

Accepted Article

Understanding Non-Adherence with Hydroxychloroquine Therapy in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus

Lucy H. Liu, MD MPH¹; Helene B. Fevrier², MSPH, MS; Robert Goldfien³, MD; Anke Hemmerling, MD PhD MPH⁴; Lisa J. Herrinton², PhD

Key Words: Hydroxychloroquine, Systemic Lupus Erythematosus

Affiliations

1. Department of Medicine, Kaiser Permanente Oakland Medical Center. Department of Medicine, Division of Rheumatology, University of California, San Francisco.
2. Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Oakland, California
3. Department of Rheumatology, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Oakland, California
4. Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of California, San Francisco

Support: This research was unfunded. There are no conflicts of interest by any of the authors.

No author benefits from commercial sources for the work reported on in the manuscript.

Conflict of interest: The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Corresponding Author: Lisa J. Herrinton, PhD, Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, 2000 Broadway, Oakland, CA, 94612. Phone: 510-891-3714. Fax: 510-627-2520. Email: Lisa.Herrinton@kp.org.

Running Head: Hydroxychloroquine Therapy Non-Adherence

ABSTRACT

Objective: Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) is a cornerstone to managing systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), yet adherence to medication is poor. We sought to measure the association of adherence with five 'dimensions of adherence' as articulated by the World Health Organization for chronic conditions: the patient's socioeconomic status, and patient-, condition-, therapy-, and healthcare-system-related factors. Our long-term goal is to generate evidence in order to design effective interventions to increase adherence.

Methods: The retrospective cohort study included Kaiser Permanente Northern California patients ≥ 18 years old during 2006-2014, with SLE and ≥ 2 consecutive prescriptions for HCQ. Adherence was calculated from the medication possession ratio and dichotomized as $< 80\%$ vs $\geq 80\%$. Predictor variables were obtained from the electronic medical record and Census data. We used multivariable logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

Results: The study included 1,956 patients. Only 58% of patients had adherence $\geq 80\%$. In adjusted analyses, socioeconomic variables did not predict adherence. Increasing age (65-89 compared with ≤ 39 years: OR=1.44, CI 1.07-1.93), white race ($p < 0.05$), and the number of rheumatology visits in the year before baseline (≥ 3 compared with 0 or 1: OR=1.47, CI 1.18-1.83) were positively associated with adherence. The rheumatologist and medical center providing care were not associated with adherence.

Conclusion: At our setting, as in other settings, about half of SLE patients were not adherent to HCQ therapy. Differences in adherence by race/ethnicity suggest the possibility of using tailored

interventions to increase adherence. Qualitative research is needed to elucidate patient preferences for adherence support.

INTRODUCTION

In numerous past reports, patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) have demonstrated poor medication adherence, with about half taking less than 80% of their medications as instructed(1). Adherence to hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) is of special interest because its side-effect profile is mild, yet the drug is evidenced to be highly effective in correlating directly with reduced SLE disease activity, decreased acute care utilization, slower progression of lupus nephritis, reduced lupus flares, and lower mortality(2,3).

The World Health Organization has articulated five 'dimensions of adherence' for chronic conditions, categorizing potential barriers to adherence(4). These include the patient's socioeconomic status, as well as patient-, condition-, therapy-, and healthcare-system-related factors. Socioeconomic status refers to a person's wealth, education, and occupation, which reflects economic barriers to care as well as health literacy. Patient factors include beliefs and attitudes regarding treatment, which may be influenced by age and culture. Condition-related factors include comorbidities, functional limitations, and overall complexity of the disease. Therapy-related factors include the complexity of the medication regimen, including co-therapies. Health system factors include integration, care coordination, and access to care. It also includes physician workflows and the local context in which the physician works.

