

29.03.2024

Research Protocol

Title

Study Protocol- The impact of social deprivation on development and progression of diabetic kidney disease

Authors

Caoimhe Casey (1, 2), Claire M Buckley (1), Patricia M Kearney (1), Matthew D Griffin (3, 4), Sean F Dinneen (2, 5), Tomás P Griffin (2, 5)

Institutions

1. School of Public Health, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

2. Centre for Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolism, Galway University Hospitals, Galway, Ireland

3. Regenerative Medicine Institute (REMEDI) at CÚRAM SFI Research Centre for Medical Devices, School of Medicine, University of Galway, Galway, Ireland

4. Department of Nephrology, Galway University Hospital, Galway, Ireland

5. School of Medicine, University of Galway, Galway, Ireland

Corresponding Author:

Caoimhe Casey. Caoimhe.casey@umail.ucc.ie

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29.03.2024

20 Short title: “Deprivation and Diabetic Kidney Disease”

21 Funding Statement

22 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-
23 for-profit sectors.

24 Competing Interests Statement

25 CC received funding to attend national and international diabetes conferences from Novo Nordisk.
26 TPG received honoraria for speaker fees and/or advisory boards from Novo Nordisk, Sanofi Aventis,
27 Mundipharma Pharmaceuticals, Dexcom, Abbott Diabetes Care, AbbVie, Astra Zeneca and Eli Lilly.

28

29 Abstract

30 Introduction

31 Diabetes is one of the leading causes of chronic kidney disease. Social deprivation is recognised as a
32 risk factor for complications of diabetes, including diabetic kidney disease. The effect of deprivation
33 on rate of decline in renal function has not been explored in the Irish Health System to date. The
34 objective of this study is to explore the association between social deprivation and the
35 development/progression of diabetic kidney disease in a cohort of adults living with diabetes in
36 Ireland.

37 Methods and analysis

38 This is a retrospective cohort study using an existing dataset of people living with diabetes who
39 attended the diabetes centre at University Hospital Galway from 2012 to 2016. The variables
40 included in this dataset include demographic variables, type and duration of diabetes, clinical
41 variables such as medication use, blood pressure and BMI and laboratory data including creatinine,
42 urine albumin to creatinine to ratio, haemoglobin A1c and lipids. This dataset will be updated with

29.03.2024

laboratory data until January 2023. Individual's addresses will be used to calculate deprivation indices using the Pobal Haase Pratschke (HP) deprivation index. Rate of renal function decline will be calculated using linear mixed-effect models. The relationship between deprivation and renal function will be assessed using linear regression (absolute and relative rate of renal function decline based on eGFR) and logistic regression models (rapid vs. non-rapid decline).

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval has been granted by the clinical research ethics committee of Galway University Hospitals- Ref C.A. 2956. Results will be presented at conferences and published in peer review journals.

Introduction

In 2021, 537 million adults aged 20-79 were estimated to live with diabetes worldwide, with projections suggesting an increase to 643 million by 2030 (1). Diabetes accounted for approximately 6.7 million deaths globally in 2021. Diabetes is one of the leading causes of chronic kidney disease (CKD) (2). The number of new cases of CKD due to type 2 diabetes increased worldwide from approximately 1.4 million in 1990 to 2.4 million in 2017 (2). There is an inverse association between CKD incidence and a country's sociodemographic index (2). Mortality is increased in people with diabetic kidney disease (DKD) (3). Those with kidney disease and type 2 diabetes have a standardised mortality rate of 31.3%, compared to 11.5% in those with diabetes without kidney disease (3). CKD due to diabetes is defined as persistent albuminuria (an albumin-to-creatinine ratio >3mg/mmol), persistently reduced

29.03.2024

renal function (an estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate <60ml/min per 1.73m²) or both for greater than 3 months (4). Hypertension, dyslipidaemia, hyperglycaemia and smoking are some modifiable risk factors for DKD (5). Socioeconomic deprivation is associated with DKD through its influence on these risk factors, but also through other mechanisms such as access to healthcare and health literacy (6).

