



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/129119/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Johnson, Miriam J, Allgar, Victoria, Chen, Hong et al. (2018) The complex relationship between household income of family caregivers, access to palliative care services and place of death: A national household population survey. *Palliative Medicine*. 269216317711825. pp. 357-365. ISSN: 0269-2163

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216317711825>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Palliative Medicine

The complex relationship between household income of family caregivers, access to palliative care services and place of death: a national household population survey.


Journal:	<i>Palliative Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID	PMJ-16-0418.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Johnson, Miriam; University of Hull, Wolfson Palliative Care Research Centre Allgar, Victoria; University of York, Hull York Medical School Chen, Hong; University of Hull, Hull York Medical School Dunn, Laurie; University of Hull, Hull York Medical School Macleod, Una; Hull York Medical School, Currow, David; University of Technology, Sydney; University of Hull, Wolfson Palliative Care Research Centre
Keywords:	caregivers, palliative care, socio-economic status, place of death, household income, population survey, carers
Abstract:	<p>Background: Previous work shows that more affluent patients with cancer are more likely to die at home. Whereas those with non-cancer conditions are more likely to die in hospital. Family caregivers are an important factor in determining place of death.</p> <p>Aim: To investigate associations between family caregivers' household income, patients' access to specialist palliative care and place of patients' death, by level of personal end-of-life care.</p> <p>Design: A cross-sectional community household population survey.</p> <p>Setting and participants: Respondents to the Household Survey for England.</p> <p>Results: One third of 1265 bereaved respondents had provided personal end-of-life care (caregivers) (30%). Approximately half (55%) of decedents accessed palliative care services and 15% died in a hospice. Place of death and access to palliative care were strongly related ($p < 0.001$). Palliative care services reduced the proportion of hospital deaths ($p < 0.001$), and decedents accessing palliative care were more likely to die at home ($p < 0.001$). Respondents' income was not associated with palliative care access ($p = 0.233$). Overall, respondents' income and home death were unrelated ($p = 0.106$), but decedents with caregivers in the highest income group were least likely to die at home ($p = 0.069$).</p> <p>Conclusions Decedents' access to palliative care services was associated with fewer deaths in hospital and more home deaths. Bereaved respondents' income was unrelated to decedents' place of death when adjusted for palliative care access. For caregivers only, decedents with more affluent caregivers</p>

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

	were the least likely to die at home. Higher income caregivers are likely to be powerful patient advocates; information needs must be addressed with regard aim of care.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review



Proportion who died at home by income, for caregivers by cancer death or not.

391x300mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Review

Title: The complex relationship between household income of family caregivers, access to palliative care services and place of death: a national household population survey.

Running Title: Caregiver household income, access to palliative care services and place of death.

Authors:

Johnson MJ^a, Allgar V^b, Chen H^a, Dunn L^a, Macleod U^a, Currow DC^{c,a}

Affiliations

^aHull York Medical School, University of Hull, Hull, UK HU6 7RX

^bHull York Medical School, University of York, York, UK YO10 5DD

^cUniversity of Technology, Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Email addresses: victoria.allgar@hyms.ac.uk; hong.chen@hyms.ac.uk;

laurie.dunn@hyms.ac.uk; una.macleod@hyms.ac.uk; david.currow@sa.gov.au

¹Corresponding author: Johnson MJ, Hertford Building, University of Hull, Hull, HU6 7RX, UK. Email: miriam.johnson@hyms.ac.uk Tel: 01482 463309

Word count 2,871

ABSTRACT

Background: Previous work shows that more affluent patients with cancer are more likely to die at home. Whereas those dying from non-cancer conditions are more likely to die in hospital. Family caregivers are an important factor in determining place of death.

Aim: To investigate associations between family caregivers' household income, patients' access to specialist palliative care and place of patients' death, by level of personal end-of-life care.

Design: A cross-sectional community household population survey.

Setting and participants: Respondents to the Household Survey for England.

Results: One third of 1265 bereaved respondents had provided personal end-of-life care (caregivers) (30%). Just over half (55%) of decedents accessed palliative care services and 15% died in a hospice. Place of death and access to palliative care were strongly related ($p < 0.001$). Palliative care services reduced the proportion of deaths in hospital ($p < 0.001$), and decedents accessing palliative care were more likely to die at home than those who did not ($p < 0.001$). Respondents' income was not associated with palliative care access ($p = 0.233$). Overall, respondents' income and home death were not related ($p = 0.106$), but decedents with caregivers in the highest income group were *least* likely to die at home ($p = 0.069$).