Medication adherence can be classified as primary and secondary adherence. Primary adherence is defined as whether patients filled their first prescription, whereas secondary adherence is defined as whether patients continue to fill their prescription over long period of time(5). Primary medication adherence is measured as a single event in time, but secondary medication adherence is a continuous measure and of more interest in the management of

chronic diseases. The reasons for poor adherence to HCQ are not well understood. Qualitative studies have cited the fear of adverse effects and patient perceptions of drug efficacy as important reasons for medication non-adherence(6). Depression and complex medication regimens are common in SLE, and both are associated with poor adherence(7). A recent study done in the Medicaid population has demonstrated that an astounding 85% of SLE patients were non-adherent to HCQ. Non-adherence was increased in younger patients as well as black and Hispanic patients(8).

Our long-term goal is to develop evidence-based interventions to improve SLE patients' adherence to HCQ. Toward that goal, we conducted a retrospective study to identify factors associated with adherence. We used the World Health Organization framework, together with Census data and information from the health plan's electronic medical record to assess predictors of HCQ adherence in SLE patients.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Setting. Kaiser Permanente Northern California is a comprehensive and integrated health care organization with a closed pharmacy system that provides care to 3.8 million members. The region has more than 200 pharmacies available to members, located within outpatient offices and hospitals. Most members (>95%) obtain their medications through a Kaiser Permanente pharmacy or mail-order system. About two-thirds of patients have a simple, fixed drug copayment ranging from \$5 to \$20, while others have coinsurance (e.g., 20%), with out-of-pocket maximums varying by insurance product. Patients can refill their medications by telephone or through the online patient portal. Our study period, using data from 2006 -2014, preceded health insurance expansion under the Affordable Care Act in 2014 and the

subsequent changes in health plans that Kaiser Permanente offered. Prior health plans offered individual coverage, employer-sponsored coverage, Senior Advantage Plan for Medicare-eligible patients, and Medicaid.

Study Population. The population included in this retrospective cohort study was patients over 18 years of age with two recorded diagnosis codes for SLE (ICD-9 code 710.0), entered by a rheumatologist in an outpatient setting. We only included patients with at least two fills for HCQ, which is necessary for calculating medication possession ratio (MPR), our primary outcome. We required the patient to obtain the second fill within 30 days after finishing the pills included in the first fill, as assessed through the day-supply variable. We did not include patients without a refill within 30 days because those patients were more likely to have a HCQ allergy or adverse effect. The date of the second fill was used as the index date. We required patients included in the analysis to be enrolled in the health plan for at least 12 months prior to the index date in order to assess the patient's baseline health condition and health care utilization. We excluded patients with contraindications to HCQ, including retinopathy (ICD-9 codes 362.01-362.07, 362.10-362.12), toxic maculopathy (362.55), and allergy (995.27, 995.3, V148, V149), recorded during the 12-month period before the index date.

Data Collection. Clinical data used for the study was obtained from the EPIC®-based electronic medical record, established in 2005. We also used information from the 2010 Census.

Our primary outcome is the rate of secondary adherence as measured by medication possession ratio (MPR), a well-established measure of medication adherence in electronic database research and have been validated in other chronic diseases(9,10). MPR is defined as the number of days of dispensed medication (days-supply) divided by the total days of follow-

up. If patients were to refill their medication sooner than the last prescription, patients can have “overadherence” where the days-supply is greater than the total days of follow-up, resulting in a MPR > 1. Because of this limitation, the algorithm used to estimate MPR allowed for 7 days of stock-piling, and we did not allow the MPR to rise above 1 on any day. Follow-up to assess the MPR began on the index date and ended on the date of disenrollment from the health plan or the second anniversary of the index date, whichever was earlier. Adherence to HCQ was dichotomized as MPR <80% and ≥80%, a conventional threshold often used to define adherence in previous studies conducted on insured patient population(10,11).