Socioeconomic deprivation, is characterized by restricted access to societal resources due to poverty, discrimination and other disadvantages (7), The prevalence of type 2 diabetes is linked to social deprivation, with a higher prevalence in deprived groups (8, 9), likely due to barriers to healthy living conditions, education, and behavioural factors imposed by economic constraints. The relationship between deprivation and type 1 diabetes is less clearly understood with studies reporting varied relationships ranging from no association (10), to an inverse association (11) to a positive association (12). Socioeconomic deprivation is also a risk factor for complications in both type 1 and type 2 diabetes including diabetic retinopathy (13, 14), cardiovascular disease (15, 16), diabetic foot ulceration and amputation (17) and mortality in type 1 and 2 diabetes (18-20). There is also significant evidence of an influence of social deprivation on development of DKD. The EURODIAB IDDM complications study showed a significant association between lower educational attainment and macroalbuminuria (21). Gonzales et al demonstrated in the UK that among people living with type 1 diabetes, those living in the most deprived circumstances had a hazard ratio of 2.92 for incident DKD compared to the least deprived. Similarly in type 2 diabetes, the most deprived had a hazard ratio of 1.39 for incident DKD compared to the least deprived (22).

Studies to date in Ireland on deprivation and diabetes have focussed on diabetes prevalence and predominantly use individual level markers of socioeconomic deprivation such as

29.03.2024

education and occupation (23-25). Educational attainment, a component used in determining deprivation status, has been shown to be inversely associated with the prevalence of multimorbidity in a cohort study in Ireland (23). Participants completed health and lifestyle questionnaires and attended for a physical exam. Multimorbidity was defined as the presence of two or more chronic diseases including diabetes. Educational attainment was ascertained from the questionnaire and divided into primary level or secondary level and above. O Connor et al looked at the determinants of undiagnosed and diagnosed diabetes and used social class (as defined by the European Socioeconomic Classification System), education and medical insurance as covariates (24). Insurance was classified into “private insurance” (paid for by the individual), means tested state assisted – “state insurance” and no insurance and results showed that those with private insurance were less likely to have a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes and those with who finished education at primary level were more likely to have a diagnosis of type 2 (24). Leahy et al used the Irish Longitudinal Study of Ageing (TILDA), a study on adults over 50 years in Ireland and looked at social class based on fathers’ occupation. Compared with professional/managerial occupations, belonging to the “manual” social class in childhood was associated with an increased risk of type 2 diabetes (25). Socioeconomic deprivation is associated with non-attendance at the Irish national diabetic retinopathy screening service (26). The most deprived quintile had approximately 12% higher non-attendance rates compared to the middle quintile. Deprivation is associated with an increased rate of admission to hospital for diabetes complications – diabetic ketoacidosis, renal complications, retinopathy, neuropathy, peripheral vascular disease and “other” complications (27). This was shown after adjusting for population density and medical-card (state insurance) coverage (27). Interestingly, a study of over 1000 people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes attending primary

29.03.2024

care showed no difference in haemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) values between deprivation categories, even after adjusting for whether the diabetes care was shared with secondary care or managed in primary care alone (28). However, this does not take into account that attendance rates may be affected by deprivation and those with higher HbA1c values may be less likely to attend for monitoring. Another study using the TILDA dataset, looked at risk factors for macro and micro vascular complications in type 2 diabetes (29) and showed that higher educational attainment was associated with a lower likelihood of microvascular complications (29).

Identifying social determinants affecting people living with diabetes is key to comprehending morbidity contributors and customizing management strategies for diverse populations, recognizing that disadvantaged backgrounds may lead to increased healthcare utilization and emergency care reliance. (30, 31). Issues that affect their health may not be fixed by physical healthcare alone, and a framework of care encompassing a biopsychosocial model may be needed. The Frome model of primary care is a project in Somerset in the UK that leverages existing social networks to improve health outcomes. It works on the basis that health is heavily influenced by social factors and uses community assets such as peer support groups to tackle social determinants of health and provide support to people in the community. This reduced hospital admissions by 14% over a 4 year period (32). We are also at a time period where diabetes technology is ever advancing, and it is imperative that access to technology is equitable across all social classes. Literature from the UK suggests disparities in access to insulin pump and continuous glucose monitoring devices (33).

Another study looking at flash glucose monitors showed that “time in range” did not differ between deprivation categories (34). Therefore, it is important to have equitable access to these technologies to allow everyone to benefit.

29.03.2024

The objective of this study is to explore the association between area level social deprivation and diabetic kidney disease in a cohort of adults living with diabetes in Ireland. Area based deprivation indices are well established and widely used and facilitate gradients to be demonstrated at a population level (35-39) . To our knowledge, this will be the first study in Ireland to look at the association between deprivation and rate of decline in renal function, using a composite, area level measure of deprivation.

Methods and Analysis

Methods

This is a retrospective cohort study of people diagnosed with diabetes attending University Hospital Galway, a tertiary referral centre serving a large catchment area in the west of Ireland. We will use an existing dataset from a previous cohort study of people with diabetes, who attended the diabetes centre between 2012 and 2016.