Conclusions

For people who had someone close to them die, decedents' access to palliative care services was associated with fewer deaths in hospital and more home deaths. Respondents' income was unrelated to care recipients' place of death when adjusted for palliative care access. When only caregivers were considered, decedents with caregivers from higher income

1
2
3 quartiles were the *least* likely to die at home. Family caregivers from higher income brackets
4 are likely to be powerful patient advocates. Caregiver information needs must be addressed
5 especially with regard to stage of disease, aim of care and appropriate interventions at the end
6 of life.
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Keywords:** caregivers; palliative care; socio-economic status; place of death; household
13 income; carers; population survey
14

15
16
17
18 **Running Title:** Caregiver household income, access to palliative care services and place of
19 death.
20
21

22
23 **Word Count:** 292
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Key Statements

What is already known about the topic?

- More affluent people who die from cancer are more likely to die at home.
- More affluent people who die from non-malignant conditions are more likely to die in hospital.

What this paper adds?

- This study of *those who had someone close die*, (providing personal care or not) found no relationship between the bereaved person's income and decedent's death at home.
- However, if *personal end-of-life care* was provided by those from higher income quartiles, decedents from *any* cause were the *least* likely to die at home.
- Decedents with identified palliative care service use were more likely to die at home.

Implications for practice, theory or policy?

- The interplay between place of care and income is more complex than being able to pay for care.
- Family caregivers from higher income brackets are likely to be powerful patient advocates.
- Caregiver information needs must be addressed especially with regard to stage of disease, aim of care and appropriate interventions at the end of life.

Introduction

Socio-economic factors (education, household income, area of residence) are some of the social determinates of health outcomes including place of death. In the United Kingdom, people who die from cancer are more likely to die at home than an institution if of higher socioeconomic status (SES).[1] However, people of higher SES dying from cardiovascular or respiratory diseases are more likely to die in an institution.[1]

In Australia, access to specialist palliative care services reduces the likelihood of dying in hospital, but not home death.[2] Several groups (older people, people with non-malignant diseases, people with lower SES) are consistently under-referred to specialist palliative care services.[2-7]

The interplay between SES, access to specialist palliative care and place of death is complex. A systematic review of the worldwide literature examined whether access to specialist palliative care modified the effect of patients' SES on place of death for adults with cancer. [8] The review found some evidence to suggest that use of specialist palliative care might modify the unfavourable effect of lower SES on home death. The presence of a family caregiver adds further complexity: another systematic review found that patients without a home caregiver are less likely to access community palliative care services.[9]

In 2013, questions about providing informal care for '*someone close*' at the end of life were included in the Health Survey for England (HSE).[10] The questions were adapted from the South Australia Health Omnibus Survey (HOS), allowing comparisons with different service, funding and social care models in this study.[3] Importantly, these are data about people who did and did not access palliative care services at the end of life, and whether or not the person "*close*" had provided care, irrespective of health service contact.

1
2
3 The aim of this study is to investigate whether access to specialist palliative care services
4 ameliorates the effects of respondents' SES on decedents' place of death. The null hypothesis
5 was that there was no relationship between these three variables by level of respondents'
6 care.
7
8
9
10

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 **Methods**

18
19
20 A population-based, observational study was conducted. Detailed methods of the Health
21 Survey for England (HSE) are described elsewhere.[11] In summary, it is an annual, face-to-
22 face, cross-sectional survey measuring health and health-related behaviours. Core socio-
23 demographic data are included yearly and specific topics added by researchers buying 'space'
24 to incorporate researchers' questions. Consolidated de-identified data are supplied to
25 researchers of core data and researchers' specific data.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 HSE is commissioned by the NHS Information Centre for Health and Social Care for the
36 Department of Health. Addresses were issued between January and December, 2013, and
37 fieldwork completed in March 2014. A random probability sample of households (9,408
38 addresses in 588 postcode sectors) was surveyed. Adults (age 16 or over) and children were
39 interviewed at households identified at the selected addresses followed by a visit from a
40 specially trained nurse for those consenting. Data were weighted by HSE weights with the
41 aim of the weighting to reduce non-response bias resulting from differential non-response at
42 the household level. [11] The dataset included 10,980 respondents, of whom 2,165 (20%)
43 stated *that someone close to them had died of a terminal illness in last five years* (hereafter
44 referred to as 'respondents) and, as a subsequent question so as not to pre-empt questions
45 about care, whether or not they had accessed palliative care services. The HSE included the
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 question set in their ethics approval processes (including consent) for the 2013 survey,
4
5 obtained from the Oxford A Research Ethics Committee (reference 12/SC/0317).
6
7
8
9
10