We used information from the 2010 Census and from the electronic medical record to assess predictors of adherence. The U.S. Census is a population survey collected every 10 years and provides demographic data by geography. Information on predictors was obtained during the 1-year period before the patient’s second HCQ fill. The first dimension of the WHO adherence frame work, socioeconomic status, was determined by linking the patient’s address code to their census block (comprising about 600-3,000 people) and obtaining mean values for the block-group. Variables used included median household income (quartiles), percent of household income below poverty level (quartiles), percent unemployment (quartiles), and percent of adults who completed high school (quartiles). Patient-related factors included age (≤39, 40-49, 50-64, ≥65 years), gender, race/ethnicity (African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic, white, multiracial/other, and unknown), and language preference (English, other). Condition-related factors included the Charlson Comorbidity Index (0, 1, ≥2), a composite score capturing multiple comorbidities such as age, diabetes, liver disease, cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, COPD, stroke, and other chronic disease(12). We also examined the

number of all-cause hospitalizations (0, ≥ 1) and the estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) as an indicator of renal function. Therapy-related factors included prescriptions for SLE, including prednisone (yes, no), mycophenolate (yes, no), azathioprine (yes, no), cyclophosphamide (yes, no), and ACE-inhibitor (yes, no), as well as the number of rheumatology visits (0-1, 2, 3, ≥ 4) in the year prior to index date. We chose these medications to capture both medication complexity as well as the severity of disease, as they are used to treat renal involvement of SLE. Health system-related factors included the rheumatologist who prescribed the HCQ and the medical center at which patient received their rheumatology care, an overall measure of clinical workflow, leadership, and culture.

Statistical Analysis. We used Chi-square tests to assess the significance of categorical variables in univariate analysis. For each adherence factor except rheumatologist and medical center, we used the SAS procedure GENMOD to perform logistic regression analysis to estimate the odds ratio (OR) and its 95% confidence interval (CI) for the association of each factor with HCQ adherence $\geq 80\%$. We examined crude ORs by examining each independent variable one at a time. We then combined variables into an adjusted model, including variables with p-values < 0.2 from the unadjusted analyses. Finally, we reduce the adjusted model by removing variables that were not associated with adherence and did not function as confounders with other variables. We used the SAS procedure GLIMMIX to perform logistic regression analysis while accounting for the random effects of rheumatologist and then medical center. This was done by using a binomial distribution with a logit link function. We assessed the fit of each model using the likelihood ratio test, and we compared models using the Akaike information

criterion. A p-value of 0.05 was chosen as threshold for statistical significance. All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.3 (Cary, North Carolina).

This study was approved by Institutional Review Board at the Kaiser Foundation Research Institute (CN-14-2069-H).

RESULTS

The study population included 1,956 SLE patients (Figure 1). The MPR was estimated from a full 2 years of observation in 76% of patients, while the mean length of observation to calculate adherence was 21.4 months. Only 58% of patients achieved $\geq 80\%$ HCQ adherence. Among those with adherence $\geq 80\%$, the mean adherence was 96%, while among those with adherence $< 80\%$, the mean adherence was 51%.

The study population was comprised of 90% women, and mean age was 47 years (standard deviation, 15 years). Median household income at the level of the Census block-group averaged \$78,710 among adherent and \$77,425 among non-adherent patients. None of the four variables measuring socioeconomic status differed between adherent and non-adherent patients (Table 1). The adherent group was slightly older than the non-adherent group ($p < 0.001$) and was disproportionately white ($p < 0.0001$). Gender and language were not associated with adherence in unadjusted analyses.

We assessed four variables that reflect the patient’s condition: Charlson comorbidity index, eGRF, number of rheumatology visits, and history of hospitalization for any cause in the year before the index date. A larger number of rheumatology visits and eGFR of 60-89 (vs. ≥ 90) mL/min/1.73 m² were associated with better adherence. The Charlson index and a history of hospitalization were not associated with adherence to a significant degree. With respect to

therapy, only 3 patients used cyclophosphamide, and therefore we did not further consider this drug. Mycophenolate was somewhat inversely associated with the odds of adherence (OR, 0.81; 95% CI, 0.64-1.03). The use of prednisone and ACE-inhibitor were not associated with adherence. With respect to healthcare-system factors, compared to the average medical center, the odds of adherence $\geq 80\%$ at the medical center with the best adherence were 1.13 (95% CI, 0.91-1.86), while at the medical center with the worst adherence, the odds were 0.84 (95% CI, 0.67-1.17) ($p>0.05$). The rheumatologist was not associated with adherence, either ($p>0.05$).

