

The Prepare Multi-Morbid Older People for End-stage Kidney Disease Trial

The PrepareME Trial

Protocol

<i>Approvals and IDs</i>	<i>Reference</i>
Protocol version	Version 1.0 November 2016
IRAS project ID	215616
REC Reference	
North Bristol NHS Trust (R&I)	Sponsor
ISRCTN	
Funder (NIHR HTA)	
NIHR CRN Portfolio	

This protocol has regard for the HRA guidance and order of content

Amendment History

Amendment No.	Protocol version no.	Date issued	Author(s) of changes	Details of changes made

SIGNATURE PAGE

The undersigned confirm that the following protocol has been agreed and accepted and that the Chief Investigator agrees to conduct the trial in compliance with the approved protocol and will adhere to the principles outlined in the Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004/1031), amended regulations (SI 2006/1928) and any subsequent amendments of the clinical trial regulations, GCP guidelines, the Sponsor's SOPs, and other regulatory requirements as amended.

I agree to ensure that the confidential information contained in this document will not be used for any other purpose other than the evaluation or conduct of the clinical investigation without the prior written consent of the Sponsor

I also confirm that I will make the findings of the study publically available through publication or other dissemination tools without any unnecessary delay and that an honest accurate and transparent account of the study will be given; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned in this protocol will be explained.

For and on behalf of the Study Sponsor:

Signature:

.....

Date:

...../...../.....

Name (please print):

.....

Position:

.....

Chief Investigator:

Signature:

.....

Date:

...../...../.....

Name: (please print):

.....

Statistician:

Signature:

.....

Date:

...../...../.....

Name: (please print):

.....

Position:

.....

KEY TRIAL CONTACTS

Chief Investigator	<p>Dr Fergus Caskey</p> <p>UK Renal Registry</p> <p>Learning and Research</p> <p>Southmead Hospital</p> <p>Westbury-on-Trym</p> <p>Bristol</p> <p>BS10 5NB</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 414 8150</p> <p>Email: mdfjc@bristol.ac.uk</p>
Lead Research Nurse	<p>Mrs Helen McNally</p> <p>Clinical Research Centre</p> <p>Southmead Hospital</p> <p>Westbury-on-Trym</p> <p>Bristol</p> <p>BS10 5NB</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 414 8108</p> <p>Fax: 0117 41 49329</p> <p>Email: Helen.McNally@nbt.nhs.uk</p>
Sponsor	<p>Research & Innovation</p> <p>North Bristol NHS Trust</p> <p>Floor 3 Learning & Research building</p> <p>Southmead Hospital</p> <p>Westbury-on-Trym</p> <p>Bristol, BS10 5NB</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 41 49330</p> <p>Fax: 0117 41 49329</p> <p>Email: research@nbt.nhs.uk</p> <p>Sponsor website for current forms and standard operating procedures: https://www.nbt.nhs.uk/research-innovation/study-set/standard-operating-procedures-policies</p>
Funder	<p>NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme</p> <p>National Institute for Health Research</p> <p>Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre</p> <p>University of Southampton</p> <p>Alpha House</p> <p>Enterprise Road</p>

	<p>Southampton</p> <p>SO16 7NS</p> <p>Telephone: 023 8059 5586</p> <p>Fax: 023 8059 5639</p> <p>Email: htaoas@southampton.ac.uk</p>
Clinical Trials Unit	<p>Bristol Randomised Trials Collaboration (BRTC)</p> <p>School of Social and Community Medicine</p> <p>University of Bristol</p> <p>Canynge Hall</p> <p>39 Whatley Road</p> <p>Bristol</p> <p>BS8 2PS</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 928 7393</p> <p>Email: enquiry-brtc@bristol.ac.uk</p>
Co-investigators	<p>Dr J Athene Lane, Reader in Clinical Trials, University of Bristol</p> <p>Professor Jenny Donovan, Professor of Social Medicine, University of Bristol</p> <p>Mrs Denise Abbott, Patient and Public Involvement, North Bristol NHS Trust</p> <p>Dr Leila Rooshenas, Lecturer in Qualitative Health Science, University of Bristol</p> <p>Dr Fliss Murtagh, Reader and Consultant in Palliative Care, King's College London</p> <p>Professor Christopher Salisbury, Professor in Primary Health Care, University of Bristol</p> <p>Dr Emma Murphy, Advanced Nurse Practitioner/Clinical Lecturer in Palliative and End of life Care, University of Southampton</p> <p>Dr Joseph Chilcot King's College London</p> <p>Professor Paul Roderick, Professor of Public Health, University of Southampton</p> <p>Professor Yoav Ben-Shlomo, Professor of Clinical Epidemiology, University of Bristol</p> <p>Professor Ken Farrington, Consultant Nephrologist, East & North Hertfordshire NHS Trust</p> <p>Dr Hugh Rayner, Consultant Nephrologist, Heart of England</p>

	<p>NHS Foundation Trust</p> <p>Dr Aine Burns, Consultant Nephrologist, Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust</p> <p>Professor Simon Davies, Consultant Nephrologist, University Hospitals of North Midlands NHS Trust</p> <p>Professor Joanna Coast, Professor in the Economics of Health and Care, University of Bristol</p> <p>Professor Richard Huxtable, Professor of Medical Ethics and Law, University of Bristol</p> <p>Dr Stephanie MacNeill, Research Fellow in Medical Statistics</p> <p>Dr Andrew Gibson, Associate Professor in Patient and Public Involvement, University of the West of England</p>
Lead Statistician	<p>Dr Stephanie MacNeill, Research Fellow in Medical Statistics</p> <p>Please use BRTC postal address</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 928 7384</p> <p>Email: stephanie.macneill@bristol.ac.uk</p>

TRIAL SUMMARY

Trial Title	The Prepare Multi-Morbid Older People for End-stage Kidney Disease Trial
Internal ref. no. (or short title)	The PrepareME Trial
Trial Design	A randomised controlled trial comparing two care pathways
Trial Participants	Multi-morbid, frail, older patients with advanced chronic kidney disease
Planned Sample Size	512
Treatment duration	27 months minimum 51 months maximum
Follow up duration	27 months minimum 51 months maximum
Planned Trial Period	01/01/2017 – 31/12/2021
Aims	To establish the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of preparing for conservative care compared with preparing for dialysis in relation to quality and length of life in multi-morbid, frail, older people with failing kidneys.

FUNDING AND SUPPORT IN KIND

Funder(s) (Names and contact details of ALL organisations providing funding and/or support in kind for this trial)	Financial and non-financial support given
<p>NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme</p> <p>National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre University of Southampton Alpha House Enterprise Road Southampton SO16 7NS</p> <p>Telephone: 023 8059 5586 Fax: 023 8059 5639 Email: htaoas@southampton.ac.uk</p>	Grant funding
<p>Bristol Randomised Trials Collaboration (BRTC) School of Social and Community Medicine University of Bristol Canyng Hall 39 Whatley Road Bristol BS8 2PS</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 928 7393 Email: enquiry-brtc@bristol.ac.uk</p>	Methodological expertise
<p>Research & Innovation North Bristol NHS Trust Floor 3 Learning & Research building Southmead Hospital Westbury-on-Trym Bristol, BS10 5NB</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 41 49330 Fax: 0117 41 49329 Email: research@nbt.nhs.uk</p>	Sponsorship
<p>UK Renal Registry Floor 3 Learning & Research building Southmead Hospital Westbury-on-Trym Bristol, BS10 5NB</p> <p>Telephone: 0117 414 8150 Email: renalregistry@renalregistry.nhs.uk</p>	Partner

ROLE OF STUDY SPONSOR AND ACADEMIC COLLABORATOR

Roles and responsibilities of the sponsor and academic collaborator

		NBT	UoB
1. Study Preparation			
1.1	Undertake role of Sponsor as defined by the Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care and the Medicines for Human Use (Clinical trials) Regulations 2004, as amended	●●○	
1.2.1	Obtaining and maintaining the relevant permissions (ethics opinions, etc.)	●	○
1.2.2	Sign off of above documentation	●●○	
1.3	Providing randomisation service	●	○
1.4	Preparation of protocol	●	○
1.5	Approval and sign off protocol	●●○	
1.6	Production of Patient Information Sheet and Consent Form.	●	○
1.7	Sign off Patient Information Sheet and Consent Form	●●○	
1.8	Design of Case Report Forms (CRFs)	●	○
1.9	Provision of site files	●●○	
1.10	Distribution of site files	●	○
1.11	Production of study specific working practice documents	●	○
1.12	Sign off study specific working practice documents	●●○	
1.13.1	Preparation and submission of applications to REC and HRA for amendments	●	○
1.13.2	Approve and sign off of above amendments	●●○	
1.14	Preparation of reports (e.g. for funding bodies, National Research	●	○

	Ethics Service (NRES), Data Monitoring Committees, Trial Steering Committees		
1.15	Coordination of the Data Monitoring and Trial Steering Committees (or equivalent)	●	⊙
1.16	Ensuring appropriate insurance cover in place to cover trial related responsibilities	● Cover for NBT's responsibilities and ensuring other clinical sites have appropriate insurance in place	⊙ Cover for UoB's responsibilities only (as detailed in letter from UoB's Insurance Officer (ref. CT1453). Excludes those of clinical sites.
1.17	Provision of appropriate insurance for clinical trial under the Clinical Negligence Scheme for Trusts (CNST) and ensuring other clinical sites have appropriate insurance in place	●⊙	
2. Risk Assessment and Monitoring			
2.1	Preparation of the overall trial risk assessment and the monitoring plan	●⊙	
2.2	Central & site monitoring including performing set-up and close out visits	●⊙	
2.3.1	Green Light Process except for 2.3.2 below	●⊙	
2.3.2	Pre-study risk assessment of participating sites (Chief Investigator and Trial Manager)	●	⊙
3. Adverse Events			
3.1	Receipt and review of relevant Serious Adverse Events (SAEs), Serious Adverse Reactions (SARs) and Suspected Unexpected Serious Adverse Reactions (SUSARs) submitted from sites (via Trial Manager)	●	⊙

3.2	Report any SARs and SUSARs to Sponsor within 24 hours	●	⊙
3.3	Ensure that SAEs are reviewed by an appropriate committee for the monitoring of trial safety	● (ensuring actions have been completed)	⊙ (central contact responsible for receiving, organising, review and reporting SAEs and forwarding copies to NBT)
4. Data Management			
4.1	Database management and data monitoring, including involvement in setting up the appropriate systems for data capture	●	⊙
4.2	Raise data queries and send to sites	●	⊙
4.3	Validation of trial database, ensuring validation process is appropriately documented	●	⊙
4.4	Sign of validation of the trial database	●⊙	
4.5	Chase outstanding data queries from sites	●	⊙
4.6	Conducting interim and final data analyses	●	⊙
4.7	Development of the trial website	●	⊙
4.8	Preparation and submission of the annual progress report to REC	●	⊙
5. Study conduct			
5.1	Liaising with potential centres in the Clinical research networks, identifying and initiating participating centres, and maintaining good communications with each centre	●	⊙
5.2	Recruiting clinical sites	●	⊙
5.3	Preparation and sign off of clinical site agreements for the	●⊙	

	participating sites		
5.4	Distribution of clinical site agreement (via Trial Manager)	●	⊙
5.5	Allocating a trial entry number and treatment to trial patients	●	⊙
5.6	Central coordination and management of essential trial documents and patient data collected from participating clinical sites	●	⊙
5.7	Provision of study information and accrual data to the National Institute for Health Research Clinical Research Network Portfolio Database (NIHR CRN)	●	⊙
5.8	Provision of statistical support	●	⊙
5.9	Preparation and submission of final publication	●	⊙
5.10	Ensure that all trial records are archived appropriately on conclusion of the trial	●	⊙
5.11	Provide Public Patient Involvement for the trial	●⊙	

KEY:

● = Accountable for task

⊙ = Responsible for task

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES/GROUPS & INDIVIDUALS

Overall Project management

The Chief Investigator will take overall responsibility for managing the various components of the trial and will meet at least monthly with the leads for each component. Years 1-2 the CI will be establishing the trial, supported by the lead renal research nurse. From a technical and strategic perspective, the CI will be advised and supported by the QuinteT team (responsible for delivering the 'QuinteT Recruitment Intervention', QRI) and the BRTC.

The Clinical Trial: The BRTC is a UK Clinical Research Collaboration (UKCRC) registered trials unit, and they will manage the trial on a day-to-day basis.

Patient Advisory Group

A Patient Advisory Group will meet 6 monthly in years 1-2, then annually. This will be co-chaired by the two PPI co-applicants.

Trial Management Group

A Trial Management Group (TMG) will meet at least once each month in the first 6 months, then 6 monthly to review progress, with potential for additional ad hoc meetings, as required/indicated. This will be chaired by Dr Fergus Caskey (CI) and will consist of representatives from the study office including the sponsor and relevant co-applicants.

Meetings will be in person and by teleconference to maximise attendance.

Trial Steering Committee

The role of the Trial Steering Committee (TSC) is to monitor and supervise the progress of the trial on behalf of the Sponsor and Funder and to ensure that the project is conducted to the rigorous standards set out in the Department of Health's Research Governance Framework

for Health and Social Care and the Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice. The TSC will be chaired by an independent member and comprise five additional independent members (covering expertise in trial statistics, nephrology, palliative care, health economics and PPI). The trial manager (Dr Helen Winton) and the CI (Dr Fergus Caskey) will also be formal members of the TSC, maintaining its membership independence at 75%. Observers may also attend, as may other members of the TMG or members of other professional bodies, at the invitation of the Chair. The TSC will meet for the first time by month 6 of the trial and then at least every 6 months.

Independence

For the TSC and DMC, independence is defined by the NIHR HTA as follows:

- *Not part of the same institution as any of the applicants or members of the project team;*
- *Not part of the same institution that is acting as a recruitment or investigative centre;*
- *Not related to any of the applicants or members of the project team;*
- *For the chair only, not an applicant on a rival proposal.*

Data Monitoring (and Ethics) Committee

An independent Data Monitoring Committee (DMC) will meet with the purpose of reviewing the accumulating data at pre-specified intervals to advise the TSC and the sponsor regarding patient safety and the ethical running of the trial. They will make recommendations to the TSC as to whether there are any ethical or safety issues that may necessitate a modification to the protocol or closure of the trial. Prof Colin Baigent, a clinical epidemiologist and highly experienced Clinical Trialist from Oxford Clinical Trial Service Unit, will be the independent chair for this committee. The DMC will comprise three additional independent members (covering expertise in trial statistics, nephrology and

palliative care). The DMC will meet for the first time by month 6 of the trial and then at least every 12 months, but more frequently if indicated.

Contents

Amendment History.....	2
Signature Page	3
Key Trial Contacts	3
Trial Summary.....	7
Funding And Support In Kind	8
Role Of Study Sponsor And Academic Collaborator	9
Roles And Responsibilities Of Trial Management Committees/Groups & Individuals	13
List Of Abbreviations	20
Trial Flow Chart	22
1 Background.....	23
2 Rationale	24
3 Objectives And Outcome Measures/Endpoints.....	26
3.1 Primary Objective	26
3.2 Secondary Objectives	26
3.3 Outcome Measures.....	26
3.3.1 Primary Outcome	26
3.3.2 Secondary Outcomes.....	26
4 Trial Design	27
5 Study Setting	27
6 Eligibility Criteria	28
6.1 Inclusion Criteria	28
6.2 Exclusion Criteria	28
6.3 Inclusion Criteria For Family Members And Carers	28
7 Trial Procedures	29
7.1 Recruitment.....	29
7.1.1 Patient Identification And Screening For Eligibility	29
7.2 Consent	30
7.3 The Randomisation Scheme	32

7.3.1 Method Of Implementing The Allocation Sequence.....	32
7.4 Data Collection.....	32
7.4.1 Baseline Data.....	33
7.4.2 Trial Assessments.....	33
7.4.3 Long Term Follow-Up Assessments.....	35
7.5 Withdrawal Criteria	35
7.6 End Of Trial	36
7.7 Assessment Of Compliance.....	36
 8. Trial Intervention - The ‘Prepare For Conservative Care’ Pathway	 37
8.1 Assess And Launch.....	37
8.2. Maintain	39
8.3. Support Enhancement.....	40
 9 Qualitative Assessments – Nested Studies	 40
9.1 Overview Of Qualitative Research Integrated Throughout Study	40
9.2 Stage 1: Optimising Trial Design	41
9.2.1 Aim And Objectives	41
9.2.2 Design	41
9.2.3 Sampling And Recruitment.....	41
9.2.4 Data Collection And Consent Processes For Stage 1	42
9.3 Stage 2: Quintet Recruitment Intervention (Qri) To Optimise Recruitment And Informed Consent (Months 6-30)	42
9.3.1 Data Collection Methods For The Qri.....	42
9.3.2 Consent Processes For The Qri	44
9.4 Stage 3: Evaluation Of Trial Processes/Interventions And Adherence To Allocated Treatment (Months 12-54)	45
9.4.1 Sampling	46
9.4.2 Consent Processes	46
9.5 Qualitative Analysis	46
 10. Safety.....	 46

