



Blood and Transplant

ANNUAL REPORT ON KIDNEY TRANSPLANTATION


**REPORT FOR 2015/2016
(1 APRIL 2006 – 31 MARCH 2016)**

PUBLISHED JULY 2016

PRODUCED IN COLLABORATION WITH NHS ENGLAND



Contents



1	Executive Summary.....	1
2	Introduction.....	3
	ADULT	8
3	Transplant list	8
3.1	Patients on the kidney transplant list as at 31 March, 2007 – 2016	9
3.2	Post-registration outcomes, 1 April 2012 – 31 March 2013.....	11
3.3	Demographic characteristics, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016.....	12
3.4	Patient waiting times for those currently on the list, 31 March 2016	13
3.6	Pre-emptive listing rates, 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015.....	16
3.7	Median time from start of dialysis to transplant, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016 ...	17
4	Response to kidney offers	18
4.1	DBD Standard criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016	20
4.2	DBD Extended criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016	22
4.3	DCD Standard criteria offer decline rates, 3 Sep 2014 – 31 March 2016	24
4.4	Reallocation of kidneys, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016	26
5	Transplants.....	28
5.1	Kidney only transplants, 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2016	29
5.2	Pre-emptive transplant rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016.....	32
5.3	Kidney donor risk-index ¹ , 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016	33
5.4	Cold ischaemia time, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016.....	37
6	Kidney outcomes	46
6.1	Deceased donor graft and patient survival.....	48
6.2	Living donor graft and patient survival.....	51
	Form return rates	56
7.1	Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016	57
7.2	Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016	59
	PAEDIATRIC	61
8	Transplant list	61
8.2	Demographic characteristics, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016.....	64
8.3	Patient waiting times for those currently on the list, 31 March 2016	65
8.4	Median waiting time to transplant, 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2013.....	66
8.5	Pre-emptive listing rates, 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015.....	68
9	Response to kidney offers	69
9.1	Standard criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016	71
10	Transplants.....	72

10.1 Kidney only transplants, 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2016	73
10.2 Pre-emptive transplant rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016	75
11 Kidney outcomes	76
11.1 Deceased donor graft and patient survival	78
11.2 Living donor graft and patient survival	81
Return rates	84
12.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016	85
12.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016	86
Appendix	87
A1 Glossary of terms	88
A2 Statistical methodology and risk-adjustment for survival rate estimation	92
A3 Factors used in risk-adjusted models for patient survival from listing	94

Executive Summary

This report presents key figures about kidney transplantation in the UK. The period reported covers 10 years of transplant data, from 1 April 2006. The report presents information on the number of transplants and survival analysis after first kidney only transplantation on a national and centre-specific basis.

Key findings

- On 31 March 2016, there were 5,011 adult patients on the UK active kidney [transplant list](#) which represents a 7% decrease in the number of patients a year earlier. The equivalent number of paediatric patients was 69, representing a 5% decrease from the previous year
- There were 2,945 adult kidney only transplants performed in the UK in 2015/16 an increase of 5% compared to 2014/15. Of these, 1,134 were from [DBD](#) donors, 851 were from [DCD](#) donors and 960 were from living donors. The equivalent number of paediatric transplants was 129 representing a 7% decrease from the previous year.
- The national rate of [graft survival](#) five years after first adult deceased donor kidney only transplant is 86%. These rates vary between centres, ranging from 81% to 93% (risk-adjusted). The equivalent rate after first paediatric deceased donor kidney only transplant is 84%, ranging from 72% to 100%.
- The national rate of [graft survival](#) five years after first adult living donor kidney only transplant is 92%. These rates vary between centres, ranging from 86% to 97% (risk-adjusted). The equivalent rate after first paediatric living donor kidney only transplant is 87%, ranging from 74% to 100%.
- The national rate of ten year [patient survival](#) from listing for deceased donor kidney only transplants in adult patients is 75%. These rates vary between centres, ranging from 68% to 84% (risk-adjusted).

Use of the contents of this report should be acknowledged as follows:

Annual Report on Kidney Transplantation 2015/16, NHS Blood and Transplant

Introduction

This report presents information on transplant activity between 1 April 2006 and 31 March 2016, for all 24 centres performing kidney transplantation in the UK. Data were obtained from the UK Transplant Registry, at NHS Blood & Transplant, that holds information relating to donors, recipients and outcomes for all kidney transplants performed in the UK.

[Graft](#) and [patient survival](#) estimates are reported at one-year post-transplant for the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2015 and five-year post-transplant for the period 1 April 2007 to 31 March 2011. Results are described separately according to the type of donor (deceased and living).

[Patient survival](#) from listing is reported at one, five and ten year post registration for a deceased donor adult kidney only transplant between 1 January 2004 and 31 December 2015.

The centre specific results for survival estimates are adjusted for differences in [risk factors](#) between the centres. The risk models used are described in the Appendix.

Patients requiring [multi-organ transplants](#) are excluded from all analyses and all results are described separately for adult (aged \geq 18years) and paediatric patients (aged $<$ 18 years) other than those presented in this Introduction section.

Throughout this report West London Renal and Transplant Centre is labeled as WLRTC.

Per million population figures have not been included throughout this report. Many dialysis units can serve more than one transplant centre and so catchment populations are difficult to estimate.

Figure 2.1 shows the number of patients on the kidney [transplant list](#) at 31 March each year between 2007 and 2016. The number of patients actively waiting for a kidney transplant increased each year from 6,481 in 2007 to 7,190 in 2009 and has since been on the decline falling to 5,275 in 2016.




Figure 2.2 shows the number of patients on the kidney [transplant list](#) at 31 March 2016 for each transplant centre. Manchester has the largest active [transplant list](#) with 457 patients registered for a kidney transplant.




Figure 2.3 shows the total number of kidney transplants performed in the last ten years. The number of transplants steadily increased from 2,130 in 2006/07 to 3,265 in 2015/16.




Figure 2.4 shows the total number of kidney transplants performed in 2015/16 at each transplant centre. Manchester performed the most kidney transplants last year with 323 patients receiving a transplant.





Figure 2.5 details the 3,265 kidney transplants performed in the UK between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016. Of these, 2,036 (62%) were deceased donor kidney only transplants and 1,038 (32%) were living donor kidney transplants. Of the 191 [multi-organ transplants](#), 167 were simultaneous kidney and pancreas transplants and 12 were kidney and liver transplants.



Adult kidney transplant list

3.1 Patients on the kidney transplant list as at 31 March, 2007 – 2016

Figure 3.1 shows the number of adult patients on the kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March each year between 2007 and 2016. The number of patients actively waiting for a kidney transplant increased each year from 6,217 in 2007 to 6,813 in 2009 and has since been on the decline falling to 5,011 in 2016.




Figure 3.2 shows the number of adult patients on the active kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March 2016 by centre. In total, there were 5,011 adults patients. Manchester had the largest proportion of the [transplant list](#) (9%) and Plymouth had the smallest (1%).





Figure 3.3 shows the number of adult patients on the [transplant list](#) at 31 March each year between 2007 and 2016 for each transplant centre.



3.2 Post-registration outcomes, 1 April 2012 – 31 March 2013

An indication of outcomes for patients listed for a kidney transplant is summarised in **Figure 3.4**. This shows the proportion of patients transplanted or still waiting one and three years after joining the list. It also shows the proportion removed from the [transplant list](#) (typically because they become too unwell for transplant) and those dying while on the [transplant list](#). Only 26% of patients are transplanted within one year, while three years after listing 56% of patients have received a transplant.








Figure 3.5 shows the proportion of patients transplanted or still waiting three years after joining the list by centre. The proportion of patients transplanted three years after listing at each centre ranges from 39% at WLRTC to 77% at Cambridge. Higher proportions of transplanted patients can in part be attributed to strong [DCD](#) programmes within centres.



3.3 Demographic characteristics, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016


The sex, ethnicity and age group of patients on the transplant are shown by centre in **Figure 3.6, 3.7** and **3.8**, respectively. Note that all percentages quoted are based only on data where relevant information was available. Changes made to the Kidney Allocation Scheme in 2006 mean that tissue matching criteria between donor and recipient are less strict than previously and waiting time to transplant is now more important than it was in deciding kidney allocation. These changes have an indirect benefit for patients from ethnic minority groups, who are less often a good tissue match with the predominantly white donor pool. As a result, access to transplantation is becoming more equitable.





3.4 Patient waiting times for those currently on the list, 31 March 2016

Figure 3.9 shows the length of time patients have been waiting on the kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March 2016 by centre. A small proportion of patients have been waiting for a transplant for more than seven years, 99% of these are highly sensitised with a calculated reaction frequency (cRF) of 85% or higher. 85% have a cRF of 100% which makes these patients very difficult to match.



3.5 Median waiting time to transplant, 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2013

The length of time a patient waits for a kidney transplant varies across the UK. The [median](#) waiting time for adult deceased donor kidney only transplantation is shown in **Figure 3.10** and **Table 3.1** for patients registered at each individual unit. During this period local allocation arrangements were in place for [DCD](#) kidneys while [DBD](#) kidneys were allocated via the [National Kidney Allocation Scheme](#). The data shown are for all adult patients, joining the list within the time period shown, including those still awaiting a transplant on the day of analysis. Patients who received a [live donor](#) or [multi-organ transplant](#) are not included. The national allocation scheme introduced in April 2006 is slowly reducing the variability in deceased donor kidney waiting times across the country but currently some variability remains. Waiting times across centres continue to differ in a way that it is difficult for centres to control, given that the [National Kidney Allocation Scheme](#) determines allocation of all kidneys available for transplant from donors after brain death ([DBD](#)).

National Kidney Allocation Scheme

Only kidneys from donors after brain death were allocated via a national allocation scheme during the time period analysed. Kidneys from donations after circulatory death ([DCD](#)) were allocated to patients through local allocation arrangements and these vary across the country because some centres have a larger [DCD](#) programme than others. As of 3 September 2014 one kidney from [DCD](#) donors aged between 5 and 49 years is allocated within four pre-defined regions using the 2006 [DBD](#) allocation principles and as such we should start to see further reductions in variability in waiting times across the country.

