

# Research Protocol

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 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

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

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

48 Ethics and dissemination

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

52

53

54

55 Introduction

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

66 renal function (an estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate  $<60\text{ml/min per }1.73\text{m}^2$ ) or both for  
67 greater than 3 months (4). Hypertension, dyslipidaemia, hyperglycaemia and smoking are  
68 some modifiable risk factors for DKD (5). Socioeconomic deprivation is associated with DKD  
69 through its influence on these risk factors, but also through other mechanisms such as  
70 access to healthcare and health literacy (6).

71 Socioeconomic deprivation, is characterized by restricted access to societal resources due to  
72 poverty, discrimination and other disadvantages (7), The prevalence of type 2 diabetes is  
73 linked to social deprivation, with a higher prevalence in deprived groups (8, 9), likely due to  
74 barriers to healthy living conditions, education, and behavioural factors imposed by  
75 economic constraints. The relationship between deprivation and type 1 diabetes is less  
76 clearly understood with studies reporting varied relationships ranging from no association  
77 (10), to an inverse association (11) to a positive association (12). Socioeconomic deprivation  
78 is also a risk factor for complications in both type 1 and type 2 diabetes including diabetic  
79 retinopathy (13, 14), cardiovascular disease (15, 16), diabetic foot ulceration and  
80 amputation (17) and mortality in type 1 and 2 diabetes (18-20). There is also significant  
81 evidence of an influence of social deprivation on development of DKD. The EURODIAB IDDM  
82 complications study showed a significant association between lower educational attainment  
83 and macroalbuminuria (21). Gonzales et al demonstrated in the UK that among people living  
84 with type 1 diabetes, those living in the most deprived circumstances had a hazard ratio of  
85 2.92 for incident DKD compared to the least deprived. Similarly in type 2 diabetes, the most  
86 deprived had a hazard ratio of 1.39 for incident DKD compared to the least deprived (22).  
87 Studies to date in Ireland on deprivation and diabetes have focussed on diabetes prevalence  
88 and predominantly use individual level markers of socioeconomic deprivation such as

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

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

121 Identifying social determinants affecting people living with diabetes is key to  
122 comprehending morbidity contributors and customizing management strategies for diverse  
123 populations, recognizing that disadvantaged backgrounds may lead to increased healthcare  
124 utilization and emergency care reliance. (30, 31). Issues that affect their health may not be  
125 fixed by physical healthcare alone, and a framework of care encompassing a biopsychosocial  
126 model may be needed. The Frome model of primary care is a project in Somerset in the UK  
127 that leverages existing social networks to improve health outcomes. It works on the basis  
128 that health is heavily influenced by social factors and uses community assets such as peer  
129 support groups to tackle social determinants of health and provide support to people in the  
130 community. This reduced hospital admissions by 14% over a 4 year period (32). We are also  
131 at a time period where diabetes technology is ever advancing, and it is imperative that  
132 access to technology is equitable across all social classes. Literature from the UK suggests  
133 disparities in access to insulin pump and continuous glucose monitoring devices (33).  
134 Another study looking at flash glucose monitors showed that “time in range” did not differ  
135 between deprivation categories (34) . Therefore, it is important to have equitable access to  
136 these technologies to allow everyone to benefit.

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

143

144

## 145 Methods and Analysis

146

### 147 Methods

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

152 This dataset contains clinical and laboratory data which was obtained from DIAMOND.

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

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

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

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183



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

184 Table 1: Data in existing dataset

185 ACR= albumin creatinine ratio

186 eGFR= estimated glomerular filtration rate

187

188 Inclusion criteria:

189 -People living with diabetes, attending the diabetes service at Galway University Hospitals  
190 with a diagnosis of diabetes (type 1, type 2 and other)

191 -Over 18 years of age

192 Exclusion criteria:

193 -Insufficient follow up laboratory data (at least 2 values of creatinine >3months apart  
194 required for inclusion)

195 -Insufficient address details to determine address-based deprivation index

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

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

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

<b>Relative Index Score</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Label</b>
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

237 Table 2: Pobal HP deprivation Indices 2016

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 m<sup>2</sup>/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/1.73m<sup>2</sup>/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 m<sup>2</sup>), 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

261 Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

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> - <i>biguanides (%)</i> - <i>sulfonylureas (%)</i> - <i>SGLT-2 inhibitors (%)</i> - <i>GLP-1 analogue (%)</i> - <i>DPP-IV inhibitor (%)</i> - <i>insulin (%)</i>					
<i>Other medications</i> - <i>ACE inhibitor (%)</i> - <i>ARB (%)</i> - <i>Statin (%)</i>					
<i>Number of antihypertensives (mean/median)</i>					
<i>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>) (mean/median)</i>					

29.03.2024

Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg) (mean/median)					
Baseline creatinine ( $\mu\text{mol/l}$ ) (mean/median)					
Baseline eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m <sup>2</sup> ) (mean/median)					
Baseline eGFR stage** -G1-Normal or high >90ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup> -G2-Mildly decreased 60-89ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup> -G3a-Mildly to moderately decreased 45-59ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup> -G3b-Moderately to severely decreased 30-44ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup> -G4-Severely decreased 15-29ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup> -G5-Kidney Failure <15ml/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>					
Baseline urine ACR (mean/median)					
Baseline urine ACR stage)** -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*

## 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.

## 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.

## 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 socioeconomic 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.

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>].

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, Blackbourn 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.

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.