10.1 Definitions	46
10.2 Operational Definitions For (S)Aes.....	47
10.3 Recording And Reporting Of Saes	47
10.4 Responsibilities	48
10.4.1 Principal Investigator/Research Nurse	48
10.4.2 Chief Investigator	48
10.4.3 Sponsor.....	48
10.4.4 Trial Steering Committee (Tsc).....	49
10.4.5 Data Monitoring Committee (Dmc).....	49
10.5 Symptoms, Results Or Events That Should Trigger Senior Clinical Review	49
11 Statistics And Data Analysis.....	49
11.1 Sample Size Calculation.....	49
11.2 Planned Recruitment Rate	50
11.3 Statistical Analysis Plan.....	51
11.3.1 Summary Of Baseline Data And Flow Of Patients	51
11.3.2 Primary Outcome Analysis	51
11.3.3 Secondary Outcome Analysis	51
11.4 Subgroup Analyses	51
11.5 Adjusted Analyses And Sensitivity Analyses.....	52
11.6 Interim Analysis And Criteria For The Premature Termination Of The Trial.....	52
11.7 Procedure(S) To Account For Missing Data	53
11.8 Economic Evaluation.....	53
11.8.1 Rationale For Inclusion Of The Economic Investigation	53
11.8.2 Means Of Assessment For The Economic Investigation.....	54
11.8.3 Data Collection	54
11.8.4 Data Analysis.....	54
12 Data Handling	56
12.1 Data Collection Tools And Source Document Identification	56
12.2 Data Handling And Record Keeping.....	56
12.2.1 Clinical Data.....	56
12.2.2 Admin Data	57

12.3 Access To Data	57
12.3.1 Source Data	57
12.3.2 Anonymised Trial Data.....	57
12.4 Archiving	57
13 Monitoring, Audit & Inspection	57
14 Ethical And Regulatory Considerations.....	58
14.1 Research Ethics Committee Review & Reports	58
14.2 Peer Review.....	58
14.3 Public And Patient Involvement.....	58
14.4 Regulatory Compliance.....	59
14.5 Protocol Compliance.....	59
14.6 Notification Of Serious Breaches To Gcp And/Or The Protocol.....	60
14.7 Data Protection And Patient Confidentiality	60
14.8 Financial And Other Competing Interests.....	61
14.9 Indemnity.....	61
14.10 Amendments	61
14.11 Post Trial Care	61
14.12 Access To The Final Trial Dataset	61
15 Dissemination Policy.....	62
15.1 Authorship Eligibility Guidelines And Any Intended Use Of Professional Writers	63
16 References.....	64
17 Appendices.....	68
Appendix 1 – Schedule Of Procedures For Randomised Controlled Trial	68
Appendix 2 - Registry Follow Up Study	72
Appendix 3 – Schedule Of Procedures For Registry Follow Up Study	75
Appendix 4 – Flow Diagram Of Consent Processes	76

Tables

Table 1 Summary of baseline data collection for the randomised controlled trial.....33

Table 2 Summary of follow up data collection for the randomised controlled trial.....34

Table 3 Example visit/contact schedule for patients recruited in first and last month of recruitment...35

Table 4 Summary of baseline data for the registry follow up study.....74

Table 5 Summary of follow up data collection for the registry follow up study.....74

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AE	Adverse Event
AR	Adverse Reaction
CA	Competent Authority
CI	Chief Investigator
CKD	Chronic Kidney Disease
CRF	Case Report Form
CTU	Clinical Trials Unit
DMC	Data Monitoring Committee
eGFR	Glomerular Filtration Rate
EQ-5D-5L	The EuroQOL 5-dimension, 5-level
ESKD	End Stage Kidney Disease
GCP	Good Clinical Practice
GP	General Practitioner
ICECAP-O	The ICEpop capability measure for older people
ICECAP-SCM	The ICEpop capability measure for supportive care management
ICF	Informed Consent Form
ICH	International Conference on Harmonisation of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use.
iPOS-S renal	The integrated palliative outcome scale – symptoms renal
ISF	Investigator Site File
ISRCTN	International Standard Randomised Controlled Trials Number
MDT	Multi-Disciplinary Teams
MTBQ	Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire
NHS	National Health Service
NHS R&D	National Health Service Research & Development
NICE	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
NIHR	National Institute for Health Research
PAG	Patient Advisory Group
PD	Peritoneal Dialysis
PI	Principal Investigator

PIS	Participant Information Sheet
PPI	Patient and Public Involvement
QA	Quality Assurance
QALY	Quality Adjusted Life Year
QC	Quality Control
QoL	Quality of Life
QP	Qualified Person
QRI	QuinteT Recruitment Intervention
RCT	Randomised Control Trial
REC	Research Ethics Committee
SAE	Serious Adverse Event
SDV	Source Data Verification
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SSI	Site Specific Information
TMG	Trial Management Group
TSC	Trial Steering Committee
TMF	Trial Master File
UK	United Kingdom
UKRR	United Kingdom Renal Registry
WHO	World Health Organisation

TRIAL FLOW CHART




Figure 1. Flow of potential participants in PrepareME

[‡] Eligibility including frailty & comorbidity assessed by research nurse

² Third phase of qualitative research, RCT participants only

^a Follow up visits 4 monthly, 1:2 face-to-face: telephone/postal

STUDY PROTOCOL

The Prepare Multi-Morbid Older People for End-stage Kidney Disease Trial

1 BACKGROUND

Every year in the UK more than 3,500 people aged 65+ develop symptomatic kidney failure – ESKD – and start dialysis (1). This number continues to rise in the elderly (1, 2). Transplantation is not an option for most of these patients, and while dialysis extends life for some, the associated survival and health-related quality of life benefits are uncertain. Conservative care packages exist (comprising all aspects of care without preparing for dialysis), but their content and availability varies widely (3). Dialysis has a considerable impact on daily life. Of patients aged 65+ commencing dialysis, 86% receive haemodialysis (three times a week for four hours up at a hospital) and 14% receive peritoneal dialysis (four times a day for 30 minutes, or overnight by machine, at home) (1). Preparation for this must start months in advance, as patients have to choose a treatment option and undergo any necessary surgery for dialysis access. As they develop symptoms and start dialysis at different levels of kidney function, knowing when to begin preparation is difficult. Although their prognosis is well documented (55% of 65-74 year olds and 40% of 75+ year olds survive 3 years (4)), it is not known how long they would have lived without dialysis. Further, the commencement of dialysis can be associated with a sharp drop in functional status (5).

Some patients aged 65+ choose not to have dialysis and instead have conservative care. Evidence of the comparative effectiveness of dialysis and conservative care is entirely observational and so prone to bias, confounding by indication and difficulty in knowing when to begin the comparison in the comparator, non-dialysis arm. What evidence there is suggests equivalent survival in several patient groups – those aged 70+ with a WHO performance status of 3+ (6), those aged 75+ with two or more comorbidities (7) and those aged 80+ regardless of comorbidity (6). QoL has been reported in 5 studies (8-12). At baseline, SF36 physical component scores were significantly lower in patients choosing conservative care compared with dialysis, whilst the mental component scores were similar (8-10). During follow up, the trajectory of QoL tends to remain similar until initiation of dialysis with improvement in some domains but significant declines in others – Satisfaction with Life Scale (9), and the KDQoL parameters effect of kidney disease and burden of kidney disease (12). QoL is also significantly affected in carers of dialysis patients (13) and the experience of caring for conservative care patients presents substantial difficulties (14).

The uncertainty about the relative benefits of dialysis and conservative care is reflected in the variations in practice. A 2013 survey of UK renal units showed great variability in the proportion of patients “choosing” conservative care depending on where they were being looked after (3).

A systematic review of the literature covering up to 2012 (15) identified three observational cohort studies of suitable quality (7, 16, 17). Considering the heterogeneity of study design, potential confounders and high risk of bias, the authors concluded that it was difficult to make any recommendations for clinical practice. They did, however, remark that any survival advantage of dialysis in patients aged 65+ appeared to be lost in the presence of severe co-morbidities or very poor functional performance (15). They highlighted the need for more evidence, particularly in those aged 75+, and emphasised the importance of collecting data on QoL and symptoms (15).

National and international research charities have indicated the importance of this topic by funding exploratory and observational (but not RCT) studies: The NIHR CKMAPPs Study undertook interviews with staff and patients and a survey to establish attitudes towards conservative care and practices in UK renal units (3, 18-20); The European EQUAL Study (21), French CKD-REIN Study (22) and Dutch PREPARE-2 Study (23) are all observational multi-centre cohort studies of pre-dialysis patients which rely on statistics to adjust for inherent bias and confounding. None are powered to compare dialysis and conservative care. In the UK there is also the observational matched cohort study of dialysis versus conservative care UK Frail and Elderly Patient Outcomes on Dialysis (FEPOD) Study part II.

2 RATIONALE

With the UK population aged 65+ predicted to increase by 60% (from 10.3m to 16.9m) by 2035 (24) and health care costs increasing (25), the optimal management of frail, multi-morbid people with advanced chronic kidney disease will remain highly relevant to the NHS. The importance of end of life kidney care was recognised in 2005 in Part 2 of the National Service Framework (26). More recently it has been targeted by the KDIGO initiative which held a consensus meeting to coordinate efforts in this area (27). Given the human and economic impact of dialysis in older people, there is a pressing need to establish the comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a conservative care pathway against the existing 'prepare for dialysis' pathway. First and foremost this study will provide high quality robust evidence to inform multi-morbid, frail, older patients, their relatives and their clinical teams when making extremely difficult decisions about whether to prepare for dialysis or conservative care. The current variation in rates of patients aged 75+ choosing not to have dialysis (3) should be reduced. The timing also allows us to capitalise on the UK Renal Registry's novel permissions to capture routine health data on all patients in secondary care with an eGFR less than 30 ml/min/1.73m², which covers all patients eligible for PrepareME. The PrepareME trial is effectively embedded in the UK Renal Registry which has 100% coverage of the UK. This will allow the generalisability of the trial findings to be ascertained.

Given the human and economic impact of dialysis in older people, there is a pressing need to establish the comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a conservative care pathway compared with the existing 'prepare for dialysis' pathway. A 2013 survey of UK renal units showed great variability in the proportion of patients "choosing" conservative care depending on where they were being looked after (3). This variation cannot be due to patient factors and likely reflects, at least in part, differing interpretation of the observational data by health professionals talking to patients when they are deciding which treatment to choose. As a result of this trial, patients and clinicians will have a great deal more evidence on which to base decisions about future care, including the roles of dialysis and conservative care and their QoL impacts.

Haemodialysis costs £25k per patient per year and peritoneal dialysis £20k per patient per year – around £500m of NHS spending each year (28). A further £75m is spent on hospital admissions and £50m on transport to and from dialysis (28). The cost of conservative care is hard to estimate as there is wide variation in what is delivered (18, 27). In the UK, only half of renal units offer advance care planning and less than half offer psychological support, occupational health or social worker review, or home visits by renal staff (3). It is known, however, that patients who choose conservative care are more likely to die at home or in a hospice, as many would wish, and are less likely to be admitted to hospital (29).

The importance of end of life kidney care was recognised in 2005 in Part 2 of the National Service Framework (26). More recently it has been targeted by the KDIGO initiative which held a consensus meeting to coordinate efforts in this area (27).

A systematic review of the literature looking for studies comparing dialysis and conservative care up to 2012 (30) identified three observational cohort studies of suitable quality (7, 15, 29). Considering the heterogeneity of study design, potential confounders and high risk of bias, the authors concluded that it was difficult to make any recommendations for clinical practice. They did, however, remark that any survival advantage of dialysis in patients aged 65+ appeared to be lost in the presence of severe co-morbidities or very poor functional performance (30). There is even less data comparing the associated quality of life. It is not known how patients value prolongation of life over quality of life when faced with such a life changing decision.

Uncertainty in this area is demonstrated by the wide variation in reported rates of conservative care in patients aged 75+ in renal units around the UK (from 5-95%) and variation in the components of the conservative care pathway in these renal units, as demonstrated in the NIHR HS&DR funded CKMAPP Study (3).

The morbidity and medicalisation of life associated with preparing for dialysis makes the decision very difficult for patients with kidney failure and their families. They need good information to inform their decision making, and this is critically important given the considerable burden of dialysis treatment; if benefit of dialysis over conservative care is limited, we need to quantify and characterise this, so as to better inform dialysis decision-making.

The difference between the two pathways is that patients randomised to prepare for conservative care will have less treatment burden – their clinic appointment frequency halved from ~2-4 monthly to ~4-8 monthly, with half of clinic attendances being replaced with structured home visits by a trained care coordinator. They will also avoid the scans and surgery that normally take place when patients prepare for dialysis and therefore any complications of that access surgery. This pathway is based on international guidance (27) and UK expert consensus with PPI involvement.

The cost of dialysis, £20-25,000 per patient per year excluding transportation and hospitalisation (28), makes this question very relevant to policy makers, particularly as the older multi-morbid population grows in number. The excess treatment costs for this study are in fact potential savings of £6.5 million to the NHS.

The results from PrepareME will therefore be immediately useful to patients facing kidney failure, healthcare professionals and policy makers.

First and foremost this study will provide high quality robust evidence to inform older patients with comorbidities their families/carers and clinicians when making extremely difficult decisions about whether to prepare for dialysis or conservative care.

Also novel is use of the UK Renal Registry's new permissions to capture data on all patients meeting the PrepareME age and kidney function eligibility criteria in secondary care, allowing the generalisability of the trial findings to be ascertained. Qualitative methods will be used to optimise the design of the RCT during the development phase. Throughout recruitment, integrated qualitative methods will be used to identify barriers and optimise information provision and trial participation (31).

Qualitative research will also investigate how components of the two treatment pathways have worked for patients and their families and help interpret results.

3 OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOME MEASURES/ENDPOINTS

The aim of the trial is to establish the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of preparing for conservative care compared with preparing for dialysis in relation to quality and length of life in multi-morbid, frail, older people with advanced CKD.

3.1 Primary objective

To determine the relative effectiveness of preparing for conservative care versus preparing for dialysis on quality adjusted life years (QALYs) after three years in an individual-level pragmatic RCT in multi-morbid, frail, older patients with advanced CKD.

3.2 Secondary objectives

1. To determine the effect of the intervention on:
 - i) Survival
 - ii) Hospital-free days
 - iii) Patient reported outcomes: generic & disease specific QoL (EQ-5D-5L & POS-S renal), capability gain (ICECAP-O & ICECAP-SCM), patient treatment burden (MTBQ) & impact on carers
 - iv) Cost-effectiveness: Incremental cost-per QALY gained, and equivalent years of full/sufficient capability gained.
2. To fully understand the external validity of the trial through screening logs and linkage to the UK Renal Registry's new database of all patients in secondary care with CKD stages 4 and 5.
3. To explore patients', relatives', and health care professionals' perspectives on the acceptability of preparation for dialysis and preparation for conservative care.

3.3 Outcome measures

3.3.1 Primary outcome

The primary outcome is the mean total number of QALYs observed in the two arms between 1 July 2017 (first patient recruited) and 1 October 2021 (end of data collection), using the EQ-5D-5L measured 4 monthly during this period to derive the health utility value and appropriate imputation methods for missing values. After death, patients are allocated a utility value of 0 therefore continue to contribute data to the study until 1 October 2021 regardless of survival. Based on projected recruitment patterns, we estimate we will have, on average, 3 years of utility value data on patients on which to calculate QALYs.

This outcome has been chosen after extensive discussion with patients and patient groups who are very clear that they care about quality of life and quantity of life and evidence that patients may be willing to forgo some quantity of life for better quality of life (32).

3.3.2 Secondary outcomes

Survival related

- All-cause mortality
- Cause-specific mortality
- Place of death

- Hospital-free days alive

Patient reported outcome related

- Generic quality of life (EQ-5D-5L (33))
- Disease specific quality of life/symptom burden (POS-S renal (34))
- Capability gain specific to older persons (ICECAP-O (35))
- Capability during end-of-life care (ICECAP-SCM (36))
- Patient treatment burden (MTBQ) (37)

Physical functioning

- Timed get up and go (38) – summary score at 12 monthly time points and changes over time
- Grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39) – summary score at 12 monthly time points and changes over time

Relative/carer reported outcomes

- Impact on carers (40)
- QUALYCARE post-bereavement survey obtaining retrospective information covering the 1 week preceding death if the patient dies (41).

Health economic

- Incremental cost-per QALY gained from the health perspective
- Cost per equivalent year of full/sufficient capability gained, from health and societal perspectives.

4 TRIAL DESIGN

This study is a two-arm, superiority, parallel group, non-blinded, individual-level, pragmatic RCT in multi-morbid, frail, older people with advanced CKD, comparing the QALYs gained over three years after preparing for conservative care versus preparing for dialysis.

Qualitative and mixed methods are integrated throughout the trial to optimise its design and delivery. These will proceed in three interconnected stages: optimising the trial intervention (stage 1), optimising recruitment (stage 2), and understanding the acceptability of the intervention and reasons for non-compliance (stage 3).

5 STUDY SETTING

This is a national, multi-centre trial recruiting patients from secondary care renal units, but with the intervention – preparation for conservative care – delivered predominantly in the community.

To participate, renal units must provide a pre-dialysis service and be willing to allow some patients to enter the trial. Eligible patients will already be attending the pre-dialysis service, either in a general CKD clinic or a specialised low-clearance/pre-dialysis clinic. Sites must also be able and willing to provide the intervention arm of the treatment, which includes having:

- Healthcare professionals able and willing to provide clinical assessments and care coordination in the patient's home, and
- Local palliative care/hospice service that is willing to support the patients randomised to the intervention if they progress to the “enhanced support” phase.

Not all healthcare professionals in a site need to agree to participate in the trial. The list of currently participating sites can be found on the trial website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/prepare-me-trial/>).

6 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

6.1 Inclusion criteria

Patients known to renal services with new or existing stage 5 CKD (eGFR <15, with at least one result confirming this in the last 12 months) and

- Aged 65+ with a World Health Organisation (WHO) performance status 3+ (6)¹, or
- Aged 65+ with a Davies co-morbidity score 2+ (42)², or
- Aged 80+ (6).