This dataset contains clinical and laboratory data which was obtained from DIAMOND. DIAMOND is the electronic record that is used in University Hospital Galway for people living with diabetes. Demographic data are input by administration staff on registering with the diabetes service. At each clinic visit DIAMOND is then used to record clinical details- anthropometric measures such as blood pressure and weight, medications used, complications and laboratory results.

29.03.2024

The remaining laboratory data in the dataset was obtained from the laboratory IT system at University Hospital Galway. This system records longitudinal laboratory measurements on all samples analysed at University Hospital Galway. Longitudinal values for serum creatinine, urine albumin to creatinine ratio (uACR), serum HbA1c, cholesterol, HDL and triglycerides were obtained for each person in the dataset. Isotope dilution mass spectrometry was to measure serum creatinine, conventional Roche Diagnostics assays were used to measure lipids and urine creatinine and high-performance liquid chromatography was used to measure Hba1c.

The dataset contains the datapoints as shown in table 1. It was previously used in a study looking at the prevalence of diabetic kidney disease and rapid renal function decline in adults with diabetes (40).

29.03.2024

Clinical and Demographic Data	Laboratory Data
Age	Creatinine (μmol/l)
Gender	eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²)
Ethnicity	Urine ACR (mg/mmol)
Type of Diabetes	HbA1c (mmol/mol)
Duration of Diabetes	Cholesterol (mmol/l)
Smoking Status	HDL cholesterol (mmol/l)
Diabetes Medications Used	LDL cholesterol (mmol/l)
Antihypertensive Medications Used	Triglycerides (mmol/l)
Body Mass Index (BMI) (kg/m ²)	Urine ACR (mg/mmol)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	

Table 1: Data in existing dataset

ACR= albumin creatinine ratio

eGFR= estimated glomerular filtration rate

Inclusion criteria:

- People living with diabetes, attending the diabetes service at Galway University Hospitals with a diagnosis of diabetes (type 1, type 2 and other)
- Over 18 years of age

Exclusion criteria:

- Insufficient follow up laboratory data (at least 2 values of creatinine >3months apart required for inclusion)
- Insufficient address details to determine address-based deprivation index

29.03.2024

196 -Primary diagnosis of gestational diabetes, impaired glucose tolerance or impaired fasting
197 glucose

198

199 The Pobal Haase Pratschke (HP) deprivation index provides a sophisticated indication of
200 deprivation across Ireland (41). It uses small area geography which was developed in 2011
201 by the Ordnance Survey of Ireland and the Central Statistics office. Small area geography is
202 useful when mapping social and economic data as the areas are homogeneous in their social
203 composition and population size, with a mean of just under 100 households per small area.
204 The HP index maps the overall levels of affluence and deprivation at the level of 18,488
205 small areas. We will use the index based off the 2016 census as this most accurately reflects
206 deprivation status at the baseline visit for participants in the study. The HP index is
207 constructed based on three dimensions of affluence/disadvantage- demographic profile,
208 social class composition and labour market situation. Demographic profile includes
209 indicators such as level of educational attainment and age of the population, social class
210 composition includes indicators such as type of profession and labour market situation looks
211 indicators such as unemployment rate.

212 The Pobal HP deprivation index has previously been used in medical research looking at
213 polypharmacy and dependency in older adults and on survival post renal transplant and on
214 chronic dialysis (42-44).

215 Individual's addresses will be used to determine their deprivation index using the Pobal HP
216 2016 deprivation index. This will be done with the assistance of colleagues in the Health
217 Intelligence Unit using Health Atlas Ireland (45). The addresses in the dataset will first be
218 matched to small area ID. This will be done through 2 processes. Firstly, an automated

29.03.2024

process will be carried out using health atlas Ireland which will match all addresses with a small area ID where possible. Secondly, a manual address matching process will be carried out where the unmatched addresses will be reviewed individually. The addresses will be refined and matched to suggested addresses on health atlas or alternatively searched on the online interactive HP Pobal deprivation map to determine the corresponding small area. The small area will then enable us to determine a deprivation index for each individual in the dataset. These indices are reported as a numerical value from roughly -40(most disadvantaged) to +40(most affluent) or category of relative index score which are defined by HP as per table 2 below. Categories of “extremely” and “very” disadvantaged will be merged into the “disadvantaged” category and similarly for the “affluent” category due to anticipation of low numbers in these categories. For each small area it is also possible to obtain data from which the deprivation scores are constructed such as population change, age dependency ratio, lone parents ratio, education level, unemployment rate, proportion of professional and manual workers, percentage of owner occupied households and rented households and average persons per room.

