



HAL
open science

Determinants of adherence and consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood among young people with severe haemophilia (TRANSHEMO): A multicentric French national observational cross-sectional study based on the FranceCoag registry

Ngoc Anh Thu Nguyen, Pascal Auquier, Any Beltran Anzola, Annie Harroche, Sabine Castet, Yoann Huguenin, Sandrine Meunier, Yohann Repesse, Roseline d'Oiron, Antoine Rauch, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Ngoc Anh Thu Nguyen, Pascal Auquier, Any Beltran Anzola, Annie Harroche, Sabine Castet, et al.. Determinants of adherence and consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood among young people with severe haemophilia (TRANSHEMO): A multicentric French national observational cross-sectional study based on the FranceCoag registry. *Haemophilia*, 2023, 29 (5), pp.1202-1218. 10.1111/hae.14841 . hal-04357404

HAL Id: hal-04357404

<https://hal.science/hal-04357404>

Submitted on 3 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Determinants of adherence and consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood among young people with severe haemophilia (TRANSHEMO): A multicentric French national observational cross-sectional study based on the FranceCoag registry

Journal:	<i>Haemophilia</i>
Manuscript ID	HAE-00054-2023.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Jul-2023
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Nguyen, Ngoc Anh Thu; Aix-Marseille-University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research</p> <p>Auquier, Pascal; Aix-Marseille-University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research; FranceCoag Network</p> <p>Beltran Anzola, Any; Aix-Marseille-University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research</p> <p>Harroche, Annie; AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Necker</p> <p>Castet, Sabine; University Hospital of Bordeaux, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>Huguenin, Yoann; University Hospital of Bordeaux, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>Meunier, Sandrine; Hospices Civils de Lyon - Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Groupement Hospitalier Est</p> <p>Repesse, Yohann; University Hospital of Caen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>d'Oiron, Roseline; AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Bicêtre</p> <p>Rauch, Antoine; University Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>desprez, dominique; University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>SPIEGEL, Alexandra; University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, Pediatric Onco-Haematology Service</p> <p>Chamouni, Pierre; University Hospital of Rouen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>Schneider, Pascale; University Hospital of Rouen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre</p> <p>Baumstarck, Karine; Aix Marseille University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and</p>

	<p>Epidemiological Research; FranceCoag Network Boucekine, Mohamed; Aix-Marseille-University, CEReSS – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research; FranceCoag Network Tabele, Clemence; Aix-Marseille-University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; FranceCoag Network Viprey, Marie; FranceCoag Network Leroy, Tanguy; Inserm U1296 Unit, Radiation: Defense, Health and Environment, Lumière University Lyon 2 Roques, Marie-Anaïs; Aix-Marseille University, Laboratory of Clinical Psychopathology; language and subjectivity, Research Unit EA 3278; AP-HM, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Children Hospital La Timone Sannié, Thomas; French Patients’ Association for People with Haemophilia (AFH) Giraud, Nicolas; French Patients’ Association for People with Haemophilia (AFH) CHAMBOST, HERVE; FranceCoag Network; AP-HM, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Children Hospital La Timone Resseguier, Noemie; Aix Marseille University, CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research; University Hospital of Marseille (APHM), Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research</p>
Keywords:	Adherence, Haemophilia, Transition, Quality of life, Adolescents, Young adults

1
2
3 Dr Cedric Hermans
4 Editor-in-Chief
5
6 *Haemophilia*
7
8
9
10

11 **Re:** HAE-00054-2023 (Word count: 3188)

12
13 *Determinants of adherence and consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood*
14 *among young people with severe haemophilia (TRANSHEMO): A multicentric French national*
15 *observational cross-sectional study based on the FranceCoag registry*
16
17
18
19

20 Marseille, July 25th, 2023

21
22
23
24 Dear Dr Hermans,
25

26
27 We thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of our paper. We also
28 would like to warmly thank the reviewers for their valuable remarks and suggestions, which
29 allowed us to improve our work.
30
31

32
33 We answered all questions raised by the reviewers and we altered the manuscript accordingly.
34 We hope that the manuscript will be accepted for publication in *Haemophilia* in its revised
35 form, and we thank you in advance for your time and consideration of the manuscript.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Yours sincerely,
42
43

44 Ngoc Anh Thu Nguyen, MPH
45 Aix-Marseille University
46 Department of Public Health
47 Research Unit EA3279
48 27 Bd Jean Moulin
49 13005 Marseille, France
50 ngoc-anh-thu.nguyen@ap-hm.fr
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 TITLE PAGE**

4
5
6 **3 Title of paper:**

7
8 4 Determinants of adherence and consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood among young
9
10 5 people with severe haemophilia (TRANSHAMO): A multicentric French national observational cross-
11
12 6 sectional study based on the FranceCoag registry
13
14 7

14 **8 Authors:**

15
16 9 NGUYEN Ngoc Anh Thu^{1,2}; AUQUIER Pascal^{1,2,3}; BELTRAN ANZOLA Any^{1,2}; HARROCHE Annie⁴;
17 10 CASTET Sabine⁵; HUGUENIN Yoann⁵; MEUNIER Sandrine⁶; REPESSE Yohann⁷; D'OIRON Roseline⁸;
18 11 RAUCH Antoine⁹; DESPREZ Dominique¹⁰; SPIEGEL Alexandra¹¹; CHAMOUNI Pierre¹²; SCHNEIDER
19 12 Pascale¹²; BAUMSTARCK Karine^{1,2,3}; BOUCEKINE Mohamed^{1,2,3}; TABELLE Clemence^{1,2,3}; VIPREY
20 13 Marie³; LEROY Tanguy¹³; ROQUES Marie-Anaïs^{14,15}; SANNIE Thomas¹⁶; GIRAUD Nicolas¹⁶;
21 14 CHAMBOST Hervé^{3,15}; RESSEGUIER Noémie^{1,2}; the TRANSHAMO Study group*

22
23
24 **16 Authors institutional affiliations:**

25 17 ¹ CEReSS / UR 3279 – Health Services and Quality of Life Research, Aix Marseille University, Marseille,
26 18 France

28 19 ² Methodological Support Unit for Clinical and Epidemiological Research, University Hospital of Marseille
29 20 (APHM), Marseille, France

30 21 ³ FranceCoag Network, Marseille, France

32 22 ⁴ AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Necker, Paris, France

33 23 ⁵ University Hospital of Bordeaux, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Bordeaux, France

34 24 ⁶ Hospices Civils de Lyon - Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Groupement Hospitalier Est, Bron, France

36 25 ⁷ University Hospital of Caen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Caen, France

37 26 ⁸ AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Bicêtre, Paris, France

38 27 ⁹ University Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Lille, France

40 28 ¹⁰ University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Strasbourg, France

41 29 ¹¹ University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, Pediatric Onco-Haematology Service, Strasbourg, France

42 30 ¹² University Hospital of Rouen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Rouen, France

44 31 ¹³ Inserm, U1296 Unit, Radiation: Defense, Health and Environment, Lumière Lyon 2 University, Lyon,
45 32 France

46 33 ¹⁴ Laboratory of Clinical Psychology, Psychopathology and Psychoanalysis, UR 3278, Aix-Marseille
47 34 University, Aix-en-Provence, France

49 35 ¹⁵ AP-HM, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Children Hospital La Timone, Marseille, France

50 36 ¹⁶ French Patients' Association for People with Haemophilia (AFH), Paris, France
51
52
53
54
55

56 * Coauthors from the TRANSHAMO Study Group are listed in Appendix
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 **Correspondence**