6.2 Exclusion criteria

- Unable to consent, e.g. significant cognitive impairment or psychiatric disorder
- Not medically fit for dialysis
- Within 4 weeks of needing to start dialysis.

6.3 Inclusion criteria for family members and carers

With the patient's consent, family members will also be recruited to the qualitative work packages if they are:

- Aged 18+ and
- Identified by the patient as the person closest to them, usually a family member, close friend, informal caregiver or neighbour and
- Able to give informed consent and to complete the questionnaires

¹ 0 = Fully active, able to carry out all normal activity without restriction; 1 = Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature; 2 = Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but unable to carry out any work activities; up and about more than 50% of waking hours; 3 = Symptomatic and in a chair or in bed for greater than 50% of the day but not bedridden; 4 = Completely disabled; cannot carry out any self-care; totally confined to bed or chair.

² Each of the following scores one point: Malignancy, ischaemic heart disease, peripheral vascular disease (including stroke), left ventricular dysfunction, diabetes mellitus, systemic collagen vascular disease, other significant pathology (including COPD, cirrhosis, psychiatric illness, HIV).

7 TRIAL PROCEDURES

A schedule of procedures is included as Appendix 17.1.

7.1 Recruitment

7.1.1 Patient identification and screening for eligibility

In sites taking part, the normal clinical teams looking after patients approaching ESKD will be made aware of the trial including the information that will be being disseminated to potential participants. It is extremely likely that patients will want reassurance from their normal clinical teams that the trial is appropriate for them.

A range of approaches will be used by clinical teams to identify patients, depending on their computer system and how they organise their clinics. If they run specialised “low clearance” or “pre-dialysis” clinics for patients approaching ESKD then clinic lists will be searched to identify potential participants. Electronic and paper records will be checked for eligibility. Alternatively, if patients approaching ESKD are seen in more general kidney clinics then electronic and records will need to be searched more widely to identify potentially eligible participants who can then be vetted for eligibility.

If a site is submitting data on patients with an eGFR less than 30 mL/min.1.73m² to the UK Renal Registry, then the Registry could facilitate the initial screening based on eGFR criteria by sending the clinical team a list of their patients who meet the eGFR eligibility criteria. The clinical team can then identify those meeting the co-morbidity and WHO performance status criteria, excluding any that meet the exclusion criteria. As the Registry is providing clinical teams with lists of their own patients for them to screen further and contact about the research, this is permitted within the Registry’s existing S251 support.

Eligibility will be assessed by nurses with the assistance of doctors where required. All eligible patients will be documented in a comprehensive screening log, which will be developed in collaboration with the QuinteT team (see Section 9.3). If the normal clinical team decides for any reason that an eligible patient should not be offered information about the trial then this will be documented on the screening log with the reasons.

A standard Patient Invitation Letter and an introductory Patient Information Sheet will be handed to eligible patients in clinic by their normal care team or sent out to eligible patients introducing the study. These will inform people that telephone communication and meetings with research nurses may be audio-recorded with permission to inform staff feedback/training to improve the clarity of information provision about the trial. The letters will be followed up with a phone call from the research nurse to offer further discussion about the study. Given the complexity of what is being discussed and the importance of involving relatives and others whose opinions they trust, up to three visits will be offered to discuss the trial. We anticipate that these visits would be optimally performed at the patient’s home but they do not have to be; they should be arranged where it is most convenient for the patient and their family and somewhere conducive to them taking on board all the information about the trial. These arrangements will be individualised according to local circumstances in each site.

During the information-giving visits, the research nurse will explore the patient’s current health state and any ESKD treatment decisions that have already been made. They will then explain the trial and in particular:

- Why the study is needed, i.e. the lack of evidence to inform decision making

- What randomisation means
- What being randomised to the conservative care pathway would mean for them
- What being randomised to the dialysis pathway would mean for them
- Other aspects of trial participation (e.g. follow up details, right to stop the trial intervention but remain in the trial and right to withdraw from the trial).

The research nurse will also explore the views and concerns of other family members about the treatment pathways being offered. With the patient and family members' consent these discussions will be audio-recorded to allow recruitment issues to be identified (see Section 9.3).

When the patient and their family feel fully informed, they will be asked to make a decision about entering the RCT.

If they decide to enter the trial, the research nurse will:

- Obtain consent for the RCT
- Conduct the baseline interview, physical assessment and administer the questionnaires
- Allocate the patient to their treatment arm, i.e. prepare for conservative care or prepare for dialysis
- Explain what will happen next in terms of (i) their clinical care and (ii) their research follow up

Patients who decide not to enter the trial will be offered the opportunity to consent to Registry follow up (see Appendix 17.2). They will also be offered the opportunity of taking part in the qualitative research exploring reasons underlying their decision to not take part (see Section 9.3).

If they decide not to take part in any of the above, they will be thanked for their contribution to the study and the research nurse will explain what will happen next in terms of continuing with their normal care. The numbers declining participation and their reasons for non-participation will be captured in a screening log as recommended in CONSORT (43).

If the patient chooses to attend the research site for the research visits, travel costs can be claimed from the local site and reimbursed by the coordinating site.

Posters, leaflets and websites will not be used to identify potentially eligible participants.

Screen failures can be reconsidered at any point if their age, eGFR, co-morbidity or functional status changes or if they wish to reverse an earlier decision not to participate in the trial.

7.2 Consent

Obtaining consent will be delegated to research nurses who will be trained and competent to participate according to the ethically approved protocol, principles of Good Clinical Practice (GCP) and Declaration of Helsinki. It will take place in several steps:

1. First contact from the research nurse

The Patient Invitation Letter and initial Patient Information Sheet outlining the study will have given patients an opportunity to contact the clinical or research team to decline participation before receiving telephone call from a member of the research team. The letter will explain that all calls will be audio-recorded with permission: when the research nurse first contacts the patient they will obtain verbal consent for the call to be audio-recorded.

2. First study visit to provide information about the trial

If patients are interested and willing, the local research team will then arrange a study visit (at the patient's home, if possible, so that family members can be present) in order to:

- establish their individual circumstances in relation to ESKD treatment decision making
- provide information about the two main treatment options available in advanced CKD, i.e. prepare for conservative care and prepare for dialysis
- explain the trial to the patient and their family and provide them with written information
- provide the patient and their family with the opportunity to ask any questions.

At the first visit, the research nurse will obtain written consent from the patient and their family for the discussions to be audio-recorded as part of the QuinteT Recruitment Intervention (QRI) work package (see Section 9.3 for more details).

3. Before a potential participant enters the trial

Once a patient is sufficiently informed to be willing to agree to take part in the trial the research team will assess the patient's understanding of the trial and their capacity to decide to participate. Only patients with the mental capacity to make this decision will be able to enter the trial.

Where a patient subsequently loses capacity for this decision, their original consent will endure the loss of capacity, providing that the trial has not significantly altered. The patient could still be removed from the trial if this was considered appropriate by their health and welfare lasting power of attorney or by their treating clinician.

4. When a potential participant declines participation in the trial

Patients who are eligible but not willing to be randomised will be asked if they would be willing to take part in an interview to understand the reasons underlying their decision. Research nurses will explain that this interview is to help improve the clarity of information provided about the study. This information will be used to change the way future patients are approached and informed and no pressure will be exerted on patients who have already declined participation to change their mind. Written information will be provided about this qualitative study. If they agree to take part in this and have the mental capacity to do so, the nurse will obtain informed consent from them. They will also be invited to consent to registry follow up (see Appendix 17.2).

5. Carers

Carers of participants in the randomised controlled trial will be provided with an additional carer-specific Information Sheet about the trial outlining:

- The inclusion of carer burden questionnaires
- The possibility that they may be asked to complete patient questionnaires by proxy, i.e. for the patient if they are not able
- The possibility that they may be contacted following the death of their loved one to complete a post-bereavement questionnaire about the quality of life of their loved one in the last days and weeks of life, and an interview with the qualitative researcher.

If they agree to take part in this and have the mental capacity to do so, the nurse will obtain informed consent from them.

Participant Information Sheets and Consent forms will be translated into Welsh or provided bilingually where this is requested by a participant at a research site.

7.3 The randomisation scheme

Participants will be randomly allocated 1:1 to the “prepare for conservative care” or “prepare for dialysis” treatment arms stratified by site to ensure a balance in terms of local differences.

Minimisation will be used to ensure balance in age (65-80 vs 80+) and rate of kidney function decline (less or equal to vs more than 5 ml/min/1.73m² in the last 12 months). We will use minimisation with probability weighting of 0.8 in order to reduce predictability.

Randomisation will be done using the BRTC Randomisation System, which provides a secure service to generate allocations. This is a validated system.

The system is available 24 hours a day with minimal downtime over several years. System data are backed up daily.

7.3.1 Method of implementing the allocation sequence

All patients who enter the study will be logged with the central trial office and given a unique Study Number. The research nurse will retrieve the information necessary for randomisation from the clinical record, i.e. site (stratified), age 65-79 vs 80+(minimised) and rate of decline in eGFR of less or equal to vs more than 5 ml/min/1.73m² in the last 12 months (minimised). Participants will then be randomly allocated 1:1 to the “prepare for conservative care” or “prepare for dialysis” treatment arms.

Randomisation will utilise the existing remote automated computer randomisation application at the study administrative centre in the BRTC, a fully registered UK CRC clinical trials unit in the University of Bristol. This randomisation application will be available both as a telephone-based system and as an internet based service.

The BRTC Randomisation system provides for layered security with access granted to BRTC Data Management staff to be able to monitor the system. The system fails over to a backup system in the event of a system problem. Randomisation data are routinely backed-up to tape. In addition these data are synchronised to a secondary system every 15 minutes. This secondary system can act as a fall-back, in the event of a failure of the primary system.

The system logs all actions and can be configured to send an email on randomisation, with allocation and any other variable used in the process.

Due to the nature of the intervention, participants and those administering the intervention will not be blinded to group allocation. The statistician performing the analysis will be blinded to the treatment allocation.

Post-randomisation

Where possible, randomisation will take place during the final home visit explaining the trial and obtaining consent. This will allow the research nurse to inform the patient and their relatives of the allocated treatment. As community care is an essential element of the intervention, patients will have to consent to their GP being informed about their participation in the trial. Hospital staff will be informed about the study by the research nurse, so that they can answer queries from participants and their relatives.

7.4 Data collection

7.4.1 Baseline data

Demographic, social, clinical, resource use, laboratory and patient/carer reported data will be collected by research nurses during study visits at baseline (following consent and prior to randomisation). Physical assessment will be performed by the research nurse following standard operating procedures. No blood or urine tests are required other than those that are being performed as part of routine care.

Table 1 Summary of baseline data collection for the randomised controlled trial

Demographics/social	Age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, education level, distance lived from kidney clinic, alcohol consumption, smoking history.
Clinical	Primary renal disease, date first seen by nephrologist, co-morbidities, dietary restrictions, prescribed medication.
Resource use	Hospital/nursing home/residential home days/hospice days, other hospital outpatient services and primary care & community services in the last 4 months. Help from family & friends in the last week.
Laboratory	Creatinine, urea, albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume, sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total cholesterol. (From the date of the study visit or the closest date prior to the study visit.)
Physical assessment	Height, weight, blood pressure, heart rate, waist circumference, timed "get up and go" (38), hand grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39), WHO performance status. (Details in standard operating procedures.)
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)
Relative/carer reported	PACKS impact on carers questionnaire (40)

7.4.2 Trial assessments

Clinical, resource use, laboratory, compliance with the intervention and patient/carer reported data will be collected by research nurses from primary and secondary care clinical notes and during study visits/contacts. The physical assessment will be performed by the research nurse following standard operating procedures. No blood or urine tests are required other than those that will already have been performed as part of routine care.

Study visits/contacts will be 4-monthly until withdrawal from the study, death or end of follow up. They will be arranged face-to-face once a year (at home or in clinic) and by telephone twice a year (with postal or telephone completion of questionnaires). If a patient/carer questionnaire is not returned, up to 3 reminders will be sent. If a patient becomes too unwell to complete the patient questionnaires, a proxy report from a relative/carer will be accepted. Relatives/carers will be asked to complete their questionnaires at the same time.

If the patient dies, the relative/carer will be asked to provide a proxy-report for the deceased's quality of life in the last week of life.

Table 2 Summary of follow up data collection for the randomised controlled trial














		Follow up 4 monthly ¹		Participant deceased
		Telephone	In person	
Clinical	Co-morbidities, hospital admissions including dates & causes, dialysis access surgery procedures & complications, other surgery, dialysis treatment received, dietary restrictions, prescribed medication, date location & cause of death.	◇	◇	◇
Resource use	Hospital/nursing home/residential home days/hospice days, other hospital outpatient services and primary care & community services in the last 4 months. Help from family & friends in the last week.	● / ○ ²	● / ○ ²	○
Laboratory (All pre-dialysis unless otherwise stated for those on dialysis)	Creatinine, urea (pre- and post-dialysis if on haemodialysis), albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume, sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total cholesterol. (From the date of the study visit/contact or the closest date prior to the study visit/contact.)	◇	◇	◇
Physical assessment	Weight, blood pressure, heart rate, waist circumference, timed “get up and go” (38), hand grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39), WHO performance status. (Details will be set out in standard operating procedures.)		◇	
Compliance with trial	Number of home visits by clinical team from renal unit; Number of attendances at CKD clinic; Number of telephone contacts from clinical team at renal unit; Number of visits from the palliative care team; Number of telephone contacts from the palliative care team; Advance care agreed; Advance care plan	◇	◇	◇



	reviewed/updated; Cardiopulmonary resuscitation decision documented; Preferred place of death documented			
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)	● / ○ ²	● / ○ ²	○
Relative/carer reported	PACKS impact on carers questionnaire (40), QUALYCARE post-bereavement survey (41)	●	●	●

¹ Two telephone contacts per year and one in person visit per year; ² If patient too unwell to complete questionnaire. ◇ Research nurse collected ● Directly reported by participant or relative/carer ○ Proxy reported by relative/carer.

The study visits/contacts of two example patients, one recruited in the first month of recruitment and one recruited in the last month of recruitment, are set out in Table.

Table 3 Example visit/contact schedule for patients recruited in first and last month of recruitment

Visit/contact	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	11	12	13
Month	1	5	9	13	17	21	25	29	33	37	41	44	47
Visit/contact type													
Recruited in July 2017	Jul 17	Nov 17	Mar 18	Jul 18	Nov 18	Mar 19	Jul 19	Nov 19	Mar 20	Jul 20	Nov 20	Mar 21	Jul 21
Recruited in June 2018	Jun 18	Oct 18	Feb 19	Jun 19	Oct 19	Feb 20	Jun 20	Oct 20	Feb 21	Jun 21			

 = In-person study visit (home or hospital/clinic);  = Telephone study contact.

7.4.3 Long term follow-up assessments

At the point of consenting to take part in the RCT, all participants will be asked to consent to linkage to existing healthcare databases, such as Hospital Episode Statistics, the Office for National Statistics and the UK Renal Registry. This will provide data on commencement of acute or chronic dialysis, hospital admissions for medical and surgical reasons and date and cause of death. This will enable follow up of outcomes (though not quality of life) for participants who wish to stop providing data to the study who might otherwise be lost to follow up, including those who move to a renal unit not participating in the trial.

7.5 Withdrawal criteria

Participants can withdraw from (a) complying with the allocated trial treatment or (b) providing data to the trial, at any time for any reason without affecting their usual care. In both cases all efforts ethically

appropriate will be made to report the reason for withdrawal as thoroughly as possible on the follow up CRF.

Should a participant wish to withdraw from receiving the allocated trial treatment, efforts will be made to continue to obtain follow-up data, with the permission of the patient or family as appropriate.

To provide reassurance that continuing with the allocated trial treatment remains clinically appropriate, a set of safety indicators has been agreed (Section 10). If any one of these indicators is reached, the clinical nurse must seek confirmation from the responsible nephrologist that remaining on the allocated treatment remains appropriate.

7.6 End of trial

The sponsor will notify the main research ethics committee of the end of a trial within 90 days of its completion, i.e. the date of the last visit/data item of the last patient undergoing the trial.

7.7 Assessment of compliance

Process evaluations will be used to study how the intervention is implemented and may provide information on contextual factors that affect the intervention. They will also provide us with information in this multi-site trial about the uniformity of delivery of the intervention, where the “same” intervention may be implemented and received in different ways. Stage 3 of the integrated qualitative research will provide a more in-depth understanding of how the trial treatments and procedures are being delivered in practice (see Section 9.4).

Process information will be documented in the multi-disciplinary team (MDT) Contact Record Form. The Contact Record Form will be used every time there is a contact with a patient or carer or healthcare professional. This will record the nature and length of the contact.

The research nurse will use the MDT Contact Record Form alongside the clinical notes to capture delivery of components of the conservative care intervention to patients in both arms of the trial in a dedicated section in the follow up CRF. From here compliance can be reported to the DMC and Sponsor.

The primary analysis will be intention to treat. For this reason, even if a patient is documented as deviating from protocol or withdrawing from their randomised treatment they will be encouraged to continue with study visits/contacts and patient questionnaires.

Participants randomised to prepare for conservative care will be considered non-compliant with their allocated treatment from the date that they:

- complete none of their “Assess and Launch” visits within 3 months of being randomised (i.e. from 90 days after randomisation)
- complete fewer than 50% of their “Maintain” face-to-face visits or telephone contacts over a 12 month period (i.e. from the date of CRF that records this protocol deviation)
- undergo a dialysis access procedure (surgery or line insertion) after being randomised to prepare for conservative care (i.e. from the date of the dialysis access procedure as it is documented in the CRF)

Participants randomised to prepare for dialysis will be considered not to comply with treatment from the date that they

- decide with their responsible nephrologist that they will not start dialysis in the future, even if they become symptomatic of ESKD, and this decision is documented in the clinical record and in a letter to the GP (i.e. date of entry in clinical record).