Kidneys from [DBD](#) are allocated to patients listed nationally through the Kidney Allocation Scheme. The Kidney Allocation Scheme introduced in April 2006 prioritises patients with ideal tissue matches (000 [HLA mismatches](#)) and then assigns points to patients based on the level of tissue match between donor and recipient, the length of time spent waiting for a transplant, age of the recipient (with a progressive reduction in points given after the age of thirty) and location points such that patients geographically close to the retrieval centre receive more points. The patients with the highest number of points for a donated kidney are preferentially offered the kidney, no matter where in the UK they receive their treatment.

The [median](#) waiting time to transplant for adult patients registered on the kidney only [transplant list](#) between 1 April 2010 and 31 March 2013 is 905 days. This ranged from 417 days at Cambridge to 1284 days at Birmingham.





Table 3.1 Median waiting time to kidney only transplant in the UK, for adult patients registered 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2013

Transplant centre	Number of patients registered	Waiting time (days)	
		Median	95% Confidence interval
Adult			
Cambridge	332	417	362 - 472
Newcastle	286	533	441 - 625
Cardiff	269	560	474 - 646
Plymouth	151	588	511 - 665
Leeds	406	589	518 - 660
Liverpool	248	622	532 - 712
Nottingham	188	749	680 - 818
Oxford	279	762	711 - 813
Edinburgh	184	863	781 - 945
Guy's	383	864	777 - 951
Glasgow	331	949	829 - 1069
The Royal Free	306	967	826 - 1108
The Royal London	255	972	900 - 1044
Manchester	510	979	909 - 1049
St George's	312	1001	932 - 1070
Coventry	94	1041	944 - 1138
Belfast	128	1052	937 - 1167
Bristol	316	1102	985 - 1219
Portsmouth	224	1134	1003 - 1265
Sheffield	178	1152	998 - 1306
Leicester	222	1166	1024 - 1308
WLRTC	494	1232	1159 - 1305
Birmingham	416	1284	1220 - 1348
UK	6512	905	883 - 927


3.6 Pre-emptive listing rates, 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015

Rates of [pre-emptive](#) kidney only listings are shown in **Figure 3.11** for adult patients joining the list between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015. Patients listed on the deceased donor [transplant list](#) prior to receiving a living donor transplant are excluded and in order to remove the effect of these patients an earlier cohort was selected. [Pre-emptive](#) listing accounted for 41% of all adult registrations across the UK ranging from 65% at Sheffield to 22% at Edinburgh.



3.7 Median time from start of dialysis to transplant, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016

The median time from dialysis start date to deceased donor transplant for adult patients transplanted between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 is shown in **Figure 3.12**. The [median](#) time is 1226 days. This ranged from 788 days at Oxford to 1677 days at Manchester.



Response to adult kidney offers

Offer decline rates

Kidney-only offers from [DBD](#) and [DCD](#) donors who had at least one kidney retrieved, offered directly and on behalf of a named individual patient and resulted in transplantation are included in the analysis. Any offers made through the reallocation of kidneys, declined kidney or fast track schemes were excluded. Only offers through the [DCD](#) kidney allocation scheme are presented, all local [DCD](#) offers are excluded.

In order to understand centre practices more fully, data are presented separately for [DBD](#) and [DCD](#) standard and extended criteria donors (SCD & ECD). ECD have been defined as donors aged ≥ 60 years at the time of death OR aged 50 to 59 years with at least two or three donor characteristics: hypertension, creatinine $> 130 \mu\text{mol/l}$ or death due to intracranial haemorrhage. SCD are donors that did not meet the ECD criteria.

[Funnel plots](#) were used to compare centre specific offer decline rates and indicate how consistent the rates of the individual transplant centres are with the national rate. The overall national unadjusted offer decline rate is shown by the solid line while the 95% and 99.8% confidence lines are indicated via a thin and thick dotted line, respectively. Each dot in the plot represents an individual transplant centre. Centres that are positioned above the upper limits indicate an offer decline rate that is higher than the national rate, while centres positioned below the lower limits indicate an offer decline rate that is lower than the national rate. Patient [case mix](#) is known to influence the number of offers a centre may receive. In this analysis however only individual offers for named patients were considered which excluded any [ABO](#)- and HLA-incompatible patients. For this reason it was decided not to risk adjust for known centre differences in patient [case mix](#).

4.1 DBD Standard criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

Figure 4.1 compares individual centre offer decline rates with the national rate for SCD over the time period, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 4.1**. Leicester have offer decline rates higher than the national rate, however they are in line with the national rate in the most recent financial year.




Table 4.1 compares individual centre offer decline rates for SCD over time by financial year. Birmingham, Leicester and Nottingham have all shown improvements in their SCD offer decline rates over time. In the latest financial year (2015-2016), Leicester and Nottingham now have an offer decline rate that is in line with the national rate. Leicester's SCD offer decline rate has decreased from 73% in 2013/14 to 55% in 2015/16.

Table 4.1 Adult standard criteria DBD donor kidney offer decline rates by transplant centre, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016									
Centre	Code	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16		Overall	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	39	(54)	33	(42)	18	(39)	90	(47)
Birmingham	B	105	(59)	102	(49)	103	(52)	310	(54)
Bristol	C	61	(51)	59	(58)	48	(54)	168	(54)
Cambridge	D	23	(39)	32	(25)	20	(35)	75	(32)
Cardiff	E	18	(33)	24	(46)	26	(42)	68	(41)
Coventry	F	26	(50)	24	(38)	12	(50)	62	(45)
Edinburgh	G	29	(55)	26	(46)	40	(48)	95	(49)
Glasgow	H	41	(27)	46	(39)	58	(47)	145	(39)
Guy's	J	25	(56)	38	(45)	55	(44)	118	(47)
Leeds	K	25	(32)	33	(18)	39	(23)	97	(24)
Leicester	L	117	(73)	106	(70)	42	(55)	265	(69)
Liverpool	M	27	(44)	35	(60)	41	(56)	103	(54)
Manchester	N	86	(29)	85	(42)	63	(33)	234	(35)
Newcastle	O	18	(39)	24	(67)	33	(45)	75	(51)
Nottingham	P	39	(69)	30	(57)	28	(50)	97	(60)
Oxford	Q	31	(39)	24	(38)	30	(23)	85	(33)
Plymouth	R	21	(48)	18	(33)	17	(24)	56	(36)
Portsmouth	S	22	(36)	38	(45)	22	(41)	82	(41)
Sheffield	T	33	(42)	38	(45)	32	(47)	103	(45)
St George's	U	53	(42)	48	(27)	51	(41)	152	(37)
The Royal Free	V	28	(29)	53	(40)	37	(30)	118	(34)
The Royal London	W	51	(31)	59	(36)	61	(48)	171	(39)
WLRTC	X	74	(51)	80	(51)	65	(54)	219	(52)
UK		992	(48)	1055	(46)	941	(44)	2988	(46)
		Centre has reached the upper 99.8% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 98.8% confidence limit							

4.2 DBD Extended criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

Figure 4.2 compares individual centre offer decline rates with the national rate for ECD over the time period, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 4.2**. Leicester and Birmingham have offer decline rates higher than the national rate, however they are in line with the national rate in the most recent financial year.




Table 4.2 compares individual centre offer decline rates for ECD over time by financial year. Birmingham and Leicester have shown improvements in their ECD offer decline rates over time. In the latest financial year (2015-2016), Birmingham and Leicester now have offer decline rates that are in line with the national rate. Birmingham's ECD offer decline rate has decreased from 80% in 2013/14 to 53% in 2015/16 and Leicester's ECD offer decline rate has decreased from 81% in 2013/14 to 60% in 2015/16.

Table 4.2 Adult extended criteria DBD donor kidney offer decline rates by transplant centre, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016									
Centre	Code	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16		Overall	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	35	(57)	18	(39)	26	(46)	79	(49)
Birmingham	B	133	(80)	94	(71)	93	(53)	320	(69)
Bristol	C	62	(61)	45	(51)	85	(66)	192	(61)
Cambridge	D	20	(50)	33	(58)	23	(52)	76	(54)
Cardiff	E	22	(77)	11	(64)	19	(68)	52	(71)
Coventry	F	15	(40)	17	(65)	11	(45)	43	(51)
Edinburgh	G	31	(52)	28	(64)	31	(74)	90	(63)
Glasgow	H	31	(39)	35	(49)	57	(53)	123	(48)
Guy's	J	35	(57)	29	(52)	54	(46)	118	(51)
Leeds	K	18	(28)	27	(41)	29	(38)	74	(36)
Leicester	L	99	(81)	89	(80)	40	(60)	228	(77)
Liverpool	M	21	(33)	28	(68)	32	(63)	81	(57)
Manchester	N	77	(45)	62	(60)	102	(41)	241	(47)
Newcastle	O	20	(70)	18	(56)	28	(57)	66	(61)
Nottingham	P	38	(68)	16	(69)	23	(48)	77	(62)
Oxford	Q	18	(50)	17	(47)	33	(61)	68	(54)
Plymouth	R	13	(69)	11	(36)	11	(27)	35	(46)
Portsmouth	S	47	(43)	44	(34)	38	(55)	129	(43)
Sheffield	T	41	(61)	41	(66)	37	(68)	119	(65)
St George's	U	41	(37)	38	(45)	56	(59)	135	(48)
The Royal Free	V	22	(64)	24	(46)	32	(59)	78	(56)
The Royal London	W	54	(72)	44	(55)	52	(73)	150	(67)
WLRTC	X	78	(56)	73	(59)	84	(51)	235	(55)
UK		971	(60)	842	(58)	996	(55)	2809	(58)
		Centre has reached the upper 99.8% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 98.8% confidence limit							

4.3 DCD Standard criteria offer decline rates, 3 September 2014 – 31 March 2016

Figure 4.3 compares individual centre offer decline rates with the national rate for SCD over the time period, 1 September 2014 and 31 March 2016. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 4.3**.




Table 4.3 compares individual centre offer decline rates for SCD over time by financial year.

