

1 Title Page

2
3
4
5 ***The economic effects of kidney failure treatment on the***
6 ***household welfare of patients on Dialysis in Buea and***
7 ***Bamenda–Cameroon.***

8
9 Therence Nwana Dingana^{1,2}, Stewart Ndutard Ngasa^{1,3*}, Neh Chang Ngasa^{1,3}, Leo Fosso
10 Fozou⁴, Fuein V. Kum⁵, Njong M. Aloysius⁵

- 11
12 1. Medical Research and Careers Organisation
13 2. Tubah District Hospital, Regional Delegation of Public Health, Northwest Region,
14 Cameroon
15 3. The Spinney, Elysium Healthcare, Manchester, United Kingdom
16 4. Ndop District Hospital, Regional Delegation of Public Health, Northwest Region,
17 Cameroon
18 5. Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Buea

19
20
21 * Corresponding author

22 Email: stewart.ndutard3@gmail.com (SN)

29 Abstract

30 **Background:** Noncommunicable diseases, such as kidney failure, diabetes, and cancer, are
31 among the leading causes of death worldwide. There is a sharp increase in the incidence and
32 prevalence of patients with kidney failure requiring replacement therapy. This has led to a
33 very high cost, especially in resource-limited settings like Cameroon. The aim of this study is
34 to determine the effects of direct and indirect costs of kidney failure treatment on their
35 household income.

36 **Methods:** A descriptive cross-sectional study design was used. Primary data was collected
37 using a self-administered pre-tested questionnaire for the economic impact of chronic
38 disease. For bivariate analysis, we used the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test to obtain crude
39 Odd Ratios (OR) of factors associated with household welfare. Multivariate logistic regression,
40 the OLS model was used to identify independent associations between kidney failure
41 treatment and household welfare. This was presented as adjusted odd ratios along with their
42 p-values. A p-value of <0.05 was used as a cut-off for statistical significance.

43 **Results:** The mean age of participants was 44.6±15.5 years; most patients (83(62.4%)) were
44 married. Seventy-nine (59.4%) were unemployed, and eighty-one (60.9%) had no financial
45 support. Their annual household expenditure ranged from 300,000FCFA to 3,360,000FCFA,
46 with a mean and standard deviation of 1,547,729FCFA and 781,882FCFA, respectively. The
47 yearly total cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 520,000FCFA to 10,000,000FCFA
48 with a mean and standard deviation of 2,137,556FCFA and 1,541,163FCFA, respectively. The
49 cost of consultation and laboratory tests had negative regression coefficients (P=0.001 and
50 <0.001 respectively).

51 **Conclusion:** kidney failure has a significant negative effect on the household welfare of
52 patients on dialysis. Kidney disease screening and prevention programs are necessary to

53 reduce the number of persons in need of hemodialysis. Health insurance schemes and
54 universal health coverage should target patients on hemodialysis.

55 **Keywords:** kidney failure, dialysis, healthcare cost, household welfare

56 **Background**

57 Globally, disease burden is rising, ranging from noncommunicable diseases,
58 malnutrition, neglected tropical diseases, and infectious disease afflictions¹. However, global
59 attention has focused on infectious diseases like HIV, tuberculosis, and the COVID-19
60 pandemic. Noncommunicable diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, kidney failure, chronic
61 respiratory disease, and diabetes, contribute a lot to global health miseries and are the
62 leading causes of death worldwide and, therefore, represent an emerging international
63 health threat. Deaths from noncommunicable diseases are far more than all communicable
64 diseases². Noncommunicable diseases end the lives of 41 million people each year,
65 corresponding to over 7 out of 10 deaths globally.

66 Kidney failure is one of the main global noncommunicable diseases lacking proper attention,
67 especially in resource-limited settings. There is a sharp rise in the incidence and prevalence
68 of patients with kidney failure requiring dialysis, whose cost is usually very high³ . The
69 International Society of Nephrology projected that in 2030, 14.5 million people will have
70 kidney failure and need treatment. However, only 5.4 million will actually receive it due to
71 economic, social, and political factors⁴.