Another reason for becoming non-compliant with treatment or even withdrawing from providing data to the RCT may be documented, but only after discussion with the CTU.

Sensitivity analyses will involve studying how many patients in each arm stop complying with their allocated treatment by either deciding not to start dialysis (participants randomised to prepare for dialysis) or deciding to undergo a dialysis access procedure (participants randomised to prepare for conservative care). We will explore the timing of the move, reason for not complying with treatment (where data are available) and the characteristics of patients making this decision.

8. TRIAL INTERVENTION - THE 'PREPARE FOR CONSERVATIVE CARE' PATHWAY

Following allocation of the participant to the Prepare for Conservative Care arm, the research nurse will inform the patient and their family about what will happen thereafter in terms of (1) conservative care visits/contacts and (2) research team visits.

8.1 Assess and Launch

The participant will receive their first telephone contact from a healthcare professional delivering the conservative care package within 1-2 weeks of referral.

The date contact is made and the duration of this telephone contact will be documented. This first contact will cover:

- Initial introductions; explain role of team; review symptoms and concerns of patient and, if appropriate, family; limited telephone conservative care assessment.
- Agree date and time for first visit. Location can be patient's home or other location (e.g. hospital if patient is attending outpatient clinic or elsewhere) as mutually agreed.

The healthcare professional will then consult with colleagues in the rest of the renal team and contact with any other relevant professionals (e.g. palliative care, primary care, rehabilitation) as required for background information.

Visit 1

The participant will receive their first visit from a healthcare professional delivering the conservative care package within 2-3 weeks of first telephone contact.

The date and duration of this visit, including travel, will be documented on the MDT Process Form.

A comprehensive advanced CKD care assessment will be carried out and documented. This will cover:

- Completion of iPOS-S renal
- Symptom control and management
- Continuity and co-ordination of care, access to services
- Psychosocial needs
- Information/communication needs
- Advance care planning

- Assessment of caregiver

This will generate an agreed personalised problem list and action plan including agreement of plan for next visit/contact.

The patient/family will be given information about the conservative care package and given contact details for the healthcare professionals delivering the conservative care package.

After visit 1

- The patient's case will be discussed with the multi-disciplinary team (including their named consultant nephrologist and GP) and these discussions documented. When complete, this will be sent to the patient and all relevant health professionals.
- The problem list/plan from first visit will be reviewed with multi-disciplinary team the healthcare professional will liaise with relevant health, social and voluntary sector professionals to ensure other services are provided and other needs met.
- The patient/family will be contacted as agreed in the plan and as required. All contacts made with the patient/carer or with healthcare professionals outside the study visits will be documented.
- The date and time of the second visit will be confirmed.

Visit 2

The second visit from the healthcare professional delivering the conservative care package will take place within 2-4 weeks of Visit 1. The date and duration of this visit, including travel, will be documented on the MDT Process Form.

A comprehensive advanced CKD care assessment will be carried out including:

- A review of outcomes from actions already taken.
- A reassessment of the patient's situation covering the same areas as visit 1.
- A review the personalised advance care plan and any actions as necessary.

After Visit 2

- The healthcare professional will liaise with relevant healthcare professionals and provide information, education, advice and co-ordination as required. They will re-review the personalised problem list/plan with multi-disciplinary team and record all activity. When complete, they will communicate the plan with the patient and all relevant health professionals.
- The healthcare professional will contact the patient/family as agreed in plan and as required. All contacts made with the patient/carer or with healthcare professionals in relation to the patient outside the study visits will be documented.
- The date and time of the third visit will be confirmed.

Visit 3

The third visit from the healthcare professional delivering the conservative care package will take place within 2-4 weeks of Visit 2. The date and duration of this visit, including travel, will be documented on the MDT Process Form.

A comprehensive advanced CKD care assessment will be carried out, including:

- A review of outcomes from actions already taken.

- A reassessment of the patient's situation covering the same areas as visit 2.
- A review the personalised advance care plan and any actions as necessary.
- The first of monthly telephone contacts will be arranged.

8.2. Maintain

Monthly telephone contacts

These telephone contacts will consist of an abridged advanced CKD care assessment, including:

- Completion of the iPOS-S renal
- Changes to medication to optimise symptom control
- Information/communication needs

All actions will be documented.

At each telephone contact, the health professional will compare current responses with previous responses looking for any worsening of symptoms and if present:

- Review symptoms and treatment with the MDT and make any possible changes to medication to control symptoms
- If clinically appropriate, arrange face-to-face contact either through a home visit or a clinic visit or a community team visit

If despite optimisation of their medication the patient's symptoms are proving difficult to adequately control and the patient still wishes to follow a conservative care pathway, treatment will escalate to "Support Enhancement" (see Section 8.3 below).

Home visits from healthcare professional delivering the conservative care package

These should alternate with the clinic visits so that, for example, if the patient is being seen every 3-4 months in clinic prior to entry into the trial they will continue to be seen by a healthcare professional every 3-4 months, but only attend renal outpatient clinic every 6-8 months.

These home visits will include a comprehensive advanced CKD care assessment (for more detail see section 8.1):

- Completion of the iPOS-S renal
- Symptom control and management
- Continuity and co-ordination of care, access to services
- Psychosocial needs
- Information/communication needs
- Advance care planning
- Assessment of caregiver

This will generate an agreed personalised problem list and action plan including agreement of plan for next visit/contact. The visit and plan will be discussed and agreed with the MDT. If despite optimisation of their medication the patient's symptoms are proving difficult to adequately control and the patient still wishes to follow a conservative care pathway, treatment will escalate to "Support Enhancement" (see Section 8.3 below).

Clinic visits with the patient's consultant nephrologist

The patient's named consultant nephrologist will not change as a result of taking part in this trial. Clinic visits should alternate with the home visits from the healthcare professional delivering the conservative

care package so that, for example, if the patient is being seen every 3-4 months in clinic prior to entry into the trial they will continue to be seen by a healthcare professional every 3-4 months, but only attend renal outpatient clinic every 6-8 months.

The content of these clinic visits will be determined by the treating nephrologist but should not include preparation for dialysis unless the patient decides to withdraw from the conservative care pathway. In this situation, the research team should be informed as soon as possible, optimally within 1 week of the clinic visit.

8.3. Support Enhancement

If the patient develops symptoms of advanced CKD that cannot be adequately controlled they should progress to the “Support Enhancement” stage. This transition may occur at a monthly telephone contact or face-to-face visit or between contacts, for example during an intercurrent illness.

The Advance Care Plan and any other documentation relating to priorities for care must be reviewed and the appropriate local community and palliative care services activated and coordinated to achieve good end-of-life care. This must be done rapidly to prevent inappropriate default “cure-centred” care being administered in the event of a sudden deterioration.

In principle, the package of care should aim to deliver the following five patient priorities for quality end-of-life care (44):

- Receiving adequate pain and symptom management
- Avoiding inappropriate prolongation of dying
- Achieving a sense of control
- Relieving burden on loved ones
- Strengthening relationships with loved ones

We recognise that each renal team is likely to have their own prescribing guidance for pain and symptom management at the end of life in advanced CKD, but guidance has also been published that some may find helpful and this will be shared with the teams.

Although the renal unit team may want to continue to lead at this stage of care, it is often more appropriate to hand over day-to-day management to the local community teams – palliative care and general practice. If earlier stages of the conservative care package have worked effectively, these services will already be aware of the patient and the possibility that they may need end-of-life support. Written and telephone guidance on prescribing in advanced CKD is generally welcomed by these teams, who may be unfamiliar with the appropriate drugs and doses to use in end-stage kidney disease.

9 Qualitative assessments – Nested studies

9.1 Overview of qualitative research integrated throughout study

Qualitative and mixed-methods research will be integrated throughout PrepareME to address key objectives at different stages of the RCT. The objective of Stage 1 (months 0-6) is to optimise the trial design prior to initiation of the pilot RCT. Stage 2 will implement the ‘QuinteT recruitment intervention’ (QRI) with the aim of optimising trial recruitment processes during the pilot stage (months 6-30). The

aim of stage 3 (month 12- 54) is to investigate the adherence and acceptability of the trial comparison groups (and processes) to patients and the professionals involved in their care.

9.2 Stage 1: Optimising trial design

Qualitative research at the pre-trial stage can optimise the efficiency of RCT processes and enhance the relevance and acceptability of trial design (45, 46). The first draft of the PrepareME protocol was designed with patient and clinician input and underwent extensive peer review through the funding acquisition process. There is, however, a need to present the RCT protocol to stakeholders anticipated to deliver the RCT.

9.2.1 Aim and objectives

Stage 1 of the integrated qualitative study aims to understand key stakeholders' perspectives on the proposed RCT with a view to refining the protocol. This work will be carried out in advance of the formal start date of the RCT (i.e. prior to sites formally opening and enrolling patients). The main objectives of stage 1 are to understand:

- a) Clinical professionals' perceived acceptability of the proposed trial interventions.
- b) Clinical professionals' perceptions of equipoise, particularly in relation to the proposed eligibility criteria.
- c) Trialists' and professionals' views about the barriers and facilitators of delivering the RCT in the context of local health care systems.

Findings from interviews will be summarised in a report for the CI and fed back to the TMG to finalise decisions about: a) details of the intervention; b) the trial eligibility criteria, and c) trial recruitment processes. A clinical consensus meeting will be held towards the end of stage 1, with the aim of finalising these decisions.

9.2.2 Design

Stage 1 will consist of qualitative, semi-structured interviews with NHS health care professionals who are anticipated to be involved in supporting or delivering the forthcoming RCT. Semi-structured interviewing has been selected as the main route of enquiry, as these allow key topics of interest to be covered within a flexible framework that provides opportunities for new themes to emerge (i.e. issues that might not have been anticipated by the researchers).

9.2.3 Sampling and recruitment

Stage 1 of the qualitative research will be conducted across the sites participating in the internal pilot phase PrepareME:

- North Bristol NHS Trust
- Heart of England NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham
- Royal Stoke University Hospital (University Hospitals of North Midlands Trust), Stoke-on-trent
- The Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust
- The Lister Hospital (East and North Herts NHS Foundation Trust), Stevenage

Sampling of potential interview participants will be purposeful, guided by intentions to recruit 'key informants'. A key informant in the context of this study will be defined as any individual responsible for delivering care to the eligible patient population, or any individual who has a role in delivering the trial.

Key informants will be identified at site initiation meetings and through liaison with the trial management group (e.g. the trial manager and trial coordinator, who will have links with the research teams at each site). The qualitative researcher will attempt to attend as many site initiation meetings as possible (depending on practical constraints). Snowball sampling techniques will also be employed, where interview participants suggest other individuals deemed appropriate to approach (in accordance with the objectives of the stage 1 qualitative interviews). As data collection progresses, further sampling will be guided by intentions to develop emerging themes or theories. Sampling will continue until the research team are confident that they have reached 'data saturation' – defined as the point at which no new themes emerge from three consecutive interviews.

Potential participants will be sent invitation letters and study information sheets explaining the study via post and/or email. They will be asked to express interest to participate by contacting the named qualitative researcher via e-mail, telephone, or a reply slip attached to their invitation letter (to be returned in a pre-paid envelope). This slip will also provide an option for individuals who do not wish to take part in the research. The letter will request potential participants to indicate if they do not wish to participate, as this will alert the qualitative researcher to make no further contact. Participants will be asked to respond to the invitation letter within two weeks. Those who do not respond will be sent reminders (another invitation letter and participant information sheet). Any late respondents will still be eligible for participation, as long as the project is ongoing.

9.2.4 Data collection and consent processes for stage 1

Interviews will be conducted face-to-face or via telephone. Face-to-face interviews are likely to be in a private room within a professional healthcare organisation or the research base (University of Bristol). Interviews will be up to one hour in duration and will be audio-recorded (subject to written permission on the consent form). A topic guide will be used to ensure key topics are consistently covered across interviews. It is anticipated that this topic guide will evolve as new themes emerge through continued data collection. The qualitative researcher will obtain informed consent on the day of the interview.

9.3 Stage 2: Quintet Recruitment Intervention (QRI) to optimise recruitment and informed consent (months 6-30)

The QRI aims to optimise recruitment and informed consent in PrepareME (65), and will begin as soon as the first centres officially open to recruitment. Recruitment may be challenging in relation to the identification of potentially eligible patients and differences in levels of equipoise. The QRI will attempt to identify sources of recruitment difficulties, and implement interventions to address these throughout the recruitment period. This work will be intensively conducted in clinical centres in the internal pilot phase. Lessons learnt from the QRI will subsequently be applied to other centres, combined with continued investigation of recruitment challenges as they occur. The process will assimilate investigation of generic and centre-specific recruitment challenges, with a combination of pre-emptive and responsive feedback/training.

The QRI uses novel qualitative and mixed-method approaches pioneered during the HTA-funded ProtecT (Prostate testing for cancer and Treatment) study (16). These methods have since been refined and applied to several other RCTs in different clinical contexts, all of which have led to insights about recruitment issues and the development of targeted recruitment strategies (12). The QRI will proceed in two iterative phases: a detailed understanding of the recruitment process will be developed in phase I, leading to tailored interventions to improve recruitment in phase II.

9.3.1 Data collection methods for the QRI

Phase I: understanding recruitment issues

Phase I will focus on building up a comprehensive understanding of recruitment challenges that arise during the pilot RCT. A multi-faceted, flexible approach will be adopted, using one or more of the following methods:

a) Mapping patient eligibility and recruitment pathways: Detailed eligibility and recruitment pathways will be compiled for clinical centres, noting the point at which patients receive information about the trial, which members of the clinical team they meet, and the timing and frequency of appointments. Recruitment pathways will be compared with details specified in the trial protocol and pathways from other centres to identify practices that are potentially more/less efficient. The qualitative researcher will also work closely with the CTU to compose detailed logs of potential RCT participants as they proceed through screening and eligibility phases, to help identify points at which patients do not continue with recruitment to the RCT. Logs of eligible and recruited patients will be assembled using simple flow charts and counts to display numbers and percentages of patients at each stage of the eligibility and recruitment processes. These figures will be compared across centres, and considered in relation to estimates specified in the grant application/study protocol.

b) Audio recording and observation of recruitment appointments: Scheduled appointments and/or home visits during which the trial is discussed will be audio-recorded and/or observed with permission, including telephone conversations. All staff involved in discussing PrepareMe with patients will be invited to audio-record their discussions with patients using an encrypted digital recorder. The audio recordings will be used to explore information provision, recruitment techniques, management of patient treatment preferences, and randomisation decisions to identify recruitment difficulties and improve information provision. Recordings will be transferred to and from the University of Bristol (for analysis) through University of Bristol-approved secure data transfer facilities and/or encrypted flash drives that adhere to NHS Trust policies.

c) Semi-structured Interviews may be conducted with:

- Members of the TMG, including the CI and those closely involved in the design, management, leadership and coordination of the trial.
- Clinical and recruitment staff across all centres delivering the RCT.
- Eligible patients who are approached to take part in the RCT.

Interviews with TMG members/recruiters will investigate their perspectives on the RCT and experiences of recruitment (where relevant). Key topics explored will include views about the trial design and protocol; understandings of the evidence on which the trial is based; perceptions of uncertainty/equipoise in relation to the RCT arms; views about how the arms/protocol are delivered in clinical centres; methods for identifying eligible patients; views on eligibility, and examples of actual recruitment successes and difficulties.

Interviews with patients will explore views on the presentation of study information, understandings of trial processes (e.g. randomisation), and reasons underlying decisions to accept or decline the trial. Patients will be purposefully selected, to build a sample of maximum variation on the basis of age, multi-morbidity status, gender, study centre, and the final decision about trial participation (i.e. accept or decline). Numbers of interviews will be guided by the concept of 'data saturation' – the need to continue sampling until findings become repetitious.

QRI interviews will take place at a mutually convenient location, in a suitably private and quiet setting. All participants will be offered the option to conduct the interview over the telephone. The University of

Bristol's 'lone researcher' safety policies will be upheld for any interviews taking place in non-public settings (e.g. participants' homes).

d) Observation of TMG and investigator meetings: It is likely that the CI, TMG and clinical investigators will meet or have telephone conferences to discuss the progress of the RCT. The qualitative researcher will observe and potentially audio-record these meetings, with permission. The aim will be to gather further information about specific issues that may have a bearing on recruitment. These meetings can also elucidate new solutions to recruitment difficulties.

e) Document analysis of trial materials: PILs, the study protocol, and other trial literature will be scrutinised to identify aspects that are unclear or potentially open to misinterpretation, thus having a possible bearing on recruitment.

Phase 2: Development and implementation of recruitment strategies

Findings from Phase 1 will be presented to the CI and TMG (with permission from CI). If recruitment difficulties are evident across the study or in particular centres, the CI/TMG and QRI team will formulate a 'plan of action' to improve recruitment and information provision. The specific plan implemented will be grounded in the findings from phase 1, with its format dependent on the nature of the recruitment barriers identified. For instance, generic challenges such as how to explain trial processes (e.g. randomisation) may be addressed through dissemination of 'tips and guidance' documents. Supportive feedback will be a core component of the plan of action, with the exact nature and timing dependent on the issues that arise. Centre-specific feedback may cover institutional barriers, while multi-centre group feedback sessions may address widespread challenges that would benefit from discussion. All group feedback sessions will be aided by anonymised data extracts from interviews and audio-recorded appointments. Individual confidential feedback will also be offered – particularly where recruiters experience specific difficulties or where there is a need to discuss potentially sensitive issues. Investigator meetings and site visits may also be employed to discuss technical or clinical challenges (e.g. discomfort surrounding eligibility criteria).

