.3%)	-	

Schizoaffective disorder	-	1 (3.7%)	
Previously seen MH professional	10 (33.3%)	12 (44.4%)	0.390
Currently seeing MH professional	1 (3.3%)	-	1.00
Previously spent time in hospital for MH	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.7%)	1.00
Presented to ED in past 12 months	15 (50.0%)	10 (37.0%)	0.325

Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation or frequencies and percentage. KOHP: Kidney Optimal

Health Program; eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate; CPD: cigarettes per day; MH: mental health; ED: emergency department.

For Peer Review

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

1 Table 4. Summary of KOHP acceptability.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I find this program to be an acceptable way of improving my wellbeing	-	5.6%	16.7%	50.0%	27.8%
2. I would be willing to use this program if I had to improve my wellbeing	-	-	11.1%	66.7%	14.8%
3. I believe that it would be acceptable to use this program without a person's consent	38.9%	25.9%	3.7%	7.4%	3.7%
4. I like the program used in this way	-	11.8%	11.8%	58.8%	17.6%
5. I believe this program is likely to be effective	-	5.6%	11.1%	55.6%	27.8%
6. I believe a person will experience discomfort during the program	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%
7. I believe this program is likely to result in permanent improvement	-	-	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%
8. I believe it would be acceptable to use this program with individuals who cannot choose treatments for themselves	-	23.5%	35.3%	29.4%	11.8%
9. Overall, I have a positive reaction to this program	-	-	16.7%	44.4%	38.9%

2

3

1 Table 5. Two-way ANOVA of intervention effects between groups and over time

Measure	Treatment Group		Interaction <i>p</i> -value, effect size (η^2), η^2 95% C.I.
	Usual care (<i>n</i> =17)	KOHP (<i>n</i> =13)	
HADS (Depression) (<i>N</i>=30)			
Baseline	4.59 ± 3.66	6.77 ± 3.17	
3-months	3.88 ± 3.43	4.46 ± 2.07	
6-months	4.82 ± 3.92	4.85 ± 2.79	
12-months	4.76 ± 3.60	2.92 ± 1.38	.012, .14, [.008, .29]
HADS (Anxiety) (<i>N</i>=30)			
Baseline	4.65 ± 3.30	5.54 ± 2.50	
3-months	4.59 ± 4.33	5.00 ± 2.55	
6-months	4.88 ± 4.46	3.62 ± 2.50	
12-months	5.00 ± 3.91	4.62 ± 2.02	.25, .047, [.000, .15]
GSE (<i>N</i>=30)			
Baseline	32.53 ± 6.70	30.85 ± 3.72	
3-months	31.88 ± 5.01	31.69 ± 2.53	
6-months	31.76 ± 6.51	30.38 ± 4.44	
12-months	31.47 ± 4.86	31.31 ± 3.04	.66, .016, [.000, .090]
WSAS (<i>N</i>=27)			
Baseline	13.07 ± 9.79	16.25 ± 12.42	

3-months	13.53 ± 10.25	18.17 ± 10.95	
6-months	14.20 ± 11.39	17.50 ± 12.76	
12-months	13.73 ± 10.09	15.92 ± 11.47	.88, .009, [.000, .050]
Brief-IPQ (N=28)			
Baseline	42.76 ± 11.66	39.31 ± 9.20	
3-months	39.81 ± 14.74	40.58 ± 9.30	
6-months	39.25 ± 12.11	39.92 ± 9.92	
12-months	38.31 ± 15.40	38.25 ± 13.36	.78, .010, [.000, .078]
KDQoL-SF12			
(N=20)			
Baseline*	64.07 ± 20.76	51.97 ± 18.03	
3-months	69.77 ± 20.36	52.67 ± 23.61	
6-months	73.64 ± 16.09	56.93 ± 22.74	
12-months	66.67 ± 17.44	54.73 ± 18.32	.81, .017, [.000, .10]
KDQoL-KDCS			
(N=20)			
Baseline*	72.78 ± 11.16	62.71 ± 11.12	
3-months	71.92 ± 14.98	67.37 ± 7.48	
6-months	76.89 ± 11.83	68.81 ± 8.14	
12-months	75.18 ± 12.61	67.18 ± 9.57	.47, .045, [.000, .16]

Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation. GSE: General Self-Efficacy Scale; WSAS: Work and Social Adjustment Scale; Brief-IPQ: Brief-Illness Perceptions Questionnaire; HADS: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; KDQoL-SF12: Kidney Disease Quality of Life Short Form generic core; KDQoL-KDCS: Kidney Disease Quality of Life-Kidney Disease Component Summary.*significantly different at baseline (*p*<.05)

Figure 1. Participant flow chart.

Figure 2. Depression scores of participants in KOHP and control groups over time. Data are expressed as mean (SD). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .005$ from baseline for KOHP group; # $p < .05$ from 6-months for KOHP group (post hoc Tukey's test).

CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a pilot or feasibility trial*

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a pilot or feasibility randomised trial in the title	Title page
	1b	Structured summary of pilot trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT abstract extension for pilot trials)	1
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale for future definitive trial, and reasons for randomised pilot trial	2-5
	2b	Specific objectives or research questions for pilot trial	5
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of pilot trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	5
	3b	Important changes to methods after pilot trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	N/A
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	6
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	6-7
	4c	How participants were identified and consented	6
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	6-7
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined prespecified assessments or measurements to address each pilot trial objective specified in 2b, including how and when they were assessed	10-11
	6b	Any changes to pilot trial assessments or measurements after the pilot trial commenced, with reasons	N/A
	6c	If applicable, prespecified criteria used to judge whether, or how, to proceed with future definitive trial	N/A
Sample size	7a	Rationale for numbers in the pilot trial	N/A
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	N/A
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	6
	8b	Type of randomisation(s); details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	6
Allocation concealment	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	6

mechanism			
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	6
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	6
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	N/A
Statistical methods	12	Methods used to address each pilot trial objective whether qualitative or quantitative	10-11
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were approached and/or assessed for eligibility, randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were assessed for each objective	Figure 1
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	Figure 1
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	5
	14b	Why the pilot trial ended or was stopped	N/A
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	Table 2, 3
Numbers analysed	16	For each objective, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis. If relevant, these numbers should be by randomised group	12
Outcomes and estimation	17	For each objective, results including expressions of uncertainty (such as 95% confidence interval) for any estimates. If relevant, these results should be by randomised group	Table 5
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed that could be used to inform the future definitive trial	Table 5
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	19
	19a	If relevant, other important unintended consequences	N/A
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Pilot trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias and remaining uncertainty about feasibility	28
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (applicability) of pilot trial methods and findings to future definitive trial and other studies	27
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with pilot trial objectives and findings, balancing potential benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	26-29
	22a	Implications for progression from pilot to future definitive trial, including any proposed amendments	28-29
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number for pilot trial and name of trial registry	Title page
Protocol	24	Where the pilot trial protocol can be accessed, if available	N/A
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	Title page
	26	Ethical approval or approval by research review committee, confirmed with reference number	5

Citation: Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT 2010 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. BMJ. 2016;355.

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010, extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials, Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see www.consort-statement.org.

For Peer Review