72 The handiness of dialysis and kidney transplantation for treating kidney failure has been one
73 of medicine's greatest successes in past decades. It has been accessible in developed
74 countries for over 50 years, with an increasing number of patients being treated^{5,6}. The use
75 of dialysis varies regionally due to differences in population demographics, the prevalence of

76 End-Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) and, most specifically, access to and provision for Renal
77 Replacement Therapy (RRT)^{7,8}. Treating renal failure is disproportionately costly compared to
78 other medical conditions and constitutes a heavy burden on communities and households
79 worldwide⁶ Available data on the cost of RRT in low-income nations, especially in sub-Saharan
80 Africa (SSA) is scarce, as opposed to high and middle-income countries^{6,9,10}. Since 2010, the
81 USA spent about \$28 billion yearly for ESRD-related medical expenses¹¹. In the UK, the
82 management cost for ESRD was 1–2% of the funds of the National Health Service for patients
83 who make up only 0.05% of the population^{11,6}. Dialysis is an example of a robust single-payer
84 dominant system in the United States, unlike most low-income countries like Cameroon,
85 where payments are mostly “out of pocket”¹²; where households are required to do 'pay as
86 they go'. Consequently, poor households quickly face catastrophic health expenditures,
87 become financially drained, income depleted, and unmanageable in the context of kidney
88 failure¹³.

89 Treatment of chronic kidney disease is very precise, comprising medical
90 consultations, laboratory investigations, dialysis/kidney transplant, drug therapy, and lifestyle
91 adjustments¹⁴. All these are very costly and can be challenging for the patients to cope with.
92 In most developed countries like the United States, patients receiving dialysis are insured by
93 Medicare, a robust single-payer dominant system¹⁵
94 Dialysis is comparatively more expensive for poorer than wealthier developing countries and
95 may not be cost-effective for poor countries such as Cameroon^{16,17}. In Cameroon, just 5.1%
96 (\$ 1.3 billion) of the state budget is assigned to healthcare. With other pressing health
97 concerns such as high maternal and infant mortality and HIV/AIDS, haemodialysis becomes a
98 serious economic burden on the healthcare sector and therefore almost all the costs are left
99 for the patients to bear. Poor households quickly become financially drained while wealthy

100 households comfortably survive. This shows a significant disparity in the economic impact on
101 the households. Lack of resources, limited access or high cost of treatment results in under-
102 diagnosis of kidney failure, and even those diagnosed end up receiving less care than required
103 (or resort to ineffective measures like prayers or traditional medicine) leading to pitiable
104 health outcome ¹⁸

105 The current socio-political crisis plaguing the English-speaking part of Cameroon has
106 brought more challenges to these patients, in terms of abandonments of settlements, death
107 of breadwinners; cost of transportation, lockdown days, and travel risks etc., all of these will
108 increase the socioeconomic burden of kidney failure. Available knowledge on the economic
109 effects of kidney treatment on household welfare in this area lacking. We, therefore, resorted
110 to evaluating the economic effects of kidney failure treatment on the household welfare of
111 patients in the dialysis centers of Buea and Bamenda – Cameroon. This evaluation consisted
112 of evaluating the direct and indirect cost of kidney failure treatment.

113 **Methods**

114 **Study design, setting and participants**

115 Cameroon's South West and North West regions, with a population of about 3.52 million, are
116 faced with a dual emergency; the socio-political crisis, which turned violent in November
117 2017, and recently the COVID-19 disease. These regions have approximately 400 patients
118 requiring dialysis and have two hemodialysis centers, the Buea Regional Hospital and the
119 Bamenda Regional Hospital.

120 The financial burden of kidney failure affects many levels; the government, firms, society, and
121 households. This study was focused on the economic burden at the household level. The
122 content of the economic effect in this study is composed of the direct and indirect costs of
123 kidney failure. The monthly expenses were analyzed and projected for one year (2022).

124 Dialysis patients for acute kidney injury and other causes like hyperkalemia requiring just a
125 few dialysis sessions were excluded. Patients who initiated dialysis less than a month ago
126 were exempted from the study.

127 **Sampling and data collection**

128 We used the descriptive cross-sectional study design and data collection started in May
129 2023. Primary data was collected using a self-administered pre-tested questionnaire for the
130 economic impact of chronic disease¹⁹. The questionnaire has mainly closed-ended questions
131 and divided into three main sections. Section A is general information and household socio-
132 demography and household expenditure, section B is the direct cost of kidney failure, and
133 section C is the indirect cost of kidney failure. All collected data was anonymised.

134 **Description of main variables**

135 The study assessed several economic factors related to kidney failure treatment. Household
136 expenditure (Y) was quantified in CFA francs, which involved approximating the patients'
137 monthly spending. To determine the average annual household expenditure, the average
138 monthly spending was multiplied by 12.