11 **Measure of socioeconomic status**

12
13
14
15
16 In this current study, household income was used as the surrogate measure of SES. Income in
17
18 the Australian dataset was grouped into four \$20,000 income bands. In the HSE dataset the
19
20 variable used was derived equivalised income. Equivalised income adjusts household income
21
22 to take account of the number of persons in the household. It should be noted that in the HSE
23
24 dataset around 19% of adults live in households where no information is provided on income,
25
26 and are therefore excluded from the breakdown by equivalised household income. This was
27
28 summarised into quartiles based on the quartiles from this equivalised income: 25%=
29
30 £14,701, 50%=£24,700, 75% =£44,094.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Provision of care**

38
39
40
41 In the Australian HOS, respondents were asked if they had provided “hands on care” and its
42
43 level. In the HSE question, this was phrased as “personal care”, and defined as “things like
44
45 helping with washing, dressing, going to the toilet, or eating.” In the HSE, respondents were
46
47 also asked if they had provided company, errands, laundry, shopping, giving lifts, taking to
48
49 appointments or out for recreation.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Palliative Care Services**

1
2
3 In both surveys, the question “Was a palliative care service used?” was asked alongside an
4 explanation from the interviewer that a palliative care service aims to comfort, not to cure, to
5 relieve pain and distress for people who are dying and to support patients, families and
6 friends in approaching death and coping with grief.” Examples of service providers were
7 given in the English survey.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Place of death**

19
20
21
22 The deceased’s place of death was reported as home, hospital, hospice, residential aged care
23 facility, or ‘other’.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Statistical analysis**

33
34
35 The main analysis conducted was a comparison of survey respondents who stated *that*
36 *someone close to them had died of a terminal illness in the last five years* and whether or not
37 they had access to palliative care services (hereinafter referred to as respondents).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Demographic characteristics of the respondents and place of death of the deceased were
45 described. Univariate analyses were undertaken comparing groups using a Chi-square test for
46 categorical data and a t-test for continuous data.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Logistic regression was undertaken to explore the relationship between home death and SES,
54 adjusting for access to palliative care, age, gender and educational and marital status. A
55 Hosmer and Lemeshow Test was used to assess model fit. **In view of the relationship between**
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 educational level and SES, findings were adjusted for educational status. Sensitivity analyses
4
5 quantified the effect of dying at home by income, adjusting for access to palliative care with
6
7 the exclusion of non-cancer patients. This analysis was repeated substituting the provision of
8
9 personal care by the respondent. Analyses were undertaken using SPSS (v.22, SPSS Inc.,
10
11 Chicago, IL).
12
13

14
15
16 Findings were reported in accordance with the STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational
17
18 (STROBe) studies in Epidemiology statement.[13]
19
20

21 22 23 24 **Results**

25
26
27 Household survey participation was 64%. Demographic characteristics of the respondents
28
29 who stated that ‘*someone close to them had died of a terminal illness in last 5 years*’, by
30
31 access to palliative care services are shown (Table 1) together with the characteristics
32
33 associated with patients’ access to palliative care. Of interest, respondents’ household income
34
35 was not associated with access to palliative care (p=0.233). Household income was missing
36
37 for 402 of respondents and 52% of those had access to palliative care. As a quality check,
38
39 there was no significant difference in the proportion who had access to palliative care
40
41 compared to those who had income recorded (p=0.164).
42
43
44
45

46
47 Age and gender of respondents were similar between groups. Hands-on care was provided by
48
49 30% of the bereaved (hereon referred to as “caregivers”), one half of decedents (55%) had
50
51 accessed palliative care services and 15% died in a hospice. The majority died from cancer
52
53 (72%).
54

55 56 **Access to palliative care and place of death**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Decedents who accessed palliative care services were less likely to die in hospital (31%
4 without, 61% with; $p<0.001$). (Table 1) The proportion of people dying in hospices *and* at
5 home increased and those who accessed palliative care services were more likely to die at
6 home (36%, 26%, $p<0.001$).
7
8
9
10

11
12 <<insert Table 1 about here>>
13

14 15 16 **Respondent's income and decedent's place of death**

17
18
19 There was no statistically significant difference between income groups regarding place of
20 death ($p=0.099$), nor any relationship between household income and dying at home
21 ($p=0.106$; Table 2).
22
23
24
25

26
27 <<insert Table 2 about here>>
28

29
30 This finding stands even when adjusted for access to palliative care and, separately,
31 excluding non-cancer patients in sensitive analyses (Table 3).
32
33
34

35
36 <<insert Table 3 about here>>
37

38 39 **Analysis of data from those who had provided care (caregiver)**

40
41
42 The intensity of hands-on care provided by the caregiver was associated with access to
43 palliative care ($p<0.001$). One third of people who accessed palliative care services had
44 provided hands-on care, compared to one quarter of those who had not.
45
46
47

48
49 For caregivers, income and place of death were associated ($p=0.147$) and income and death at
50 home compared with elsewhere ($p=0.069$; Table 4).
51
52

53
54
55 <<insert Table 4 about here>>
56
57
58
59
60

Caregivers in the highest income group were *least* likely to provide care for someone who died at home (25%), although this did not reach statistical significance ($p=0.069$) even after adjusting for diagnosis (0.108). For those who had died from a non-cancer condition ($p=0.180$) and cancer ($p=0.378$), those with caregivers in the highest income group were *least* likely to die at home (Figure 1).