For a proportion of the cohort, the address may not be detailed enough to identify a corresponding small area but a larger area may be identified. In these cases, the average deprivation index of each of the small areas within the larger area will be used.

Relative Index Score	Standard Deviation	Label
Over 30	>3	Extremely affluent
20-30	2 to 3	Very affluent
10-20	1 to 2	Affluent
0 to 10	0 to 1	Marginally above average
0 to -10	0 to -1	Marginally below average
-10 to -20	-1 to -2	Disadvantaged
-20 to -30	-2 to -3	Very disadvantaged
Below -30	<3	Extremely Disadvantaged

Table 2: Pobal HP deprivation Indices 2016

29.03.2024

238 The existing dataset will be updated with serial laboratory measurements of creatinine,
 239 urine ACR, Hba1c and lipids until January 2023. eGFR will be calculated using the CKD-EPI
 240 2021 equation (46) for all creatinine values from the last clinical episode date in the existing
 241 dataset until January 2023. These eGFR values will then be censored to exclude those on
 242 dialysis or who have received renal transplant as these variations in eGFR are not reflective
 243 of renal function decline. Rate of renal function decline will be calculated as per the
 244 methods in the previous study utilising this dataset (40). Linear mixed-effects models
 245 (incorporating random within-subject trajectories of eGFR over time) will be used to
 246 generate individual-specific eGFR slopes. These models will be applied to untransformed
 247 eGFR measurements to estimate absolute change in eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m²/year), and to
 248 log-transformed eGFR measurements to estimate percentage change (% change per year).
 249 These slopes represent the change in renal function over time for each participant
 250 incorporating all eGFR measurements. Only individuals with at least 2 eGFR readings 3
 251 months apart will be included to calculate rate of decline. Progressive or rapid decline in
 252 renal function among participants with DM will be defined as either an absolute reduction in
 253 eGFR of >3.5mL/min/1.73m²/year (47) or proportionate eGFR loss per year of >3.3% (48) .
 254

255 The primary outcome will be rate of renal function decline (absolute and percentage values
 256 as per formula above). Secondary outcomes will include time to reaching end stage kidney
 257 disease (eGFR<15mL/min/1.73 m²), dialysis or renal transplant and variability in eGFR and
 258 ACR measurements which may reflect fluctuation in health status which could have been
 259 influenced by external social factors.

260

29.03.2024

Analysis

Stata V.17 will be used for statistical analysis. Data will be assessed for normality.

Descriptive analysis will be performed, comparing the distribution of variables between deprivation categories. Age, duration of diabetes, number of antihypertensive medications used, BMI, blood pressure, baseline creatinine, eGFR, uACR, HbA1c and lipids will be described with median/mean with standard deviation values depending on distribution and minimum/maximum values. Frequencies and proportions will be used to describe categorical variables- gender, type of diabetes, ethnicity, smoking status and medications used. χ^2 squared test will be used to compare categorical variables between deprivation groups. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used to compare means of continuous variables between groups.

Linear regression models will be used to explore the relationship between explanatory variables (including deprivation) and the primary outcome of rate of decline in renal function (absolute and relative based on eGFR). Logistic regression models will be used to explore categories of rapid and non-rapid decline. A “time to event” analysis will be carried out using the endpoints of ESKD/dialysis or renal transplant as described above.

Confounders such as diabetes duration and HbA1c be adjusted for in the models with careful consideration to differentiate confounders from mediating factors on the causal pathway.

Missing data will be dealt with using a complete case analysis approach. It is anticipated that there will be data missing from the exposure variable (deprivation) as a result of inadequate/incomplete address data and outcome variable (rate of renal function decline) as a result of lack of follow up laboratory data which may be due to change in location of diabetes management or death. Missing data will therefore be excluded from the analysis. A

29.03.2024

284 sensitivity analysis will be carried out using only the addresses matched to exact small area
285 (i.e., excluding those with an averaged deprivation index).

286

287 A data protection impact assessment (DPIA) has been carried out to ensure the research
288 methodology is in line with general data protection regulation (GDPR). Consent has not
289 been obtained from participants as the data will be anonymised when accessed and
290 analysed and therefore ethical approval was granted without the requirement to obtain
291 consent. All data will be stored on a password protected Health Service Executive laptop
292 with approved encryption software and anti-virus software. The file containing the dataset
293 will be password protected.

294

295 The dataset was accessed on 1/12/23 and is currently being updated with the additional
296 laboratory data and deprivation indices as outlined above. The dataset does not contain any
297 information that can identify individual participants. The planned start date for the study
298 analysis is 03/06/2024.