Table 4.3 Adult standard criteria DCD donor kidney offer decline rates by transplant centre, 3 September 2014 and 31 March 2016							
Centre	Code	2014/15		2015/16		Overall	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	5	(40)	16	(50)	21	(48)
Birmingham	B	10	(80)	29	(62)	39	(67)
Bristol	C	13	(46)	32	(47)	45	(47)
Cambridge	D	7	(14)	13	(15)	20	(15)
Cardiff	E	3	(67)	8	(75)	11	(73)
Coventry	F	1	(0)	6	(67)	7	(57)
Edinburgh	G	5	(20)	23	(43)	28	(39)
Glasgow	H	5	(20)	34	(26)	39	(26)
Guy's	J	15	(33)	16	(56)	31	(45)
Leeds	K	9	(0)	15	(33)	24	(21)
Leicester	L	11	(55)	15	(67)	26	(62)
Liverpool	M	2	(0)	19	(58)	21	(52)
Manchester	N	5	(20)	28	(29)	33	(27)
Newcastle	O	9	(33)	12	(33)	21	(33)
Nottingham	P	2	(50)	13	(38)	15	(40)
Oxford	Q	4	(25)	18	(39)	22	(36)
Plymouth	R	4	(0)	8	(38)	12	(25)
Portsmouth	S	9	(56)	22	(68)	31	(65)
Sheffield	T	6	(50)	20	(55)	26	(54)
St George's	U	15	(47)	21	(48)	36	(47)
The Royal Free	V	10	(50)	12	(25)	22	(36)
The Royal London	W	22	(36)	22	(27)	44	(32)
WLRTC	X	26	(54)	33	(58)	59	(56)
UK		198	(40)	435	(46)	633	(44)
<div> <div></div> Centre has reached the upper 99.8% confidence limit </div> <div> <div></div> Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit </div> <div> <div></div> Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit </div> <div> <div></div> Centre has reached the lower 98.8% confidence limit </div>							

4.4 Reallocation of kidneys, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

Since 3 April 2006 all kidneys from donation after brain death ([DBD](#)) donors have been allocated through the 2006 [National Kidney Allocation Scheme](#) (KAS). There are however certain situations when a kidney can be reallocated to an alternative patient of the centre's choice. This occurs when the kidney is accepted and dispatched to a named patient but is subsequently declined and there are no other patients listed nationally who fall within Tiers A to D of the kidney allocation scheme (000 mismatched adult and paediatric patients or favourably matched paediatric patients).

In this situation the centre in receipt of the kidney can reallocate the organ to a locally listed patient of their choice based on an individual centre matching run.

[Funnel plots](#) were used to compare centre specific reallocation rates and indicate how consistent the rates of the individual transplant centres are with the national rate. The overall national reallocation rate is shown by the solid line while the 95% and 99.8% confidence lines are indicated via a thin and thick dotted line, respectively. Each dot in the plot represents an individual transplant centre. Centres that are positioned above the upper limits indicate a reallocation rate that is higher than the national rate, while centres positioned below the lower limits indicates a reallocation rate that is lower than the national rate.

Figure 4.4 compares individual centre reallocation rates with the national rate over the time period, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 4.4**. Nationally 6% of all [DBD](#) kidney only transplants used kidneys that had been reallocated. Leicester and Nottingham have reallocation rates consistently higher than the national rate.




Table 4.4 compares individual reallocation rates over time by financial year. Birmingham, Cambridge, Glasgow, Leeds, Portsmouth and The Royal Free have all shown improvements in their reallocation rates over time. In the latest financial year (2015-2016), all centres now have a reallocation rate that is in line with the national rate.

Table 4.4 Local reallocation of DBD donor kidneys following an acceptance of an adult offer through the national allocation scheme									
Centre	Code	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16		Overall	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	37	(8)	30	(0)	27	(7)	94	(5)
Birmingham	B	79	(10)	88	(8)	96	(1)	263	(6)
Bristol	C	61	(7)	50	(4)	55	(4)	166	(5)
Cambridge	D	41	(7)	50	(2)	29	(0)	120	(3)
Cardiff	E	31	(10)	20	(0)	28	(4)	79	(5)
Coventry	F	22	(0)	23	(9)	14	(7)	59	(5)
Edinburgh	G	33	(6)	32	(0)	39	(3)	104	(3)
Glasgow	H	58	(10)	53	(6)	62	(5)	173	(7)
Guy's	J	47	(4)	56	(4)	84	(1)	187	(3)
Leeds	K	52	(8)	62	(5)	73	(0)	187	(4)
Leicester	L	62	(11)	58	(16)	42	(7)	162	(12)
Liverpool	M	39	(8)	35	(11)	39	(8)	113	(9)
Manchester	N	111	(4)	91	(13)	108	(2)	310	(6)
Newcastle	O	27	(4)	20	(0)	35	(6)	82	(4)
Nottingham	P	30	(17)	27	(11)	30	(13)	87	(14)
Oxford	Q	34	(0)	41	(2)	50	(4)	125	(2)
Plymouth	R	18	(6)	22	(14)	22	(5)	62	(8)
Portsmouth	S	44	(5)	52	(4)	31	(3)	127	(4)
Sheffield	T	41	(10)	37	(5)	32	(9)	110	(8)
St George's	U	59	(2)	59	(0)	55	(2)	173	(1)
The Royal Free	V	37	(8)	68	(6)	49	(4)	154	(6)
The Royal London	W	58	(9)	65	(5)	57	(12)	180	(8)
WLRTC	X	80	(11)	82	(11)	77	(5)	239	(9)
UK		1101	(7)	1121	(6)	1134	(4)	3356	(6)
<div></div> Centre has reached the upper 99.8% confidence limit <div></div> Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit <div></div> Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit <div></div> Centre has reached the lower 98.8% confidence limit									

Adult kidney transplants

5.1 Kidney only transplants, 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2016

Figure 5.1 shows the total number of adult kidney only transplants performed in the last ten years, by type of donor. The number of adult transplants from donors after circulatory death (DCD) steadily increased from 272 in 2006/2007 to 851 in 2015/2016 with a slip dip to 711 in 2014/15. The number of adult transplants from donors after brain death (DBD) has increased in the last 4 years to 1,134 in 2015/2016 after remaining fairly constant between 2007/2008 and 2011/2012. The number of adult living kidney transplants performed was steadily increasing over time before decreasing by 9% from 1,051 in 2013/13 to 960 in the latest financial year.




Figure 5.2 shows the total number of adult kidney only transplants performed in 2015/16, by centre and type of donor. The same information is presented in **Figure 5.3** but this shows the proportion of [DBD](#), [DCD](#) and living donor transplants performed at each centre.








Figure 5.4 shows the total number of adult kidney only transplants performed in last ten years, by centre and type of donor.



5.2 Pre-emptive transplant rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016

Rates of [pre-emptive](#) kidney only transplantation are shown in **Figure 5.5** for adult deceased donor transplants and **Figure 5.6** for adult living donor transplants. Living donor transplants are more likely to be carried out before the need for dialysis than deceased donor transplants: 37% and 15% respectively. This is because a living donor transplant can often be carried out more quickly than a deceased donor kidney transplant as the latter often necessitates a long waiting time. Adult deceased donor [pre-emptive](#) transplant rates ranged from 35% at Coventry to 2% at The Royal London. Adult living donor [pre-emptive](#) transplant rates ranged from 56% at Nottingham to 12% at Bristol.



5.3 Kidney donor risk-index¹, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

The severe shortage of deceased donor (DD) organs available for transplantation has led to increased use of kidneys from suboptimal donors with potentially less good transplant outcome. Categorising such kidneys according to anticipated outcome is important because it enables clinicians to be better informed when making decisions about organ allocation and allows appropriate counselling of potential recipients. Kidneys from suboptimal donors are variously referred to as marginal, extended criteria, or expanded criteria organs. Although categorising DD kidneys as either standard or expanded criteria has the advantage of simplicity, it does not adequately reflect the wide spectrum of donor kidney quality, and this has led to the development of more refined approaches to assessing the quality of DD kidneys. A donor risk index was developed by determining the factors that influence transplant survival, the time from transplant to the earlier of graft failure or patient death. A UK donor risk index was derived from the parameter estimates of the donor factors in the Cox model developed for overall transplant survival. This gives the following index:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{UKKDRI} = & \exp\{-0.245 \times (\text{donor age} < 40) + \\ & 0.396 \times (\text{donor age} \geq 60) + \\ & 0.265 \times (\text{history of hypertension}) + \\ & 0.0253 \times [\text{donor weight(kg)} - 75] / 10 + \\ & 0.00461 \times (\text{days in hospital}) + \\ & 0.0465 \times (\text{adrenaline})\} \end{aligned}$$

Reference

- 1 Watson CJE, Johnson RJ, Birch R, Collett D, Bradley JA. A simplified donor risk index for predicting outcome after deceased donor kidney transplantation. *Transplantation*, 2012; 93: 314-318

Figure 5.7 shows the number of transplanted [DBD](#) donor kidneys over the last ten financial years by kidney donor risk index group. In 2006/07 25% of all transplants were performed using kidneys from donors categorised as high risk (UK Donor risk index ≥ 1.35) compared with 38% in 2015/16.





Figure 5.8 shows the number of transplanted [DBD](#) donor kidneys in 2015/16 by kidney donor risk index group for each transplant centre. The same information is presented in **Figure 5.9** but this shows the proportion of standard risk and high risk donor transplants performed at each centre.



**Figure 5.9 UK Kidney Donor Risk Index of transplanted DBD donor kidneys
1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016**




Figure 5.10 shows the number of transplanted [DBD](#) donor kidneys in the last ten years by kidney donor risk index group for each transplant centre.



5.4 Cold ischaemia time, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

The length of time that elapses between a kidney being removed from the donor to its transplantation into the recipient is called the Cold Ischaemia Time (CIT). Generally, the shorter this time, the more likely the kidney is to work immediately and the better the long-term outcome. One of the reasons why [live donor](#) kidney transplantation is so successful is because the CIT is only one to two hours long. For deceased donor renal transplants, CIT can never be as short as this, but efforts are made to keep the time to a minimum. Evidence indicates that the outcome is only adversely affected when CIT is longer than 20 hours, although many deceased donor kidney transplants with a CIT of more than 20 hours have been very successful.

The factors which determine CIT include a) transportation of the kidney from the retrieval hospital to the hospital where the transplant is performed, b) the need to tissue type the donor and [cross-match](#) the donor and potential recipients, c) the occasional necessity of moving the kidney to another hospital if a transplant cannot go ahead, d) contacting and preparing the recipient for the transplant and e) access to the operating theatre.

[Median](#) CITs are shown in addition to [inter-quartile ranges](#). Fifty percent of the transplants have a CIT within the [inter-quartile range](#). There is some variation in average ([median](#)) CIT between different transplant centres although all centres continually try to reduce this time.

Figure 5.11 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult [DBD](#) donor kidney only transplants over the last 10 years. The [median](#) total cold ischaemia time has fallen over the last 10 years from 16 hours in 2006/07 to 14 hours in 2015/16.