<<insert Fig 1 about here>>

Discussion

Main findings

Decedents who died from *any cause* with identified access to palliative care services were least likely to die in hospital ($p<0.001$), and were more likely to die at home. This study found no relationship between the *respondent's* income and *decedent's* death at home once adjusted for palliative care service access. However, people with *caregivers* from higher income quartiles were the *least* likely to die at home irrespective of identified access to palliative care services.

How does this compare with other findings?

This survey found a reduction in hospital deaths in people with identified access to palliative care services and an increase in home deaths. In contrast, in Australia, with access to palliative care services, the deaths moved from hospital to hospice but did not change levels of death in the community.[2] This may be due to a variety of factors including the wide cultural diversity and extreme rurality in Australia coupled with a community expectation to go to hospital. However, although in both countries palliative care services are provided at no

1
2
3 cost to the patient, there are also important differences in Australian and English primary care
4
5 with regard to caring for the dying. In England there is widespread implementation of
6
7 systems of care such as Gold Standards Framework, the palliative care register as part of the
8
9 Quality Outcomes Framework which embeds this into their system of remuneration, and the
10
11 maintenance of a clinical culture of visiting the patient in their own homes. The quality of
12
13 primary care is known to be crucially important with regard to supporting people to die at
14
15 home if that is their wish across a variety of countries [14] and responsibility for community
16
17 palliative care supported by early integration with specialist teams[15] and home visits by the
18
19 family practitioner have been highlighted as important factors.[16, 17] However, in Australia,
20
21 home visits are less frequent and there is variable practice with regard to the composition of
22
23 the multi-disciplinary primary and palliative care teams across settings and the level of
24
25 integration with palliative care teams.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The intensity of hands on care provided by the caregiver was associated with increased access
34
35 to palliative care ($p < 0.001$). Those referred to palliative care services may be those assumed
36
37 to have sufficient support to sustain home care. Family and friends involved in providing care
38
39 may more effectively advocate for additional help. A recent mortality follow-back study of
40
41 place of death in people with cancer found that patients' and relatives' preferences, home
42
43 palliative care, and district/community nursing explained over 90% of home deaths.[18]
44
45
46
47
48

49 Although there was no association between respondents' household income and care
50
51 recipients' place of death, when only those who had provided hands on, personal care were
52
53 considered, income did play a part. Those with caregivers from higher income quartiles were
54
55 the *least* likely to die at home. This is consistent with the National End of Life Care
56
57 Intelligence Network (NEoLCIN) 2012 report for people dying of *non-cancer* disease but in
58
59
60

1
2
3 contrast to the data regarding death due to cancer.[19] The NEOLCIN data are mainly sourced
4
5 from NHS and social care *patient* data. The HSE caregiver dataset is therefore not directly
6
7 comparable with NEOLCIN data as household income of patient and caregivers before and
8
9 after the death may be different. Gomes *et al* found that people with cancer were more likely
10
11 to die at home if family members were aware that the disease was no longer curable, and
12
13 preferences for place of care had been discussed with patients and families.[18] However, as
14
15 more educated, higher income caregivers are likely to be effective using their health literacy
16
17 to advocate for those for whom they care,[20] then if the caregiver believes that best care is
18
19 hospital, even in very advanced disease, then this might help to explain the caregiver income
20
21 effect on home deaths.[18] However, we did not have data on the caregivers' employment
22
23 status. These caregivers may be those in employment and may be less able to increase the
24
25 level of personal care around the time of death, especially if they have used leave entitlement
26
27 prior to this point.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 With non-cancer conditions there are particular challenges of a disease trajectory with
35
36 episodic deteriorations and periods of recovery, poorer professional skills in determining and
37
38 communicating prognosis reflected in lower rates of advance care planning.[21, 22] There is
39
40 poorer public understanding of the terminal nature of such conditions and conversations
41
42 about prognosis are less likely than for cancer.[23] This issue is complicated by the fact that
43
44 for people with advanced non-cancer conditions, hospital admission may be beneficial during
45
46 deteriorations, any of which may lead to death. As there is emerging evidence that a palliative
47
48 approach alongside appropriate disease-modifying treatment does not appear to shorten
49
50 survival[24, 25] and may even prolong it,[26] our findings may indicate clinically important
51
52 disadvantage to patients.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There is a need for clear communication with patients *and* their caregivers about the
4 implications of advanced disease and the need for advance care planning including informed
5 preferences for place of death. There is increasing emphasis on the importance of advanced
6 care discussions between clinicians and *patients* to encourage a realistic understanding of
7 their stage of disease. However, there is no systematic approach to ensure patients' family
8 caregivers have an up-to-date understanding of the stage of disease, aim of care and viable
9 treatment options. The family member or friend usually seen with the patient in the clinic, or
10 at home, or visiting in hospital may not be the person who is the most health literate or
11 strongest patient advocate. If information is not passed accurately on by the patient or
12 accompanying person, or expressly communicated by clinical staff then the family
13 member/friend acting as the main patient advocate may influence place of care and
14 interventions from a basis of incomplete understanding.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The issue of providing care for *someone close* at the end of life and the relationship with
33 socioeconomic status is therefore complex and not simply a matter of being able to pay for
34 help in the home.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Limitations**