299

300 Results

301 The baseline characteristics of each individual will be described as per table 3 using the
302 information available from the existing dataset:

29.03.2024

	<i>All individuals</i>	<i>Disadvantaged</i>	<i>Marginally below average</i>	<i>Marginally above average</i>	<i>Affluent</i>
<i>Age (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Gender</i> - <i>Male (%)</i> - <i>Female (%)</i>					
<i>Type of Diabetes (%)</i> - <i>Type 1 Diabetes</i> - <i>Type 2 Diabetes</i> - <i>Other</i>					
<i>Duration of Diabetes (years) (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Smoking Status</i> - <i>Current (%)</i> - <i>Past (%)</i> - <i>Never (%)</i>					
<i>Diabetes medications</i> -biguanides (%) -sulfonylureas (%) -SGLT-2 inhibitors (%) -GLP-1 analogue (%) -DPP-IV inhibitor (%) -insulin (%)					
<i>Other medications</i> -ACE inhibitor (%) -ARB (%) -Statin (%)					
<i>Number of antihypertensives (mean/median)</i>					
<i>BMI (kg/m²) (mean/median)</i>					

29.03.2024

<i>Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg) (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Baseline creatinine (μmol/l) (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Baseline eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m²) (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Baseline eGFR stage**</i> -G1-Normal or high >90ml/min/1.73m ² -G2-Mildly decreased 60-89ml/min/1.73m ² -G3a-Mildly to moderately decreased 45-59ml/min/1.73m ² -G3b-Moderately to severely decreased 30-44ml/min/1.73m ² -G4-Severely decreased 15-29ml/min/1.73m ² -G5-Kidney Failure <15ml/min/1.73m ²					
<i>Baseline urine ACR (mean/median)</i>					
<i>Baseline urine ACR stage)**</i> -normal to mildly increased(<3mg/mmol) -moderately increased (3-29mg/mmol) -severely increased (>30mg/mmol)					

Baseline HbA1c (mmol/mol) (mean/median)					
Baseline Cholesterol: (mean/median) -total cholesterol mmol/l -LDL mmol/l -HDL mmol/l -triglycerides mmol/l					

Table 3. Baseline characteristics of individuals categorised by deprivation status

SGLT-2 inhibitor= sodium-glucose co- transporter-2 inhibitor, GLP-1 agonist= glucagon-like peptide 1 agonist, DPP-IV inhibitor= dipeptidyl-peptidase IV inhibitor, LDL= low-density lipoprotein, HDL= high density lipoprotein, ACE inhibitor= angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitors, ARB= angiotensin receptor blocker

***Urine ACR and eGFR were classified as per the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) 2012 Clinical Practice Guideline*

29.03.2024

Discussion

There is a large body of evidence internationally demonstrating that social deprivation has a detrimental outcome on people's health (49-60). The association between deprivation and diabetes complications has been explored internationally. This study will be the first in Ireland to explore the relationship between area level social deprivation and rate of decline in renal function among people with diabetes. It will be a starting point in a specific geographical area which can then be replicated across the country. If we identify an association between social deprivation and diabetic kidney disease in Ireland, it will highlight a need for targeted interventions for vulnerable subgroups with diabetes. This may be achieved in part through the enhanced community care programme, a national programme in Ireland designed to move the management of chronic diseases (including diabetes) to the community and away from tertiary or hospital care. Delivering care in the community and perhaps targeting more deprived areas could help to address the effect of deprivation. We may need to consider the impact of deprivation at each clinical assessment of a person with diabetes and how we can help modify the effects of same. Our models of care for diabetes management would need to be amended to address the impact of deprivation and how we can address this, for example through equitable access to technology, tailored diabetes education and virtual clinics where appropriate. We would need to ensure that our health system provides equal access to care and ensure there are governmental policies to subsidise healthy foods and provide equitable access to recreational facilities. The results of this study may have significant impact on informing new health care and governmental policies.

29.03.2024

Strengths and limitations of this study

- First study in Ireland exploring an association between deprivation and rate of decline in renal function using a composite deprivation index
- Long duration of follow up of longitudinal laboratory data (7+years)
- Follow up results limited to a single tertiary public centre
- Quality of data dependent on accuracy of data entry into electronic patient record system by healthcare professionals

Ethics and Dissemination

Ethical approval was granted from the Clinical Research Ethics Committee at Galway University Hospitals in March 2023- Ref C.A. 2956. A data protection impact assessment (DPIA) was also completed.

The results will be written up for publication in a peer reviewed journal and presentation at national/and or international diabetes and public health conferences. The findings will be relevant to clinicians managing diabetes, public health specialists and healthcare service managers/policy makers.