Figure 5.12 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult [DBD](#) donor kidney only transplants in 2015/16 for each transplant centre. Coventry had the longest [median](#) cold ischaemia time, 18 hours in 2015/16 compared with St. George's who had the shortest, 11 hours.




Figure 5.13 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult [DBD](#) donor kidney only transplants over the last ten years for each transplant centre.




Figure 5.14 shows the proportion of adult [DBD](#) donor kidney only transplants in 2015/16 that have been performed within 18 hours of CIT for each transplant centre. All centres have at least half of all [DBD](#) kidney only transplants performed within 18 hours CIT.




Figure 5.15 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult [DCD](#) donor kidney only transplants over the last 10 years. The [median](#) total ischaemia time has fallen over the last 10 years from 17 hours in 2006/07 to 13 hours in 2015/16.




Figure 5.16 shows the median total cold ischaemia time in adult DCD donor kidney only transplants in 2015/16 for each transplant centre. Cambridge and Liverpool had the longest median cold ischaemia time, 16 hours in 2015/16 compared with Belfast who had the shortest, 9 hours.




Figure 5.17 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult [DCD](#) donor kidney only transplants over the last ten years for each transplant centre.

Figure 5.17 Median cold ischaemia time in adult DCD donor kidney transplants,
1 April 2006 - 31 March 2016




Figure 5.18 shows the proportion of adult [DCD](#) donor kidney only transplants in 2015/16 that have been performed within 12 hours of CIT for each transplant centre. The wide variability across centres can partly be explained by the proportion of kidneys that the centre imports from across the UK.




Figure 5.19 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult living donor kidney transplants over the last 10 years. The [median](#) total cold ischaemia time has increased marginally over the last ten years.




Figure 5.20 shows the median total cold ischaemia time in adult living donor kidney transplants in 2015/16 for each transplant centre.




Figure 5.21 shows the [median](#) total cold ischaemia time in adult living donor kidney transplants over the last ten years for each transplant centre.



Adult kidney outcomes

We present a visual comparison of survival rates among centres that is based on a graphical display known as a [funnel plot](#) (1, 2). This display is used to show how consistent the rates of the different transplant units are with the national rate. [Funnel plots](#) show the [risk-adjusted survival rate](#) plotted against the number of transplants for each centre, with the overall national [unadjusted survival rate](#) (solid line), and its 95% (thin dotted lines) and 99.8% (thick dotted lines) [confidence limits](#) superimposed. Each dot in the plot represents one of the centres. Note that many patients return to local renal units for follow-up care after their transplant and although we report survival according to transplant unit, patients may in fact be followed up quite distantly from their transplant centre.

Interpreting the [funnel plots](#)

If a centre lies within all the limits, then that centre has a survival rate that is statistically consistent with the national rate. If a centre lies outside the 95% [confidence limits](#), this serves as an alert that the centre may have a rate that is significantly different from the national rate. If a centre lies outside the 99.8% limits, then further investigations may be carried out to determine the reasons for the possible difference. When a centre lies above the upper limits, this indicates a survival rate that is higher than the national rate, while a centre that lies below the lower limits has a survival rate that is lower than the national rate. It is important to note that adjusting for patient mix through the use of risk-adjustment models may not account for all possible causes of centre differences. There may be other factors that are not taken into account in the risk-adjustment process that may affect the survival rate of a particular centre.

References

1. Tekkis PP, McCulloch P, Steger AC, Benjamin IS, Poloniecki JD. Mortality control charts for comparing performance of surgical units: validation study using hospital mortality data. *British Medical Journal* 2003; 326: 786 – 788.
2. Stark J, Gallivan S, Lovegrove J, Hamilton JRL, Monro JL, Pollock JCS, Watterson KG. Mortality rates after surgery for congenital heart defects in children and surgeons' performance. *Lancet* 2000; 355: 1004 – 1007.

6.1 Deceased donor graft and patient survival

The [funnel plots](#) show that, for the most part, the centres lie within the [confidence limits](#). Some of the [funnel plots](#) show some centres lie outside the lower 95% [confidence limits](#), indicating that these centres have survival rates that are significantly lower than the national rate. Some of the [funnel plots](#) show some centres to be above the upper 99.8% [confidence limit](#). This suggests that these centres may have survival rates that are considerably higher than the national rate. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 6.1**.





Figure 6.3 Risk-adjusted five year graft (death censored) survival rates for first deceased donor kidney transplants in adult patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Figure 6.4 Risk-adjusted five year patient survival rates for first deceased donor kidney transplants in adult patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Table 6.1 One and five year first adult kidney-only graft and patient survival using kidneys from deceased donors

Centre	Code	Kidney graft survival				Patient survival			
		One-year*		Five-year**		One-year*		Five-year**	
		%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Belfast	A	98	(93 - 100)	89	(80 - 95)	94	(87 - 98)	87	(75 - 94)
Birmingham	B	93	(89 - 95)	85	(79 - 90)	97	(94 - 99)	92	(87 - 95)
Bristol	C	96	(92 - 98)	86	(80 - 91)	94	(90 - 97)	87	(81 - 91)
Cambridge	D	95	(92 - 97)	88	(83 - 91)	97	(94 - 98)	89	(85 - 93)
Cardiff	E	97	(94 - 99)	89	(84 - 93)	96	(93 - 98)	89	(84 - 93)
Coventry	F	90	(80 - 96)	88	(76 - 95)	93	(85 - 97)	87	(75 - 95)
Edinburgh	G	95	(90 - 98)	83	(76 - 88)	98	(93 - 100)	85	(79 - 90)
Glasgow	H	93	(88 - 96)	93	(87 - 96)	96	(93 - 98)	93	(87 - 96)
Guy's	J	94	(91 - 96)	87	(81 - 92)	97	(95 - 99)	90	(84 - 94)
Leeds	K	94	(91 - 96)	84	(78 - 88)	97	(95 - 99)	86	(81 - 90)
Leicester	L	93	(88 - 96)	90	(82 - 95)	99	(97 - 100)	83	(73 - 90)
Liverpool	M	93	(88 - 96)	87	(80 - 92)	93	(88 - 96)	84	(76 - 89)
Manchester	N	97	(95 - 99)	87	(82 - 91)	95	(92 - 97)	91	(86 - 94)
Newcastle	O	95	(91 - 97)	81	(75 - 87)	96	(92 - 98)	86	(81 - 91)
Nottingham	P	95	(91 - 98)	85	(77 - 91)	99	(96 - 100)	86	(78 - 92)
Oxford	Q	95	(91 - 97)	88	(82 - 92)	97	(93 - 98)	89	(84 - 93)
Plymouth	R	89	(81 - 94)	83	(75 - 88)	94	(89 - 97)	90	(84 - 94)
Portsmouth	S	91	(85 - 95)	81	(71 - 88)	94	(90 - 97)	85	(77 - 90)
Sheffield	T	96	(91 - 98)	84	(76 - 90)	96	(91 - 98)	91	(85 - 95)
St George's	U	93	(89 - 96)	89	(81 - 94)	97	(94 - 99)	95	(89 - 98)
The Royal Free	V	94	(91 - 97)	88	(83 - 93)	98	(95 - 99)	90	(85 - 94)
The Royal London	W	90	(85 - 94)	83	(77 - 88)	92	(87 - 96)	82	(75 - 87)
WLRTC	X	95	(92 - 97)	86	(80 - 90)	98	(95 - 99)	91	(87 - 94)
UK		94	(94 - 95)	86	(85 - 87)	96	(96 - 97)	88	(87 - 89)
		Centre has reached the upper 98.8% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 99.8% confidence limit							

* Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2011 - 31 March 2015

** Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2007 - 31 March 2011

6.2 Living donor graft and patient survival

The [funnel plots](#) show that, for the most part, the centres lie within the [confidence limits](#). None of the [funnel plots](#) show any centres that lie outside the lower 95% [confidence limits](#). Some of the [funnel plots](#) show some centres to be above the upper 95% [confidence limit](#). This suggests that these centres may have survival rates that are considerably higher than the national rate. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 6.2**. Living donor antibody incompatible kidney transplants are included in the analysis and these transplants are known to have inferior graft survival rates. **Table 6.3** shows the number of such transplants performed by each centre for each of the time periods analysed.





Figure 6.7 Risk-adjusted five year graft (death censored) survival rates for first live donor kidney transplants in adult patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Figure 6.8 Risk-adjusted five year patient survival rates for first live donor kidney transplants in adult patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Table 6.2 One and five year first adult kidney-only graft and patient survival using kidneys from living donors

Centre	Code	Kidney graft survival				Patient survival			
		One-year*		Five-year**		One-year*		Five-year**	
		%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Belfast	A	97	(93 - 99)	91	(81 - 97)	100	N/A	95	(82 - 99)
Birmingham	B	97	(94 - 99)	93	(88 - 96)	99	(96 - 100)	95	(90 - 98)
Bristol	C	96	(91 - 99)	96	(91 - 99)	100	N/A	96	(90 - 98)
Cambridge	D	98	(94 - 100)	96	(91 - 99)	100	N/A	95	(89 - 98)
Cardiff	E	97	(92 - 99)	88	(80 - 94)	98	(92 - 100)	97	(91 - 99)
Coventry	F	99	(93 - 100)	95	(86 - 99)	100	N/A	96	(88 - 99)
Edinburgh	G	99	(94 - 100)	87	(78 - 93)	100	N/A	93	(84 - 97)
Glasgow	H	97	(92 - 99)	91	(83 - 96)	100	N/A	90	(78 - 96)
Guy's	J	99	(96 - 100)	93	(89 - 96)	99	(96 - 100)	95	(92 - 97)
Leeds	K	97	(92 - 99)	88	(81 - 93)	99	(95 - 100)	95	(89 - 98)
Leicester	L	98	(94 - 99)	90	(84 - 94)	96	(91 - 99)	94	(89 - 97)
Liverpool	M	97	(91 - 99)	86	(76 - 92)	98	(94 - 100)	93	(85 - 98)
Manchester	N	98	(95 - 99)	95	(91 - 97)	99	(97 - 100)	94	(88 - 97)
Newcastle	O	99	(96 - 100)	93	(87 - 97)	100	N/A	95	(89 - 98)
Nottingham	P	98	(87 - 100)	92	(81 - 97)	97	(84 - 100)	94	(83 - 99)
Oxford	Q	96	(91 - 98)	95	(89 - 98)	99	(96 - 100)	93	(87 - 97)
Plymouth	R	98	(91 - 100)	86	(72 - 94)	100	N/A	93	(83 - 98)
Portsmouth	S	100	N/A	89	(78 - 96)	98	(93 - 100)	96	(87 - 100)
Sheffield	T	99	(93 - 100)	95	(86 - 99)	100	N/A	98	(90 - 100)
St George's	U	98	(95 - 100)	95	(90 - 98)	99	(97 - 100)	93	(88 - 97)
The Royal Free	V	99	(95 - 100)	97	(91 - 99)	100	N/A	96	(90 - 99)
The Royal London	W	97	(94 - 99)	88	(81 - 93)	99	(94 - 100)	92	(82 - 98)
WLRTC	X	97	(94 - 99)	88	(83 - 92)	99	(97 - 100)	95	(91 - 97)
UK		98	(97 - 98)	92	(91 - 93)	99	(99 - 99)	95	(94 - 95)
		Centre has reached the upper 98.8% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit							
		Centre has reached the lower 99.8% confidence limit							

* Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2011 - 31 March 2015

** Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2007 - 31 March 2011

6.3 Graft and patient survival from listing

Survival from listing was analysed for all adult (≥ 18 years) patients registered for the first time for a kidney only between 1 January 2004 and 31 December 2015. Survival time was defined as the time from joining the [transplant list](#) to death, regardless of the length of time on the [transplant list](#), whether or not the patient was transplanted and any factors associated with such a transplant eg donor type. Survival time was censored at either the date of removal from the list, or at the last known follow up date post transplant when no death date was recorded, or at the time of analysis if the patient was still active on the [transplant list](#).

Renal patients may receive a [live donor](#) kidney without prior registration on the [transplant list](#), although centre practices differ in relation to listing of potential [live donor](#) recipients. Consequently, patients who received a [live donor](#) kidney transplant within 6 months of listing were excluded from the analysis to minimise centre bias.

Ten year [risk-adjusted survival rates](#) from the point of kidney transplant listing are shown by centre in **Figure 6.9**. Eight centres were above the upper 99.8% [confidence limit](#) indicating that these centres have 10 year survival rates from listing that are considerably higher than the national rate. Leicester and Newcastle fell below the 99.8% lower [confidence limit](#). This suggests that 10 year survival from listing at Leicester and Newcastle may be significantly lower than the national rate.

Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 6.3**, which also shows one and five year [risk-adjusted survival rates](#) from the point of kidney transplant listing.




Table 6.3 Risk-adjusted 1, 5 and 10 year patient survival from listing for adult patients registered between 1 January 2004 and 31 December 2015 for deceased donor kidney transplants

Centre	Code	One year		Five year		Ten year	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	654	(98)	654	(88)	654	(75)
Birmingham	B	1829	(98)	1829	(89)	1829	(79)
Bristol	C	1179	(99)	1179	(90)	1179	(77)
Cambridge	D	1262	(99)	1262	(92)	1262	(82)
Cardiff	E	995	(99)	995	(91)	995	(79)
Coventry	F	404	(98)	404	(88)	404	(73)
Edinburgh	G	839	(99)	839	(91)	839	(82)
Glasgow	H	1110	(99)	1110	(92)	1110	(84)
Guy's	J	1375	(99)	1375	(90)	1375	(81)
Leeds	K	1529	(99)	1529	(86)	1529	(73)
Leicester	L	1074	(98)	1074	(83)	1074	(68)
Liverpool	M	931	(98)	931	(88)	931	(75)
Manchester	N	2021	(98)	2021	(87)	2021	(75)
Newcastle	O	1109	(98)	1109	(84)	1109	(68)
Nottingham	P	685	(98)	685	(89)	685	(77)
Oxford	Q	1147	(99)	1147	(87)	1147	(73)
Plymouth	R	560	(98)	560	(90)	560	(80)
Portsmouth	S	807	(98)	807	(85)	807	(72)
Sheffield	T	703	(98)	703	(90)	703	(79)
St Georges	U	1233	(99)	1233	(91)	1233	(82)
The Royal Free	V	1047	(99)	1047	(95)	1047	(89)
The Royal London	W	1119	(98)	1119	(89)	1119	(77)
WLRTC	X	1510	(99)	1510	(90)	1510	(81)
UK		25866	(98)	25866	(87)	25866	(75)
		Centre has reached the upper 98.8% confidence limit					
		Centre has reached the upper 95% confidence limit					
		Centre has reached the lower 95% confidence limit					
		Centre has reached the lower 99.8% confidence limit					

Form Return Rates

7.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016

Form return rates are reported in **Table 7.1** for the kidney transplant record, three month and 1 year follow up form, along with lifetime follow up (more than 2 years). These include all adult deceased donor kidney only transplants between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 for the transplant record, and all requests for follow up forms issued in this time period. Centres highlighted are transplant centres.

Table 7.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016								
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up	
	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned
Aberdeen, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary							143	96
Airdrie, Monklands District General Hospital							45	100
Bangor, Ysbyty Gwynedd District General Hospital							55	95
Basildon, Basildon Hospital							48	69
Belfast, Antrim Hospital							53	94
Belfast, Belfast City Hospital	50	100	47	98	40	75	252	99
Belfast, The Ulster Hospital							27	81
Birmingham, Heartlands Hospital							101	92
Birmingham, Queen Elizabeth Hospital	128	99	118	100	94	97	536	97
Bodelwyddan, Glan Clwyd District General Hospital							41	100
Bradford, St Lukes Hospital							207	77
Brighton, Royal Sussex County Hospital							213	97
Bristol, Southmead Hospital	91	96	83	99	58	71	652	80
Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital	101	93	101	97	98	89	438	97
Canterbury, Kent And Canterbury Hospital							284	75
Cardiff, University Of Wales Hospital	63	100	60	95	45	100	613	91
Carlisle, Cumberland Infirmary							97	77
Carshalton, St Helier Hospital							313	93
Chelmsford, Broomfield Hospital							80	98
County Down, Daisy Hill Hospital							60	60
Coventry, University Hospital	26	100	21	100	29	90	219	97
Derby, Royal Derby Hospital							132	95
Doncaster, Doncaster Royal Infirmary							42	95
Dorchester, Dorset County Hospital							184	98
Dudley, Russells Hall Hospital							53	100
Dulwich, King's College Hospital							197	99
Dundee, Ninewells Hospital							116	97
Edinburgh, Royal Infirmary Of Edinburgh	62	100	60	95	52	81	373	56
Exeter, Royal Devon And Exeter Hospital							148	97
Glasgow, Western Infirmary	114	99	106	96	85	98	814	94

Table 7.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016									
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up		
Gloucester, Gloucestershire Royal Hospital							90	50	
Great Yarmouth, James Paget Hospital							41	100	
Hull, Hull Royal Infirmary							253	57	
Inverness, Raigmore Hospital							75	65	
Ipswich, Ipswich Hospital							148	81	
Leeds, St James's University Hospital	130	100	131	96	141	69	637	77	
Leicester, Leicester General Hospital	71	100	72	100	81	100	466	99	
Liverpool, Royal Liverpool University Hospital	69	96	66	100	56	93	457	88	
London, Guy's Hospital	130	98	125	98	103	97	479	99	
London, Royal Free Hospital	79	100	87	95	101	88	596	92	
London, St George's Hospital	79	100	87	90	88	97	270	66	
London, The Royal London Hospital	84	100	78	87	76	47	525	47	
London, West London Renal And Transplant Centre	122	84	107	93	102	91	798	91	
Londonderry, Altnagelvin Area Hospital							46	52	
Manchester, Manchester Royal Infirmary	185	99	174	99	125	93	642	97	
Middlesbrough, The James Cook University Hospital							296	70	
Newcastle, Freeman Hospital	65	100	63	95	48	71	367	97	
Northampton, Northampton General Hospital							60	48	
Norwich, Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital							206	97	
Nottingham, Nottingham City Hospital	64	100	63	98	47	81	388	97	
Omagh, Tyrone County Hospital							39	5	
Oxford, Churchill Hospital	113	99	110	100	75	93	542	98	
Plymouth, Derriford Hospital	46	100	47	85	37	84	194	92	
Portsmouth, Queen Alexandra Hospital	64	100	70	99	54	48	542	64	
Preston, Royal Preston Hospital							317	100	
Reading, Royal Berkshire Hospital							258	100	
Salford, Salford Royal							328	90	
Sheffield, Northern General Hospital	51	98	57	96	54	63	435	85	
Shrewsbury, Royal Shrewsbury Hospital							77	73	
Stevenage, Lister Hospital							176	69	
Stoke-On-Trent, Royal Stoke University Hospital							180	98	
Sunderland, Sunderland Royal Hospital							133	91	
Swansea, Morriston Hospital							216	88	
Truro, Royal Cornwall Hospital							152	72	
Westcliff On Sea, Southend Hospital							58	90	
Wirral, Arrowe park Hospital							33	82	
Wolverhampton, New Cross Hospital							100	95	
Wrexham, Maelor General Hospital							79	96	
York, York District Hospital							178	85	

7.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016

Form return rates are reported in **Table 7.2** for the kidney transplant record, three month and 1 year follow up form, along with lifetime follow up (more than 2 years). These include all adult living donor kidney only transplants between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 for the transplant record, and all requests for follow up forms issued in this time period. Centres highlighted are transplant centres.