139 Direct cost (X1) represented the total annual cost of treating kidney failure, encompassing
140 expenses such as consultation fees, laboratory tests, medication costs, medical devices, self-
141 medications, other treatments like special diets, dialysis costs, and additional expenses
142 related to dialysis. These costs were projected for a one-year duration.

143 Indirect cost (X2) referred to the average annual expenses associated with kidney failure
144 treatment but not directly linked to medical procedures. This included transport expenses,
145 parking fees, accommodation costs, caregiver fees, informal caregiver expenses, the cost of

146 accompanying persons, caregiver accommodation, and other related costs. Like direct costs,
147 these expenses were projected over a one-year period.

148 To examine the impact of these factors on household expenditure and, consequently,
149 household welfare, the study employed an ordinary least square (OLS) approach due to the
150 continuous nature of the dependent variables. OLS estimators involve linear functions of the
151 household expenditure (Y) values, connected through weights that are a non-linear function
152 of the direct and indirect cost values (X1 and X2). The analysis was conducted using the
153 software SPSS, which generated values for the unknowns ($\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$) in the linear model
154 equation.

155 The research employed the Ordinary Least Squares regression model to investigate the
156 relationship between the direct and indirect costs of kidney failure treatment and household
157 welfare. Household welfare was considered the dependent variable, while direct and indirect
158 costs were treated as independent variables. This relationship can be summarized by the
159 following function:

160 Household welfare (HW) = F (direct cost, indirect cost);

161 $HW = F (DC, IC) \dots\dots\dots (3)$

162 In our study, we measured household welfare by measuring household consumption in terms
163 of household expenditure as specified by World Bank (2000).

164 Using the multiple regression models, we transformed the function into a multiple regression
165 equation for empirical verification as follows:

166 $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon_i \dots\dots\dots (4)$

167 Where:

168 Y_i = HE (household expenditure), the dependent variable and a measure of household welfare
169 X_1 = Direct cost (DC) and X_2 = Indirect cost (IC) are the independent variables
170 ϵ_i = Error term, which constitutes other predictors of household welfare not considered in
171 our model.
172 Our data set will then help us to get estimates for β_0 , β_1 , and β_2 ,

173 **Sample size calculation**

174 We determined the sample size for this work based on Taro Yamane's approach to finite
175 populations²⁰

$$176 \quad n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

177 Where,

178 n = the minimum sample size

179 N = the finite population out of which the sample was taken

180 e = the acceptable sampling error (or limit of tolerable error)

181 The total number of patients permanently on dialysis in Buea is 95, and Bamenda is 71 giving
182 a total of 166, setting the significance level at 0.05 or 5%. Therefore, the minimum sample
183 size (n) was calculated as

$$184 \quad n = \frac{166}{1 + 166(0.05)^2} = 117.314 = 18 \text{ patients} \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

185 We used the stratified sampling technique to recruit the participants. These participants
186 were grouped as men, women, and children. One hundred and thirty-three (133) participants
187 took part in the study.

188 **Statistical methods and data analysis**

189 Data were entered into excel spreadsheet and analysed using Stata version 14 statistical
190 software. Results were presented as means and standard deviation (SD) for continuous

191 variables and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables. At bivariate analysis, we
192 used the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test to obtain crudes Odd Ratios (OR) of factors associated
193 with household welfare. Multivariate logistic regression was used to identify independent
194 associations with kidney failure treatment and household welfare. This was presented as
195 adjusted odd ratios along with their p-values. A p-value of <0.05 was used as cut off for
196 statistical significance.

197 **Results**

198 **Sociodemographic characteristics of participants**

199 The patient ages exhibited a normal distribution and varied from 13 to 80 years, with an
200 average age of 44.6 ± 15.5 years. The majority of patients fell in the age range of 30 to 60 years,
201 making up 63.9% of the sample (refer to Table 1). Out of the 133 participants, 80 (60.2%) were
202 male, while 53 (39.8%) were female. In terms of marital status, the majority of patients (83
203 or 62.4%) were married, 38 (28.6%) were single, 10 (7.5%) were widows or widowers, and 2
204 (1.5%) were divorced. Regarding employment, 79 (59.4%) of the patients were unemployed,
205 while 54 (41%) were employed. Educational backgrounds varied, with 55 (41.4%) having
206 attended secondary education, 38 (28.6%) having completed primary education, 39 (29.3%)
207 having tertiary education, and one patient having no formal education.