42
43
44 As the numbers with a spousal relationship were small, there is no sub-group analysis.
45 Spousal household income is a measure that may change with the death of the spouse but this
46 paper focuses on *respondents'* (*not decedent*) household income acknowledging that this may
47 be different to the patients'. Previous work with caregivers more broadly showed people with
48 lower household incomes were more likely to become caregivers, to carry a higher caregiver
49 burden and experience poorer health. This work found that caregivers who are less deprived
50 are likely to have greater health, knowledge and skills, and greater material resources with
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which to support the care recipient.[27] Findings were adjusted for educational status but our
4
5 lack of data regarding employment status limits our ability to draw conclusions, given the
6
7 issues highlighted above. SES is more complex than household income alone, each aspect
8
9 highlighting differing aspects of access to health services.
10

11 12 13 14 15 16 **Implications for policy and practice**

17
18
19 Despite government policy urging more care in the community, in part driven by a desire to
20
21 save hospital costs, good care of the dying at home requires excellent (and costly) nursing,
22
23 medical and social supports, without accounting for the care provided by family and friends.
24
25 Dying at home is perceived by bereaved caregivers as having poorer symptom control than
26
27 inpatient care suggesting that community care is still sub-optimal.[28]
28
29

30
31 Caregivers can play a powerful advocacy role for the care recipient and their own needs,
32
33 especially when the patient is too sick to convey their own wishes. If the caregiver believes
34
35 that the best place of care is hospital, especially if due to a lack clear explanation and honest
36
37 discussion regarding treatment futility, then health literate caregivers will continue to push
38
39 for hospital admission.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 47 **Conclusions**

48
49
50 This study examined data concerning people in England who had *someone close* to them die.
51
52 For study respondents, access by the decedent to palliative care services was strongly
53
54 associated with a reduction in deaths in hospital and an increase in home deaths.
55
56 Respondents' household income and decedents' place of death were not associated when
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adjusted for palliative care use. However, when only caregivers were considered, decedents
4
5 with caregivers from higher income quartiles were the *least* likely to die at home.
6
7

8 There is a complex relationship between caregivers' SES, ability to provide personal care,
9
10 and health literacy that is likely to have an impact on a patient's place of death. Further
11
12 research is needed to help interpret these findings, inform tailored and relevant support, and
13
14 provide appropriate resources for caregivers for someone at the end of life.
15
16

17 18 19 20 21 22 **Declarations**

23
24
25
26
27 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** The HSE included the question set in their
28
29 ethics approval processes (including consent) for the 2013 survey, obtained from the Oxford
30
31 A Research Ethics Committee (reference 12/SC/0317). For the elements involved in this
32
33 report, verbal consent only was sought. Verbal consent was not recorded assuming that those
34
35 who took part in the survey, and provided data had consented to do so.
36
37

38 39 40 **Consent to publish**

41
42 This article does not publish individual participant data.
43
44
45

46
47 **Availability of data:** The HSE data used in this analysis are available at the UK Data Archive:
48
49 NatCen Social Research and University College London. Department of Epidemiology and
50
51 Public Health, Health Survey for England, 2013 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data
52
53 Archive [distributor], January 2015. SN: 7649, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7649-1>.
54
55

56
57 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Funding:** The work was funded by palliative care speciality group lead (MJ) support funding
4 provided by the North East Yorkshire, North Lincolnshire (NEYNL) Local Clinical Research
5 Network who were completely independent of the study.
6
7
8