Iterative nature of Phases 1 and 2

The QRI has been presented as two distinct phases for clarity, although in reality these are likely to overlap or run in tandem. For instance, new avenues of enquiry may emerge through feedback meetings, which can be a route to investigating recruitment difficulties in their own right. Insights into recruitment can emerge at any point during the RCT and instigate further investigations (phase 1) or intervention (phase 2).

Evaluating changes in recruitment practice and randomisation

The impact of QRI interventions implemented in phase 2 will be evaluated through mixed approaches, including 'before/after' comparisons (number of recruited patients, eligible patients identified, patients accepting allocation) and investigation of changes in recruiter practice (through continued analysis of audio-recorded appointments). Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with recruiting staff and TMG members to explore their views on QRI interventions and suggestions for areas that would benefit from continued QRI input.

9.3.2 Consent processes for the QRI

Health care professional consent

Recruiting staff and TMG member consent will be obtained through a 'master' consent form that covers all aspects of the qualitative research throughout stage 2 (the QRI) and stage 3 (described in

next section); this form sets out individual clauses for each aspect of the qualitative research, with the option to select 'Yes' or 'No' for each research activity accordingly. Research nurses or the qualitative researcher will obtain written consent from all staff. This will be a one-off process to cover consent for all future recordings of appointments, interviews, and observations of TMG/investigator meetings throughout the study.

Patient consent

Audio recording/observing recruitment appointments: Patient consent for audio-recording/observing appointments will be a two-step process. Recruiters will obtain verbal consent to record the discussion when they first contact the potential PrepareME participant. Patients will receive the QRI patient PIL during this appointment or via post (if conducted over the phone), and will be provided with sufficient time to read the information, ask any questions, and consider their participation. Patients who agree to their appointments being audio-recorded/observed will sign a written QRI consent form during a subsequent visit carried out by the research nurse. Future discussions will be audio-recorded subject to receiving this written consent; if patients choose not to consent to their appointments being audio-recorded, the recording made from their initial recruitment appointment will be deleted and no further recordings made.

Interviews: The QRI consent form will include a clause that asks patients if they would be willing to be take part in a future research interview ('Yes' or 'No'). Patients who select 'Yes' may then be approached by the qualitative researcher.

9.4 Stage 3: Evaluation of trial processes/interventions and adherence to allocated treatment (months 12-54)

Stage 3 of the integrated qualitative research has two objectives: a) to explore the acceptability of the intervention and trial processes, and b) to understand reasons for non-compliance/protocol deviations. This stage will begin shortly after recruitment initiates and continue into the follow up phase of the study.

There will be an intention to interview trial participants (and/or family members/carers) within the first year of randomisation, with follow up interviews arranged at regular (but flexible) intervals to construct longitudinal summaries of experiences of patients (and family member/carers). The exact frequency and timing of subsequent interviews will vary depending on clinical events and patient/family member preferences, but it is anticipated that at least one follow up interview will be conducted each year. In addition to the above, patients who 'cross over' or withdraw from the RCT (and/or their family members/carers) will be invited to take part in a specific interview that explores the reasons underlying these events. Other health care professionals involved in patient care/decision making will also be targeted for interview (e.g. nurses, GPs, renal consultants, and palliative care specialists).

Interviews that explore acceptability and adherence will be supported with observational data of how the protocol is being implemented in practice. Nurse follow up visits and telephone discussions with patients will be observed and audio-recorded (with written permission) to understand the content and nature of these appointments and any difficulties in implementing the intervention or trial processes.

In addition to the above, the acceptability of trial processes and end-of-life care will be specifically explored with family members/carers of deceased patients. These individuals will be informed about the possibility of being contacted for interview in the 'carer-specific PIL', distributed at the consent stage for the RCT (see Section 9.3.2, above).

9.4.1 Sampling

All patients who consent to taking part in the trial will be eligible for the stage 3 qualitative study. Sampling will be purposeful, with an intention to build a sample of maximum variation, reflecting the full range of quality of life scores reported, and a range of patients with clinical characteristics at the extremes of eligibility criteria (on trial entry). Patients will be approached for interview at multiple time points from the point of randomisation, with a view to constructing longitudinal summaries of their experiences and how these vary over time.

9.4.2 Consent processes

See Appendix 4 for a flow diagram of when consent is taken for the different stages of the main trial and the nested qualitative study.

9.5 Qualitative analysis

All qualitative interviews and recruitment discussions will be audio-recorded using digital encrypted recorders, and transcribed verbatim by an approved transcription services that has the necessary signed confidentiality agreements with the University of Bristol. All transcripts will be edited to ensure anonymity of respondent. Data will be managed using NVivo software, and stored on encrypted drives at the University of Bristol in line with the university's data storage policies.

Interviews conducted throughout the trial will thematically analysed using constant comparative approaches. Case study approaches will also be used to analyse data from patients interviewed at multiple time points (for interviews focusing on patient acceptability of interventions), and patients for whom there is potential to combine interview with observational data. A sample of transcripts from each set of interviews will be independently coded by a second qualitative methodologist. A basic coding frame will be agreed, though this is anticipated to evolve as data collection proceeds for each set of interviews. There will an attempt to search for negative cases in relation to particular themes. Descriptive accounts of emerging interview findings will be prepared throughout the process of analysis for each set of interviews. These documents will evolve as analyses progress and discussions amongst the research team develop over time.

Audio-recorded recruitment consultations and follow up discussions will be subjected to content, thematic, and novel analytical approaches, including targeted conversation analysis (70) and appointment timing (the 'Q-Qat method') (71). There will be a focus on aspects of information provision that are unclear, disrupted, or potentially detrimental to recruitment and/or adherence. Notes from observations of appointments and TMG/investigator meetings will be documented in a detailed log for each qualitative program of study. Key issues/themes from these notes will be considered alongside emerging findings from interviews and audio-recorded appointments.

10. SAFETY

10.1 Definitions

Term	Definition
Adverse Event (AE)	Any untoward medical occurrence in a participant to whom a medicinal product has been administered, including occurrences which are not necessarily caused by or related to that product.
Serious Adverse	A serious adverse event is any untoward medical occurrence that:

Event (SAE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • results in death • is life-threatening • requires inpatient hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation • results in persistent or significant disability/incapacity • consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect <p>Other 'important medical events' may also be considered serious if they jeopardise the participant or require an intervention to prevent one of the above consequences.</p> <p>NOTE: The term "life-threatening" in the definition of "serious" refers to an event in which the participant was at risk of death at the time of the event; it does not refer to an event which hypothetically might have caused death if it were more severe.</p>
--------------------	--

10.2 Operational definitions for (S)AEs

Due to the nature of advanced CKD and its treatment, especially in multi-morbid frail older people, SAEs would be expected to occur throughout the course of the disease. These expected SAEs include:

- Abnormal electrolyte and haematological laboratory results that can be explained directly or indirectly by their advanced CKD
- Hospital admissions – elective and emergency – that can be explained directly or indirectly by their advanced CKD
- Hospice admissions – planned and emergency – that can be explained directly or indirectly by their advanced CKD
- Infections and cardiovascular events that can be explained directly or indirectly by their advanced CKD
- Commencement of dialysis
- Death that can be explained directly or indirectly by their advanced CKD

These expected SAEs do not require reporting to the Sponsor. However, anything not in the above list, or anything the PI deems unexpected, must be reported to the Sponsor.

10.3 Recording and reporting of SAEs

All reportable SAEs occurring from the time of consent until 30 days after the end of the trial must be documented on the SAE form (see Key Trial Contacts section for link to website) and faxed or emailed securely to the CTU and Sponsor within 24 hours of the research staff becoming aware. The CI will report any SAE that is related to the research procedures and unexpected to the Research Ethics Committee and the Sponsor within 24 hours becoming aware of the event.

For each SAE the following information will be collected:

- full details in medical terms and case description
- event duration (start and end dates, if applicable)
- action taken
- outcome
- seriousness criteria
- causality (i.e. relatedness to trial/intervention), in the opinion of the investigator

- whether the event would be considered expected or unexpected.

Each SAE must be reported separately and not combined on one SAE form. Any change of condition or other follow-up information relating to a previously reported SAE should be documented on the appropriate form (see Key Trial Contacts section for link to website) and faxed or emailed securely to the CTU and Sponsor as soon as it is available or within at least 15 days of the information becoming available to the research team. Events will be followed up until the event has resolved or a final outcome has been reached.

All other adverse events will be captured as part of the primary and secondary outcomes for the trial and are therefore likely to form part of the report that is submitted to the DMC on a regular basis, although their report requirements will not be finalised until they have met and written their charter.

10.4 Responsibilities

Adverse events will be documented and reported in accordance with North Bristol NHS Trust's Safety Reporting SOP.

10.4.1 Principal Investigator/research nurse

Principal investigators (PIs) and research nurses at each site will be checking for AEs when participants attend for treatment /follow-up; they will be responsible for:

- Using medical judgement in assigning seriousness, causality and expectedness.
- Ensuring that all SAEs are documented and reported to the Sponsor within 24 hours of becoming aware of the event and provide further follow-up information as soon as available. Ensuring that SAEs are chased with the Sponsor if a record of receipt is not received within 2 working days of initial reporting.
- Ensuring that AEs are documented and reported to the Sponsor in line with the requirements of the protocol.

10.4.2 Chief Investigator

The chief investigator will be responsible for:

- Clinical oversight of the safety of patients participating in the trial, including an ongoing review of the risk/benefit.
- Using medical judgement in assigning seriousness, causality and expectedness of SAEs where it has not been possible to obtain local medical assessment.
- Using medical judgement in assigning expectedness.
- Immediate review of all reportable SAEs.
- Ensuring safety reports are prepared in collaboration with appropriate members of the TMG group for the main REC and DMC.
- Reporting safety information to the CI, delegate or independent clinical reviewer for the ongoing assessment of the risk/benefit.
- Reporting safety information to the independent oversight committees identified for the trial (DMC and TSC).
- Expedited reporting of SAEs to the REC within required timelines.
- Notifying PIs of SAEs that occur within the trial.
- Central data collection of SAEs.

10.4.3 Sponsor

The sponsor will be responsible for:

- Overall oversight of the trial.

10.4.4 Trial Steering Committee (TSC)

In accordance with the Trial Terms of Reference for the TSC, this group will be responsible for periodically reviewing safety data and liaising with the DMC regarding safety issues.

10.4.5 Data Monitoring Committee (DMC)

In accordance with the Trial Terms of Reference for the DMC, this group will be responsible for periodically reviewing unblinded overall safety data to determine patterns and trends of events, or identifying safety issues, which would not be apparent on an individual case basis.

10.5 Symptoms, results or events that should trigger senior clinical review

Although all clinical teams will have their own local arrangements for seeking senior clinical review of a patient about whom they have concerns, it is necessary for the safe delivery of the intervention to agree a minimum threshold across all sites for making the patient's nephrologist aware of any change in the status of their kidney condition. Such causes for concern fall into a number of categories:

Symptoms

- Any severe or overwhelming iPOS-S renal symptoms (see Key Trial Contacts section for link to website) reported for the first time during planned or unplanned telephone or face-to-face healthcare professional contact

Blood results

- An eGFR below 6 mL/min/1.73m²
- A potassium above 6.5 mmol/L
- A urea above 40 mmol/L

Events

- An unplanned GP/emergency department/hospital attendance due to fluid overload
- An unplanned GP/emergency department/hospital attendance due to infection causing systemic illnesses

Other

- Concern about unexplained or rapid loss of flesh weight (i.e. after allowing for changes in weight due to removal of fluid)
- The patient or their family is expressing doubts about the appropriateness of them continuing on the allocated treatment that cannot be resolved
- The healthcare professional believes that a senior clinical review is required

In the event of the healthcare professional delivering the intervention becoming aware of any of the above, they must inform the patient's nephrologist (or covering nephrologist) and the research team within 1 working day. Appropriate clinical action should already have been taken by the responsible clinical team, so the purpose of this escalation is to ensure that it remains appropriate for the patient to remain in the trial on their allocated treatment arm.

11 STATISTICS AND DATA ANALYSIS

11.1 Sample size calculation

The total sample size of 512 will have 90% power to detect a difference between the pathways of 0.345 QALYs (5% two-sided) over 3 years of follow up based on EQ-5D-5L. A discrete choice experiment in 8 renal units in Australia suggests that patients with kidney failure are willing to forgo 7 months of life expectancy to reduce the number of visits to hospital for dialysis by one per week (32).

Conservative care reduces visits to hospital completely. Based on a median EQ-5D utility value for being alive on dialysis of 0.69 (47), 7 months of life at this value would equate to 0.4 QALYs. We wanted to be able to detect a slightly smaller difference than this of 6 months between the two pathways, equivalent to 0.345 QALYs.

For the purposes of informing our calculation we examined data from a longitudinal study (15) of patients that were pre-dialysis where utility score data were available at multiple points during follow up. In that particular study, patients were followed up from eGFR 20-30 ml/min/1.73m² until starting dialysis. From these data we calculated total QALYs over 3 years of follow up (based on EQ-5D). The data suggested a bimodal distribution (means 0.36 and 2.4).

Bi-modal distributions of EQ-5D values (which are used to calculate QALYs) have been noted in a variety of conditions including rheumatoid arthritis (48) and cancer (49). Explanations for such distributions include the algorithm used to calculate the EQ-5D score itself which tends to cluster scores in the extremity close to 1.0 (perfect health) and near 0.45 (representing moderate health) (50). While we cannot exclude the possibility that a larger sample would have yielded a unimodal distribution, it is worth noting that a large study of over 1041 Finnish patients with rheumatoid arthritis found a bi-modal distribution for EQ-5D scores (51).

Based on summary statistics from the observed data and visual inspection of the histogram, we simulated datasets of 1,000,000 observations for control groups using the SKBIM command in STATA (52). This command allows the user to simulate a bimodal distribution while specifying different characteristics of the distribution including means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis (for the control group the simulated dataset was generated with this command: `skbim (0.5 0.359 0.096 2.413 2.413 0.154 1 1000000 123 0.804 2.492 0 3)`). To simulate the distribution of QALYs in the intervention group we assumed the same distribution as the control group, but shifted the two means by 0.345 QALYs to reflect a clinically meaningful difference we want to be able to detect. Simulated values greater than 3 were discarded.

Sample size calculations involved re-sampling (1,000 iterations) samples of varying sizes from these simulated distributions of continuous QALY scores and performing Mann Whitney tests. To allow for possible cross over, we selected our intervention group samples by taking 95% of our sample from the intervention distribution and 5% from the control distribution. The same process was used to identify the control group sample.

Having 230 patients/group allows detection of a difference between the pathways of 0.345 QALYs with 90% power (2-sided $\alpha=0.05$). As death is not a censoring event (utility becomes and remains 0) so loss to follow up should not exceed 10%. Allowing for loss-to-follow-up increased the total sample size to 512.

11.2 Planned recruitment rate

Based on numbers of patients starting renal replacement therapy it is estimated that there will be ~270 patients aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² in each renal unit over the recruitment period of the trial. Considering the co-morbidity, performance status and the additional age criteria, we estimate that 40% of these patients will be eligible (~20% will have 3+ co-morbidities (1, 2), 15-25% will have a dependent performance status (1, 53) and ~30% will be over 80 years (54)). This gives an estimate of 108 eligible patients per renal unit over the recruitment period of the trial. If we assume

20% of these agree to participate in the first 6 months in each site, increasing to 33% after this with the embedded QRI, we estimate that with 16 sites we will recruit 512 patients by month 30, equivalent to 1.7 per site month.

11.3 Statistical analysis plan

11.3.1 Summary of baseline data and flow of patients

Analysis and reporting will be in line with CONSORT guidelines and the primary statistical analyses will be conducted on an intention-to-treat (ITT) basis. Descriptive statistics will be used to determine whether there are imbalances at baseline between treatment groups. Baseline variables to be explored are those described in section 7.4.1. Patient-reported outcome scores based on standardised questionnaires will be calculated based on the developers' scoring manuals and missing and erroneous items will be handled according to these manuals. Continuous measures will be presented as means and standard deviations or medians and ranges depending on their distribution. Categorical data will be presented as frequencies and proportions.

Template tables of baseline data and CONSORT flow charts will be presented in a detailed statistical analysis plan to be approved by the TSC and made publicly available prior to analysis.

11.3.2 Primary outcome analysis

The primary endpoint in this study is quality adjusted life years which will be calculated using EQ-5D-5L data collected 4-monthly and survival data. The primary statistical analyses between the randomised groups will be conducted on an intention-to-treat (ITT) basis. Longitudinal responses to the EQ-5D-5L will be used to generate scores based on the developer's scoring manuals and these will be used to compute QALYs experienced over the follow up period using the area under the curve approach. If the observed QALYs data are normally distributed, the mean differences in QALYs between treatment arms with 95% confidence intervals will be calculated using multivariate linear regression models. Should the data not be normally distributed, however, we will consider the shape of the distribution to inform the choice of alternative, suitable regression models (including non-parametric models) for this outcome.

11.3.3 Secondary outcome analysis

While QALYs helpfully bring together quantity and quality of life in a single score, there will be a number of other experiences and outcomes that are important for the individual patient when they are deciding whether or not to have dialysis. These secondary endpoints – such as overall survival, hospital-free days and a series of patient-reported outcome measures – will capture the factors behind the QALYs and assist in the interpretation of the trial results at all levels, from the policy maker to the individual faced with the choice between dialysis and conservative care.