208 Only a small proportion (39 or 29.3%) of patients had no comorbidities. Among the 94 (70.6%)
209 patients with comorbidities, 86 (64.7%) had chronic hypertension, 12 (9.0%) had diabetes, 3
210 (2.3%) had heart disease, and 3 (2.3%) had other chronic illnesses, such as liver failure. Ten
211 (7.5%) of the patients had both hypertension and diabetes. Household density ranged from 2
212 to 15 individuals per household, with an average of 5.7 ± 2.8 persons per household. The
213 duration of time the patients had been on dialysis ranged from 1 month to 168 months

214 (equivalent to 14 years), with an average duration of 28.9 ± 36.4 months (approximately
215 2.4 ± 3.0 years). The time spent in the hospital for each dialysis session varied widely, spanning
216 from 5 to 48 hours, with an average duration of 17.5 ± 11.1 hours. The time patients needed
217 to travel to the hospital ranged from 0 minutes (for those residing in the hospital) to 240
218 minutes (4 hours), with a mean travel time of 57.2 ± 45.8 minutes.

219 None of the patients had their medical bills covered by health insurance, as illustrated in
220 Figure 1. The majority (60.9%) were responsible for paying their own bills, while 24 (18.0%)
221 had their bills covered by their parents. Additionally, 18 (13.5%) of the patients had their
222 children covering the bills, 7 (5.3%) had their spouses paying the bills, and 3 (2.3%) had their
223 bills covered through alternative means, such as by their siblings (refer to Figure 1).

224 **Total household expenditures**

225 The annual household expenditure ranged from 300,000FCFA to 3,360,000FCFA. The mean,
226 median, and standard deviation of annual household expenditures were 1.547.729FCFA,
227 1.500.000FCFA, and 781.882FCFA, respectively.

228 **Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of Participants**

Variable	Number	Percentage
Gender		
Male	80	60.2
Female	53	39.8
Marital Status		
Married	83	62.4
Single	38	28.6
Divorced	2	1.5
Widow	10	7.5
Employment status		
Employed	54	40.6
Unemployed	79	59.4
Level of education		
None	1	0.8

Primary	38	28.6
Secondary	55	41.4
Tertiary	39	29.3
Who pays bills		
Self	81	60.9
Parents	24	18.0
Insurance	0	0.0
Spouse	7	5.3
Children	18	13.5
Others	3	2.3
Comorbidities		
None	39	29.3
Heart disease	3	2.3
Diabetes	12	9.0
Hypertension	86	64.7
Other	3	2.3
Variable	Mean ± SD	Median (IQR)
Age (years)*	44.6 ± 15.5	43 (34 – 55.5)
Duration on dialysis (months)	28.9 ± 36.4	12 (7 – 33)
House hold density	5.7 ± 2.8	6 (4 – 7)
Duration in hospital per session (hours)	17.5 ± 11.1	15 (7.5 – 24)
Time spent travelling (mins)	57.2 ± 45.8	45 (30 – 90)
Annual household income	1,547,729 ± 781,882	1,500,000(1.5 - 2.1M)

229
230 None of the patients had their bills covered by health insurance. Eighty-one (60.9%) were
231 paying their bills by themselves, and 24(18.0%) had their bills paid by their parents, while
232 children paid the bills of 18(13.5%) of the patients, 7(5.3%) of the participants reported that
233 their bills were paid by their spouses and 3(2.3%) of the participants' bills were paid by other
234 means like the siblings.

235 **Total household expenditures**

236 The annual household expenditure ranged from 300,000FCFA to 3,360,000FCFA. The mean,
237 median, and standard deviation of annual household expenditures were 1.547.729FCFA,
238 1.500.000FCFA, and 781.882FCFA, respectively.

239 **Direct cost of kidney failure**

240 The annual direct cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 520,000FCFA to
241 7,160,000FCFA with a mean and standard deviation of 1,648,176FCFA and 1,213,777FCFA,
242 respectively.

