

INFLUENCE OF HIV STATUS ON ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND ALLOCATION: A DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT AMONG AUSTRALIAN TRANSPLANT PROVIDERS

Authors:

Griffin DWJ^{1,2}, Vaz K³, Gopal B⁴, Mulley W⁵, Kotecha S⁶, Levin K⁶, Leet A⁷, Snell G⁶, McMahon JH^{1,2}, Hoy JF^{1,2}, Ong JJ^{2,9,10}

¹Department of Infectious Diseases, Alfred Health, Melbourne, VIC

²School of Translational Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC

³Victorian Liver Transplant Unit, Austin Health, Heidelberg, VIC

⁴Department of Renal Medicine, Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, VIC

⁵Department of Nephrology, Monash Health and Department of Medicine, Monash University, Clayton, VIC

⁶Lung Transplant Service, Alfred Health, Melbourne, VIC

⁷Alfred Heart Transplant Service, Alfred Health, Melbourne, VIC

⁸Melbourne Sexual Health Centre, Alfred Health, Melbourne, Australia

⁹ Faculty of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom.

Background:

People with HIV (PWH) experience disparate access to solid organ transplantation (SOT), but are eligible to be organ recipients and donors in Australia. Clinicians are central to decision-making about transplant access, and the utilisation of organs. This study aimed to determine the influence of HIV infection, and other key attributes, in decision-making about the suitability of recipients and donors for SOT.

Methods:

We conducted a discrete choice experiment (DCE), using Bayesian D-efficient experimental design, among a convenience sample of Australian medical practitioners involved in transplant-related care. Clinicians were presented with six hypothetical SOT recipients and donors and asked to nominate a preferred candidate based on eight recipient and six donor attributes. DCEs were hosted in Qualtrics, accessible by link or QR code, and distributed via professional networks, society newsletters, and mailing lists. A multinomial logit model was used to calculate the relative utility (how much someone prefers something).

Results:

Seventy-eight transplant doctors participated. Among recipient attributes, age (Relative importance (RI)=25.4%), expected survival without a transplant (RI=16.5%), and medication compliance (15.4%) were the most important factors in recipient selection. Conversely, HIV status was the least influential (RI=4.2%). The optimal recipient was 35 years old, without HIV, not frail, 20 years life expectancy post-SOT, poor quality of life, less than three months to live pre-SOT, 100% medication compliance, and adequate social supports. In contrast, among donor attributes, organ quality (RI=32.1) HIV status (RI=24.5%) and type of donor (RI=14.9%) were the most influential factors in donor selection. The optimal donor was 21 years old, a living donor, registered to donate, with maximum organ potential, high organ quality, and HIV Negative.

Conclusion:

While HIV had limited influence on the choice between two hypothetical recipients, HIV infection was the second most important factor in consideration of the selection of a potential donor.

Disclosure of Interest Statement:

The authors have no relevant disclosures.