Survival will be assessed using Kaplan-Meier curves and a Cox proportional hazard model analysis. Hospital-free days will be studied using appropriate regression models - such as the negative binomial model with offset for the duration of follow-up - based on the distribution of the data. Appropriate repeated measures regression models for patient-reported outcome scores will be chosen based on the distribution of each outcome.

11.4 Subgroup analyses

We will conduct pre-planned subgroup analyses to investigate any differential effects according to a number of factors used in defining the patient cohort and for the minimised randomisation. These will

be done by introducing appropriate interaction terms in the regression models. We will carry out these analyses by age at baseline (65-79 years vs 80+ years) and rate of kidney function decline in the 12 months pre-baseline (≤ 5 ml/min/1.73m² vs >5 ml/min/1.73m²). In the group aged 80+ years we will also stratify according to co-morbidity scores at baseline (<2 vs ≥ 2) and WHO performance status at baseline (<3 vs ≥ 3).

11.5 Adjusted analyses and sensitivity analyses

All analyses will be adjusted for stratification and minimisation variables: age (65-79 yrs vs 80+), rate of decline in eGFR (≤ 5 vs >5) and site. Furthermore, we will adjust for baseline EQ-5D scores in our analyses of the primary outcome (QALYs). In our analyses of patient-reported outcomes we will also adjust for the value of the outcome at baseline.

Descriptive statistics will be used to identify whether there are imbalances at baseline between treatment groups. Where imbalances are observed, sensitivity analyses will be performed where regression models will be further adjusted for these variables.

Sensitivity analyses will involve studying how many patients in each arm become non-compliant with treatment by either deciding not to start dialysis (participants randomised to prepare for dialysis) or deciding to undergo a dialysis access procedure (participants randomised to prepare for conservative care). We will describe the timing of the move, reason for becoming non-compliant with treatment (where data are available) and the characteristics of patients making this decision.

11.6 Interim analysis and criteria for the premature termination of the trial

A dashboard with red/amber/green thresholds is proposed to help the HTA decide whether the internal pilot should proceed to the full trial. Achieving all green targets would almost certainly mean the pilot proceeding to the full trial, whereas achieving predominantly red targets would almost certainly indicate that a full-scale RCT is not feasible.

% of rate proposed	The number of sites recruiting, based on the target of 16 sites	The recruitment rate per active site month, based on the target of 20% initially increasing to 33% ⁱ	The % of eligible patients randomised, based on the target of 20% initially increasing to 33% ⁱ	The % of randomised patients crossing over, based on the estimate of 5% in the power calculation
$\geq 85\%$	14 sites or more	1.3 pts/mth or more	18% or more	6% or less
60-84%	10-13 sites	0.9-1.2 pts/mth	13-17%	7-9%
$<60\%$	9 sites or fewer	0.8 pts/mth or fewer	12% or less	10% or more

ⁱ All sites have been allowed a 20% rate of randomisation of eligible patients in months 1-6 of recruitment, increasing to 33% in month 7 with the QRI work. The recruitment rate and % of eligible patients randomised are therefore a combination of (1) 4 sites spending half their pilot time at the lower rate and half their pilot time at the higher rate and (2) 12 sites spending all their pilot time at the lower rate. Pts/mth = participants per active site month.

To further assist with the decision, we will report in all scenarios the numbers of patients at each stage of the flow chart.

At the first DMC meeting, the committee will agree on its charter of operation and advise on the criteria for the need for interim analyses and adoption of formal stopping rules for efficacy or safety. The DMC will be responsible for assessing safety and efficacy; they will be responsible for recommending stopping the trial at any time if there are significant safety or ethical issues. Judgements will be made at their discretion.

Any interim statistical analyses by study arm will be performed by the study statistician blinded to treatment allocation. They will report blinded data to the DMC who will have unblinded access to all data if they have concerns about the safety of the RCT and will discuss the results of the interim analyses with the TSC in a joint meeting. The TSC will then report to the central ethics committee.

A detailed statistical analysis plan will be developed for the approval of the TSC and will be finalised before any interim analyses are undertaken for the DMC.

11.7 Procedure(s) to account for missing data

In order to limit missing patient reported outcome data – including the EQ-5D-5L which informs the primary outcome - if a patient is unable to complete questionnaires due to poor health status these can be completed by a relative or carer. Where this has occurred it will be documented. Study visits have been designed to impose the least burden on the patient by including home visits and telephone study visits, further maximising follow-up and preventing missing data. We will record whether the patient reported outcome questionnaires are completed by a relative/carers and – where information are available - will record the reasons why visits are not conducted or data not collected.

For long term follow-up of outcomes except quality of life, all participants will be asked on consenting to the RCT to consent to linkage to existing healthcare databases, such as Hospital Episode Statistics, the Office for National Statistics and the UK Renal Registry. This will provide data on commencement of acute or chronic dialysis, hospital admissions for medical and surgical reasons and date and cause of death. This will enable follow up for participants that deviate from the trial protocol or might otherwise be lost to follow-up.

Where missing data exist, sensitivity analyses will be conducted using a range of techniques to impute missing data based on patterns of missingness.

11.8 Economic evaluation

11.8.1 Rationale for inclusion of the economic investigation

Economic evaluation will be undertaken given the potential high economic and quality of life impacts of shifting resources within the area of kidney care in line with the provision of a conservative care pathway. 'Back of the envelope' calculations based on the NHS costs associated with conduct of the trial suggest the importance of conducting a full economic assessment. For the trial, expected costs for both the "prepare for dialysis" and the "prepare for conservative care" interventions were estimated as being approximately £30,000 for "prepare for dialysis" and approximately £3,000 for "prepare for conservative care". The implication is that, on average the delivery of preparing for dialysis will cost approximately £27,000 more per patient over the median of 3 years from entry into the trial (eGFR less than 15 mL/min/1.73m²) to end of follow-up.

This is not, however, sufficient information upon which to base decision-making. These costs include only an NHS perspective and need to be considered with caution given they are based on prices

quoted rather than actual costs. Further, costs beyond the health service – personal and social services, third sector costs, informal care costs and other societal costs – are not included in this estimate but are clearly very important in the context of a shift to conservative care where much provision happens outside the formal health sector. It is also difficult at this stage to provide even semi-robust estimates of the relative benefits of preparing for dialysis relative to preparing for conservative care. However, if dialysis produces one additional QALY (through gains in length and/or quality of life) per patient over this period compared to conservative care, then preparing for dialysis would fall within the NICE cost-effectiveness threshold of £20-30k/QALY gained. To avoid reaching the maximum threshold of £30k, the number of QALYs gained would need to be at least 0.9. At values less than this, conservative care would be the more cost-effective option. Note that this 'back of the envelope' analysis assumes that we are only interested in the time horizon of the period of the trial. Given that there is considerable uncertainty about the gains in quality and quantity of life from dialysis in this group, this preliminary estimate suggests that the trial will inform decision-making in this area if an economic evaluation is included. A full economic evaluation is therefore clearly required in the study.

11.8.2 Means of assessment for the economic investigation

The economic evaluation will compare the costs and outcomes of Preparing for Conservative Care with those of Preparing for Dialysis from the perspectives of (a) the NHS and personal social services, and (b) society, from the point of randomisation (i) up to three years based on trial data alone and (ii) to death based on trial data combined with decision modelling. Economic evaluation will take the form of (i) cost-effectiveness analysis using QALYs generated using EQ-5D-5L, (ii) cost-effectiveness analysis using equivalent years of full/sufficient capability gained using ICECAP, (iii) cost consequences analysis using a balance sheet approach including all costs and outcomes presented in disaggregated format.

11.8.3 Data collection

Data will be collected as detailed in section 7.4. Costs from the NHS/personal social services perspective will include costs associated with hospital, hospice and general practice and community care, and will include the costs of facilities, staff salaries and medication. For both interventions, appropriate preparation costs will be included, as will costs associated with delivery of the pathway of care experienced by the patient. Discussion with clinical collaborators prior to the start of the trial will ensure that all relevant resource use is captured. For 'Preparing for conservative care' this pathway is likely to include additional support for the patient and carer/family, as well as routine monitoring. For those 'preparing for dialysis' it will include all visits, scans, surgical appointments and surgical/radiological procedures. Where possible, resource use data will be obtained routinely, through hospital and general practice records, as such data are generally much more complete. Resource use that is not captured through routine sources will be captured through the clinical trial documentation or questionnaires (adapted version of the Client Service Receipt Inventory) administered to patients/family at follow up as appropriate.

11.8.4 Data analysis

Valuations will be assigned to all QALY and capability outcomes based on published UK population tariffs at the end of the study (35, 53). During the pilot phase, the validity of the ICECAP measures in this population will be assessed, considering construct validity and sensitivity to change. All resource use will be valued using unit costs derived from national sources where these are available, or alternatively through the trial centres. Areas where detailed micro-costing is required (such as in

relation to the conservative care package) will be identified early on to enable such micro-costing to take place.

Analysis will be conducted on an ITT basis using an incremental approach. Mean total costs and outcomes will be calculated across all patients and incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for the trial arms will be estimated to produce an incremental cost per QALY gained/cost per year of full capability equivalent gained from both health and societal perspectives. Missing cost and outcome data will be imputed using appropriate methods (54). To avoid bias, imbalances in baseline utility/capability/costs between the groups will be controlled for (55). Discounting will be applied at the UK Treasury rate at the end of the study (currently 3.5%). Given the multicentre nature of this study, it may be appropriate to use hierarchical modelling techniques (with explanatory variables stratified into patient and centre levels). It is anticipated that only around one third of patients will have died by the end of the trial and so modelling will be used to extrapolate beyond the trial, to capture costs and impacts for the remaining lifetime. Markov models will be developed to simulate the clinical pathways of patients with end stage renal disease for both economic outcomes; Markov models are appropriate as they can represent situations where patients change from one state to another (for example, the shift to dialysis) as well as experiencing recurrent states (such as remaining on dialysis) over long periods of time. The models will be structured such that clinical pathways are based on the arms of the trial. Transition probabilities, costs and outcome information (in terms of both health-related quality of life, and capability wellbeing) will be taken primarily from the trial, but will be supplemented with information from routine datasets including the UK Renal Registry, as well as published data where necessary; time-dependent probabilities will be used as in other Markov models of ESKD (56). Time intervals for transitions between states will be based on the four monthly follow-up period within the trial. The effect of uncertainty will be estimated using both deterministic and probabilistic sensitivity analysis. Deterministic sensitivity analysis will focus particularly on those issues where it has been necessary to make assumptions about resource use and/or cost or where particular issues have been encountered (for example, if it appears that economies of scale might result with an overall change in practice but these are not generated with the scale of change within the randomised trial). Probabilistic sensitivity analysis will be used to estimate the joint effect of uncertainty in the model parameters.

Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves will be constructed to show the probability that the results fall below given cost-effectiveness thresholds. They will draw on the joint distribution of incremental costs and effects from the probabilistic sensitivity analysis to summarise uncertainty in the cost-effectiveness estimates. The NICE recommended cost/QALY threshold (currently £20,000 to £30,000/QALY gained (57)) at the time of the completion of the study will be used to judge the cost-effectiveness of the interventions in terms of cost/QALY gained. New research funded through MRC (<https://www.mrc.ac.uk/funding/how-we-fund-research/highlightnotices/improving-cross-sector-comparisons-beyond-qaly/successfully-funded-proposals/>) is currently aiming to determine thresholds for the ICECAP measures and these will be applied if there are no NICE recommended thresholds for ICECAP available before the end of the study. Costs broken down by more detailed perspectives (hospital, GPs, social services, third sector, patients, carers and families) will also be presented alongside all primary and secondary outcomes (including the POS-S renal condition specific measure, as well as the generic measures) from the study as a whole, in the form of a cost consequences analysis tabulating the costs and outcomes of the alternative treatment pathways.

12 DATA HANDLING

12.1 Data collection tools and source document identification

Data will be entered directly into a case report forms (CRF), patient questionnaires (PQs) and carer questionnaires (CQs). Once completed, and no more than 4 weeks after the study visit, copies of the completed CRFs, PQs and CQs must be sent securely (by post or electronically) to the CTU for entry into the database.

Standardised tools are being used:

- Co-morbidity: Davies co-morbidity Score (42) & Charlson co-morbidity index (58)
- Physical performance and functioning: WHO performance status (59), Timed “get up and go” (38) & Hand grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39)
- Quality of life: EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37), PACKS impact on carers questionnaire (40), QUALYCARE post-bereavement survey (41)

A central administrative database will be set up by BRTC that prompts research nurses when study visits are due and CRFs, PQs and CQs are outstanding.

PIs must keep records of all participating patients (sufficient to link records e.g., CRFs and hospital records), all original signed informed consent forms and copies of the CRF pages.

12.2 Data handling and record keeping

12.2.1 Clinical data

- The clinical data will be stored using REDCap. REDCap is a secure, web-based electronic data capture (EDC) system designed for the collection of research data.
- Although the system has been developed (and it is supported) by Vanderbilt University, the School of Social and Community Medicine (SSCM) (University of Bristol, ‘UoB’) has set up its own infrastructure to host the REDCap application so that all elements reside within UoB.
- REDCap is used solely for anonymized clinical data linked by a participant ID. Email address are usually collected as they are essential for the correct functioning of the survey feature. As long as the ‘Email Address’ field is flagged as an identifier and not included in the export for the statistician, then the data set can be considered pseudonymised at export and doesn't need further processing.
- Data are stored in a secured UoB server subject to standard UoB security procedures. The full database is backed up daily. Additionally, changes are logged every 5 minutes. A disaster/recovery plan is in place as part of the Service Level Agreement (SLA) we have with IT Services.
- A combination of field type validation, data ranges, logic and thorough testing is used to ensure the quality of the data collected via REDCap.
- REDCap supports the whole data lifecycle, including database design, data collection, validation, branching logic, analysis, reporting and storage. In addition, REDCap provides automated export procedures for seamless data downloads to common statistical packages (SPSS, SAS, Stata, R)
- REDCap provides a full audit log cataloguing individual changes with date/time, old value, new value and the identity of the user who made the change.
- REDCap user roles can be used in combination with field validation as identifier to determine the data that can be viewed by different members of the team. This facility can be used to avoid unblinding the statistician if necessary.

- Data entry can be performed by accessing the REDCap application directly or via surveys. In order to access the application directly, users will be added to the system (following request from the Trial Manager) by the Data Manager. It is the Trial Manager's responsibility to add the user to a specific project and role.

12.2.2 Admin Data

- The Administrative data will be kept in an "AdminDb" format SQL Server database
- Data is stored in secured clustered UoB servers subject to standard UoB security procedures. The full database is backed up daily. Additionally, every change is immediately logged. A disaster/recovery plan is in place as part of the Service Level Agreement (SLA) we have with IT Services.
- AdminDb provides a full audit log cataloguing individual changes with date/time, old value, new value and the identity of the user who made the change.
- A combination of field type validation, data ranges, logic and thorough testing is used to ensure the quality of the data collected via the user interface.
- All users of Admin data will require honorary contracts with UoB
- Data entry can be performed by accessing AdminDb directly. In order to access the application directly, users will be added to a Windows User Group (following request from the Trial Manager) and then to AdminDb itself by the Data Manager. It is the Trial Manager's responsibility to add the user to a specific role.

12.3 Access to Data

12.3.1 Source data

The PI will allow monitors from the sponsor (NBT R&I), persons responsible for the audit, representatives of the Research Ethics Committee and of the Regulatory Authorities to have direct access to source data/documents.

12.3.2 Anonymised trial data

The Senior IT Manager (in collaboration with the Chief Investigator) will manage access rights to the data set. Prospective new users must demonstrate compliance with legal, data protection and ethical guidelines before any data are released. We anticipate that anonymised trial data will be shared with other researchers to enable international prospective meta-analyses.

12.4 Archiving

This trial will be sponsored by North Bristol NHS Trust, with University of Bristol as the data custodian. Hard copies of completed case report forms will be kept for 15 years following the end of a study to enable audit of data used in publications. These will be kept at the University of Bristol for this time and then destroyed.

13 MONITORING, AUDIT & INSPECTION

The study will be monitored in accordance with North Bristol NHS Trust's Monitoring SOP. All trial related documents will be made available on request for monitoring and audit by North Bristol NHS Trust, the Research Ethics Committee and available for inspection by other licensed bodies. The monitoring plan will be developed and agreed by the sponsor.

Monitoring and audits undertaken by North Bristol NHS Trust, under their remit as sponsor, or individuals appointed responsibility for monitoring on behalf of the Trust, will ensure adherence to GCP and the NHS Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care (2nd edition). Remote monitoring will be conducted based on information submitted by sites and analysis of the trial database. Site visits will then be initiated using a risk-based approach.

14 ETHICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

14.1 Research Ethics Committee review & reports

Ethical and Health Research Authority (HRA) approval will be sought through the HRA for the trial and the qualitative work embedded within the trial. While the trial raises some ethical issues, we hope the Committee will be reassured by (a) the close involvement of PPI in the development of the trial and its patient facing information, (b) the requirement for participants to have the mental capacity to voluntarily participate in the trial, (c) the involvement of relatives at the trial information and consent stage, (d) the continuous monitoring of research discussions at the trial information and consent stages, (e) involvement of an expert in Medical Ethics and Law, and (f) the international guidelines-based (3), NICE guidance-consistent (50) conservative care pathway, developed with patient involvement, that will form the intervention.

All research will be performed in accordance with the recommendations guiding biomedical research involving human subjects adopted in the 18th World Medical Assembly, Helsinki, Finland. All staff doing specific research activities will be required to complete training in Good Clinical Practice.

Health Research Authority approval will be sought, where appropriate, for any analyses relating to UK Renal Registry data collected under section 251 of the NHS Act 2006 on nonparticipating patients.