243 **Table 2: Annual Direct, Annual Indirect, and Total annual expenditure on kidney failure**
244 **treatment**

Statistic	Annual Direct Cost	Annual Indirect Cost	Total Annual Expenditure on Kidney Failure
N	133	133	133
Mean	1,648,176	489,380	2,137,556
Median	1,288,000	312,000	1,684,000
Std. Deviation	1,213,777	620,519	1,541,164
Minimum	520,000	0	520,000
Maximum	7,160,000	3,596,000	10,000,000
Percentiles	974,000	67,600	1,230,550
	1,288,000	312,000	1,684,000
	1,690,600	610,000	2,324,800

245

246 **Indirect cost of kidney failure**

247 The annual indirect cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 00FCFA to 3,596,000FCFA
248 with a mean and standard deviation of 489,380FCFA and 620,519FCFA, respectively (Table 2).

249 The annual total cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 520,000FCFA to
 250 10,000,000FCFA with a mean and standard deviation of 2,137,556FCFA (\$3, 320) and
 251 1,541,163FCFA. To estimate the effect of kidney failure treatment on household welfare, we
 252 used household consumption measured in terms of household expenditure. The annual direct
 253 and indirect cost of kidney failure treatment both have negative regression coefficients of -
 254 0.022 and -0.147 respectively, (p=0.814 and p=0.114, respectively). The net effect of spending
 255 on kidney failure treatment had a regression coefficient of -0.119 (p=0.172) on household
 256 expenditure.

257 **Table 3: OLS analysis for the direct, indirect, and total annual costs associated with**
 258 **average annual household expenditure.**

	Variables	β_0	β coef	p-value	R squared	
		1,676,982				
	Annual Direct cost		-0.022	0.814	0.024	
	Annual Indirect cost		-0.147	0.113		
	Total annual cost		-0.119	0.172		

259
 260 From equation (2) above,

261 $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$ (5)

262 This implies,
 263 $Household\ Expenditure = 1,676,982 - 0.022\ Direct\ Cost - 0.147\ Indirect\ Cost + \varepsilon$ (6)
 264

265 **Effects of the direct cost components of kidney failure treatment**
 266 **on the household expenditure of dialysis patients.**

267
 268 Evaluating the regressions of each direct cost component reveals that the cost of
 269 consultation, laboratory tests, other treatment costs (nutrition), and cost of medical devices

270 had negative regression coefficients of -0.293, -0.358, -0.005, and -0.07, respectively as on
271 Table 4. These were statistically significant only for the consultation and laboratory test fees,
272 with p-values of 0.001 and <0.001, respectively.

273 Drugs cost and other drugs cost (auto-medication) had positive regression coefficients of
274 0.189 and 0.327, respectively, with p-values of 0.028 and <0.001, respectively.

275 **Table 4: Multiple linear regressions for the direct costs associated with average Annual**
276 **household expenditure.**

Variables	β coef	p-value	R squared
Consultation cost	-0.293	0.001	0.264
Tests cost	-0.358	<0.001	
Drugs cost	0.189	0.028	
Other drugs cost	0.327	<0.001	
Other treatments cost	-0.005	0.95	
Cost medical equipment	-0.07	0.427	

277 **Effects of indirect cost of kidney failure treatment on the**
278 **household expenditure of dialysis patients**

279 The regression analysis of each indirect cost component showed that the cost of
280 transportation, caregiver accommodation, informal caregiver cost, and other costs on
281 caregivers had negative regression coefficients of -0.131, -0.055, -0.059, and -0.094,
282 respectively as on table 5. However, none of these were statistically significant.

283 Parking cost, accommodation cost, and caregiver cost caregiver transport cost all had positive
284 regression coefficients of 0.164, 0.012, 0.004, and 0.127, respectively, however, none of them
285 were statistically significant.

286 **Table 5 Multiple linear regressions for the indirect cost of kidney failure treatment**
287 **associated with average annual household expenditure.**

Variables	β coef	p-value	R squared
Transport cost	-0.131	0.26	0.264
Parking cost	0.164	0.087	
Accommodation cost	0.012	0.884	
Caregiver cost	0.004	0.958	
Caregiver accommodation cost	-0.055	0.509	
Caregiver transport cost	0.127	0.309	
Informal caregiver cost	-0.059	0.483	
Other caregiver costs	-0.094	0.242	

289

290 **Discussion**

291

292 **Direct cost of kidney failure**

293 The annual direct cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 520,000FCFA to
294 7,160,000FCFA with a mean and standard deviation of 1,648,176FCFA and 1,213,777FCFA,
295 respectively as on Table 2. This was way too low compared to the 7,678,553FCFA obtained by
296 Halle and collaborators in tertiary hospitals in Cameroon⁵; this is simply because their study
297 was not focused on household expenditure. They had a 30% cost covered by out-of-pocket
298 while we had 100% out-of-pocket payments. Computing 30% of their value (7 678 553FCFA)
299 gives 2,303,500, which is very close to the figure obtained in our study.