9
10 **Author contribution:** MJ and DC; conception and design, acquisition of data - VA, MJ, DC;
11 analysis and interpretation of data - MJ; drafting of the manuscript - MJ, DC, VA, HC, LD,
12 UM; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content - MJ, DC, VA, HC,
13 LD, UM read and approved the final manuscript - VA; statistical analysis - MJ; obtaining
14 funding.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Acknowledgements.** With thanks to: the members of the public and Lisa Dikomitis,
23 Research Fellow, University of Hull and to Annie Jones, patient and public representative to
24 the Hull York Medical School who contributed to the focus groups to adapt the Australian
25 question set for an English setting; to Amy Abernethy from Duke University, N. Carolina for
26 her work developing the original question set for the HOS, and for her comments on the
27 adaptation for English use; to Rachel Craig Senior Research Director, and Sally Bridges,
28 Research Director, Health Survey for England for providing excellent liaison assistance and
29 advice; Tessa Ing, Head of End of Life Care and Death Certification Department of Health
30 and Barbara Hanratty, Senior Lecturer in Primary Care Research, NIHR Career Development
31 Fellow. Hull York Medical School for valuable comments on question adaptation
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure legend.**
4

5
6
7 **Figure 1: Proportion who died at home by income, for caregivers**
8
9
10 **by cancer death or not.**
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Reference List

- 1
2
3
4
5 (1) Pring A, Verne J. Deprivation and death: Variation in place and cause of death -
6 National End of Life Care Intelligence Network. [http://www.endoflifecare-](http://www.endoflifecare-intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death)
7 [intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death](http://www.endoflifecare-intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death) 2012 February
8 1; Available from: URL: [http://www.endoflifecare-](http://www.endoflifecare-intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death)
9 [intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death](http://www.endoflifecare-intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/deprivation_and_death)
- 10
11 (2) Currow DC, Burns CM, Abernethy AP. Place of death for people with noncancer and
12 cancer illness in South Australia: a population-based survey. *J Palliat Care*
13 2008;**24**(3):144-50.
- 14
15 (3) Ahmed N, Bestall JC, Ahmedzai SH, Payne SA, Clark D, Noble B. Systematic review
16 of the problems and issues of accessing specialist palliative care by patients, carers
17 and health and social care professionals. *Palliat Med* 2004 September;**18**(6):525-42.
- 18
19 (4) Grande GE, Farquhar MC, Barclay SI, Todd CJ. The influence of patient and carer
20 age in access to palliative care services. *Age Ageing* 2006 May;**35**(3):267-73.
- 21
22 (5) Davidson PM, Abernethy AP, Newton PJ, Clark K, Currow DC. The caregiving
23 perspective in heart failure: a population based study. *BMC Health Serv Res*
24 2013;**13**:342.
- 25
26 (6) Gadoud A, Kane E, Macleod U, Ansell P, Oliver S, Johnson M. Palliative Care
27 among Heart Failure Patients in Primary Care: A Comparison to Cancer Patients
28 Using English Family Practice Data. *PLoS One* 2014;**9**(11):e113188.
- 29
30 (7) Walshe C, Todd C, Caress A, Chew-Graham C. Patterns of access to community
31 palliative care services: a literature review. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2009
32 May;**37**(5):884-912.
- 33
34 (8) Chen H, Nicolson DJ, Macleod U, Allgar V, Dalglish C, Johnson M. Does the use of
35 specialist palliative care services modify the effect of socioeconomic status on place
36 of death? A systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2015 September 1.
- 37
38 (9) Grande GE, Addington-Hall JM, Todd CJ. Place of death and access to home care
39 services: are certain patient groups at a disadvantage? *Soc Sci Med* 1998
40 September;**47**(5):565-79.
- 41
42 (10) Johnson MJ, Allgar V, Macleod U, Jones A, Oliver S, Currow D. Family Caregivers
43 Who Would Be Unwilling to Provide Care at the End of Life Again: Findings from
44 the Health Survey for England Population Survey. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**(1):e0146960.
- 45
46 (11) Boodhna G, Bridges S, Darton R et al. Methods and Documentation. Household
47 Survey for England 2013. HSE 2013. Department of Epidemiology and Public
48 Health, UCL; 2013. Report No.: Volume 2.
- 49
50 (12) Organisation for economic co-operation and development (OECD). Prices and
51 Purchasing Power Parities: Monthly comparative price levels. [http://stats.oecd](http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CPL#)
52 [org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CPL#](http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CPL#) 2016 April 7; Available from: URL:
53 <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CPL#>
- 54
55 (13) Observational studies: getting clear about transparency. *PLoS Med* 2014
56 August;**11**(8):e1001711.
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 (14) De Roo ML, Miccinesi G, Onwuteaka-Philipsen BD et al. Actual and preferred place
- 4 of death of home-dwelling patients in four European countries: making sense of
- 5 quality indicators. *PLoS One* 2014;**9**(4):e93762.
- 6
- 7 (15) Costa V, Earle CC, Esplen MJ et al. The determinants of home and nursing home
- 8 death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Palliat Care* 2016;**15**:8.
- 9
- 10 (16) Bell CL, Somogyi-Zalud E, Masaki KH. Factors associated with congruence between
- 11 preferred and actual place of death. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2010 March;**39**(3):591-
- 12 604.
- 13
- 14 (17) Brogaard T, Neergaard MA, Sokolowski I, Olesen F, Jensen AB. Congruence
- 15 between preferred and actual place of care and death among Danish cancer patients.
- 16 *Palliat Med* 2013 February;**27**(2):155-64.
- 17
- 18 (18) Gomes B, Calanzani N, Koffman J, Higginson IJ. Is dying in hospital better than
- 19 home in incurable cancer and what factors influence this? A population-based study.
- 20 *BMC Med* 2015;**13**:235.
- 21
- 22 (19) National End of Life Care Intelligence Network. Deprivation and death: Variation in
- 23 place and cause of death. 2012 Feb.
- 24
- 25 (20) Sorensen K, Van den BS, Fullam J et al. Health literacy and public health: a
- 26 systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health*
- 27 2012;**12**:80.
- 28
- 29 (21) McIlvennan CK, Allen LA. Palliative care in patients with heart failure. *BMJ*
- 30 2016;**353**:i1010.
- 31
- 32 (22) Boland J, Martin J, Wells AU, Ross JR. Palliative care for people with non-malignant
- 33 lung disease: summary of current evidence and future direction. *Palliat Med* 2013
- 34 October;**27**(9):811-6.
- 35
- 36 (23) Barclay S, Momen N, Case-Upton S, Kuhn I, Smith E. End-of-life care conversations
- 37 with heart failure patients: a systematic literature review and narrative synthesis. *Br J*
- 38 *Gen Pract* 2011 January;**61**(582):e49-e62.
- 39
- 40 (24) Sidebottom AC, Jorgenson A, Richards H, Kirven J, Sillah A. Inpatient palliative care
- 41 for patients with acute heart failure: outcomes from a randomized trial. *J Palliat Med*
- 42 2015 February;**18**(2):134-42.
- 43
- 44 (25) Farquhar MC, Prevost AT, McCrone P et al. The clinical and cost effectiveness of a
- 45 Breathlessness Intervention Service for patients with advanced non-malignant disease
- 46 and their informal carers: mixed findings of a mixed method randomised controlled
- 47 trial. *Trials* 2016;**17**(1):185.
- 48
- 49 (26) Higginson IJ, Bausewein C, Reilly C et al. An integrated palliative and respiratory
- 50 care service for patients with advanced disease and refractory breathlessness: a
- 51 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 14 A.D. October
- 52 29;[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(14\)70226-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(14)70226-7).
- 53
- 54 (27) Bruhn JG, Rebach HM. Socioeconomic status and caregiving. *The Sociology of*
- 55 *Caregiving. Clinical Sociology: research and practice*. Heidelberg, New York,
- 56 london: Springer Dordrecht, 2014. p86.
- 57
- 58 (28) Colvin H, Office for National Statistics. National Survey of Bereaved People
- 59 (VOICES): England, 2015. Quality of care delivered in the last 3 months of life for
- 60 adults who died in England. 2016 Apr 22.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents who stated that *someone close to them had died of a terminal illness in last 5 years by access to palliative care*