All correspondence with the REC will be retained in the Trial Master File/Investigator Site File. An annual progress report will be submitted to the REC within 30 days of the anniversary date on which the favourable opinion was given, and annually until the trial is declared ended. The CI will notify the REC of the end of the study and if the study is ended prematurely (including the reasons for the premature termination). Within one year after the end of the study, the CI will submit a final report with the results, including any publications/abstracts, to the REC.

14.2 Peer review

The proposal for this trial has been peer-reviewed through the NIHR HTA peer-review process, which includes independent expert and lay reviewers.

In addition, the protocol has been reviewed by the Trial Management Group and the Sponsor.

14.3 Public and Patient Involvement

Patients and their relatives/carers have been involved in the development of the study design. Their input has led us to focus on quality of life as well as survival, and providing patients and their relatives with clear information to enable informed decisions. It has also emphasised the importance people place on being able to stay at home as much as possible and minimise the impact on family carers. Representatives of the National Kidney Federation have worked with the research team to agree the research topic and randomised-nature of the study. They have attended all three study development meetings.

The topic and trial design have arisen from prior exploratory work with patients. It has been discussed in small focus groups with patients and their families (~10) as well as at a dedicated patient workshop and a local patient association meeting. This has changed the application in three major ways:

- Encouraging us to use a combination of quality and quantity of life as the primary end-point, not just survival.
- Ensuring that a wide range of aspects of quality of life are captured.
- Offering to provide trial information in the patient's home where family members can be present and provide support to the patient whilst discussing the details of the trial.

Patients and the public will take an active role in the running of the trial through:

- The Trial Management Group: PPI co-applicants will sit on the TMG.
- The Patient Advisory Group (PAG): This will evolve from the patient workshop held to assess the acceptability of the pathways being tested and the trial design. It will be co-chaired by our PPI co-applicants and provide advice, support and oversight of patients' involvement throughout the study. This group will meet 6 monthly in the first two years then annually.

Members of the PAG will develop patient information and advise on study design to optimise its acceptability to patients. The PAG will also act as a point of contact for patients and their relatives. Progress and results from the study will be presented to the group and patient/carer interpretation sought. They will also advise on the best way to disseminate the study findings to patients, including the production of plain English summaries.

Members of the PPI group will be involved in a number of ways – face-to-face meetings, workshops for more in-depth work and email for reviewing documents – in the following activities:

- Optimising the conservative care intervention (months 1-6) to ensure that it is acceptable to patients and carers
- Designing information and consent sheets and advising on the recruitment process
- Acting as a point of contact for participants and potential-participants throughout the study
- Reading summaries of the qualitative and QRI findings to ensure that patient concerns are adequately reflected in the analysis
- Developing plain English summaries of the findings that can be used by patients and carers to assist them in making evidence based treatment decisions and developing a dissemination policy.

14.4 Regulatory Compliance

Before any site can enrol patients into the trial, the CI/PI or designee will obtain confirmation of capacity and capability for each site.

For all amendments the CI/PI or designee will confirm with the Sponsor, the HRA (+/- REC) and sites' R&D departments that permissions are ongoing.

14.5 Protocol compliance

There will be no prospective, planned deviations or waivers to the protocol. Accidental protocol deviations can happen at any time, but they must be adequately documented on the relevant forms (see Key Trial Contacts section for link to website) and reported to the CI and Sponsor immediately. Deviations from the protocol which are found to frequently recur are not acceptable, will require immediate action and could potentially be classified as a serious breach.

14.6 Notification of Serious Breaches to GCP and/or the protocol

A “serious breach” is a breach which is likely to effect to a significant degree –

- a) the safety or physical or mental integrity of the subjects of the trial; or
- b) the scientific value of the trial

The sponsor must be notified immediately of any case where the above definition applies during the trial conduct phase. They will assess the seriousness of any breach as per the appropriate SOP (see Key Trial Contacts section for link to website).

14.7 Data protection and patient confidentiality

The University of Bristol will be the data custodian. All data held in Bristol will conform to the University of Bristol Data Security Policy and in Compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Data collected on paper case report forms at study centres or as questionnaires from participants will be identifiable only by participant study number. This will be transported by post or securely electronically to the PrepareME study office at University of Bristol, and stored in a secure locked cabinet in a locked room.

Data obtained by paper will also be entered onto and maintained on an SQL Server database system maintained by University of Bristol Information Services. Information capable of identifying individuals and the nature of treatment received will be held in the database with passwords restricted to PrepareME study staff. Information capable of identifying participants will not be removed from University of Bristol or clinical centres or made available in any form to those outside the study.

Patient identification codes will be held by the University of Bristol for 15 years, all other data sources will be stored for 15 years after the close of the study. Personal data (e.g. name and address, or any data from which a participant might be identified) will be withdrawn from the study if this is requested by a participant.

Interviews and appointments will be documented on an encrypted digital recorder which will be locked in a secured cabinet at the School of Social and Community Medicine. Recordings will be transferred onto a computer as soon as possible after each interview, and stored only in a password protected drive maintained by the University of Bristol. Only the qualitative researchers working on this study will have access to this drive.

Recordings and transcriptions will be named with a study-assigned participant number, centre initials, and the date of recording. There will be no participant identifiers in files, databases, or transcripts, which will only be labelled with study assigned participant numbers. Coding keys matching the name of the participants with their study participation number will be stored in a password protected spreadsheet, which will be maintained and only accessed by the qualitative researchers. All recordings will be coded and securely transferred to a University of Bristol approved transcription company that has signed the required confidentiality agreements. All transcripts will be anonymised upon receipt.

All electronic data files will (databases and audio-recordings) be saved in a secured computer and to a password protected University of Bristol network space, in accordance with the University of Bristol's data security policies.

All nonessential data will be wiped upon completion of the study. Essential documents will be kept for up to 15 years, after which they will be deleted and all copies destroyed in accordance with the University of Bristol's secure erasure of data policy.

The anonymised interview data (transcripts only) will be uploaded to an 'open data' repository, subject to individual written informed consent from the participants. This will have been fully explained in the Patient Information Sheet, and requires participants to initial a specific statement on the Consent Form (if they agree).

14.8 Financial and other competing interests for the chief investigator, PIs at each site and committee members for the overall trial management

The research team and all PIs must disclose any ownership interests that may be related to products, services, or interventions considered for use in the trial or that may be significantly affected by the trial. Competing interests will be reported in all publications and in the final report.

14.9 Indemnity

The necessary trial insurance is provided by the Sponsor. North Bristol NHS Trust holds standard NHS Hospital Indemnity and insurance cover with NHS Litigation Authority for NHS Trusts in England, which apply to this trial. The Patient Information Sheet provides a statement regarding indemnity for negligent and non-negligent harm.

14.10 Amendments

The Sponsor will determine whether an amendment is substantial or non-substantial. All amendments will be processed through the HRA and where appropriate the REC. If applicable, other specialist review bodies (e.g. CAG) will be notified about substantial amendments in case the amendment affects their opinion of the study. Amendments will also be notified to NHS R&D departments of participating sites to confirm ongoing capacity and capability to deliver the study.

14.11 Post trial care

Following the end of the trial, continued provision of the conservative care intervention (in the format specified for the trial) will be at the discretion of the normal care team and is likely to depend on the trial results. Participants will be informed of this in the written information given to them when they are considering entering the trial.

14.12 Access to the final trial dataset

Anonymous research data will be stored securely and kept for future analysis. Because this is a unique trial it may be that the data will be valuable for many years to come. It might be important to make it available for analysis in Cochrane or other reviews.

Members of the TMG will develop a data sharing policy consistent with University of Bristol policy and reviewed by the TSC. Data will be kept anonymous on secure access computers, and access will be via written confidentiality and data sharing agreements (DSA) with the CI (or his appointed nominee), supervised by the CI with the involvement of other members of the research team. All requests for data release outside of the planned analyses will be considered by the TSC. Any request approved will be covered by a written Data Sharing Agreement, detailing limitations of use, transfer to 3rd parties, data storage and acknowledgements. The person applying for use of the data will be scrutinized for appropriate eligibility by members of the research team. All requests will require their own separate REC approval prior to data being released. Data will not be released prior to analyses for purposes that might detrimentally affect the trial integrity.

15 DISSEMINATION POLICY

A comprehensive plan for disseminating PrepareME results will be developed by TMG which will include PPI co-applicants. The results of the study will be published in academic journals and all participants will be offered a plain English summary of the main findings of the study. Meetings will be arranged with stakeholders to consider the implications of the results and how they will most effectively be translated into clinical practice.

On completion of the trial a final report will be prepared for the Funder (NHR HTA) and once approved made publicly available on their website. The Funder needs formal notice in advance of all publications and the Funder and Sponsor need to be acknowledged within the publications.

The results of the trial are likely to be highly novel and practice changing and will be targeted at high impact general medical journals such as the BMJ, the Lancet, the New England Journal of Medicine and the Journal of the American Medical Association. Findings will be presented at leading nephrology conferences in Europe (the ERA-EDTA Annual Congress) and North America (The American Society of Nephrology Kidney Week) as well as at the UK Kidney Week, co-hosted by the Renal Association and the multi-disciplinary British Renal Society. Findings will also be used to inform future iterations of the NICE-approved UK Renal Association clinical guidelines and the European Renal Best Practice clinical guidelines on preparing for dialysis.

We will also disseminate the findings through the UK Renal Registry and the UK Renal Association. Both have active twitter accounts with 1.9k and 2.3k followers, respectively. A PrepareME twitter account will be set up to keep interested clinicians, policy makers and patients up-to-date with trial progress. Progress and results will also be reported back to the community through the Renal Association's monthly e-newsletter to all members and through the joint UK Kidney Research Consortium-UK Renal Registry Clinical Study Groups for chronic kidney disease and dialysis. Representatives from the British Kidney Patient Association and National Kidney Federation have worked with us on this bid and they too are active on social media and have established channels for communicating the progress and findings of the study to patients such as regular newsletters, a network of kidney patient associations and annual meetings.

The results of the study will be published in peer-reviewed open access journals and all participants will be offered a plain English summary of the findings.

Once finalised, the protocol will be published in an open access academic journal. With the key findings likely to be practice changing and of interest to a wide range of clinicians and policy makers, they will be of interest to high impact journals such as the BMJ, the Lancet, the New England Journal of Medicine and the Journal of the American Medical Association. The Bristol Randomised Trials Collaboration has a track record of publishing output from its complex trials in high impact clinical journals and high respected methodological journals.

The findings in these peer-reviewed publications will in turn inform standards in future versions of the UK Renal Association Clinical Practice Guidelines, European Renal Best Practice Guidelines and Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes guidelines relating to planning for dialysis or conservative care.

15.1 Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers

The final trial report will be written by the CI with support from the TMG and all co-investigators. All TMG members and co-investigators who have contributed to the design, conduct analysis and write up will be offered authorship on the final report.

On manuscripts arising from the trial, authorship will be on an individual authorship basis (rather than group authorship basis) with inclusion based on the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors will be developed.

16 REFERENCES

1. Gilg J, Caskey FJ, Fogarty D. UK Renal Registry 18th Annual Report: Chapter 1 UK Renal Replacement Therapy Incidence in 2014: National and Centre-specific Analyses. *Nephron Clin Pract*. 2016.
2. Pippias M, Jager KJ, Kramer A, Leivestad T, Sanchez MB, Caskey FJ, et al. The changing trends and outcomes in renal replacement therapy: data from the ERA-EDTA Registry. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2015;In press.
3. Roderick P, Rayner H, Tonkin-Crine S, Okamoto I, Eyles C, Leydon G, et al. A national study of practice patterns in UK renal units in the use of dialysis and conservative kidney management to treat people aged 75 years and over with chronic kidney failure. Health Services and Delivery Research. Southampton (UK)2015.
4. Steenkamp R, Rao A, Roderick P. UK Renal Registry 17th Annual Report: Chapter 5 Survival and Cause of Death in UK Adult Patients on Renal Replacement Therapy in 2013: National and Centre-specific Analyses. *Nephron*. 2015;129 Suppl 1:99-129. PubMed PMID: 25695809.
5. Kurella Tamura M, Covinsky KE, Chertow GM, Yaffe K, Landefeld CS, McCulloch CE. Functional status of elderly adults before and after initiation of dialysis. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2009 Oct 15;361(16):1539-47. PubMed PMID: 19828531. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2789552.
6. Hussain JA, Mooney A, Russon L. Comparison of survival analysis and palliative care involvement in patients aged over 70 years choosing conservative management or renal replacement therapy in advanced chronic kidney disease. *Palliative medicine*. 2013 Oct;27(9):829-39. PubMed PMID: 23652841.
7. Murtagh FE, Marsh JE, Donohoe P, Ekbal NJ, Sheerin NS, Harris FE. Dialysis or not? A comparative survival study of patients over 75 years with chronic kidney disease stage 5. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2007 Jul;22(7):1955-62. PubMed PMID: 17412702. eng.
8. Brown MA, Collett GK, Josland EA, Foote C, Li Q, Brennan FP. CKD in elderly patients managed without dialysis: survival, symptoms, and quality of life. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2015 Feb 6;10(2):260-8. PubMed PMID: 25614492. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4317735.
9. Da Silva-Gane M, Wellsted D, Greenshields H, Norton S, Chandna SM, Farrington K. Quality of life and survival in patients with advanced kidney failure managed conservatively or by dialysis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2012 Dec;7(12):2002-9. PubMed PMID: 22956262. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3513739.
10. De Biase V, Tobaldini O, Boaretti C, Abaterusso C, Pertica N, Loschiavo C, et al. Prolonged conservative treatment for frail elderly patients with end-stage renal disease: the Verona experience. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2008 Apr;23(4):1313-7. PubMed PMID: 18029376.
11. Shum CK, Tam KF, Chak WL, Chan TC, Mak YF, Chau KF. Outcomes in older adults with stage 5 chronic kidney disease: comparison of peritoneal dialysis and conservative management. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences*. 2014 Mar;69(3):308-14. PubMed PMID: 23913933.
12. Seow YY, Cheung YB, Qu LM, Yee AC. Trajectory of quality of life for poor prognosis stage 5D chronic kidney disease with and without dialysis. *American journal of nephrology*. 2013;37(3):231-8. PubMed PMID: 23467046.
13. Belasco A, Barbosa D, Bettencourt AR, Diccini S, Sesso R. Quality of life of family caregivers of elderly patients on hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2006 Dec;48(6):955-63. PubMed PMID: 17162150.
14. Noble H, Kelly D, Hudson D. Experiences of carers supporting dying renal patients managed without dialysis. *J Adv Nurs*. 2013;69:1829-39.
15. Joly D, Anglicheau D, Alberti C, Nguyen A-T, Touam M, Grunfeld J-P, et al. Octogenarians Reaching End-Stage Renal Disease: Cohort Study of Decision-Making and Clinical Outcomes. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2003 April 1, 2003;14(4):1012-21.
16. Chan CH, Noble H, Lo SH, Kwan TH, Lee SL, Sze WK. Palliative care for patients with end-stage renal disease: experiences from Hong Kong. *International journal of palliative nursing*. 2007 Jul;13(7):310-4. PubMed PMID: 17851374.
17. Teo BW, Ma V, Xu H, Li J, Lee EJ, Nephrology Clinical Research G. Profile of hospitalisation and death in the first year after diagnosis of end-stage renal disease in a multi-ethnic Asian population. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore*. 2010 Feb;39(2):79-87. PubMed PMID: 20237727.