4 2 RESSEGUIER Noémie

5 3 27 Boulevard Jean Moulin

6 4 UR 3279 - Centre d'Études et de Recherche sur les Services de Santé et la Qualité de Vie

7 5 Faculté de Médecine, Campus Timone, 13385 Marseille Cedex 05

8 6 Phone Number: 0033 4 91 32 42 72

9 7 E-mail: noemie.resseguier@univ-amu.fr

10 8

11 9 **Key words:** Adherence, haemophilia, transition, quality of life, adolescents, young adults

12 10

13 11 **Word count:** 3188

14 12

For Peer Review

1
2
3 **1 ABSTRACT**

4 **2 Introduction:** It is necessary to gain insights into adherence to healthcare in people with severe haemophilia
5 (PwSH), especially during the transition from pediatric to adult care, which is an important phase in lives
6 of young people with childhood chronic disease. This adherence can be considered as a marker of successful
7 transition.
8

9 **5 Objectives:** The main objective of the quantitative phase of the TRANSEMO project was to compare the
10 adherence to healthcare between adolescents and young adults (YAs) with severe haemophilia. The
11 secondary objective was to identify the determinants (facilitators and barriers) of this adherence and
12 associations between these determinants.
13

14 **10 Methods:** A multicenter, observational, cross-sectional study was conducted in 2017-2019 on PwSH aged
15 between 14 and 17 years (adolescents) or between 20 and 29 years (YAs), included in the FranceCoag
16 registry and having completed the questionnaires. The adherence to healthcare (treatment regimens and
17 clinical follow-up) was compared between adolescents and YAs using the chi-squared test. The
18 determinants of this adherence were analyzed by structural equation modeling.
19

20 **15 Results:** There were 277 participants, 107 adolescents and 170 YAs. The rate of adolescents adhering to
21 healthcare was 82.2%, while the rate of YAs was 61.2% ($p < 0.001$). The barriers to the adherence to
22 healthcare were being YA, having repeated at least one school grade and presenting mental health concerns.
23

24 **18 Conclusion:** Adolescents had better adherence to healthcare than YAs. According to the determinants
25 enlightened in this project, targeted supportive strategies and adapted therapeutic education programs can
26 be developed for young PwSH to facilitate their adherence to healthcare.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Haemophilia is a rare and inherited bleeding disorder affecting mainly men due to deficiency in clotting
3 factors.¹ People with severe haemophilia (PwSH) have less than 1% blood clotting factors, which can cause
4 serious hemorrhagic events (e.g., intracranial hemorrhage, hemarthrosis) if insufficiently treated. It is
5 possible to avoid these events by haemophilia care, such as substitutive therapies and lifelong regular
6 clinical follow-up, whose major issue is adherence.

7 Non-adherence to healthcare might have serious consequences, such as hemarthrosis, which may lead to
8 impairment in physical functioning and quality of life (QoL).² A study on adherence to prophylaxis of people
9 with haemophilia (PwH) aged 12-25 years found a higher number of hemarthroses in people who were less
10 adherent to prophylaxis.³ It is necessary to gain insights into adherence to healthcare during the transition
11 from pediatric to adult care, since this is an important phase of young PwH.⁴⁻⁶ Previous studies assessed
12 adherence to the prescribed therapeutic regimen and found a decrease in the level of adherence when PwH
13 reached adulthood. In a study on practice patterns for the management of haemophilia A, the rates of high
14 adherence in people aged 13-18 years and those aged 19-28 years were 54% and 36%, respectively.⁷ In
15 another study, 83% of adolescents aged 13-17 years adhered to prophylaxis, while this rate was 53% in
16 young adults (YAs) aged 18-25 years.⁸ Similarly, a lower level of adherence in adults compared to children,
17 as well as in adolescents compared to children with haemophilia was found.^{9,10} As the decrease in adherence
18 to treatment regimens from adolescence to adulthood exists, maintaining the adherence to healthcare
19 remains one of the issues in the transition process.

20 In the context of transition to adult care in adolescents and YAs with serious pediatric illness conditions,
21 the SMART (Social-ecological Model of adolescents and young adults Readiness for Transition)¹¹
22 incorporates pre-existing objective factors (sociodemographics, medical status) and modifiable subjective
23 factors (knowledge, skills, beliefs, goals, relationships, psychosocial functioning).

24 In the general context of haemophilia outside the transition process, determinants of adherence to healthcare
25 were identified as barriers (absence of or infrequent symptoms, older age) and motivators (belief in necessity
26 of treatment, good relationship with healthcare provider, experience of symptoms).¹²⁻¹⁴ Regarding the
27 transition process in young PwH, younger age, positive emotions, high self-esteem, sufficient school
28 attendance, adequate disease management, family and social support were found to be positively associated
29 with adherence to treatment in quantitative studies.^{8,15,16}

30 However, the number of quantitative studies^{8,15,16} on determinants of adherence to healthcare in young PwH
31 is very limited. This adherence was only assessed by adherence to prophylaxis. People under on-demand
32 treatment were not included. Adherence to clinical follow-up was not assessed. The power of these studies
33 is rather small, with sample sizes below 100. The determinants explored in these studies are not based on

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 the determinants proposed by SMART. Additionally, traditional regression and statistical tests may not be
2 sufficient to analyze complex associations between these determinants.
3 The main objective of the quantitative phase of the TRANSHEMO project was to compare the adherence
4 to healthcare, which was considered as a marker of the successful transition, between adolescents and YAs
5 with severe haemophilia. The secondary objective was to identify the determinants (facilitators and barriers)
6 of this adherence and associations between these determinants by structural equation modeling (SEM).
7

For Peer Review

1 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2 **Study design and study population**

3 The study protocol of the TRANSHEMO project was previously published.¹⁷

4 It was designed as a multicenter, observational, cross-sectional study involving 29 Haemophilia Treatment
5 Centers (HTCs) in France. The inclusion criteria were PwSH A or B, aged between 14 and 17 years
6 (adolescent group) or between 20 and 29 years (YA group), followed in one of the participating HTCs,
7 included in the national registry FranceCoag,¹⁸ affiliated with the French social security system and having
8 no reading or writing difficulties. Written consent was obtained from the YAs and the parents (or legal
9 representatives) of adolescents. Participants were those who met all the inclusion criteria, consented to
10 participate and sent back the questionnaires. The inclusion period started in February 2017 and ended in
11 February 2019.

12 **Ethical approval**

13 The study was approved by the French Ethical Research Committees, by the French National Agency for
14 the Safety of Medicines and Health Products (reference number ID RCB: 2016-A01034-47), and by French
15 Data Protection Authority, whose principles are in line with those of the General Data Protection Regulation.
16 The protocol was registered in ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02866526).

17 **Data collection**

18 Sociodemographic and psycho-behavioral data were collected by a self-administered questionnaire sent by
19 post. There were two versions of the questionnaire: one for adolescents and one for YAs. The questionnaires
20 for adolescents were completed by the adolescents themselves. People who agreed to participate completed
21 it at home and sent it back in a prepaid envelope. Clinical data were extracted from FranceCoag's database
22 and filled in a short questionnaire by the referring physician of each participant. Organizational data were
23 collected by an ad hoc questionnaire completed by the physician in charge of each HTC.

24 **Measurements**

25 ***Main evaluation criterion***

26 The adherence to healthcare was assessed using the seven dichotomized criteria described in Table 1.

27 A composite quantitative endpoint was created by adding these criteria (7 for people under prophylaxis, 5
28 for people under on-demand treatment). Adherent people were defined as those having 4 to 7 points if under
29 prophylaxis, and as those having 3 to 5 points if under on-demand treatment.