The adjusted analysis included age, race/ethnicity, and the number of rheumatology visits (Table 2). Increasing age (65-89 compared with ≤ 39 years: OR=1.44, CI 1.07-1.93), white race ($p<0.05$), and the number of rheumatology visits in the year before baseline (≥ 3 compared with 0 or 1: OR=1.47, CI 1.18-1.83) were associated with higher adherence $\geq 80\%$. Compared to white patients, the OR for $\geq 80\%$ adherence was 0.74 (CI 0.56-0.97) for African-American patients, 0.76 (0.59-0.99) for Asian/Pacific Islander patients, and 0.59 (0.44-0.77) for Hispanic patients. We also compared adjusted analyses with and without eGFR, which ultimately was removed from the adjusted model because it was not significantly associated with adherence after accounting for age, race, and the number of rheumatology visits. Finally, we assessed whether the random effects of rheumatologist and medical center improved the fit of the adjusted model, but they did not (both $p>0.05$).

DISCUSSION

In a community-based population with insurance coverage, relatively low drug copayments, and a high level of care coordination, only 58% of SLE patients had $\geq 80\%$ adherence to HCQ. Factors associated with adherence included age, race/ethnicity, and the

number of rheumatology visits in the previous year, a marker of SLE severity. Our findings are consistent with previous studies that showed age, race, and SLE severity were associated with medication adherence(1,2,6,7,13).

The study included patients who differed broadly in their socioeconomic status, but in this population with health insurance, socioeconomic status was not an important predictor of adherence. This likely reflects adequate access to medication in our integrated healthcare system. In an integrated healthcare system, patients have increased physical access to medication as clinics are in close proximity to pharmacies, and refills can be mailed directly to patients. In contrast, Feldman and colleagues' study of Medicaid patients with SLE found that patients who were non-adherent to HCQ had lower socioeconomic status than adherent patients(2). One important socioeconomic factor is the ability to pay for medications. In our patient population, financial barrier is likely limited given that the average copay for medication is less than \$20 for the majority of the patients. In a quasi-experimental study of Veteran's Administration patients, Doshi and colleagues observed that co-pay was inversely related to adherence. Notwithstanding, among patients with a zero copayment, 40% were non-adherent(14). HCQ is one of the less expensive medications used in rheumatology, yet adherence to HCQ is lower than adherence to biologic agents, which are costlier(15). Interventions for improving medication adherence must expand beyond increasing financial accessibility.

HCQ is a medication with mild side effects that takes effect over several weeks. This may mislead patients to believing that the medication is not effective. A patient's belief in the efficacy of medication has been shown to be integral to adherence, and patients who do not

experience an immediate clinical effect from a drug may not take it, regardless of other factors. Patients who have more frequent follow-up visits with their rheumatologists are more likely to be adherent to HCQ. Close follow-up provides an opportunity for providers to forge therapeutic alliance with their patients and reinforce the importance of medication adherence. Though our study did not capture remote encounters, there is some evidence that online interactions through web-based education modules and social media group participation may improve HCQ adherence, particularly in younger patient population(16). In one study, cellular text messaging helped improved adherence to office visits but not HCQ adherence in patients with pediatric-onset SLE(17). FaceTime has also been used successfully to enforce directly observed therapy remotely, increasing adherence to mycophenolate mofetil in pediatric SLE patients(18). Studies are underway to explore the use of mobile health technologies in other chronic diseases such as hypertension(19–21), diabetes(20,22), cancer treatment(23), and HIV(24), and the findings of these studies may be applicable to the SLE population in enhancing medication adherence.

It is well-known that patients who are sicker are more likely to be adherent. The patients in our community-based study have relatively few comorbidities and intact renal function, and one reason for the relatively low adherence that we observed may be the low severity or activity of SLE. Neurologic manifestations of SLE often include depression and cognitive impairment, which are not captured by the Charlson comorbidity index alone. Severity of depression in SLE patients has been shown to strongly impact adherence(25). Although not within the scope of our study, it would have been interesting to examine the impact of specific lupus disease activity measure on adherence.

