

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<sup>1,2</sup>, Stewart Ndutard Ngasa<sup>1,3\*</sup>, Neh Chang Ngasa<sup>1,3</sup>, Leo Fosso  
10 Fozou<sup>4</sup>, Fuein V. Kum<sup>5</sup>, Njong M. Aloysius<sup>5</sup>

- 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](mailto: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 afflictions<sup>1</sup>. 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 diseases<sup>2</sup>. 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 high<sup>3</sup> . 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 factors<sup>4</sup>.

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<sup>5,6</sup>. 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)<sup>7,8</sup>. Treating renal failure is disproportionately costly compared to  
78 other medical conditions and constitutes a heavy burden on communities and households  
79 worldwide<sup>6</sup> 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<sup>6,9,10</sup>. Since 2010, the  
81 USA spent about \$28 billion yearly for ESRD-related medical expenses<sup>11</sup>. 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<sup>11,6</sup>. 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”<sup>12</sup>; 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 failure<sup>13</sup>.

89 Treatment of chronic kidney disease is very precise, comprising medical  
90 consultations, laboratory investigations, dialysis/kidney transplant, drug therapy, and lifestyle  
91 adjustments<sup>14</sup>. 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 system<sup>15</sup>  
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<sup>16,17</sup>. 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 <sup>18</sup>

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 disease<sup>19</sup>. 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);

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

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  $\epsilon_i$  = 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  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ , and  $\beta_2$ ,

### 173 **Sample size calculation**

174 We determined the sample size for this work based on Taro Yamane's approach to finite  
175 populations<sup>20</sup>

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

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  $44.6 \pm 15.5$  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  $5.7 \pm 2.8$  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  $28.9\pm 36.4$  months (approximately  
215  $2.4\pm 3.0$  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  $17.5\pm 11.1$  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  $57.2\pm 45.8$  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
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	80	60.2
Female	53	39.8
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married	83	62.4
Single	38	28.6
Divorced	2	1.5
Widow	10	7.5
<b>Employment status</b>		
Employed	54	40.6
Unemployed	79	59.4
<b>Level of education</b>		
None	1	0.8

Primary	38	28.6
Secondary	55	41.4
Tertiary	39	29.3
<b>Who pays bills</b>		
Self	81	60.9
Parents	24	18.0
Insurance	0	0.0
Spouse	7	5.3
Children	18	13.5
Others	3	2.3
<b>Comorbidities</b>		
None	39	29.3
Heart disease	3	2.3
Diabetes	12	9.0
Hypertension	86	64.7
Other	3	2.3
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>Median (IQR)</b>
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.**

	<b>Variables</b>	<b><math>\beta_0</math></b>	<b><math>\beta</math> coef</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>R squared</b>	
		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	$\beta$ 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	$\beta$ 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 Cameroon<sup>5</sup>; 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 Cameroon<sup>5</sup>. 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 USA<sup>21</sup>, 5,736 in India<sup>22</sup>, between \$ 22 000–55 000 in  
312 Nigeria<sup>23</sup>, \$ 27 440 in Tanzania<sup>24</sup>. 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/pb_2.pdf)  
[http://www.who.int/health\\_financing/documents/pb\\_e\\_08\\_1-cct.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).