Table 7.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016								
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up	
	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned
Aberdeen, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary							64	91
Basildon, Basildon Hospital							27	63
Belfast, Antrim Hospital							33	97
Belfast, Belfast City Hospital	66	100	66	95	51	92	149	99
Birmingham, Heartlands Hospital							35	83
Birmingham, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham	58	24	60	100	58	95	334	99
Bodelwyddan, Glan Clwyd District General Hospital							22	100
Bradford, St Lukes Hospital							39	82
Brighton, Royal Sussex County Hospital							121	99
Bristol, Southmead Hospital	42	100	44	98	32	56	287	80
Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital	53	89	49	100	40	88	201	97
Canterbury, Kent And Canterbury Hospital							217	86
Cardiff, University Of Wales Hospital	26	100	28	96	34	97	273	95
Carlisle, Cumberland Infirmary							28	64
Carshalton, St Helier Hospital							228	92
County Down, Daisy Hill Hospital							28	71
Coventry, University Hospital	29	100	31	90	26	88	219	97
Derby, Royal Derby Hospital							41	93
Dorchester, Dorset County Hospital							71	99
Dulwich, King's College Hospital							128	99
Dundee, Ninewells Hospital							51	96
Edinburgh, Royal Infirmary Of Edinburgh	39	100	36	83	28	75	136	58
Exeter, Royal Devon And Exeter Hospital							77	100
Glasgow, Western Infirmary	39	100	41	98	33	100	307	93
Gloucester, Gloucestershire Royal Hospital							43	42
Hull, Hull Royal Infirmary							104	43
Inverness, Raigmore Hospital							30	60
Ipswich, Ipswich Hospital							44	61
Leeds, St James's University Hospital	41	100	40	98	44	77	170	82
Leicester, Leicester General Hospital	20	100	19	100	32	97	377	99

Table 7.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016								
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up	
Liverpool, Royal Liverpool University Hospital	43	100	43	95	39	95	221	90
London, Guy's Hospital	74	96	81	100	68	94	407	99
London, Royal Free Hospital	39	100	37	100	29	93	303	90
London, St George's Hospital	49	100	46	91	37	84	122	57
London, The Royal London Hospital	34	97	36	97	46	57	290	47
London, West London Renal And Transplant Centre	36	94	40	98	62	94	603	93
Londonderry, Altnagelvin Area Hospital							25	64
Manchester, Manchester Royal Infirmary	86	100	87	99	76	87	286	98
Middlesbrough, The James Cook University Hospital							137	60
Newcastle, Freeman Hospital	49	100	48	96	51	59	179	98
Norwich, Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital							53	94
Nottingham, Nottingham City Hospital	16	100	17	100	13	100	124	98
Omagh, Tyrone County Hospital							24	4
Oxford, Churchill Hospital	48	100	45	100	50	98	302	99
Plymouth, Derriford Hospital	13	100	14	86	19	79	73	95
Portsmouth, Queen Alexandra Hospital	23	100	21	100	25	68	217	64
Preston, Royal Preston Hospital							171	100
Reading, Royal Berkshire Hospital							92	99
Salford, Salford Royal							127	87
Sheffield, Northern General Hospital	23	100	20	95	22	68	180	86
Shrewsbury, Royal Shrewsbury Hospital							43	53
St Helier, Jersey General Hospital							21	62
Stevenage, Lister Hospital							65	68
Stoke-On-Trent, Royal Stoke University Hospital							118	99
Sunderland, Sunderland Royal Hospital							57	88
Swansea, Morriston Hospital							61	92
Truro, Royal Cornwall Hospital							48	69
Westcliff On Sea, Southend Hospital							32	94
Wolverhampton, New Cross Hospital							49	94
Wrexham, Maelor General Hospital							31	90
York, York District Hospital							53	87

Paediatric kidney transplant list

8.1 Patients on the kidney transplant list as at 31 March, 2007– 2016

Figure 8.1 shows the number of paediatric patients on the kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March each year between 2007 and 2016. The number of patients actively waiting for a kidney transplant fell from 102 in 2007 to 69 in 2016.




Figure 8.2 shows the number of paediatric patients on the active kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March 2016 by centre. In total, there were 69 paediatric patients. Birmingham had the largest proportion of the [transplant list](#) (26%) and Belfast had the smallest (0%).








Figure 8.3 shows the number of paediatric patients on the [transplant list](#) at 31 March each year between 2007 and 2016 for each transplant centre.



8.2 Demographic characteristics, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016


The sex, ethnicity and age group of patients on the transplant are shown by centre in **Figure 8.4, 8.5** and **8.6**, respectively. Note that all percentages quoted are based only on data where relevant information was available. Changes made to the Kidney Allocation Scheme in 2006 mean that tissue matching criteria between donor and recipient are less strict than previously and waiting time to transplant is now more important than it was in deciding kidney allocation. These changes have an indirect benefit for patients from ethnic minority groups, who are less often a good tissue match with the predominantly white donor pool. As a result, access to transplantation is becoming more equitable.





8.3 Patient waiting times for those currently on the list, 31 March 2016

Figure 8.7 shows the length of time patients have been waiting on the kidney only [transplant list](#) at 31 March 2016 by centre.



8.4 Median waiting time to transplant, 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2013

The length of time a patient waits for a kidney transplant varies across the UK. The [median](#) waiting time for paediatric deceased donor kidney only transplantation is shown in **Figure 8.8** and **Table 8.1** for patients registered at each individual unit. During this period local allocation arrangements were in place for [DCD](#) kidneys while [DBD](#) kidneys were allocated via the [National Kidney Allocation Scheme](#). The data shown are for all paediatric patients, joining the list within the time period shown, including those still awaiting a transplant on the day of analysis. Patients who received a [live donor](#) or [multi-organ transplant](#) are not included. The national allocation scheme introduced in April 2006 is slowly reducing the variability in deceased donor kidney waiting times across the country but currently some variability remains. Waiting times across centres continue to differ in a way that it is difficult for centres to control, given that the [National Kidney Allocation Scheme](#) determines allocation of all kidneys available for transplant from donors after brain death ([DBD](#)).

National Kidney Allocation Scheme

Only kidneys from donors after brain death were allocated via a national allocation scheme during the time period analysed. Kidneys from donations after circulatory death ([DCD](#)) were allocated to patients through local allocation arrangements and these vary across the country because some centres have a larger [DCD](#) programme than others. As of 3 September 2014 one kidney from [DCD](#) donors aged between 5 and 49 years will be allocated within four pre-defined regions using the 2006 [DBD](#) allocation principles and as such we should start to see further reductions in variability in waiting times across the country.

Kidneys from [DBD](#) are allocated to patients listed nationally through the Kidney Allocation Scheme. The Kidney Allocation Scheme introduced in April 2006 prioritises patients with ideal tissue matches (000 [HLA mismatches](#)) and then assigns points to patients based on the level of tissue match between donor and recipient, the length of time spent waiting for a transplant, age of the recipient (with a progressive reduction in points given after the age of thirty) and location points such that patients geographically close to the retrieval centre receive more points. The patients with the highest number of points for a donated kidney are preferentially offered the kidney, no matter where in the UK they receive their treatment.

The [median](#) waiting time to transplant for paediatric patients registered on the kidney only [transplant list](#) between 1 April 2010 and 31 March 2013 is 266 days. This ranged from 176 days at Leeds and Nottingham to 704 days at Birmingham.





Table 8.1 Median waiting time to kidney only transplant in the UK, for paediatric patients registered 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2013

Transplant centre	Number of patients registered	Waiting time (days)	
		Median	95% Confidence interval
Paediatric			
Belfast	0	-	
Newcastle	0	-	
Glasgow	0	-	
Leeds	20	176	81 - 271
Nottingham	34	176	149 - 203
Guy's	19	227	168 - 286
GOSH	27	261	64 - 458
Bristol	21	277	168 - 386
Manchester	22	428	12 - 844
Birmingham	21	704	83 - 1325
UK	197	266	199 - 333

8.5 Pre-emptive listing rates, 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015

Rates of [pre-emptive](#) kidney only listings are shown in **Figure 8.9** for paediatric patients joining the list between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015. Patients listed on the deceased donor [transplant list](#) prior to receiving a living donor transplant are excluded and in order to remove the effect of these patients an earlier cohort was selected. [Pre-emptive](#) listing accounted for 39% of all paediatric registrations across the UK ranging from 100% at Newcastle to 0% at Belfast.



Response to paediatric kidney offers

Offer decline rates

Kidney-only offers from [DBD](#) donors who had at least one kidney retrieved, offered directly and on behalf of a named individual patient and resulted in transplantation are included in the analysis. Any offers made through the reallocation of kidneys, declined kidney or fast track schemes were excluded, as were offers of kidneys from donations after circulatory death donors.

Data are presented for standard criteria donors (SCD). SCD are [DBD](#) donors aged <50 at the time of death.

[Funnel plots](#) were used to compare centre specific offer decline rates and indicate how consistent the rates of the individual transplant centres are with the national rate. The overall national unadjusted offer decline rate is shown by the solid line while the 95% and 99.8% confidence lines are indicated via a thin and thick dotted line, respectively. Each dot in the plot represents an individual transplant centre. Centres that are positioned above the upper limits indicate an offer decline rate that is higher than the national rate, while centres positioned below the lower limits indicate an offer decline rate that is lower than the national rate. Patient [case mix](#) is known to influence the number of offers a centre may receive. In this analysis however only individual offers for named patients were considered which excluded any [ABO](#)- and HLA-incompatible patients. For this reason it was decided not to risk adjust for known centre differences in patient [case mix](#).

9.1 Standard criteria offer decline rates, 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2016

Figure 9.1 compares individual centre offer decline rates with the national rate for SCD over the time period, 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2016. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 9.1**. All centres have an offer decline rate that is in line with the national rate.




Table 9.1 compares individual centre offer decline rates for SCD over time by financial year.

Centre	Code	2013/14		2014/15		2015/16		Overall	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Belfast	A	1	(100)	2	(50)	3	(67)		
Birmingham	B	9	(44)	10	(0)	31	(39)	12	(67)
Bristol	C	12	(50)	6	(67)	24	(58)	6	(67)
GOSH	I	11	(27)	6	(17)	26	(27)	9	(33)
Glasgow	H	7	(14)	4	(25)	16	(19)	5	(20)
Guy's	J	8	(63)	6	(33)	20	(45)	6	(33)
Leeds	K	13	(46)	12	(17)	37	(32)	12	(33)
Manchester	N	5	(0)	15	(67)	32	(53)	12	(58)
Newcastle	O	1	(0)			5	(40)	4	(50)
Nottingham	P	10	(30)	3	(67)	25	(32)	12	(25)
UK		77	(38)	64	(36)	219	(39)	78	(44)

Paediatric kidney transplants

10.1 Kidney only transplants, 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2016

Figure 10.1 shows the total number of paediatric kidney only transplants performed in the last ten years, by type of donor. Only a small number of paediatric transplants use kidneys from donors after circulatory death ([DCD](#)), 4 in 2015/16.





Figure 10.2 shows the total number of paediatric kidney only transplants performed in 2015/16, by centre and type of donor. The same information is presented in **Figure 10.3** but this shows the proportion of [DBD](#), [DCD](#) and living donor transplants performed at each centre.