Author Contributions

SD, TG, MG and CC conceived and designed the study. CC wrote the protocol. CMB and PMK refined the study design. All authors revised the protocol.

29.03.2024

References

1. IDF Diabetes Atlas: International Diabetes Federation; 2021 [01/02/2023]. Available from: <https://diabetesatlas.org/>.
2. IDF Atlas Reports- Diabetes and Kidney Disease: International Diabetes Federation; 2023 [20/03/2024]. Available from: <https://diabetesatlas.org/idfawp/resource-files/2023/11/IDF1040-Atlas-Diabetes-and-Kidney-Disease-Report-V4.pdf>.
3. Afkarian M, Sachs MC, Kestenbaum B, Hirsch IB, Tuttle KR, Himmelfarb J, et al. Kidney disease and increased mortality risk in type 2 diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2013;24(2):302-8.
4. Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) Diabetes Work Group. KDIGO 2022 Clinical Practice Guideline for Diabetes Management in Chronic Kidney Disease. *Kidney Int*. 2022;102(5S).
5. Pacilli A, Viazzi F, Fioretto P, Giorda C, Ceriello A, Genovese S, et al. Epidemiology of diabetic kidney disease in adult patients with type 1 diabetes in Italy: The AMD-Annals initiative. *Diabetes/Metabolism Research and Reviews*. 2017;33(4):e2873.
6. Casey C, Buckley CM, Kearney PM, Griffin MD, Dinneen SF, Griffin TP. Social deprivation and diabetic kidney disease: A European view. *J Diabetes Investig*. 2024.
7. Association AP. APA dictionary of psychology Washington2023 [27/03/2023]. Available from: <https://dictionary.apa.org/social-deprivation>.
8. Stringhini S, Tabak AG, Akbaraly TN, Sabia S, Shipley MJ, Marmot MG, et al. Contribution of modifiable risk factors to social inequalities in type 2 diabetes: prospective Whitehall II cohort study. *Bmj*. 2012;345:e5452.
9. Agardh E, Allebeck P, Hallqvist J, Moradi T, Sidorchuk A. Type 2 diabetes incidence and socio-economic position: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2011;40(3):804-18.
10. Connolly VM, Kesson CM. Socioeconomic status and clustering of cardiovascular disease risk factors in diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care*. 1996;19(5):419-22.
11. du Prel JB, Icks A, Grabert M, Holl RW, Giani G, Rosenbauer J. Socioeconomic conditions and type 1 diabetes in childhood in North Rhine–Westphalia, Germany. *Diabetologia*. 2007;50(4):720-8.
12. Liese AD, Puett RC, Lamichhane AP, Nichols MD, Dabelea D, Lawson AB, et al. Neighborhood level risk factors for type 1 diabetes in youth: the SEARCH case-control study. *International Journal of Health Geographics*. 2012;11(1):1.
13. Funakoshi M, Azami Y, Matsumoto H, Ikota A, Ito K, Okimoto H, et al. Socioeconomic status and type 2 diabetes complications among young adult patients in Japan. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(4):e0176087.
14. Alvarez-Ramos P, Jimenez-Carmona S, Alemany-Marquez P, Cordoba-Doña JA, Aguilar-Diosdado M. Socioeconomic deprivation and development of diabetic retinopathy in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2020;8(2).
15. Tatulashvili S, Fagherazzi G, Dow C, Cohen R, Fosse S, Bihan H. Socioeconomic inequalities and type 2 diabetes complications: A systematic review. *Diabetes Metab*. 2020;46(2):89-99.
16. Talbo MK, Katz A, Dostie M, Legault L, Brazeau AS. Associations Between Socioeconomic Status and Patient Experience With Type 1 Diabetes Management and Complications: Cross-sectional Analysis of a Cohort From Québec, Canada. *Can J Diabetes*. 2022;46(6):569-77.
17. Hurst JE, Barn R, Gibson L, Innes H, Bus SA, Kennon B, et al. Geospatial mapping and data linkage uncovers variability in outcomes of foot disease according to multiple deprivation: a population cohort study of people with diabetes. *Diabetologia*. 2020;63(3):659-67.
18. Saydah S, Lochner K. Socioeconomic status and risk of diabetes-related mortality in the U.S. *Public Health Rep*. 2010;125(3):377-88.