	HSE respondents			
	Access to pall care missing for 3 responders			
	Total n=2165	PCS n=1190	No PCS n=975	p-value
Age (Mean (sd)) (n=2165)	47.7 (18.6)	47.0 (18.0)	48.6 (19.3)	0.042
Sex (n=2165)				0.147
Female	1174 (54%)	662 (56%)	512 (53%)	
Male	991 (46%)	528 (44%)	463 (47%)	
Marital Status (n=2163)				0.018
Single	478 (22%)	280 (24%)	198 (20%)	
Married	1032 (48%)	555 (47%)	477 (49%)	
Co-habiting	286 (13%)	162 (14%)	123 (13%)	
Separated/Divorced	182 (8%)	104 (9%)	78 (8%)	
Widowed	186 (9%)	88 (7%)	98 (10%)	
Household Income* (n=1763)				0.233
Q1	440 (25%)	254 (26%)	186 (24%)	
Q2	447 (25%)	250 (26%)	197 (25%)	
Q3	436 (25%)	225 (23%)	211 (27%)	
Q4	440 (25%)	253 (26%)	187 (24%)	
Qualifications† (n=2160)				0.050
No qualifications	462 (21%)	241 (20%)	221 (23%)	
Trade qualification,/certificate/diploma	1138 (53%)	616 (52%)	522 (54%)	
Degree	560 (26%)	332 (28%)	228 (23%)	
Relationship to deceased (n=2164)				0.033
Spouse/Partner	133 (6%)	72 (6%)	61 (6%)	
Parent	425 (20%)	226 (19%)	199 (20%)	
Child	73 (3%)	42 (4%)	31 (3%)	
Sibling	209 (10%)	100 (8%)	109 (11%)	