Figure 10.4 shows the total number of paediatric kidney only transplants performed in last ten years, by centre and type of donor.



10.2 Pre-emptive transplant rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016

Rates of [pre-emptive](#) kidney only transplantation are shown in **Figure 10.5** for paediatric deceased donor transplants and **Figure 10.6** for paediatric living donor transplants. Living donor transplants are more likely to be carried out before the need for dialysis than deceased donor transplants: 36% and 20% respectively. This is because a living donor transplant can often be carried out more quickly than a deceased donor kidney transplant as the latter often necessitates a long waiting time. Paediatric deceased donor [pre-emptive](#) transplant rates ranged from 50% at Glasgow and Newcastle to 0% at Bristol, GOSH, Guy's and Manchester. Paediatric living donor [pre-emptive](#) transplant rates ranged from 100% in adult centres to 0% at Leeds and Newcastle.



Paediatric kidney outcomes

We present a visual comparison of survival rates among centres that is based on a graphical display known as a [funnel plot](#) (1, 2). This display is used to show how consistent the rates of the different transplant units are with the national rate. [Funnel plots](#) show the [risk-adjusted survival rate](#) plotted against the number of transplants for each centre, with the overall national [unadjusted survival rate](#) (solid line), and its 95% (thin dotted lines) and 99.8% (thick dotted lines) [confidence limits](#) superimposed. Each dot in the plot represents one of the centres. Note that many patients return to local renal units for follow-up care after their transplant and although we report survival according to transplant unit, patients may in fact be followed up quite distantly from their transplant centre.

Interpreting the [funnel plots](#)

If a centre lies within all the limits, then that centre has a survival rate that is statistically consistent with the national rate. If a centre lies outside the 95% [confidence limits](#), this serves as an alert that the centre may have a rate that is significantly different from the national rate. If a centre lies outside the 99.8% limits, then further investigations may be carried out to determine the reasons for the possible difference. When a centre lies above the upper limits, this indicates a survival rate that is higher than the national rate, while a centre that lies below the lower limits has a survival rate that is lower than the national rate. It is important to note that adjusting for patient mix through the use of risk-adjustment models may not account for all possible causes of centre differences. There may be other factors that are not taken into account in the risk-adjustment process that may affect the survival rate of a particular centre.

References

1. Tekkis PP, McCulloch P, Steger AC, Benjamin IS, Poloniecki JD. Mortality control charts for comparing performance of surgical units: validation study using hospital mortality data. *British Medical Journal* 2003; 326: 786 – 788.
2. Stark J, Gallivan S, Lovegrove J, Hamilton JRL, Monro JL, Pollock JCS, Watterson KG. Mortality rates after surgery for congenital heart defects in children and surgeons' performance. *Lancet* 2000; 355: 1004 – 1007.

11.1 Deceased donor graft and patient survival

The [funnel plots](#) show that, for the most part, the centres lie within the [confidence limits](#). None of the [funnel plots](#) show any centres that lie outside the lower 95% [confidence limits](#). Some of the [funnel plots](#) show some centres to be above the upper 99.8% [confidence limit](#). This suggests that these centres may have survival rates that are considerably higher than the national rate. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 11.1**.





Figure 11.3 Risk-adjusted five year graft (death censored) survival rates for first deceased donor kidney transplants in paediatric patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Figure 11.4 Risk-adjusted five year patient survival rates for first deceased donor kidney transplants in paediatric patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Table 11.1 One and five year first adult kidney-only graft and patient survival using kidneys from deceased donors

Centre	Code	Kidney graft survival				Patient survival			
		One-year*		Five-year**		One-year*		Five-year**	
		%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Belfast	A	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A
Birmingham	B	100	N/A	72	(42 - 89)	100	N/A	100	N/A
Bristol	C	96	(75 - 100	81	(57 - 94)	100	N/A	96	(76 - 100
GOSH	I	91	(49 - 100	78	(59 - 89)	100	N/A	100	N/A
Glasgow	H	100	N/A	92	(56 - 100	100	N/A	100	N/A
Guy's	J	96	(78 - 100	81	(45 - 96)	100	N/A	88	(58 - 99)
Leeds	K	100	N/A	88	(68 - 97)	97	(85 - 100	97	(84 - 100
Manchester	N	100	N/A	94	(66 - 100	100	N/A	93	(61 - 100
Newcastle	O	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A
Nottingham	P	95	(82 - 99)	86	(68 - 96)	100	N/A	100	N/A
UK		97	(94 - 99)	84	(79 - 88)	100	(97 - 100	97	(94 - 99)

* Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2011 - 31 March 2015

** Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2007 - 31 March 2011

11.2 Living donor graft and patient survival

The [funnel plots](#) show that, for the most part, the centres lie within the [confidence limits](#). None of the [funnel plots](#) show any centres that lie outside the lower 95% [confidence limits](#). Some of the [funnel plots](#) show some centres to be above the upper 99.8% [confidence limit](#). This suggests that these centres may have survival rates that are considerably higher than the national rate. Centres can be identified by the information shown in **Table 11.2**.





Figure 11.7 Risk-adjusted five year graft (death censored) survival rates for first live donor kidney transplants in paediatric patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Figure 11.8 Risk-adjusted five year patient survival rates for first live donor kidney transplants in paediatric patients, between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011




Table 11.2 One and five year first adult kidney-only graft and patient survival using kidneys from living donors

Centre	Code	Kidney graft survival				Patient survival			
		One-year*		Five-year**		One-year*		Five-year**	
		%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Belfast	A	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A
Birmingham	B	100	N/A	89	(59 - 99)	100	N/A	100	N/A
Bristol	C	87	(55 - 98)	78	(43 - 94)	95	(75 - 100)	96	(76 - 100)
GOSH	I	100	N/A	84	(67 - 94)	100	N/A	98	(88 - 100)
Glasgow	H	95	(70 - 100)	86	(58 - 97)	100	N/A	100	N/A
Guy's	J	96	(85 - 100)	89	(72 - 97)	100	N/A	100	N/A
Leeds	K	91	(49 - 100)	92	(56 - 100)	100	N/A	91	(50 - 100)
Manchester	N	96	(85 - 99)	90	(74 - 97)	98	(88 - 100)	97	(86 - 100)
Newcastle	O	92	(56 - 100)	100	N/A	100	N/A	100	N/A
Nottingham	P	100	N/A	74	(25 - 95)	85	(14 - 100)	93	(63 - 100)
UK		97	(93 - 98)	87	(82 - 91)	99	(96 - 100)	98	(94 - 99)

* Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2011 - 31 March 2015

** Includes transplants performed between 1 april 2007 - 31 March 2011

Form return rates

12.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016

Form return rates are reported in **Table 12.1** for the kidney transplant record, three month and 1 year follow up form, along with lifetime follow up (more than 2 years). These include all paediatric deceased donor kidney only transplants between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 for the transplant record, and all requests for follow up forms issued in this time period.

Table 12.1 Deceased donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016								
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up	
	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned
Belfast, Belfast City Hospital							20	95
Birmingham, Birmingham Children's Hospital							25	96
Birmingham, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham	5	100	8	100	11	100	58	100
Bradford, St Lukes Hospital							29	79
Bristol, Bristol Royal Hospital For Children							21	86
Bristol, Southmead Hospital	2	100	2	100	2	100	47	79
Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital							20	100
Cardiff, University Of Wales Hospital							43	72
Glasgow, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital							30	73
Leeds, St James's University Hospital	9	100	9	100	9	78	92	85
Leicester, Leicester General Hospital							24	96
Liverpool, Royal Liverpool University Hospital							20	60
London, Great Ormond Street Hospital For Children	7	100	8	100	6	100	52	87
London, Guy's Hospital	5	100	7	100	4	75	76	96
London, Royal Free Hospital							35	49
Manchester, Manchester Royal Infirmary	7	100	8	100	6	50	70	94
Nottingham, Nottingham City Hospital	10	90	7	100	1	100	72	96
Sheffield, Northern General Hospital							35	80

12.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016

Form return rates are reported in **Table 12.2** for the kidney transplant record, three month and 1 year follow up form, along with lifetime follow up (more than 2 years). These include all paediatric living donor kidney only transplants between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 for the transplant record, and all requests for follow up forms issued in this time period.

Table 12.2 Living donor form return rates, 1 April 2015 - 31 March 2016								
Centre	Transplant record		3 month follow-up		1 year follow-up		Lifetime follow-up	
	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned	N	% returned
Birmingham, Birmingham Children's Hospital							22	100
Cardiff, University Of Wales Hospital	3	100	2	100	1	100	23	78
Leeds, St James's University Hospital	5	100	6	100	3	67	21	86
Liverpool, Alder Hey Children's Hospital							26	31
London, Great Ormond Street Hospital For Children	19	100	17	88	20	85	71	92
London, Guy's Hospital	15	100	13	100	14	100	92	97
London, Royal Free Hospital							21	43
Manchester, Manchester Royal Infirmary	19	100	17	100	16	50	45	93
Newcastle, Royal Victoria Infirmary							22	73
Nottingham, Nottingham City Hospital	3	100	2	100	5	100	24	96

Appendix

A1 Glossary of terms

ABO

The most important human blood group system for transplantation is the ABO system. Every human being is of blood group O, A, B or AB, or of one of the minor variants of these four groups. ABO blood groups are present on other tissues and, unless special precautions are taken, a group A kidney transplanted to a group O patient will be rapidly rejected.

Active transplant list

When a patient is registered for a transplant, they are registered on what is called the 'active' transplant list. This means that when a donor kidney becomes available, the patient is included among those who are matched against the donor to determine whether or not the kidney is suitable for them. It may sometimes be necessary to take a patient off the transplant list, either temporarily or permanently. This may be done, for example, if someone becomes too ill to receive a transplant. The patient is told about the decision to suspend them from the list and is informed whether the suspension is temporary or permanent. If a patient is suspended from the list, they are not included in the matching of any donor kidneys that become available.

Case mix

The types of patients treated at a unit for a common condition. This can vary across units depending on the facilities available at the unit as well as the types of people in the catchment area of the unit. The definition of what type of patient a person is depends on the patient characteristics that influence the outcome of the treatment. For example the case mix for patients registered for a kidney transplant is defined in terms of various factors such as the blood group, tissue type and age of the patient. These factors have an influence on the chance of a patient receiving a transplant.