29.03.2024

19. Roper NA, Bilous RW, Kelly WF, Unwin NC, Connolly VM. Excess mortality in a population with diabetes and the impact of material deprivation: longitudinal, population based study. *Bmj*. 2001;322(7299):1389-93.
20. Chaturvedi N, Jarrett J, Shipley MJ, Fuller JH. Socioeconomic gradient in morbidity and mortality in people with diabetes: cohort study findings from the Whitehall Study and the WHO Multinational Study of Vascular Disease in Diabetes. *Bmj*. 1998;316(7125):100-5.
21. Chaturvedi N, Stephenson JM, Fuller JH. The relationship between socioeconomic status and diabetes control and complications in the EURODIAB IDDM Complications Study. *Diabetes Care*. 1996;19(5):423-30.
22. González-Pérez A, Saéz ME, Vizcaya D, Lind M, García Rodríguez LA. Impact of chronic kidney disease definition on assessment of its incidence and risk factors in patients with newly diagnosed type 1 and type 2 diabetes in the UK: A cohort study using primary care data from the United Kingdom. *Prim Care Diabetes*. 2020;14(4):381-7.
23. Sinnott C, Mc Hugh S, Fitzgerald AP, Bradley CP, Kearney PM. Psychosocial complexity in multimorbidity: the legacy of adverse childhood experiences. *Family Practice*. 2015;32(3):269-75.
24. JM OC, Millar SR, Buckley CM, Kearney PM, Perry IJ. The prevalence and determinants of undiagnosed and diagnosed type 2 diabetes in middle-aged irish adults. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(11):e80504.
25. Leahy S, Canney M, Scarlett S, Kenny RA, McCrory C. Life-course social class is associated with later-life diabetes prevalence in women: evidence from the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*. 2020;11(3):353-81.
26. Kelly SR, Loisele AR, Pandey R, Combes A, Murphy C, Kavanagh H, et al. Factors associated with non-attendance in the Irish national diabetic retinopathy screening programme (INDEAR study report no. 2). *Acta Diabetol*. 2021;58(5):643-50.
27. Sexton E, Bedford D. GP supply, deprivation and emergency admission to hospital for COPD and diabetes complications in counties across Ireland: an exploratory analysis. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2016;185(2):453-61.
28. O'Connor R, Houghton F, Saunders J, Dobbs F. Diabetes mellitus in Irish general practice: level of care as reflected by HbA1c values. *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2006;12(2):58-65.
29. Tracey ML, McHugh SM, Fitzgerald AP, Buckley CM, Canavan RJ, Kearney PM. Risk Factors for Macro- and Microvascular Complications among Older Adults with Diagnosed Type 2 Diabetes: Findings from The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. *J Diabetes Res*. 2016;2016:5975903.
30. Loef B, Meulman I, Herber GM, Kommer GJ, Koopmanschap MA, Kunst AE, et al. Socioeconomic differences in healthcare expenditure and utilization in The Netherlands. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):643.
31. Unwin M, Crisp E, Stankovich J, McCann D, Kinsman L. Socioeconomic disadvantage as a driver of non-urgent emergency department presentations: A retrospective data analysis. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(4):e0231429.
32. Relationships Project. Case Study: Frome Model of Enhanced Primary Care [Available from: <https://relationshipsproject.org/project/frome/>].
33. Fallon C, Jones E, Oliver N, Reddy M, Avari P. The impact of socio-economic deprivation on access to diabetes technology in adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2022;39(10):e14906.
34. Kingsnorth AP, Wilson C, Choudhary P, Griffin TP. Comparing Glucose Outcomes Following Face-to-Face and Remote Initiation of Flash Glucose Monitoring in People Living With Diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2023;19322968231176531.
35. Bihan H, Laurent S, Sass C, Nguyen G, Huot C, Moulin JJ, et al. Association among individual deprivation, glycemic control, and diabetes complications: the EPICES score. *Diabetes Care*. 2005;28(11):2680-5.
36. Townsend Deprivation Index: National Centre for Research Methods; 2022 [Available from: <https://www.restore.ac.uk/geo-refer/36229dtuks00y19810000.php>].