18. Okamoto I, Tonkin-Crine S, Rayner H, Murtagh FE, Farrington K, Caskey F, et al. Conservative care for ESRD in the United kingdom: a national survey. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2015 Jan 7;10(1):120-6. PubMed PMID: 25388518.
19. Tonkin-Crine S, Okamoto I, Leydon GM, Murtagh FE, Farrington K, Caskey F, et al. Understanding by older patients of dialysis and conservative management for chronic kidney failure. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2015 Mar;65(3):443-50. PubMed PMID: 25304984. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4339698.
20. Tonkin-Crine S, Santer M, Leydon GM, Murtagh FE, Farrington K, Caskey F, et al. GPs' views on managing advanced chronic kidney disease in primary care: a qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2015 Jul;65(636):e469-77. PubMed PMID: 26120137. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4484948.
21. Jager KJ, Ocaik G, Drechsler C, Caskey FJ, Evans M, Postorino M, et al. The EQUAL study: a European study in chronic kidney disease stage 4 patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2012 Oct;27 Suppl 3:iii27-31. PubMed PMID: 22764196. Eng.
22. Stengel B, Combe C, Jacquelinet C, Briancon S, Fouque D, Laville M, et al. The French Chronic Kidney Disease-Renal Epidemiology and Information Network (CKD-REIN) cohort study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2014 Aug;29(8):1500-7. PubMed PMID: 24064325. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4106639.
23. de Goeij MC, Ocaik G, Rotmans JI, Eijgenraam JW, Dekker FW, Halbesma N. Course of symptoms and health-related quality of life during specialized pre-dialysis care. *PLoS one*. 2014;9(4):e93069. PubMed PMID: 24699666. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3974712.
24. Office for National Statistics. National Population Projections, 2010-Based Projections 2011 [13th August 2015]. Available from: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/npp/national-population-projections/2010-based-projections/rep-2010-based-npp-results-summary.html>.
25. Appleby J. Spending on health and social care over the next 50 years. Why think long term? London, UK: Kings Fund, 2013.
26. Department of Health. National Services Framework - Part 2. London, UK: Department of Health, 2005.
27. Davison SN, Levin A, Moss AH, Jha V, Brown EA, Brennan F, et al. Executive summary of the KDIGO Controversies Conference on Supportive Care in Chronic Kidney Disease: developing a roadmap to improving quality care. *Kidney international*. 2015 Apr 29. PubMed PMID: 25923985.
28. Kerr M, Bray B, Medcalf J, O'Donoghue DJ, Matthews B. Estimating the financial cost of chronic kidney disease to the NHS in England. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2012 Oct;27 Suppl 3:iii73-80. PubMed PMID: 22815543. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3484716.
29. Carson RC, Juszczak M, Davenport A, Burns A. Is Maximum Conservative Management an Equivalent Treatment Option to Dialysis for Elderly Patients with Significant Comorbid Disease? *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2009 October 1, 2009;4(10):1611-9.
30. Brown L, Gardner G, Bonner A. A comparison of treatment options for management of End Stage Kidney Disease in elderly patients: A systematic review protocol. *The JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*. 2013;11(4):12.
31. Donovan JL, Paramasivan S, de Salis I, Toerien M. Clear obstacles and hidden challenges: understanding recruiter perspectives in six pragmatic randomised controlled trials. *Trials*. 2014;15:5. PubMed PMID: 24393291. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3892115.
32. Morton RL, Snelling P, Webster AC, Rose J, Masterson R, Johnson DW, et al. Factors influencing patient choice of dialysis versus conservative care to treat end-stage kidney disease. *CMAJ*. 2012 Mar 20;184(5):E277-83. PubMed PMID: 22311947. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3307582.
33. Oppe M, Devlin NJ, van Hout B, Krabbe PF, de Charro F. A program of methodological research to arrive at the new international EQ-5D-5L valuation protocol. *Value Health*. 2014 Jun;17(4):445-53. PubMed PMID: 24969006.
34. Murphy EL, Murtagh FE, Carey I, Sheerin NS. Understanding symptoms in patients with advanced chronic kidney disease managed without dialysis: use of a short patient-completed assessment tool. *Nephron Clin Pract*. 2009;111(1):c74-80. PubMed PMID: 19088482. eng.
35. Coast J, Flynn TN, Natarajan L, Sproston K, Lewis J, Louviere JJ, et al. Valuing the ICECAP capability index for older people. *Social science & medicine* (1982). 2008 Sep;67(5):874-82. PubMed PMID: 18572295.
36. Sutton EJ, Coast J. Development of a supportive care measure for economic evaluation of end-of-life care using qualitative methods. *Palliative medicine*. 2014 Feb;28(2):151-7. PubMed PMID: 23698452.

37. Man MS, Chaplin K, Mann C, Bower P, Brookes S, Fitzpatrick B, et al. Improving the management of multimorbidity in general practice: protocol of a cluster randomised controlled trial (The 3D Study). *BMJ open*. 2016 Apr 25;6(4):e011261. PubMed PMID: 27113241. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4854003.
38. Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed "Up & Go": a test of basic functional mobility for frail elderly persons. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 1991 Feb;39(2):142-8. PubMed PMID: 1991946.
39. Roberts HC, Denison HJ, Martin HJ, Patel HP, Syddall H, Cooper C, et al. A review of the measurement of grip strength in clinical and epidemiological studies: towards a standardised approach. *Age and ageing*. 2011 Jul;40(4):423-9. PubMed PMID: 21624928.
40. Noble HR, Agus A, Brazil K, Burns A, Goodfellow NA, Guiney M, et al. Palliative Care in chronic Kidney diSease: the PACKS study--quality of life, decision making, costs and impact on carers in people managed without dialysis. *BMC nephrology*. 2015;16:104. PubMed PMID: 26163382. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4499188.
41. Gomes B, McCrone P, Hall S, Koffman J, Higginson IJ. Variations in the quality and costs of end-of-life care, preferences and palliative outcomes for cancer patients by place of death: the QUALYCARE study. *BMC cancer*. 2010;10:400. PubMed PMID: 20678203. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2919503.
42. Davies SJ, Phillips L, Naish PF, Russell GI. Quantifying comorbidity in peritoneal dialysis patients and its relationship to other predictors of survival. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2002 Jun;17(6):1085-92. PubMed PMID: 12032201. eng.
43. Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman D, Group C. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomized trials. *JAMA*. 2001 Apr 18;285(15):1987-91. PubMed PMID: 11308435.
44. Singer PA, Martin DK, Kelner M. Quality end-of-life care: patients' perspectives. *Jama*. 1999 Jan 13;281(2):163-8. PubMed PMID: 9917120. eng.
45. O'Cathain A, Thomas KJ, Drabble SJ, Rudolph A, Goode J, Hewison J. Maximising the value of combining qualitative research and randomised controlled trials in health research: the QUALitative Research in Trials (QUART) study--a mixed methods study. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)*. 2014 Jun;18(38):1-197, v-vi. PubMed PMID: 24914457. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4781055.
46. group TBs. Bluebelle study (phase A): a mixed-methods feasibility study to inform an RCT of surgical wound dressing strategies. *BMJ open*. 2016;6(9):e012635.
47. Roderick P, Nicholson T, Armitage A, Mehta R, Mullee M, Gerard K, et al. An evaluation of the costs, effectiveness and quality of renal replacement therapy provision in renal satellite units in England and Wales. Southampton, UK.: 2005.
48. Lendrem D, Mitchell S, McMeekin P, Bowman S, Price E, Pease CT, et al. Health-related utility values of patients with primary Sjogren's syndrome and its predictors. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*. 2014 Jul;73(7):1362-8. PubMed PMID: 23761688.
49. Conner-Spady B, Cumming C, Nabholz JM, Jacobs P, Stewart D. Responsiveness of the EuroQol in breast cancer patients undergoing high dose chemotherapy. *Qual Life Res*. 2001;10(6):479-86. PubMed PMID: 11789549.
50. Jansson KA, Granath F. Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D) before and after orthopedic surgery. *Acta orthopaedica*. 2011 Feb;82(1):82-9. PubMed PMID: 21189112. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3230002.
51. Lillegraven S, Kristiansen IS, Kvien TK. Comparison of utility measures and their relationship with other health status measures in 1041 patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*. 2010 Oct;69(10):1762-7. PubMed PMID: 20448285.
52. Kontopantelis E. SKBIM: Stata module to generate a sample from a bimodal distribution using normal or skewed (skew-normal) unimodal distributions, as defined by the user: Boston College Department of Economics, revised 25 Nov 2008. Available from: <http://econpapers.repec.org/software/bocbocode/s456917.htm>.
53. van Hout B, Janssen MF, Feng YS, Kohlmann T, Busschbach J, Golicki D, et al. Interim scoring for the EQ-5D-5L: mapping the EQ-5D-5L to EQ-5D-3L value sets. *Value Health*. 2012 Jul-Aug;15(5):708-15. PubMed PMID: 22867780.
54. Faria R, Gomes M, Epstein D, White IR. A guide to handling missing data in cost-effectiveness analysis conducted within randomised controlled trials. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2014 Dec;32(12):1157-70. PubMed PMID: 25069632. Pubmed Central PMCID: 4244574.

55. Ridyard CH, Hughes DA. Methods for the collection of resource use data within clinical trials: a systematic review of studies funded by the UK Health Technology Assessment program. *Value Health*. 2010 Dec;13(8):867-72. PubMed PMID: 20946187.
56. Howard K, Salkeld G, White S, McDonald S, Chadban S, Craig JC, et al. The cost-effectiveness of increasing kidney transplantation and home-based dialysis. *Nephrology*. 2009;14(1):123-32.
57. Appleby J, Devlin N, Parkin D. NICE's cost effectiveness threshold. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2007 Aug 25;335(7616):358-9. PubMed PMID: 17717337. Pubmed Central PMCID: 1952475.
58. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic co-morbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chron Dis*. 1987;40(5):373-83.
59. Oken MM, Creech RH, Tormey DC, Horton J, Davis TE, McFadden ET, et al. Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *American journal of clinical oncology*. 1982 Dec;5(6):649-55. PubMed PMID: 7165009.

17 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Procedures for randomised controlled trial

Procedures		Screening Face-to-face visits -3, -2, -1 (as required)	Baseline Face-to-face visit 1	Treatment Phase		Follow Up (Linkage)	Event based
				Telephone visits 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12	Face-to-face visits 4, 7, 10		
Eligibility assessment		√					
Informed consent		√					
Randomisation			√				
Demographics	Age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, education level, distance lived from kidney clinic, alcohol consumption, smoking history		√				
Clinical	Primary renal disease, date first seen by nephrologist, co-morbidities, dietary restrictions, prescribed medication		√				
Resource use	Hospital/nursing home/residential home days/hospice days, other hospital outpatient services, primary care & community services, help from family & friends		√				
Laboratory tests	Creatinine, urea, albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume, sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total		√				

	cholesterol. (From the date of the study visit or the closest date prior to the study visit.)						
Physical assessment	Height, weight, blood pressure, heart rate, waist circumference, timed "get up and go" (38), hand grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39), WHO performance status. (Details in standard operating procedures.)		√				
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)		√				
Family/carer reported	PACKS impact on carers questionnaire (40)		√				
Clinical	Co-morbidities, hospital admissions including dates & causes, dialysis access surgery procedures & complications, other surgery, dialysis treatment received, dietary restrictions, prescribed medication, date location & cause of death.			√	√		
Resource use	Hospital/nursing home/residential home days/hospice days, other hospital outpatient services, primary care & community services, help from family & friends			√	√		
Laboratory tests (all done routinely as part of standard care; pre-dialysis, if on	Creatinine, urea (pre- and post-dialysis if on haemodialysis), albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume,			√	√		

dialysis, unless otherwise stated)	sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total cholesterol. (From the date of the study visit or the closest date prior to the study visit.)						
Physical assessment	Weight, blood pressure, heart rate, waist circumference, timed "get up and go" (38), hand grip strength (Jamar hand dynamometer) (39), WHO performance status. (Details in standard operating procedures.)				√		
Compliance with trial	Number of home visits by clinical team from renal unit; Number of attendances at CKD clinic; Number of telephone visits from clinical team at renal unit; Number of visits from the palliative care team; Number of telephone visits from the palliative care team; Advance care plan in place produced; Advance care plan reviewed/updated; Cardiopulmonary resuscitation decision documented; Preferred place of death documented			√	√		
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)			√	√		
Family/carers reported	PACKS impact on carers questionnaire (40), QUALYCARE post-			√	√		

	bereavement survey (41)						
Clinical	Co-morbidities, hospital admissions including dates & causes, dialysis access surgery procedures & complications, other surgery, dialysis treatment received, date location & cause of death.					√	
Resource use	Hospital days, other hospital outpatient services.					√	
Laboratory tests	Creatinine, urea (pre- and post-dialysis if on haemodialysis), albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume, sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total cholesterol.					√	
SAE assessments			√	√	√		
SAE reporting							√

Appendix 2 - Registry follow up study

Eligible patients who decline participation in the RCT will be documented in screening logs and invited to consent to participate in a cohort study. The overall aim of this study is to assess the external validity the randomised controlled trial by comparing three groups of patients:

1. Participants in the PrepareME RCT
2. Non-participants in the PrepareME RCT who consent for registry follow-up (the focus of this appendix), and
3. People identified from the UKRR as aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² who were not approached to participate in the RCT. As these patients are not being asked to give individual consent for their data to be analysed, appropriate applications will be made to the Health Research Authority for Section 251 support to carry out this comparison.

More specifically the study will:

- Describe the outcomes of people who were eligible for the PrepareME RCT but chose not to participate (and so received standard care, commencing dialysis or receiving conservative care when indicated)
- Comparing the baseline characteristics of this eligible but not randomised group against patients who participated in the PrepareME RCT and people identified from the UKRR as aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² who were not approached to participate in the RCT.
- Compare the outcomes of this eligible but not randomised group against patients who participated in the PrepareME RCT and people identified from the UKRR as aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² who were not approached to participate in the RCT.

Individuals who decline participation in the PrepareME RCT will be provided with written information about the Registry follow-up study. This will be at the end of discussions about participating in the PrepareME RCT and so patients will offered a few days to consider participation in the Registry follow up study. The nurse will:

- Arrange to follow up the decision about participation in the Registry follow up study by telephone or at the next clinic appointment
- Arrange a face-to-face meeting with the patient to obtain informed consent and conduct the baseline interview, physical assessment and administer the questionnaires, probably at the next clinic appointment
- Explain what will happen next in terms of (i) their normal care, (ii) annual questionnaires on patient reported outcomes and (iii) their registry follow up

If, however, they feel ready to decide straight away then progressing to participate in the Registry follow up study on the same day will be permitted.

Data collection for the registry follow up study

Baseline data

Demographic, social, clinical, resource use, laboratory and patient/ carer reported data will be collected by research nurses during study visits at baseline (following consent). The physical assessment will be performed by the research nurse following standard operating procedures. No blood or urine tests are required other than those that will already have been performed as part of routine care.

Table 4 Summary of baseline data for the registry follow up study.

Demographics/ social	Age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, education level, distance lived from kidney clinic, alcohol consumption, smoking history
Clinical	Primary renal disease, date first seen by nephrologist, co-morbidities, dietary restrictions, prescribed medication
Laboratory	Creatinine, urea, albumin, haemoglobin, haematocrit, mean corpuscular volume, sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, corrected calcium, phosphate, intact parathyroid hormone, total cholesterol. (From the date of the study visit or the closest date prior to the study visit.)
Physical assessment	Height, weight, blood pressure, heart rate, WHO performance status. (Details in standard operating procedures.)
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35)/ ICECAP-SCM (36), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)

Follow up data

There are no study visits following the baseline study visit. All participants will be asked at recruitment to consent to researchers having access to their primary and secondary care clinical notes and to linkage to existing healthcare databases, such as Hospital Episode Statistics, the Office for National Statistics and the UK Renal Registry. This will provide outcomes data such as commencement of acute or chronic dialysis, hospital admissions for medical and surgical reasons and date and cause of death, including for participants that might otherwise be lost to follow up, for example if they move to a non-participating renal unit.

Once a year, participants will be sent a patient questionnaire for completion and return by post. This will continue for a minimum of 27 months and a maximum of 51 months, i.e. for the duration of the RCT follow up.

Table 5 Summary of follow up data collection for the registry follow up study

		Annually By post
Patient reported	EQ-5D-5L (33), POS-S renal (34), ICECAP-O (35), Multimorbidity Treatment Burden Questionnaire (37)	•
Key: • Directly reported by participant		

Statistical analyses

We will use descriptive statistics to describe the baseline characteristics of (1) participants in the PrepareME RCT, (2) non-participants in the PrepareME RCT who consent for registry follow-up and (3) people identified from the UKRR aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² who were not approached to participate in the RCT. This will include age, gender, social deprivation, rate of decline in eGFR in the past 12 months, co-morbidity and dialysis decision making status. For those patients

participating in the RCT and non-participants who consented to registry follow-up, we will also describe differences in quality of life and symptom burden at baseline.

We will use descriptive statistics to describe the outcomes of people eligible for the PrepareME RCT who do not consent to registry follow-up as these patients will receive standard care. We will describe the post-baseline rate of decline in eGFR, rate of decline in quality of life, rate of increase in symptoms. We will describe when dialysis is started and – among those who undergo dialysis – survival rates and quality of life on dialysis. Outcomes will also be compared with those of participants in the PrepareME RCT and – where data are available – patients identified from UKRR who are aged 65+ with an eGFR less than 15mL/min/1.73m² who were not approached to participate in the RCT.

A full Statistical Analysis Plan will be developed and reviewed by the Trial Steering Committee.

Appendix 3 – Schedule of Procedures for registry follow up study

Procedures	Screening Face-to-face visits -3, -2, -1 (as required)	Baseline Face-to-face visit 1	Follow Up (Linkage and postal)
Eligibility assessment	√		
Informed consent	√		
Demographics		√	
Medical history		√	√
Medications		√	
Laboratory tests		√	√
Height		√	
Weight		√	
Blood pressure		√	
Heart rate		√	
WHO Performance Status		√	
Patient questionnaires		√	√

Appendix 4 – Flow diagram of consent processes

For Health Care Professionals

Information Sheet – so they can decide whether to allow their patients to be assessed.

Health professionals – to allow interviews +/- audio recording of meetings and discussions re study

- PIS^{hp_quali1}
- CF^{hp_quali1}

For all patients that are eligible

- Invitation letter – to mention audio-recording of research nurse telephone communication
- PIS^{p_info} – to cover providing information about RCT and Registry follow-up and audio-recording discussions
- CF^{p_v} – Verbal consent for audio-recording of research nurse telephone communication



For patients (^p) and carers (^c) that agree to Information Visits

1. Start by getting consent for giving information and the embedded qualitative research:
 - PIS^{p&c_info&quali} – to cover giving information about the study and taking part in stage 2 of the qualitative research (patient and carers)
 - CF^{p_info&quali} – to cover giving information about the study and taking part in stage 2 of the qualitative research (patients)
 - CF^{c_info&quali} – to cover giving information about the study and taking part in stage 2 of the qualitative research (carers)
2. Then give all eligible participants information about the RCT:
 - PIS^{rct} – to cover RCT, and if they agree to the RCT
3. If they decline the RCT:
 - PIS^{rfu} – to cover Registry follow up

Agree to RCT	Agree to registry follow up only
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF^{rct} – to cover RCT - CF^{p_quali3} – to cover patient qualitative research phase 3 - Letter to their health professionals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF^{rfu} – to cover Registry follow up - Letter to their health professionals

In a subset:

- PIS^{quali3} – to cover qualitative research phase 3 (patients and carers)
- CF^{c_quali3} – to cover carer qualitative research phase 3

Carers (^c) – to allow interviews and post-bereavement survey

- PIS^{c_quali3}
- CF^{c_quali3}