Accepted Article

A limitation of the study was the use of the MPR in place of more direct measures such as pill count, electronic lid monitoring, or blood level of HCQ. While MPR and other measures such as proportion of days covered (PDC) are often used to measure medication adherence based on claims data, they preclude the evaluation of primary medication adherence because they can only be calculated if at least two prescriptions have been filled. In one study, Tamblyn and colleagues found that up to a third of patients in the primary care setting do not fill their new prescription, highlighting the need to understand primary as well as secondary adherence(26). MPR and PDC also exclude patients who filled their first prescription, but then failed to fill their second prescription, which will likely underestimate the rate of secondary medication adherence. Recent studies have demonstrated the utility of HCQ blood level to monitor medication adherence and correlation with SLE flare(27–29). Future studies on medication adherence in HCQ can be strengthened by measuring blood level rather than using MPR.

Our study also did not examine the dosing schedule of hydroxychloroquine as related to adherence, which can vary by weight and renal function. Although it is well-known that increasing dosing frequency negatively impacts adherence(30), our analysis would have been complicated by changes in dosing schedule during the study period. The strengths of the study included access to comprehensive information, the integrated setting in which certain sources of variation were minimized, and the large and diverse study population. Despite the integrated setting, we found a high level of non-adherence with HCQ therapy.

Medication adherence is a major public health problem in the management of SLE and other chronic illnesses and is thought to cost the United States healthcare system an excess of

\$100-300 billion a year(31). Given this burden, it is critical to determine contributing causes and to develop and create evidence for tailored interventions to improve adherence(32). Research is needed to better understand the role of patient beliefs and attitudes, the patient-physician relationship and communication, and health literacy. We recommend mixed-method and qualitative approaches to learn why patients are not taking their medications.

References:

1. Koneru S, Kocharla L, Higgins GC, Ware A, Passo MH, Farhey YD, et al. Adherence to medications in systemic lupus erythematosus. *J Clin Rheumatol* 2008;14:195-201.
2. Feldman CH, Yazdany J, Guan H, Solomon DH, Costenbader KH. Medication Nonadherence Is Associated With Increased Subsequent Acute Care Utilization Among Medicaid Beneficiaries With Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2015;67:1712-21.
3. Ruiz-Irastorza G, Ramos-Casals M, Brito-Zeron P, Khamashta MA. Clinical efficacy and side effects of antimalarials in systemic lupus erythematosus: a systematic review. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2010;69:20-8.
4. WHO | ADHERENCE TO LONG-TERM THERAPIES: EVIDENCE FOR ACTION [Internet]. WHO [cited 2018 Nov 13]. Available from: http://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence_report/en/
5. Raebel MA, Schmittdiel J, Karter AJ, Konieczny JL, Steiner JF. Standardizing terminology and definitions of medication adherence and persistence in research employing electronic databases. *Med Care* 2013;51:S11-21.
6. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Pouchot J, Guettrot-Imbert G, Le Guern V, Leroux G, Marra D, et al. Adherence to treatment in systemic lupus erythematosus patients. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2013;27:329-40.
7. Petri M, Perez-Gutthann S, Longenecker JC, Hochberg M. Morbidity of systemic lupus erythematosus: role of race and socioeconomic status. *Am J Med* 1991;91:345-53.
8. Feldman CH, Collins J, Zhang Z, Subramanian SV, Solomon DH, Kawachi I, et al. Dynamic patterns and predictors of hydroxychloroquine nonadherence among Medicaid beneficiaries with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Semin Arthritis Rheum* 2018;48:205-13.