1 **Other measurements**

2 The measurements are presented in Table 1. International validated scales and ad hoc items were used to
3 assess sociodemographic, clinical, psycho-behavioral and organizational (HTC-related) aspects. They were
4 completed by the referring physicians of the participants and/or by the participants themselves.

5 **Statistical analyses**

6 **Descriptive analysis.** Categorical variables were described by counts and percentages. Quantitative
7 variables were described by mean values and standard deviations (SD).

8 **Comparison between participants and non-participants.** Sociodemographic and clinical data were
9 compared using the chi-squared test or Fisher's test for categorical variables, and Student's t test or
10 Mann–Whitney U test for quantitative variables.

11 **Comparison of the adherence to healthcare between adolescents and YAs.** The evaluation criteria were
12 compared between adolescents and YAs using the chi-squared test.

13 **Analyses of determinants of adherence to healthcare**

14 **Univariate analysis.** The characteristics of participants were compared between adherent and non-
15 adherent people by using the chi-squared test or Fisher's test for categorical variables, and Student's t test
16 or Mann–Whitney U test for quantitative variables. The univariate logistic regression was performed to
17 analyze the association of each characteristic with the adherence to healthcare. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%
18 confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for this analysis.

19 **Structural equation modeling** (Figure 1). Based on the results from previous studies presented in
20 Table 2 and results of the univariate analysis, a theoretical model was built consistently with SMART. The
21 model specification is shown in Figure 1.

22 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and mediation analysis were carried out to estimate the effects of the
23 determinants on adherence to healthcare. As the main evaluation criterion was a binary variable, logistic
24 regression in SEM was performed. There were two mediators (mental health concerns and haemophilia-
25 specific QoL) for the effects on the outcome. “Mental health concerns” was a latent variable manifested by
26 past-negative perspective,^{19,20} avoidance coping strategy^{21–23} and mental health-related quality of life
27 (HRQoL).²⁴ “Haemophilia-specific QoL” was a latent variable manifested by six items in the Haemo-QoL
28 Index^{25,26} (Item 2-feeling, Item 3-view, Item 4-family, Item 5-friends, Item 6-others, Item 7-sports).
29 “Autonomy” was a latent variable manifested by functional, emotional, and attitudinal autonomy.²⁷ All
30 latent variables were verified by CFA.

31 The total indirect effect via two mediators was obtained by adding two indirect effects. To estimate the total
32 effect, the direct effect was added to the total indirect effect. The model was built using diagonally weighted
33 least squares estimation with robust standard errors. ORs and 95% CIs were calculated for the direct, indirect
34

1 and total effects. Standardized coefficients (β) were calculated for the association between the two mediators
2 and the other determinants.

3 *Model fit.* Indicators to assess the model fit were Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index
4 (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual
5 (SRMR). Recommended cutoffs for good fit are $CFI \geq 0.90$; $TLI \geq 0.95$; $RMSEA$ and $SRMR < 0.08$.²⁸

6 All statistical tests were two-sided with p-value < 0.05 as statistically significant and performed with
7 RStudio version 3.4.1 (RStudio, Boston, MA). The Rstudio “lavaan” package was used to conduct the SEM.
8

For Peer Review

1 RESULTS

2 Participants

3 According to FranceCoag's database and considering the inclusion criteria, 543 questionnaires were sent.
4 There were 266 non-participants who did not send back the questionnaires and 277 participants (107
5 adolescents and 170 YAs).

6 Regarding sociodemographic and clinical characteristics, the non-participants were more frequently YAs
7 and had a history of major orthopedic interventions more often than the participants. Regarding
8 organizational factors, the non-participants more often stayed in the same hospital and service from
9 adolescence to adulthood. The non-participants came from the HTCs without education activities for
10 transition more often than the participants. The remaining sociodemographic and clinical characteristics did
11 not significantly differ between the participants and non-participants (Table 3).

13 Adherence to healthcare

14 The results concerning the main objective are presented in Table 4.

15 The adherence to healthcare in adolescents was 21% higher than in YAs (82.2% vs. 61.2%, $p < 0.001$).

16 The adolescents also had better results than the YAs in all subcriteria. Wider differences between
17 adolescents and YAs were found in the physician-reported adherence to clinical follow-up (+22.9%,
18 $p < 0.001$) and in the adherence to prophylaxis if under this treatment (+26.6%, $p < 0.001$).

19 In the univariate analysis (Table 5), people having repeated at least one school grade (OR 0.31; 95% CI
20 0.18-0.53) and people having history of major orthopedic interventions (OR 0.40; 95% CI 0.18-0.92) were
21 less likely to adhere to healthcare, while members of the French association for people with haemophilia
22 (OR 1.74; 95% CI 1.04-2.97) and people under prophylaxis (OR 2.51; 95% CI 1.27-4.94) were more likely
23 to adhere to healthcare. No significant differences were found in comorbidities, psycho-behavioral and
24 organizational factors.

25 The results of SEM are presented in Figure 2, Table 6 and Table 7. Being YA (OR 0.64; 95% CI 0.41-0.99),
26 having repeated at least one school grade (OR 0.47; 95% CI 0.31-0.71) and presenting mental health
27 concerns (OR 0.37; 95% CI 0.15-0.94) had negative effects on adherence to healthcare. No significant direct
28 effects of the remaining factors on the adherence, neither indirect effects were found.

29 Regarding the association between the determinants, higher level of autonomy was associated with fewer
30 mental health concerns ($\beta = -0.10$, $p < 0.001$) and better haemophilia-specific QoL ($\beta = -0.09$, $p < 0.001$).
31 Higher frequency of using social support coping strategies was associated with more mental health concerns
32 ($\beta = 0.09$, $p = 0.022$).

33 Indicators verifying good fit of the model were CFI=0.919, TLI=0.964, RMSEA=0.031, SRMR=0.054.

34

1 DISCUSSION

2 Comparison of the adherence to healthcare between adolescents and YAs

3 In this study, the adherence to healthcare in adolescents was 21% higher than in YAs. The adolescents also
4 had better results than the YAs in all subcriteria. This result is consistent with the findings of previous
5 studies on adherence to prophylaxis of young PwH. Geraghty et al. showed that 54% of their participants
6 aged 13 to 18 years had high adherence, while this rate was 36% in the 19-28 age group.⁷ Witktop et al. also
7 reported a higher percentage of adherence to prophylaxis in adolescents (13-17 years) compared to YAs
8 (18-25 years) (83% vs. 53%, $p=0.01$).⁸ Van Os et al. used VERITAS-Pro (Validated Hemophilia Regimen
9 Treatment Adherence Scale-Prophylaxis) and found better adherence in adolescents (12-17 years) than in
10 YAs (18-25 years).¹⁵ These studies focused on adherence to prophylaxis, without including adherence to
11 on-demand treatment and to clinical follow-up.

12 Determinants of the adherence to healthcare

13 Being YA and having repeated at least one school grade had negative direct effects on adherence. Presenting
14 mental health concerns was considered simultaneously as a determinant and a mediator in this model. Its
15 direct effect on the outcome was found, whereas the indirect effects through this mediator were not
16 significant.