300 **Indirect cost of kidney failure**

301 The annual indirect cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 00FCFA to 3,596,000FCFA
302 with a mean and standard deviation of 489,380FCFA and 620,519FCFA, respectively as on
303 Table 2. This was very similar to the mean value of 530,118FCFA obtained by Halle and
304 collaborators in tertiary hospitals in Cameroon⁵. However, their study was not a household-
305 based study like ours.

306 **Total cost of kidney failure**

307 The annual total cost of kidney failure treatment ranged from 520,000FCFA to
308 10,000,000FCFA with a mean and standard deviation of 2,137,556FCFA (\$3 320) and
309 1,541,163FCFA, respectively as on Table 2. Our annual cost was approximately \$ 3 320, with
310 out-of-pocket payments being the main payment method. The annual cost of dialysis has
311 been estimated at \$ 87 500 in the USA²¹, 5,736 in India²², between \$ 22 000–55 000 in
312 Nigeria²³, \$ 27 440 in Tanzania²⁴. One of the reasons for our lower cost is that we did not
313 include the staff and building costs as has been done in other studies and all the costs
314 considered are household expenditures and not general costs like in the other studies.

315 **Effects of kidney failure treatment on the household welfare of dialysis**
316 **patients.**

317 We used household consumption measured in terms of household expenditure as a
318 metric for household welfare. The annual direct and indirect cost of kidney failure treatment
319 both have negative regression coefficients of -0.022 and -0.147 respectively, suggesting that
320 as the direct and indirect cost of kidney failure treatment increase, the household
321 expenditure decreases. This is very logical because the patients incur these health costs and
322 are left with little to spend on other household needs and hence a negative impact on their
323 household welfare. These coefficients, however, are close to zero, indicating a weak effect.

324 Furthermore, these effects were not statistically significant ($p = 0.814$ and $p = 0.114$,
325 respectively). The net effect of spending on kidney failure treatment had a regression
326 coefficient of -0.119 with household expenditure, but this effect was not also statistically
327 significant ($p = 0.172$) as on Table 3.

328 **Effects of the direct cost components of kidney failure treatment** 329 **on the household expenditure of dialysis patients.**

330 Evaluating the regressions of each direct cost component reveals that the cost of
331 consultation, laboratory tests, other treatment costs (nutrition), and cost of medical devices
332 had negative regression coefficients of -0.293 , -0.358 , -0.005 , and -0.07 , respectively as on
333 Table 4. This implies that; as the expenses on these services increase, household expenditure
334 on other goods and services decreases, decreasing household welfare. However, these were
335 statistically significant only for the consultation and laboratory test fees, with p-values of
336 0.001 and <0.001 , respectively.

337 Drugs cost and other drugs cost (auto-medication) had positive regression coefficients of
338 0.189 and 0.327 , respectively, suggesting that the more you spend on drugs and auto-
339 medications, the higher will be your household expenditure, implying better household
340 welfare. These two were, in fact, statistically significant, with p-values of 0.028 and <0.001 ,
341 respectively. This was controversial to what we expected since spending on these will, in fact,
342 deplete household income, and little will be left to spend for the consumption of other goods
343 and services.

344 **Effects of indirect cost of kidney failure treatment on the** 345 **household expenditure of dialysis patients**

346 The regression analysis of each indirect cost component showed that the cost of
347 transportation, caregiver accommodation, informal caregiver cost, and other costs on
348 caregivers had negative regression coefficients of -0.131, -0.055, -0.059, and -0.094,
349 respectively as on table 5. This infers that; as the expenses on these services increase,
350 household expenditure on other goods and services decreases, decreasing household
351 welfare. However, none of these were statistically significant.

352 Parking cost, accommodation cost, and caregiver cost caregiver transport cost all had positive
353 regression coefficients of 0.164, 0.012, 0.004, and 0.127, respectively, suggesting that the
354 more you spend on parking, accommodation, caregiver, and caregiver transport, the higher
355 your household expenditure will be implying better household welfare. These parameters
356 may be looked upon as indicators of a high standard of living and, therefore, better household
357 welfare. However, none of them were statistically significant.