9. Márquez-Contreras E, López García-Ramos L de, Martell-Claros N, Gil-Guillen VF, Márquez-Rivero S, Pérez-López E, et al. Validation of the electronic prescription as a method for measuring treatment adherence in hypertension. *Patient Educ Couns* 2018;101:1654-60.
10. Andrade SE, Kahler KH, Frech F, Chan KA. Methods for evaluation of medication adherence and persistence using automated databases. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2006;15:565-74; discussion 575-577.
11. Karve S, Cleves MA, Helm M, Hudson TJ, West DS, Martin BC. Good and poor adherence: optimal cut-point for adherence measures using administrative claims data. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2009;25:2303-10.
12. Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-9-CM administrative databases. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1992;45:613-9.
13. Mehat P, Atiquzzaman M, Esdaile JM, Aviña-Zubieta A, De Vera MA. Medication Nonadherence in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: A Systematic Review. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2017;69:1706-13.
14. Doshi JA, Zhu J, Lee BY, Kimmel SE, Volpp KG. Impact of a prescription copayment increase on lipid-lowering medication adherence in veterans. *Circulation* 2009;119:390-7.
15. Tkacz J, Ellis L, Bolge SC, Meyer R, Brady BL, Ruetsch C. Utilization and adherence patterns of subcutaneously administered anti-tumor necrosis factor treatment among rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Clin Ther* 2014;36:737-47.
16. Scalzi LV, Hollenbeak CS, Mascuilli E, Olsen N. Improvement of medication adherence in adolescents and young adults with SLE using web-based education with and without a social media intervention, a pilot study. *Pediatr Rheumatol* 2018;16:18.
17. Ting TV, Kudalkar D, Nelson S, Cortina S, Pendl J, Budhani S, et al. Usefulness of cellular text messaging for improving adherence among adolescents and young adults with systemic lupus erythematosus. *J Rheumatol* 2012;39:174-9.
18. Hui Yuen JS. Usefulness of FaceTime to Improve Medication Adherence in Adolescents and Young Adults with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: A Case Series. *Rheumatology: Current Research [Internet]* 2015 [cited 2018 Nov 14];05. Available from: <https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/usefulness-of-facetime-to-improve-medication-adherence-in-adolescents-and-young-adults-with-systemic-lupus-erythematosus-a-case-series-2161-1149-1000153.php?aid=54701>
19. Skolarus LE, Cowdery J, Dome M, Bailey S, Baek J, Byrd JB, et al. Reach Out Churches: A Community-Based Participatory Research Pilot Trial to Assess the Feasibility of a Mobile Health Technology Intervention to Reduce Blood Pressure Among African Americans. *Health Promot Pract* 2018;19:495-505.

20. Huo X, Spatz ES, Ding Q, Horak P, Zheng X, Masters C, et al. Design and rationale of the Cardiovascular Health and Text Messaging (CHAT) Study and the CHAT-Diabetes Mellitus (CHAT-DM) Study: two randomised controlled trials of text messaging to improve secondary prevention for coronary heart disease and diabetes. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e018302.
21. Chow CK, Thiagalingam A, Santo K, Kok C, Thakkar J, Stepien S, et al. TEXT messages to improve MEDication adherence and Secondary prevention (TEXTMEDS) after acute coronary syndrome: a randomised clinical trial protocol. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e019463.
22. Sarayani A, Mashayekhi M, Nosrati M, Jahangard-Rafsanjani Z, Javadi M, Saadat N, et al. Efficacy of a telephone-based intervention among patients with type-2 diabetes; a randomized controlled trial in pharmacy practice. *Int J Clin Pharm* 2018;40:345-53.
23. Wu YP, Linder LA, Kanokvimankul P, Fowler B, Parsons BG, Macpherson CF, et al. Use of a Smartphone Application for Prompting Oral Medication Adherence Among Adolescents and Young Adults With Cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum* 2018;45:69-76.
24. Britto MT, Rohan JM, Dodds CM, Byczkowski TL. A Randomized Trial of User-Controlled Text Messaging to Improve Asthma Outcomes: A Pilot Study. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2017;56:1336-44.
25. Julian LJ, Yelin E, Yazdany J, Panopalis P, Trupin L, Criswell LA, et al. Depression, medication adherence, and service utilization in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;61:240-6.
26. Tamblyn R, Egale T, Huang A, Winslade N, Doran P. The incidence and determinants of primary nonadherence with prescribed medication in primary care: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;160:441-50.
27. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, LE Guern V, Piette J-C. Routine Hydroxychloroquine Blood Concentration Measurement in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Reaches Adulthood. *J Rheumatol* 2015;42:1997-9.
28. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Houssiau F, Izmirly P, Le Guern V, Navarra S, Jolly M, et al. A Prospective International Study on Adherence to Treatment in 305 Patients With Flaring SLE: Assessment by Drug Levels and Self-Administered Questionnaires. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2018;103:1074-82.
29. Durcan L, Clarke WA, Magder LS, Petri M. Hydroxychloroquine Blood Levels in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Clarifying Dosing Controversies and Improving Adherence. *J Rheumatol* 2015;42:2092-7.
30. Coleman CI, Limone B, Sobieraj DM, Lee S, Roberts MS, Kaur R, et al. Dosing frequency and medication adherence in chronic disease. *J Manag Care Pharm* 2012;18:527-39.