17 Being YA had a negative direct effect on the adherence to healthcare. During the transition from adolescence
18 to adulthood, like other people, young PwSH may have pressures and changes in their life when they move
19 out of their parents' house, adapt to lifestyle changes, have new relationships and make a career.^{4-6,29,30}
20 However, they have an additional difficulty, which is disease management. It seems that the shift in
21 responsibilities for disease management from parents is the most common reason for the non-adherence of
22 YAs.⁸ They need to take responsibility for building a relationship with a new medical team when transferring
23 from pediatric to adult services, communicating with caregivers, managing to attend clinic appointments,
24 adapting to a complex treatment plan, performing self-injection and reordering medicine.^{5,6,31} These
25 healthcare-related challenges can make them feel uncomfortable following treatment plans and avoid
26 regular medical visits.

27 The negative effect of having repeated at least one school grade on adherence to healthcare has not been
28 analyzed previously, and school-related problems have been rarely studied. A positive association between
29 sufficient school attendance and adherence to prophylaxis was found in a study on QoL in children and
30 adolescents with haemophilia A.¹⁶ Concerning childhood chronic disease like haemophilia, academic
31 difficulty may be a potential marker for the difficulties in seeking and applying health information.
32 Knowledge about the disease, sufficient abilities and skills in treatment management have been considered
33 to be important for adequate adherence to healthcare and successful transition to adult care.^{12,15,31,32} This
34

1
2
3 1 finding on academic achievement emphasizes the essential role of adapted and targeted education programs,
4 2 during transition process.^{5,6}
5
6 3 Mental health concerns (avoidance coping strategies, past negative perceptions, mental HRQoL) directly
7 4 impaired the adherence to healthcare. Avoidance coping strategies can be considered as a lack of disease
8 5 acceptance. Previous studies^{6,15,31,32} found that struggling with haemophilia acceptance was associated with
9 6 a lower level of adherence to healthcare, since this adherence was perceived as a burden. PwSH may avoid
10 7 coping with difficulties in disease management since they think that prophylaxis and clinical follow-up
11 8 would interfere in daily activities, preventing them from integrating into life with other people.^{4-6,31,33}
12 9 Avoidance, which is less adaptive for long-term psychological well-being,³⁴ may not be a suitable way to
13 10 eliminate psychological distress in a complex phase like the transition process from adolescence and
14 11 adulthood. Certain concerns, such as stress, worries about understanding health information, fear of lifestyle
15 12 changes and fear of the unknown, are very common in young PwSH during the transition process and may
16 13 have negative impacts on the adherence to healthcare.^{5,15,16,30,31,35} These concerns stem from their negative
17 14 experiences with the disease, which may constrain social-emotional functioning, making it difficult for them
18 15 to prepare for taking responsibility, to maintain a healthy mental state and good QoL. Acquiring autonomy,
19 16 for example by gradually assuming responsibility, and appropriate social support, such as therapeutic
20 17 education programs, accompaniment of medical team, support from family, friends and peers, can be
21 18 effective to enhance mental health and QoL.⁶
22 19 Autonomy was not significantly associated with adherence to healthcare. However, it was associated with
23 20 improvement in mental health and QoL, which may help young people adapt better to the condition.
24 21 Autonomy during the transition from adolescence to adulthood can be developed by adjusting life (i.e.,
25 22 taking new opportunities and responsibilities) for self-regulation and independent decision-making.^{36,37}
26 23 Helping young PwSH to acquire autonomy may be a good way to calm their worries about treatment
27 24 management and gain confidence in making decisions and assuming responsibility.
28 25 Use of social support coping strategies was positively associated with the presence of mental health concerns.
29 26 This result showed that people with mental health concerns needed more social support from others (e.g.,
30 27 help, comfort, understanding, advice), probably because they do not have enough personal resources to
31 28 lighten the burden. Although they are frequently supported by others, this support may not be sufficient for
32 29 them. These findings may suggest the essential role of family and social support in enhancing mental health
33 30 for young PwSH during their transition process.
34 31 Although we assumed that comorbidities and complications of severe haemophilia might have impacts on
35 32 the adherence to healthcare, significant associations between these clinical factors and the adherence were
36 33 not found.
37 34

1 **Strengths and limitations**

2 Certain limitations need to be acknowledged. This study was designed as a cross-sectional study to provide
3 a general understanding of the adherence to healthcare in young PwSH. Future longitudinal study allowing
4 to follow PwSH from adolescence to adulthood could be proposed to evaluate changes during the transition
5 process and shed light on the findings of our study.

6 The validity of the results might be affected by the non-inclusion of some eligible people, especially those
7 who did not return the questionnaire. The non-participants were more often followed by the HTC's in the
8 same hospital and same medical service from adolescence to adulthood. This might suggest that they were
9 less interested in the transition issue.

10 Although the main outcome of this study is still debatable as a measure of the successful transition, it allows
11 to assess the adherence to healthcare more completely than previous studies, as it combines physician- and
12 patient-reported adherence to treatment regimens and to clinical follow-up, as well as the number of
13 prophylactic injections, number of follow-up visits and number of hemorrhagic events collected in the
14 FranceCoag registry database. Moreover, the level of adherence to healthcare is in the top five of healthcare
15 transition outcomes identified by the Delphi process with an interdisciplinary group of medical and
16 psychosocial professionals.³⁸ It can apply for adolescents and YAs, allowing for a more specific assessment
17 of the potential impact on the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Since the distance between Likert-
18 type response options might not be equal,³⁹ and since some of the subcriteria assessing the adherence in
19 our study were binary criteria and some others were based on 5-point Likert-scales, the Likert-type
20 responses were dichotomized to make all the subcriteria similar in order to create a composite endpoint .

21 To the best of our knowledge, the sample size of this study is larger than that of previous studies on
22 adherence to healthcare in young PwSH. The participants were included from the exhaustive national cohort
23 of PwSH in France (FranceCoag registry).

24 Although not all the associations between the potential determinants and the adherence to healthcare
25 hypothesized in the theoretical model were significant, this model suited to explore the determinants of the
26 adherence to healthcare, as recommended indicators for goodness of fit were acquired. Moreover, the SEM
27 had higher statistical power than that of traditional regressions and allowed to analyze associations between
28 the determinants.⁴⁰ Additionally, the determinants were chosen based on data from the literature and
29 consistent with SMART, which can be considered as an ideal framework to identify the determinants of
30 transition for people with serious pediatric illness conditions.¹¹

31 **CONCLUSION**

32 Adolescents with severe haemophilia adhere better to healthcare than YAs. The barriers to the adherence to
33 healthcare were being YA, having repeated at least one school grade and presenting mental health concerns.
34

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Based on these barriers, healthcare professionals can develop targeted supportive strategies and adapted
2 therapeutic education programs, which will be proposed to young PwSH according to their profiles. The
3 TRANSHAMO project is based on a mixed methods design with quantitative and qualitative phases. The
4 qualitative phase will shed light on the results from the quantitative phase and will be published later.
5