358

359 **Conclusion**

360

361 This multi-center study demonstrated that the cost of hemodialysis at the household level in
362 Cameroon is exceptionally high compared with the cost of living and is mainly due to the cost
363 of consultation, drugs, and laboratory investigation. Despite the state subsidy, most patients
364 are at a low socioeconomic level; out-of-pocket expenditure is extremely high and
365 unaffordable for patients and their relatives in the long term. Hemodialysis is an economic
366 burden on households, so strategies to cut these costs should be implemented. The cost of
367 consultation, laboratory tests, other treatment costs (nutrition), and the cost of medical

368 devices had negative correlations. This implies that; increasing the use of these
369 commodities/services at the best minimal cost will decrease the household burden of kidney
370 failure. The indirect cost components showed that the cost of transportation, caregiver
371 accommodation, informal caregiver cost, and other costs on caregivers had a negative
372 correlation; therefore, increasing the use of these commodities/services at best minimal cost
373 will decrease the household burden of kidney failure.

374 The government should hasten universal health coverage in Cameroon to specifically cover
375 the cost of consultation, laboratory tests, medications and transportation for dialysis patients
376 in these regions.

377 Kidney disease screening and prevention programs are necessary to reduce the number of
378 persons in need of dialysis and kidney transplants. This remains the only cost-effective and
379 sustainable approach, especially in developing countries like Cameroon. Therefore, the
380 government should implement a policy of annual kidney disease screening especially for
381 people at risk.

382 **Declarations**

383 **Ethics approval and consent to participate.**

384 Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Regional
385 Delegation of health for the Northwest Region and the Regional Delegation of health for the
386 Southwest Region. The respondents were adequately informed using the participant's
387 information section about all the relevant aspects of the study, including its aim, procedures,
388 and anticipated benefits before data were collected. All participants provided verbal or/and
389 written consent to participating in this study. Assent was obtained for children (less than
390 21years)

391 **Consent for publication**

392 Not applicable

393 **Availability of data and materials**

394 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
395 corresponding author on reasonable request.

396 **Competing interests**

397 The authors declare that they have no competing interests" in this section.

398 **Funding**

399 The authors declare that no external fundings sources were used to fund this piece of work

400 **Authors' contributions**

401 TND conceptualised the idea and generated a research proposal from which the study was
402 conducted. TNN, SNN, NCN, LFF, NMA were major contributors in writing the manuscript.
403 FVK analysed and interpreted the patient data regarding the indirect and Direct cost of kidney
404 failure. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

405 **Acknowledgements**

406 Our sincere gratitude goes to all the patients at the Dialysis Centres of the Buea and Bamenda
407 Regional Hospitals. We also thank the directors of the above centres for giving us the
408 administrative clearance needed to complete this piece of work.

409
410
411
412
413
414
415

REFERENCES

1 WHO. (2021). World Health Statistics.

2 CDC. (2020). About Global NCDs | Division of Global Health Protection | Global Health | CDC. About Global NCDs. <https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/healthprotection/ncd/global-ncd-overview.html>

3 Eknoyan, G., Lameire, N., Barsoum, R., Eckardt, K. U., Levin, A., Levin, N., Locatelli, F., MacLeod, A., Vanholder, R., Walker, R., & Wang, H. (2004). The burden of kidney disease: Improving global outcomes. *Kidney International*, 66(4), 1310–1314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1755.2004.00894.x>

4 Himmelfarb, J., Vanholder, R., Mehrotra, R., & Tonelli, M. (2020). The current and future landscape of dialysis. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*, 16(10), 573–585. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41581-020-0315-4>

5 Halle, M. P., M., Kaze, F. F., Fouda, H., Belley, E. P., & Ashuntantang, G. (2017). Cost of care for patients on maintenance haemodialysis in public facilities in Cameroon. *African Journal of Nephrology*, 20(1), 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.21804/20-1-2548>

6 Halle, M. P., M., Kaze, F. F., Fouda, H., Belley, E. P., & Ashuntantang, G. (2017). Cost of care for patients on maintenance haemodialysis in public facilities in Cameroon. *African Journal of Nephrology*, 20(1), 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.21804/20-1-2548>

7 Allan, J. C., Robert, N. F., Charles, H., Blanche, C., David, G., Charles, H., & Areef Ishani, Kirsten Johansen, Bertram Kasiske, Nancy Kutner, Jiannong Liu, Wendy St Peter, Shu Ding, Haifeng Guo, Allyson Kats, Kenneth Lamb, Shuling, L. A. (2012). US Renal Data System 2012 Annual Data Report - volume2.pdf. University of Minnesota, School of Medicine, USA.