31. Iuga AO, McGuire MJ. Adherence and health care costs. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy* 2014;7:35-44.
32. Viswanathan M, Golin CE, Jones CD, Ashok M, Blalock S, Wines RCM, et al. Closing the quality gap: revisiting the state of the science (vol. 4: medication adherence interventions: comparative effectiveness). *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Full Rep)* 2012;1-685.

Accepted Article

Figure legend

Figure 1. Cohort Enrollment




Table 1. Crude odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for associations of four WHO dimensions of adherence with adherence $\geq 80\%$, 1,956 Kaiser Permanente patients with SLE and two recent prior fills of hydroxychloroquine, Northern California, 2006-14.

| Characteristic | Adherence $\geq 80\%$, (n=1,132) | Adherence $< 80\%$, (n=824) | Crude OR | 95% CI | p-value |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|
| Socioeconomic status (block-group) | | | | | |
| Median household income, \$1000s | | | | | |
| 15-54 | 26.9 | 28.7 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 55-74 | 23.1 | 23.7 | 1.21 | 0.94, 1.56 | 0.13 |
| 75-99 | 24.7 | 25.3 | 1.04 | 0.81, 1.33 | 0.75 |
| 100-250 | 25.3 | 22.3 | 1.04 | 0.81, 1.34 | 0.74 |
| Percent household income below poverty level | | | | | |
| 0-3.0% | 24.5 | 25.5 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 3.1-6.5% | 25.9 | 23.5 | 1.03 | 0.80, 1.33 | 0.80 |
| 6.6-12.7% | 24.7 | 25.9 | 0.99 | 0.77, 1.28 | 0.96 |
| 12.8-100% | 24.9 | 25.1 | 1.15 | 0.89, 1.48 | 0.30 |
| Percent unemployed | | | | | |
| 0-3.7% | 26.2 | 24.8 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 3.8-5.4% | 25.0 | 25.6 | 0.90 | 0.70, 1.15 | 0.40 |
| 5.5-7.2% | 23.6 | 23.2 | 0.97 | 0.75, 1.25 | 0.79 |
| 7.3-22% | 25.2 | 26.4 | 0.92 | 0.72, 1.19 | 0.54 |
| Percent high school graduate | | | | | |
| 0-13% | 26.3 | 25.0 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 14-19% | 21.7 | 23.5 | 1.06 | 0.81, 1.38 | 0.68 |
| 20-28% | 30.1 | 31.8 | 0.90 | 0.71, 1.14 | 0.37 |
| 29-59% | 21.9 | 19.7 | 0.87 | 0.67, 1.13 | 0.30 |
| Patient-related factors | | | | | |
| Age, years | | | | | |
| ≤ 39 | 29.4 | 34.2 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 40-49 | 21.0 | 26.6 | 0.92 | 0.72, 1.17 | 0.50 |
| 50-64 | 32.0 | 25.8 | 1.44 | 1.14, 1.82 | 0.00 |
| 65-89 | 17.6 | 13.4 | 1.53 | 1.16, 2.03 | 0.00 |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 10.5 | 9.0 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| Female | 89.5 | 91.0 | 0.84 | 0.62, 1.14 | 0.26 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | |
| African-American | 15.2 | 16.9 | 0.68 | 0.52, 0.89 | < 0.01 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 19.7 | 21.2 | 0.70 | 0.54, 0.90 | < 0.01 |
| Hispanic | 14.1 | 19.2 | 0.55 | 0.42, 0.72 | < 0.0001 |
| White | 41.0 | 30.8 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| Other/Unknown* | 2.2 | 3.2 | 0.63 | 0.46, 0.86 | < 0.001 |
| Language | | | | | |
| English | 93.0 | 92.3 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| Other | 7.0 | 7.7 | 0.91 | 0.64, 1.28 | 0.57 |
| Condition-related factors in the year before index | | | | | |
| Charlson comorbidity index | | | | | |
| 0 | 83.6 | 84.5 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 1 | 9.2 | 6.9 | 1.34 | 0.96, 1.88 | 0.09 |