For Peer Review

1 Acknowledgements

2 The authors would like to thank all collaborators who participate in the study:

3 AIT CHEKDHIDH Tafat (Hospital of Simone Veil, Haemophilia Treatment Center, Eaubonne-
4 Montmorency, France); AMICHI Kahéna (AP-HM, France); ARCE Claire (AFH); AUGAGNEUR Marie
5 (University Hospital of Brest, France); AURIOL-VIGNE Thérèse (AP-HM, France); BABE Mélanie (AFH);
6 BENDJEMAR Lynda (Hospital of Simone Veil, Haemophilia Treatment Center, Eaubonne-Montmorency,
7 France); BODET Linda (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier Est, France); BOITTELLE
8 Véronique (University Hospital of Rouen, France); BONNESSOEUR Johann (University Hospital of Reims,
9 France); BOUHAUCHE Alia (FranceCoag Network, France); BRICK Lysiane (University Hospital of
10 Tours, France); CADET Aurélie (University Hospital of Reunion, Reunion Island, France); CERATO-
11 BLANC Carine (University Hospital of Nice, France); CEREDIG Rhian-Alice (University Regional
12 Hospital of Strasbourg, France); CHALEON Christine (AP-HM, France); CHAMPENOIS Isabelle
13 (University Hospital of Nice, France); CHAMPIAT Marie-Agnès (University Hospital of Montpellier,
14 France); CHARBONNEAU Sylvie (University Hospital of Tours, France); CHATAGNER Virginie
15 (Hospital of Versailles, France); CHENUUEL Céline (University Hospital of Nancy, France); CLEMENT
16 Sonia (University Hospital of Caen, France); COCHENNEC Sabrina (University Hospital of Rennes,
17 France); COTTA Emilie (AFH); COUROUAU Alix (Hospital of Chambéry, France); DALIBARD Vincent
18 (FranceCoag Network, France); DELAVAL Guillaume (University Hospital of Caen, France); DELIENNE
19 Stéphanie (University Hospital of Dijon, France); DEMAY Yohan (FranceCoag Network, France);
20 DHORNE Jean (AP-HM, France); DOUAY Jessica (University Hospital of Limoges, France); DOUCI
21 Assia (AP-HP, Hospital Bicêtre, France); DRUGMANNE Guillaume (University Hospital of Brest, France);
22 DUPRE Charlène (Hospital of Chambéry, France); DURANTEL Sandra (Hospices Civils de Lyon,
23 Groupement Hospitalier Est, France); DURIEUX Frédérique (AP-HM, France); ERRICHELLO Katia
24 (AP-HM, France); FERRE Emmanuelle (Hospital of Versailles, France); GERARD Sylvie (University
25 Hospital of Toulouse, France); GLEIZES Eva (University Hospital of Saint-Etienne, France); GOESIN
26 Isabelle (University Hospital of Rennes, France); GOMBERT Giovanni (University Hospital of Toulouse,
27 France); GUERIN Nicolas (University Hospital of Caen, France); GUILLAUME Yves (AP-HM, France);
28 HACKER Veronique (University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, France); IDDIR Hayet (University
29 Hospital of Saint-Etienne, France); IMBERT Stéphanie (University Hospital of Bordeaux, France);
30 KHERFELLAH Djamel (HTC - University Hospital of Bordeaux, France and FranceCoag Network,
31 France); KORTEBI Amal (University Hospital of Brest, France); LAUMOND Stéphanie (University
32 Hospital of Rouen, France); LE DORE Sophie (Hospital of Versailles, France); LECLERE Anne
33 (University Hospital of Reims, France); LOUNDOU Anderson-Dieudonné (AP-HM, France); MAIRE
34 Cécile (University Hospital of Besançon, France); MARICHEZ Catherine (University Regional Hospital of

1
2
3 1 Lille, France); MARQUIS Eric (University Hospital of Reims, France); MATINGOU Marcelline (AP-HP,
4 Hospital Necker, France); MOUNIER Sébastien (University Hospital of Limoges, France);
5 2 PALAMARINGUE Pascale (University Hospital of Reims, France); PRADINES Bénédicte (University
6 3 Regional Hospital of Lille, France); PROTIERE Alice (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier
7 4 Est, France); QUINIOU Laurence (Hospital of Versailles, France); RAMIREZ Paola (AP-HM, France);
8 5 RARISON Onja (AP-HM, France); RICK Olivia (University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, France);
9 6 RINGENBACH Stéphanie (Filière MHEMO, France); RISSO Marini (University Hospital of Nice, France);
10 7 ROCHE Martine (AP-HM France); ROJAS VERGARA Ana Cristina (AP-HM, France); ROLLAND
11 8 Amandine (AP-HM, France); ROY Gwendoline (University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, France);
12 9 SANTOS Christine (University Hospital of Nice, France); SAVARY Isabelle (University Hospital of Rouen,
13 10 France); SCHWARTZ Anne-Marie (University Regional Hospital of Strasbourg, France); SENECHAL
14 11 Pascale (University Hospital of Amiens, France); SEVERS Véronique (University Hospital of Reims,
15 12 France); TAMBURRO Maryse (University Hospital of Reunion, Reunion Island, France); TAMDEM-
16 13 SIGHAKA Sonia (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier Est, France); TURUBAN Christelle
17 14 (University Hospital of Bordeaux, France); WARCHOL Magda (University Hospital of Reims, France);
18 15 Filière MHEMO' organization.

17 **Contributions**

18 Ngoc Anh Thu NGUYEN, Noémie RESSEGUIER, Pascal AUQUIER, Hervé CHAMBOST, Tanguy
19 LEROY, Thomas SANNIE, Any BELTRAN ANZOLA, Natacha ROSSO-DELSEMME, Marie- Anaïs
20 ROQUES, Nicolas GIRAUD, APOSTOLIDIS Thémis, CALVEZ Thierry and MORANGE Pierre-
21 Emmanuel conceived the design of this study. The investigators of the French Haemophilia Treatment
22 Centres (Laurent ARDILLON, Sophie BAYART, Claire BERGER, Marie-Anne BERTRAND, Christine
23 BIRON-ANDREANI, Annie BOREL-DERLON, Sabine CASTET, Amandine CELLI, Hervé
24 CHAMBOST, Pierre CHAMOUNI, Ségolène CLAEYSSENS DONADEL, Emmanuelle DE RAUCOURT,
25 Dominique DESPREZ, Roseline D'OIRON, Céline FALAISE, Alexandra FOURNEL, Birgit FROTSCHER,
26 Valérie GAY, Fabienne GENRE-VOLOT, Jenny GOUEMAND, Yves GRUEL, Benoît GUILLET, Annie
27 HARROCHE, Abel HASSOUN, Audrey HOCHART, Yoann HUGUENIN, Thierry LAMBERT, Aurélien
28 LEBRETON, Anne LIENHART, Raphaël MARLU, Michèle MARTIN, Sandrine MEUNIER, Fabrice
29 MONPOUX, Guillaume MOUREY, Claude NEGRIER, Philippe NGUYEN, Placide NYOMBE, Caroline
30 OUDOT-CHALLARD, Brigitte PAN-PETESCH, Benoît POLACK, Anne RAFOWICZ, Antoine RAUCH,
31 Yohann REPESSE, Delphine RIVAUD, Pierre-Simon ROHRLICH, Florence ROUSSEAU, Pascale
32 SCHNEIDER, Alexandra SPIEGEL, Cecile STOVEN, Sophie SUSEN, Brigitte TARDY, Marc
33 TROSSAËRT, Jean-Baptiste VALENTIN, Stéphane VANDERBECKEN, Annelise VOYER-EBRARD,
34 Bénédicte WIBAUT) enrolled participants. The members of the French Patients' Association for People

1 with Haemophilia (Nicolas GIRAUD, Thomas SANNIE) contributed with the communication actions for
2 participants. The members of the FranceCoag registry (Karine BAUMSTARCK, Mohamed BOUCEKINE,
3 Vanessa MILIEN, Clemence TABELLE, Marie VIPREY, Romain VOLTZENLOGEL) contributed by
4 supplying datasets of the registry. Ngoc Anh Thu NGUYEN and Noémie RESSEGUIER performed the
5 statistical analyses. Ngoc Anh Thu NGUYEN, Noémie RESSEGUIER, Pascal AUQUIER, Hervé
6 CHAMBOST and Any BELTRAN ANZOLA wrote the draft of the manuscript. All authors critically
7 reviewed the manuscript, provided input on data interpretation, and approved the final version of manuscript.