29.03.2024

37. Nitsch D, Burden R, Steenkamp R, Ansell D, Byrne C, Caskey F, et al. Patients with diabetic nephropathy on renal replacement therapy in England and Wales. *Qjm*. 2007;100(9):551-60.
38. Deprivation Guidance for Analysts Public Health Scotland, GPD Team; 2020 [Available from: <https://www.isdscotland.org/Products-and-Services/GPD-Support/Deprivation/docs/PHS-Deprivation-Guidance-version-3-4.pdf>].
39. Höhn A, McGurnaghan SJ, Caparrotta TM, Jeyam A, O'Reilly JE, Blackburn LAK, et al. Large socioeconomic gap in period life expectancy and life years spent with complications of diabetes in the Scottish population with type 1 diabetes, 2013-2018. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(8):e0271110.
40. Griffin TP, O'Shea PM, Smyth A, Islam MN, Wall D, Ferguson J, et al. Burden of chronic kidney disease and rapid decline in renal function among adults attending a hospital-based diabetes center in Northern Europe. *BMJ Open Diabetes Research & Care*. 2021;9(1):e002125.
41. Haase T PJ. The Pobal HP Deprivation Index for Small Areas in the Republic of Ireland. Dublin: Pobal; 2018.
42. Swan L, Horgan NF, Fan CW, Warters A, O'Sullivan M. Residential Area Socioeconomic Deprivation is Associated with Physical Dependency and Polypharmacy in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: An Analysis of Health Administrative Data in Ireland. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2022;15:1955-63.
43. Ward FL, O'Kelly P, Donohue F, ÓhAiseadha C, Haase T, Pratschke J, et al. Influence of socioeconomic status on allograft and patient survival following kidney transplantation. *Nephrology (Carlton)*. 2015;20(6):426-33.
44. Ward FL, O'Kelly P, Donohue F, O'Haiseadha C, Haase T, Pratschke J, et al. The influence of socioeconomic status on patient survival on chronic dialysis. *Hemodial Int*. 2015;19(4):601-8.
45. Health Atlas Ireland National Health Intelligence Unit: Health Information and Quality Authority; [Available from: <https://www.hiqa.ie/areas-we-work/health-information/data-collections/health-atlas-ireland>].
46. CKD-EPI Creatinine Equation (2021): National Kidney Foundation; [Available from: <https://www.kidney.org/content/ckd-epi-creatinine-equation-2021>].
47. Krolewski AS. Progressive renal decline: the new paradigm of diabetic nephropathy in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38(6):954-62.
48. Krolewski AS, Niewczas MA, Skupien J, Gohda T, Smiles A, Eckfeldt JH, et al. Early progressive renal decline precedes the onset of microalbuminuria and its progression to macroalbuminuria. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(1):226-34.
49. Singh GK. Area deprivation and widening inequalities in US mortality, 1969-1998. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(7):1137-43.
50. A EL, Ashford-Wilson S, Brown S, Pal A, Lal R, Aryal K. Effect of Social Deprivation on the Stage and Mode of Presentation of Colorectal Cancer. *Ann Coloproctol*. 2016;32(4):128-32.
51. Kargoli F, Shulman E, Aagaard P, Hoch E, Di Biase L, Ferrick K, et al. Socioeconomic status and predictors of survival in patients admitted with atrial fibrillation. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2015;65(10):A471.
52. Lipman TH, Hawkes CP. Racial and Socioeconomic Disparities in Pediatric Type 1 Diabetes: Time for a Paradigm Shift in Approach. *Diabetes Care*. 2021;44(1):14-6.
53. Phillimore P, Beattie A, Townsend P. Widening inequality of health in northern England, 1981-91. *Bmj*. 1994;308(6937):1125-8.
54. Mackenbach JP, Stirbu I, Roskam AJ, Schaap MM, Menvielle G, Leinsalu M, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in health in 22 European countries. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(23):2468-81.
55. Eachus J, Williams M, Chan P, Smith GD, Grainge M, Donovan J, et al. Deprivation and cause specific morbidity: evidence from the Somerset and Avon survey of health. *Bmj*. 1996;312(7026):287-92.
56. Nadrowski P, Drygas W, Bielecki W, Pajak A, Tykarski A, Zdrojewski T, et al. The higher socioeconomic status, the lower risk of cardiovascular death ? *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*. 2018;25(2):S87-S8.

29.03.2024

57. Guan TR, Zhang XH, Dong LG, Wang SY, Zheng RP, Liu LS. Low socioeconomic status is a significant predictor of incidental stroke risk in Chinese population from a prospective cohort study in Beijing. *European Heart Journal*. 2011;32:59-60.
58. Zhang D, Earp BE, Blazar P. Association of Economic Well-Being With Comorbid Conditions in Patients Undergoing Carpal Tunnel Release. *J Hand Surg Am*. 2022;47(12):1228.e1-.e7.
59. Kargoli F, Shulman E, Aagaard P, Briceno DF, Hoch E, Di Biase L, et al. Socioeconomic Status as a Predictor of Mortality in Patients Admitted With Atrial Fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol*. 2017;119(9):1378-81.
60. Jones DA, Howard JP, Rathod KS, Gallagher SM, Knight CJ, Jain AK, et al. The impact of socioeconomic status on all-cause mortality after percutaneous coronary intervention: an observational cohort study of 13,770 patients. *EuroIntervention*. 2015;10(10):e1-8.