| Characteristic | Adherence ≥80%, (n=1,132) | Adherence <80%, (n=824) | Crude OR | 95% CI | p-value |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| ≥2 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 0.85 | 0.61, 1.18 | 0.34 |
| Rheumatology visits | | | | | |
| 0-1 | 24.0 | 29.6 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| 2 | 26.3 | 25.1 | 1.29 | 1.01, 1.65 | 0.04 |
| ≥3 | 49.7 | 45.3 | 1.35 | 1.09, 1.68 | 0.01 |
| Hospitalization for any cause | | | | | |
| No | 81.6 | 82.0 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| Yes | 18.4 | 18.0 | 1.03 | 0.81, 1.30 | 0.82 |
| eGFR, ** mL/min/1.73 m ² | | | | | |
| 30-59 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.53 | 0.22, 1.32 | 0.17 |
| 60-89 | 29.1 | 21.1 | 1.52 | 1.23, 1.89 | 0.0001 |
| ≥90 | 70.2 | 77.4 | 1.00 | Ref. | |
| Therapy-related factors in the year before index | | | | | |
| Medications (yes vs no) | | | | | |
| Prednisone | 58.0 | 56.9 | 1.05 | 0.87, 1.26 | 0.62 |
| Mycophenolate | 15.6 | 18.5 | 0.81 | 0.64, 1.03 | 0.09 |
| Azathioprine | 11.8 | 11.5 | 1.03 | 0.78, 1.36 | 0.83 |
| ACE-inhibitor | 20.1 | 18.3 | 1.12 | 0.89, 1.41 | 0.32 |

*Includes Multiracial, Native American, and unknown.

**Missing for 65 patients.

Table 2. Adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for associations of patient- and condition-related factors with adherence $\geq 80\%$, 1,956 Kaiser Permanente patients with SLE and two recent prior fills of hydroxychloroquine, Northern California, 2006-14.

| Variable | Adjusted OR | 95% CI | P-value |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| Age | | | |
| ≤39 | 1.00 | Ref | |
| 40-49 | 0.92 | 0.72, 1.18 | 0.51 |
| 50-64 | 1.39 | 1.09, 1.76 | 0.01 |
| 65-89 | 1.44 | 1.07, 1.93 | 0.02 |
| Race | | | |
| African-American | 0.74 | 0.56, 0.97 | 0.03 |
| Asian/ Pacific Islander | 0.76 | 0.59, 0.99 | 0.04 |
| Hispanic | 0.59 | 0.44, 0.77 | <0.001 |
| White | 1.00 | Ref | |
| Other/Unknown | 0.67 | 0.49, 0.92 | 0.01 |
| Number of rheumatology visits | | | |
| 0-1 | 1.00 | Ref | |
| 2 | 1.30 | 1.01, 1.67 | 0.04 |
| ≥3 | 1.47 | 1.18, 1.83 | <0.001 |

*Other factors in Table 1 were not associated with adherence to a significant degree in the adjusted model. The rheumatologist and the medical center also were not associated with adherence to a significant degree in the adjusted model.