8 **Funding**

9 The project was funded by a grant from the French Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Ministère des
10 Affaires sociales et de la Santé, grant number: PREPS-15-0597) and was supported by the 'Filière MHEMO'
11 organization.

12 **Disclosures**

13 The authors have no competing interests.

14 **Data sharing statement**

15 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

16 The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

17 **Appendix: TRANSHEMO Study Group**

18 Coauthors participating in the TRANSHEMO Study Group are listed in alphabetical order:

19 APOSTOLIDIS Thémis (Aix-Marseille University, Social Psychology Laboratory, UR 849, Aix-en-
20 Provence, France); ARDILLON Laurent (University Hospital of Tours, Haemophilia Treatment Centre,
21 Tours, France); BAYART Sophie (University Hospital of Rennes, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Rennes,
22 France); BERGER Claire (University Hospital of Saint-Etienne, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Saint-
23 Etienne, France); BERTRAND Marie-Anne (University Hospital of Besançon, Haemophilia Treatment
24 Centre, Besançon, France); BIRON-ANDREANI Christine (University Hospital of Montpellier,
25 Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Montpellier, France); BOREL-DERLON Annie (University Hospital of
26 Caen, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Caen, France); CALVEZ Thierry (Sorbonne University, UPMC
27 University of Paris 06, INSERM, UMR-S 1136, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health,
28 Paris, France); CELLI Amandine (University Hospital of Nantes, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Nantes,
29 France); CLAEYSSSENS DONADEL Ségolène (University Hospital of Toulouse, Haemophilia Treatment
30 Centre, Toulouse, France); DE RAUCOURT Emmanuelle (Hospital of Versailles, Haemophilia Treatment
31 Centre, Versailles, France); FALAISE Céline (AP-HM, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Children Hospital
32 La Timone, Marseille, France); FOURNEL Alexandra (University Hospital of Besançon, Haemophilia
33 Treatment Centre, Besançon, France); FROTSCHER Birgit (University Hospital of Nancy, Haemophilia
34 Treatment Centre, Nancy, France); GAY Valérie (Hospital of Chambéry, Haemophilia Treatment Centre,

1
2
3 1 Chambéry, France); GENRE-VOLOT Fabienne (University Hospital of Dijon, Haemophilia Treatment
4 Centre, Dijon, France); GOUDEMANT Jenny (University Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia
5 Treatment Centre, Lille, France); GRUEL Yves (University Hospital of Tours, Haemophilia Treatment
6 Centre, Tours, France); GUILLET Benoît (University Hospital of Rennes, Haemophilia Treatment Centre,
7 Rennes, France); HASSOUN Abel (Hospital of Simone Veil, Haemophilia Treatment Center, Eaubonne-
8 Montmorency, France); HOCHART Audrey (University Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia Treatment
9 Centre, Lille, France); LAMBERT Thierry (AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Bicêtre, Paris,
10 France); LEBRETON Aurélien (University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, Haemophilia Treatment Centre,
11 Clermont-Ferrand, France); LIENHART Anne (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier Est, Bron,
12 France); MARLU Raphaël (University Hospital of Grenoble, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Grenoble,
13 France); MARTIN Michèle (University Hospital of Nancy, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Nancy, France);
14 MILIEN Vanessa (AP-HM, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Children Hospital La Timone, France /
15 FranceCoag Network, Marseille, France); MONPOUX Fabrice (University Hospital of Nice, Haemophilia
16 Treatment Centre, Nice, France); MORANGE Pierre-Emmanuel (Laboratory of Haematology, La Timone
17 Hospital, Marseille, France); MOUREY Guillaume (University Hospital of Besançon, Haemophilia
18 Treatment Centre, Besançon, France); NEGRIER Claude (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement
19 Hospitalier Est, Bron, France); NGUYEN Philippe (University Hospital of Reims, Haemophilia Treatment
20 Centre, Reims, France); NYOMBE Placide (University Hospital of Reunion, Haemophilia Treatment Centre,
21 Reunion Island, France); OUDOT-CHALLARD Caroline (University Hospital of Limoges, Haemophilia
22 Treatment Centre, Limoges, France); PAN-PETESCH Brigitte (University Hospital of Brest, Haemophilia
23 Treatment Centre, Brest, France); POLACK Benoît (University Hospital of Grenoble, Haemophilia
24 Treatment Centre, Grenoble, France); RAFOWICZ Anne (Hospital of Versailles, Haemophilia Treatment
25 Centre, Versailles, France / AP-HP, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Hospital Bicêtre, Paris, France);
26 RIVAUD Delphine (University Hospital of Reunion, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Reunion Island,
27 France); ROHRLICH Pierre-Simon (University Hospital of Nice, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Nice,
28 France); ROSSO-DELSEMME Natacha (Aix-Marseille University, Laboratory of Clinical
29 Psychopathology; language and subjectivity, UR 3278, Aix-en-Provence, France / AP-HM, Haemophilia
30 Treatment Centre, Children Hospital La Timone, Marseille, France); ROUSSEAU Florence (University
31 Hospital of Montpellier, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Montpellier, France); STOVEN Cecile (University
32 Hospital of Reunion, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Reunion Island, France); SUSEN Sophie (University
33 Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Lille, France); TARDY Brigitte (University
34 Hospital of Saint-Etienne, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Saint-Etienne, France); TROSSAËRT Marc
(University Hospital of Nantes, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Nantes, France); VALENTIN Jean-Baptiste
(University Hospital of Tours, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Tours, France); VANDERBECKEN

1 Stéphane (University Hospital of Reunion, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Reunion Island, France);
2 VOLTZENLOGEL Romain (FranceCoag Network, Marseille, France); VOYER-EBRARD Annelise
3 (University Hospital of Amiens, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Amiens, France); WIBAUT Bénédicte
4 (University Regional Hospital of Lille, Haemophilia Treatment Centre, Lille, France).
5