Other relative	1009 (47%)	551 (46%)	458 (47%)	
Friend	275 (13%)	173 (45%)	102 (11%)	
Other	40 (2%)	26 (2%)	14 (1%)	
Provided hands on care (n=2141)				<0.001
Daily	306 (14%)	197 (17%)	109 (11%)	
Intermittent	251 (12%)	154 (13%)	97 (10%)	
Rare	87 (4%)	52 (4%)	35 (4%)	
No care	1497 (70%)	773 (66%)	724 (75%)	
Place of death (n=2153)				<0.001
Home	686 (32%)	432 (36%)	254 (26%)	
Hospital	952 (44%)	369 (31%)	583 (61%)	
Hospice	316 (15%)	284 (24%)	32 (3%)	
Residential, hostel or other	199 (9%)	104 (9%)	95 (10%)	
Place of death (Home) (n=2153)	686 (32%)	432 (36%)	254 (26%)	<0.001
Cause of death (Cancer) (n=2165)	1552 (72%)	997 (84%)	555 (57%)	<0.001

PCS –palliative care services; HSE – Health Survey for England: *NB *respondent's* household income. Figures represent income quartiles: 25%= £14,701, 50%=£24,700, 75% =£44,094. † Trade qualification, certificate, diploma or higher = Below degree or NVQ4/NVQ5

Table 2: Household income quartiles and place of death

Place of death	Income Quartiles†			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Home	147 (34%)	160 (36%)	137 (31%)	124 (28%)
Hospital	196 (45%)	189 (42%)	194 (45%)	187 (43%)
Hospice	60 (14%)	65 (15%)	62 (14%)	69 (16%)
Residential, hostel or other	35 (8%)	32 (7%)	42 (10%)	57 (13%)

† Figures represent income quartiles: 25%= £14,701, 50%=£24,700, 75% =£44,094.

Table 3: Logistic regression for odds of dying at home compared to elsewhere

	Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted Odds* Ratio (95% CI)	p-value
	All patients (Unadjusted model: n=1791, Adjusted model: n=1790)			
Palliative care (Yes)	1.52 (1.24, 1.87)	<0.001	1.52 (1.24, 1.87)	<0.001
Income		0.102		0.055
Q1	1.28 (0.96, 1.71)	0.095	1.35 (0.98, 1.86)	0.065
Q2	1.43 (1.07, 1.90)	0.015	1.53 (1.13, 2.08)	0.006
Q3	1.19 (0.89, 1.60)	0.235	1.25 (0.93, 1.68)	0.148
Q4	1.00		1.00	
	Cancer only patients (Unadjusted model: n=1283, Adjusted model: n=1283)			
Palliative care (Yes)	1.66 (1.29, 2.13)	<0.001	1.68 (1.31, 2.17)	<0.001
Income		0.639		0.386
Q1	1.06 (0.76, 1.47)	0.734	1.16 (0.81, 1.68)	0.418
Q2	1.20 (0.86, 1.66)	0.284	1.32 (0.93, 1.88)	0.118
Q3	1.19 (0.85, 1.67)	0.300	1.28 (0.91, 1.81)	0.155
Q4	1.00		1.00	

*Adjusted for age, gender, marital status and educational status

Table 4: Income and place of death for those who provided personal care

Caregiver n=648, p=0.147	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Home	53 (32%)	73 (38%)	46 (29%)	33 (25%)
Hospital	74 (45%)	78 (41%)	64 (41%)	58 (43%)
Hospice	25 (15%)	25 (13%)	27 (17%)	22 (16%)
Residential, hostel or other	12 (8%)	16 (8%)	21 (13%)	21 (16%)

There was an association for the caregivers ($p=0.069$) between place of death and income, after adjusting for access to palliative care. (Table 5) The Hosmer and Lemeshow Test demonstrated a good model fit and was not seen for non-caregivers.

Table 5: Logistic regression for odds of dying at home compared to elsewhere by caring status

	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Caregiver (n=682)		
Palliative care (Yes)	2.39 (1.65, 3.47)	<0.001
Income		0.069
Q1	1.53 (0.91, 2.57)	0.111
Q2	1.91 (1.16, 3.15)	0.011
Q3	1.31 (0.77, 2.22)	0.323
Q4	1.00	
Not a caregiver (n=1066)		
Palliative care (Yes)	1.23 (0.95, 1.60)	0.110
Income		0.778
Q1	1.17 (0.82, 1.67)	0.389
Q2	1.19 (0.83, 1.71)	0.353
Q3	1.13 (0.79, 1.62)	0.510
Q4	1.00	