Confidence interval (CI)

When an estimate of a quantity such as a survival rate is obtained from data, the value of the estimate depends on the set of patients whose data were used. If, by chance, data from a different set of patients had been used, the value of the estimate may have been different. There is therefore some uncertainty linked with any estimate. A confidence interval is a range of values whose width gives an indication of the uncertainty or precision of an estimate. The number of transplants or patients analysed influences the width of a confidence interval. Smaller data sets tend to lead to wider confidence intervals compared to larger data sets. Estimates from larger data sets are therefore more precise than those from smaller data sets. Confidence intervals are calculated with a stated probability, usually 95%. We then say that there is a 95% chance that the confidence interval includes the true value of the quantity we wish to estimate.

Confidence limit

The upper and lower bounds of a confidence interval.

Cox Proportional Hazards model

A statistical model that relates the instantaneous risk (hazard) of an event occurring at a given time point to the risk factors that influence the length of time it takes for the event to occur. This model can be used to compare the hazard of an event of interest, such as graft failure or patient death, across different groups of patients.

Cross-match

A cross-match is a test for patient antibodies against donor antigens. A positive cross-match shows that the donor and patient are incompatible. A negative cross-match means there is no reaction between donor and patient and that the transplant may proceed.

Donor after brain death (DBD)

A donor whose heart is still beating when their entire brain has stopped working so that they cannot survive without the use of a ventilator. Organs for transplant are removed from the donor while their heart is still beating, but only after extensive tests determine that the brain cannot recover and they have been certified dead.

Donor after circulatory death (DCD)

A donor whose heart stops beating before their brain stops working and who is then certified dead. The organs are then removed.

Funnel plot

A graphical method that shows how consistent the survival rates of the different transplant units are compared to the national rate. The graph shows for each unit, a survival rate plotted against the number of transplants undertaken, with the national rate and confidence limits around this national rate superimposed. In this report, 95% and 99.8% confidence limits were used. Units that lie within the confidence limits have survival rates that are statistically consistent with the national rate. When a unit is close to or outside the limits, this is an indication that the centre may have a rate that is considerably different from the national rate.

Graft survival rate

The percentage of patients whose grafts are still functioning. This is usually specified for a given time period after transplant. For example, a five-year transplant survival rate is the percentage of transplants still functioning five years after transplant.

HLA mismatch

Human Leucocyte Antigen (HLA) antigens are carried on many cells in the body and the immune system can distinguish between those that can be recognised as 'self' (belonging to you or identical to your own) and those that can be recognised as 'nonself'. The normal response of the immune system is to attack foreign/non-self material by producing antibodies against the foreign material. This is one of the mechanisms that provide protection against infection. This is unfortunate from the point of view of transplantation as the immune system will see the graft as just another 'infection' to be destroyed, produce antibodies against the graft and rejection of the grafted organ will take place. To help overcome this response, it is recognised that 'matching' the recipient and donor on the basis of HLA (and blood group) reduces the chances of acute rejection and, with the added use of immunosuppressive drugs, very much improves the chances of graft survival. 'Matching' refers to the similarity of the recipient HLA type and donor HLA type. HLA mismatch refers to the number of mismatches between the donor and the recipient at the A, B and DR (HLA) loci. There can only be a total of two mismatches at each locus. For example, an HLA mismatch value of 000, means that the donor and recipient are identical at all three loci, while an HLA mismatch value of 210 means that the donor and recipient differ completely at the A locus, are partly the same at the B locus and are identical at the DR locus.

Inter-quartile range

The values between which the middle 50% of the data fall. The lower boundary is the lower quartile, the upper boundary the upper quartile.

Kaplan-Meier method

A method that allows patients with incomplete follow-up information to be included in estimating survival rates. For example, in a cohort for estimating one year patient survival rates, a patient was followed up for only nine months before they relocated. If we calculated a crude survival estimate using the number of patients who survived for at least a year, this patient would have to be excluded as it is not known whether or not the patient was still alive at one year after transplant. The Kaplan-Meier method allows information about such patients to be used for the length of time that they are followed-up, when this information would otherwise be discarded. Such instances of incomplete follow-up are not uncommon and the Kaplan-Meier method allows the computation of estimates that are more meaningful in these cases.

Live donor

A donor who is a living person and who is usually, but not always, a relative of the transplant patient. For example, a parent may donate one of their kidneys to their child.

Median

The midpoint in a series of numbers, so that half the data values are larger than the median, and half are smaller.

Multi-organ transplant

A transplant in which the patient receives more than one organ. For example, a patient may undergo a transplant of a kidney and liver.

National Kidney Allocation Scheme

A nationally agreed set of rules for sharing and allocating kidneys for transplant between transplant centres in the UK. The scheme is administered by NHS Blood and Transplant.

Patient survival rate

The percentage of patients who are still alive (whether the graft is still functioning or not). This is usually specified for a given time period after transplant. For example, a five-year patient survival rate is the percentage of patients who are still alive five years after their first transplant.

p value

In the context of comparing survival rates across centres, the p value is the probability that the differences observed in the rates across centres occurred by chance. As this is a probability, it takes values between 0 and 1. If the p value is small, say less than 0.05, this implies that the differences are unlikely to be due to chance and there may be some identifiable cause for these differences. If the p value is large, say greater than 0.1, then it is quite likely that any differences seen are due to chance.

Pre-emptive

Patients that are placed on the kidney transplant list or receive a transplant prior to the need for dialysis are termed as pre-emptive. Patients listed pre-emptively will usually require dialysis within six months of being placed on the transplant list.

Risk-adjusted survival rate

Some transplants have a higher chance than others of failing at any given time. The differences in expected survival times arise due to differences in certain factors, the risk factors, among patients. A risk-adjusted survival rate for a centre is the expected survival rate for that centre given the case mix of their patients. Adjusting for case mix in estimating centre-specific survival rates allows valid comparison of these rates across centres and to the national rate.

Risk factors

These are the characteristics of a patient, transplant or donor that influence the length of time that a graft is likely to function or a patient is likely to survive following a transplant. For example, when all else is equal, a transplant from a younger donor is expected to survive longer than that from an older donor and so donor age is a risk factor.

Unadjusted survival rate

Unadjusted survival rates do not take account of risk factors and are based only on the number of transplants at a given centre and the number and timing of those that fail within the post-transplant period of interest. In this case, unlike for risk-adjusted rates, all transplants are assumed to be equally likely to fail at any given time. However, some centres may have lower unadjusted survival rates than others simply because they tend to undertake transplants that have increased risks of failure. Comparison of unadjusted survival rates across centres and to the national rate is therefore inappropriate.

A2 Statistical methodology and risk-adjustment for survival rate estimation

Unadjusted and risk-adjusted estimates of patient and graft survival are given for each centre. Unadjusted rates give an estimate of what the survival rate at a centre is, assuming that all patients at the centre have the same chance of surviving a given length of time after transplant. In reality, patients differ and a risk-adjusted rate that allows for these differences would give a more meaningful estimate of survival.

Computing unadjusted survival rates

Unadjusted survival rates were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method, which allows patients with incomplete follow-up information to be included in the computation. For example, in a cohort for estimating one-year patient survival rates, a patient was followed up for only nine months before they relocated. If we calculated a crude survival estimate using the number of patients who survived for at least a year, this patient would have to be excluded, as it is not known whether or not the patient was still alive one year after transplant. The Kaplan-Meier method allows information about such patients to be used for the length of time that they are followed-up, when this information would otherwise be discarded. Such instances of incomplete follow-up are not uncommon in the analysis of survival data and the Kaplan-Meier method therefore allows the computation of survival estimates that are more meaningful.

Computing risk-adjusted survival rates

A risk-adjusted survival rate is an estimate of what the survival rate at a centre would have been if they had had the same mix of patients as that seen nationally. The risk-adjusted rate therefore presents estimates in which differences in patient mix across centres have been removed as much as possible. For that reason, it is valid to only compare centres using risk-adjusted rather than unadjusted rates, as differences among the latter can be attributed to differences in patient mix.

Risk-adjusted survival estimates were obtained through indirect standardisation. A [Cox Proportional Hazards model](#) was used to determine the probability of survival for each patient based on their individual risk factor values. The sum of these probabilities for all patients at a centre gives the number, E, of patients or grafts expected to survive at least one year or five years after transplant at that centre. The number of patients who actually survive the given time period is given by O. The risk-adjusted estimate is then calculated by multiplying the ratio O/E by the overall unadjusted survival rate across all centres. The risk-adjustment models used were based on results from previous studies that looked at factors affecting the survival rates of interest. The factors included in the models are shown in the table below.

Risk adjustment factors

Adult patient transplants

First transplants from deceased donors

1 year graft survival	Donor age, donor type, donor cause of death, recipient age, waiting time to transplant, primary renal disease, HLA mismatch group, cold ischaemic time*, recipient ethnicity
1 year patient survival	Donor age, recipient age, waiting time to transplant, primary renal disease, HLA mismatch group, cold ischaemic time*
5 year graft survival	Graft year, donor age, donor type, donor cause of death, recipient age, waiting time to transplant, primary renal disease, HLA mismatch group, recipient ethnicity
5 year patient survival	Graft year, donor age, recipient age, waiting time to transplant, primary renal disease

Transplants from live donors

1 year graft survival	Donor age, recipient age, primary renal disease, number of HLA mismatches
1 year patient survival	Recipient age
5 year graft survival	Graft year, donor age, recipient age, primary renal disease, number of HLA mismatches
5 year patient survival	Recipient age, primary renal disease

Paediatric patient transplants

First transplants from deceased donors

1 year graft survival	Donor age, recipient age, HLA mismatch group, cold ischaemic time*
1 year patient survival	Recipient age
5 year graft survival	Donor age, recipient age, HLA mismatch group
5 year patient survival	Recipient age

Transplants from live donors

1 year graft survival	Donor age, recipient age
1 year patient survival	Recipient age
5 year graft survival	Donor age, recipient age
5 year patient survival	Recipient age

*Time between retrieval of kidney from the donor and time of transplant in the patient.

A3 Factors used in risk-adjusted models for patient survival from listing

Adult patient registrations

First registrations for deceased donor transplant

1, 5 and 10 year patient survival from listing age, gender, ethnicity, blood group, BMI, cRF*>85%, primary disease, dialysis status

* Calculated reaction frequency

Prepared by:

Statistics and Clinical Studies, NHS Blood and Transplant

Mrs Lisa Bradbury
Miss Chloe Brown