For Peer Review

1
2
3 **1 REFERENCES**

- 4 2 1. Srivastava A, Brewer AK, Mauser-Bunschoten EP, et al. Guidelines for the management of
5 3 hemophilia.*Haemophilia*. 2013;19(1):e1-47.
- 6 4 2. Lee Mortensen G, Strand AM, Almén L. Adherence to prophylactic haemophilic treatment in young
7 5 patients transitioning to adult care: A qualitative review.*Haemophilia*. 2018;24(6):862-72.
- 8 6 3. Pérez-Robles T, Romero-Garrido JA, Rodriguez-Merchan EC, et al. Objective quantification of
9 7 adherence to prophylaxis in haemophilia patients aged 12 to 25years and its potential association with
10 8 bleeding episodes.*Thromb Res*. 2016;143:22-27.
- 11 9 4. Young G. From boy to man: recommendations for the transition process in haemophilia.*Haemophilia*.
12 10 2012;18:27-32.
- 13 11 5. Breakey VR, Blanchette VS, Bolton-Maggs PHB. Towards comprehensive care in transition for young
14 12 people with haemophilia.*Haemophilia*. 2010;16(6):848-57.
- 15 13 6. Brand B, Dunn S, Kulkarni R. Challenges in the management of haemophilia on transition from
16 14 adolescence to adulthood.*Eur J Haematol*. 2015;95 Suppl 81:30-35.
- 17 15 7. Geraghty S, Dunkley T, Harrington C, et al. Practice patterns in haemophilia A therapy -- global
18 16 progress towards optimal care.*Haemoph Off J World Fed Hemoph*. 2006;12(1):75-81.
- 19 17 8. Witkop ML, McLaughlin JM, Anderson TL, et al. Predictors of non-adherence to prescribed
20 18 prophylactic clotting-factor treatment regimens among adolescent and young adults with a bleeding
21 19 disorder.*Haemophilia*. 2016;22(4):e245-50.
- 22 20 9. Duncan N, Shapiro A, Ye X, et al. Treatment patterns, health-related quality of life and adherence to
23 21 prophylaxis among haemophilia A patients in the United States.*Haemophilia*. 2012;18(5):760-65.
- 24 22 10. Krishnan S, Vietri J, Furlan R, et al. Adherence to prophylaxis is associated with better outcomes in
25 23 moderate and severe haemophilia: results of a patient survey.*Haemoph Off J World Fed Hemoph*.
26 24 2015;21(1):64-70.
- 27 25 11. Schwartz LA, Tuchman LK, Hobbie WL, et al. A social-ecological model of readiness for transition to
28 26 adult-oriented care for adolescents and young adults with chronic health conditions.*Child Care Health
29 27 Dev*. 2011;37(6):883-95.
- 30 28 12. De Moerloose P, Urbancik W, Van Den Berg HM, et al. A survey of adherence to haemophilia therapy
31 29 in six European countries: results and recommendations.*Haemophilia*. 2008;14(5):931-38.
- 32 30 13. Schrijvers LH, Uitslager N, Schuurmans MJ, et al. Barriers and motivators of adherence to prophylactic
33 31 treatment in haemophilia: a systematic review.*Haemoph Off J World Fed Hemoph*. 2013;19(3):355-
34 32 61.
- 35 33 14. Llewellyn CD, Miners AH, Lee CA, et al. The Illness Perceptions and Treatment Beliefs of Individuals
36 34 with Severe Haemophilia and their Role in Adherence to Home Treatment.*Psychol Health*.
37 35 2003;18(2):185-200.
- 38 36 15. van Os SB, Troop NA, Sullivan KR, et al. Adherence to Prophylaxis in Adolescents and Young Adults
39 37 with Severe Haemophilia: A Quantitative Study with Patients. Garcia de Frutos P, editor. *PLOS ONE*.
40 38 2017;12(1):e0169880.
- 41 39 16. García-Dasí M, Aznar JA, Jiménez-Yuste V, et al. Adherence to prophylaxis and quality of life in
42 40 children and adolescents with severe haemophilia A.*Haemophilia*. 2015;21(4):458-64.
- 43 41 17. Resseguier N, Rosso-Delsemme N, Beltran Anzola A, et al. Determinants of adherence and
44 42 consequences of the transition from adolescence to adulthood among young people with severe
45 43 haemophilia (TRANSEMO): study protocol for a multicentric French national observational cross-
46 44 sectional study.*BMJ Open*. 2018;8(7):e022409.
- 47 45 18. Doncarli A, Demiguel V, et al. FranceCoag: a 22-year prospective follow-up of the national French
48 46 cohort of patients with inherited bleeding disorders.*Eur J Epidemiol*. 2019;34(5):521-32.
- 49 47 19. Apostolidis T, Fieulaine N. Validation française de l'échelle de temporalité : The Zimbardo Time
50 48 Perspective Inventory (ZTPI).*Eur Rev Appl Psychology*. 2004;54:207-17.
- 51 49 20. Zimbardo PG, Boyd JN. Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric.*J
52 50 Pers Soc Psychol*. 1999;77(6):1271-88.

21. Baumstarck K, Alessandrini M, Hamidou Z, et al. Assessment of coping: a new french four-factor structure of the brief COPE inventory. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2017;15(1):8.
22. Carver CS. You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: consider the brief COPE. *Int J Behav Med*. 1997;4(1):92-100.
23. Muller L, Spitz E. [Multidimensional assessment of coping: validation of the Brief COPE among French population]. *L'Encephale*. 2003;29(6):507-18.
24. Ware JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. SF-12: How to Score the SF-12 Physical and Mental Health Summary Scales. Second edition. Boston, Massachusetts: The Health Institute, New England Medical Center; 1995.
25. Pollak E, Mühlhan H, VON Mackensen S, et al. The Haemo-QoL Index: developing a short measure for health-related quality of life assessment in children and adolescents with haemophilia. *Haemoph Off J World Fed Hemoph*. 2006;12(4):384-92.
26. von Mackensen S, Bullinger M, Haemo-QoL Group. Development and testing of an instrument to assess the Quality of Life of Children with Haemophilia in Europe (Haemo-QoL). *Haemoph Off J World Fed Hemoph*. 2004;10 Suppl 1:17-25.
27. Noom MJ, Deković M, Meeus W. Conceptual Analysis and Measurement of Adolescent Autonomy. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2001;30(5):577-95.
28. Hooper, D, Coughlan, J, Mullen, M. Structural Equation Modelling: Guidelines for Determining Model Fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1), 53-60.
29. McLaughlin JM, Munn JE, Anderson TL, et al. Predictors of quality of life among adolescents and young adults with a bleeding disorder. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2017;15(1):67.
30. Lindvall K, Colstrup L, Wollter I-M, et al. Compliance with treatment and understanding of own disease in patients with severe and moderate haemophilia. *Haemophilia*. 2006;12(1):47-51.
31. Lee Mortensen G, Strand AM, Almén L. Adherence to prophylactic haemophilic treatment in young patients transitioning to adult care: A qualitative review. *Haemophilia*. 2018;24(6):862-72.
32. Schrijvers LH, Kars MC, Beijlevelt-van der Zande M, et al. Unravelling adherence to prophylaxis in haemophilia: a patients' perspective. *Haemophilia*. 2015;21(5):612-21.
33. Schrijvers LH, Schuurmans MJ, Fischer K. Promoting self-management and adherence during prophylaxis: evidence-based recommendations for haemophilia professionals. *Haemophilia*. 2016;22(4):499-506.
34. Smith MM, Saklofske DH, Keefer KV, et al. Coping Strategies and Psychological Outcomes: The Moderating Effects of Personal Resiliency. *J Psychol*. 2016;150(3):318-32.
35. Lamiani G, Strada I, Mancuso ME, et al. Factors influencing illness representations and perceived adherence in haemophilic patients: a pilot study. *Haemophilia*. 2015;21(5):598-604.
36. Oudekerk BA, Allen JP, Hessel ET, et al. The Cascading Development of Autonomy and Relatedness From Adolescence to Adulthood. *Child Dev*. 2015;86(2):472-85.
37. Zimmermann P, Mohr C, Spangler G. Genetic and attachment influences on adolescents' regulation of autonomy and aggressiveness. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2009;50(11):1339-47.
38. Fair C, Cuttance J, Sharma N, et al. International and Interdisciplinary Identification of Health Care Transition Outcomes. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2016;170(3):205-11.
39. Sullivan GM, Artino AR. Analyzing and Interpreting Data From Likert-Type Scales. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2013;5(4):541-42.
40. Iacobucci D, Saldanha N, Deng X. A Meditation on Mediation: Evidence That Structural Equations Models Perform Better Than Regressions. *J Consum Psychol*. 2007;17(2):139-53.