8 Vivekanand, J., Garcia-Garcia, G., & Kunitoshi Iseki, Zuo Li, Saraladevi Naicker, Brett Plattner, Rajiv Saran, Angela Yee-Moon Wang, C.-W. Y. (2013). Chronic kidney disease: global dimension and perspectives. - PubMed - NCBI. *Lancet*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23727169>

9 Vecchi, A. F. De, & M Dratwa, M. E. W. (1999). Healthcare systems and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) therapies--an international review: costs and reimbursement/funding of ESRD therapies. PubMed.

10 Mushi, L., Krohn, M., & Flessa, S. (2015). Cost of dialysis in Tanzania: evidence from the provider's perspective. *Health Economics Review*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13561-015-0064-4>

11 Hainsworth, T. (2004). The NSF for Renal Services. Part One: Dialysis and transplantation. *Nursing Times*, 100(5), 28–29.

12 Pockros, B. M., Finch, D. J., & Weiner, D. E. (2021). Dialysis and total health care costs in the united states and worldwide: The financial impact of a single-payer dominant system in the us. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, 32(9), 2137–2139. <https://doi.org/10.1681/ASN.2021010082>

13 Xu K, Evans D, Carrin G, A.-R. A. (2008). Designing health financing systems to reduce catastrophic health expenditure. 7. www.who.int/health_financing/pb_2.pdf http://www.who.int/health_financing/documents/pb_e_08_1-cct.pdf

14 NIDDK. Choosing a Treatment for Kidney Failure | NIDDK. In National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. [https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/kidney-disease/kidney-failure/choosing-treatment\(2016\)](https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/kidney-disease/kidney-failure/choosing-treatment(2016)).

15 WHO. (2005). Empirical evidence on the economic impact of health in the Russian Federation. In *Economic impact of health in the Russian Federation Box* (Issue 2005, pp. 11–16).

16 Mushi, L., Marschall, P., & Fleßa, S. The cost of dialysis in low and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1166-8> (2015).

17 Datonye, D. A., Pedro, E.-C., & Friday, S. W. A single-center 7-year experience with end-stage renal disease care in Nigeria-. *PMC*. (2012).

18. seneh, J. B., Kemah, B. L. A., Mabouna, S., Njang, M. E., Ekane, D. S. M., & Agbor, V. N. (2020). Chronic kidney disease in Cameroon: A scoping review. *BMC Nephrology*, 21(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-020-02072-5>
19. Thompson, S., & Wordsworth, S. An annotated cost questionnaire for completion by patients. 1-92.[http://dirum.org/instruments/details/28%5Cnhttp://dirum.org/assets/downloads/634432307461163116-An annotated cost questionnaire for completion by patients.pdf](http://dirum.org/instruments/details/28%5Cnhttp://dirum.org/assets/downloads/634432307461163116-An%20annotated%20cost%20questionnaire%20for%20completion%20by%20patients.pdf). 2001.
20. Adam, A. M. Sample Size Determination in Survey Research. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 26(5), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2020/v26i530263> (2020).
21. Collins, A. J., Foley, R. N., Gilbertson, D. T., & Chen, S. C. (2015). United States Renal Data System public health surveillance of chronic kidney disease and end-stage renal disease. In *Kidney International Supplements* (Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 2–7). <https://doi.org/10.1038/kisup.2015.2>
22. Valsa J. J., Susan G. J., Joseph R., Arun T. E. T., Philip J. G. Out-of-pocket expenditures, catastrophic household finances, and quality of life among hemodialysis patients in Kerala, India. *Hemodial Int.* (2022).
23. Okafor, C., & Kankam, C. Future options for the management of chronic kidney disease in Nigeria. In *Gender Medicine* (Vol. 9, Issue 1 SUPPL.). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genm.2011.10.002>, (2012).
24. Mushi, L., Krohn, M., & Flessa, S. Cost of dialysis in Tanzania: evidence from the provider's perspective. *Health Economics Review*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13561-015-0064-4>, (2015).