Table 1. Measurements

Dichotomized criteria assessing the adherence to healthcare		
	Original	Dichotomized
Number of follow-up visits over the last two years (FranceCoag registry)	Quantitative variable	In agreement / Not in agreement with the recommended number
Physician-reported adherence to clinical follow-up	- Very high - High - Average - Low - Very low	Very high / High to very low
Patient-reported adherence to clinical follow-up	Visiting Haemophilia Treatment Centre (HTC) at least once a year / Not visiting HTC every year	
If under prophylaxis, number of prophylactic injections over the last three months (FranceCoag registry)	Quantitative variable	In agreement / Not in agreement with the recommended number
If under prophylaxis, physician-reported adherence to prophylaxis	- Very high - High - Average - Low - Very low	Very high / High to very low
Patient-reported adherence to treatment	<p>If under prophylaxis:</p> <p>- Having no difficulties in adherence to prophylaxis or having difficulties but missing treatment less than once a week / Having difficulties and missing treatment once a week or more</p> <p>If under on-demand treatment:</p> <p>- Having no difficulties in recognizing early signs of hemorrhage / Having difficulties in recognizing early signs of hemorrhage</p>	
Physician-reported number of hemorrhagic events over the last two years	Quantitative variable	None / At least one
Sociodemographics		
Age, sex		
Living near the HTC	Yes (under 30 km) / No (more than 30 km)	
Socioeconomic status (SES) of family measured by Family Affluence Scale (FAS)	4-item questionnaire measuring family material wealth Scores ranging from 0 to 5 indicating "low or medium" SES Scores ranging from 6 to 9 indicating "high" SES	
Academic difficulty	At least one grade repetition at school	
Member of French association for people with haemophilia (AFH)	Yes / No	

Clinical characteristics	
Type of haemophilia	Severe haemophilia A or B
Comorbidity	Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection Hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection Hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection Cancer Other chronic pathology
Complication	History of inhibitors Current inhibitor status (if having history of inhibitors) History of intracranial hemorrhage History of major orthopedic interventions
Current treatment regimen	On-demand treatment Prophylaxis
Self-injection (if under prophylaxis)	Yes / No (by family members and/or healthcare professionals)
Number of injections per week (if under prophylaxis)	1 injection 2 or more than 2 injections
Emicizumab	Yes / No
Psycho-behavioral factors	
Family functioning measured by Family Assessment Device (FAD)	6-item questionnaire Scores range from 1 to 4 with lower score indicating better general family functioning
Generic quality of life (QoL) measured by Short form 12 Health Survey (SF- 12)	Two subscores: Physical component score (PCS) for physical health-related quality of life (HRQoL), mental component score (MCS) for mental HRQoL. Scores range from 0 to 100 with higher scores indicating better HRQoL
Haemophilia-specific QoL measured by Haemo-QoL Index	8-item questionnaire Each item represents for one dimension of QoL: Physical well- being, emotional well-being, perceived support, relationship with friends, view, relationship with others, sports, treatment management Scores range from 0 to 100 with lower scores indicating better haemophilia-specific QoL
Coping strategies measured by Brief Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced Scale (Brief COPE)	28-item questionnaire evaluating 14 coping strategies, which are grouped into four main strategies: Social support, problem solving, avoidance, and positive thinking Higher scores indicate a more frequent use of the assessed coping strategy
Autonomy measured by Noom questionnaire	15-item questionnaire classified into three dimensions: Attitudinal autonomy, Functional autonomy, Emotional autonomy Scores range from 5 to 25 with higher scores indicating higher level of autonomy

Time perspective measured by Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI)	Two subscales “Negative past” (9 items) and “Future” (12 items) were retained from the original 56-item questionnaire, measuring tendency to focus on different aspects of the past and future Higher scores indicate stronger projection in the assessed time perspective
Satisfaction with the clinical follow-up of the HTC	Yes / No
Organizational (HTC-related) factors	
Type of healthcare transition in the HTC	Same hospital and service for adolescents and adults Same hospital, two different services (pediatric/adult)
Pediatrician in the medical team of the HTC	Yes / No
Setup of therapeutic education activities for transition in the HTC	Yes / No

Table 2. Previous findings on adherence to treatment regimens of PwH

	Findings	References
Comparison between adolescents and young adults	Adolescents have better adherence to healthcare compared to young adults	7, 8, 15, 33
Factors positively associated with adherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Younger age - Lower level of chronic pain, fewer orthopedic interventions, better physical functioning associated with better adherence to prescribed treatment regimen - Good quality of life 	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 33
Factors negatively associated with adherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negative emotions, inadequate emotional management, low self-esteem - Struggling with stress of disease acceptance, concerns about treatment - Overprotection of family - Limitations in sport practices 	5, 15, 16, 35
Challenges during the transition from adolescence to adulthood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Education - Finances - Career - New relationships - Communication and collaboration with medical team 	6, 8, 30

Table 3. Characteristics of the participants and non-participants

	Participants (n=277)	Non- participants (n=266)	p-value
<i>Sociodemographics</i>			
Group			<0.001
Adolescents	107 (38.6)	62 (23.3)	
Young adults	170 (61.4)	204 (76.7)	
Age, mean (SD)	21.3 (5.1)	21.8 (4.6)	0.201
Sex: male, n (%)	273 (98.6)	266 (100.0)	0.124
<i>Clinical characteristics</i>			
Type of haemophilia, n (%)			0.634
Haemophilia A	241(87.0)	235 (88.3)	
Haemophilia B	36 (13.0)	31 (11.7)	
At least one comorbidity: yes, n (%)	35 (12.6)	36 (13.5)	0.756
Comorbidity: yes, n (%)			
HIV infection	0	0	
HBV infection	7 (2.5)	2 (0.8)	0.177
HCV infection	3 (1.1)	3 (1.1)	0.999
Cancer	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	0.999
Other chronic pathology	16 (5.8)	20 (7.5)	0.415
Complication: n (%)			
History of inhibitors			0.286
No	215 (77.6)	196 (73.7)	
Yes	62 (22.4)	70 (26.3)	
Current inhibitor status (if having history of inhibitors)			0.092
Disappeared	47 (75.8)	61 (87.1)	
Always present	15 (24.2)	9 (12.9)	
History of intracranial hemorrhage			0.604
No	266 (96.0)	253 (95.1)	
Yes	11 (4.0)	13 (4.9)	
History of major orthopedic interventions			<0.001
No	251 (90.6)	198 (74.4)	
Yes	26 (9.4)	68 (25.6)	
Current treatment regimen, n (%)			0.307
On-demand treatment	41(14.8)	48 (18.0)	
Prophylaxis	236 (85.2)	218 (82.0)	
Emicizumab, n (%)			0.240
No	277 (100)	264 (99.2)	
Yes	0	2 (0.08)	
<i>Organizational (HTC-related) factors: yes, n (%)</i>			
Type of healthcare transition in the HTC			<0.001
Same hospital and service for adolescents and adults	177 (63.9)	227 (85.3)	
Same hospital, two different services (pediatric/adult)	100 (36.1)	39 (14.7)	

Pediatrician in the medical team of HTC	208 (75.1)	210 (79.0)	0.286
Setup of therapeutic patient education activities for transition by the HTC	60 (21.7)	40 (15.0)	0.047

Abbreviations: HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; HTC, haemophilia treatment center.

For Peer Review

Table 4. Comparison of the adherence to healthcare between adolescents and young adults

	All participants (n=277)	Adolescents (n=107)	Young adults (n=170)	p-value
Composite main evaluation criterion, adherence to healthcare: yes, n (%)	192 (69.3)	88 (82.2)	104 (61.2)	<0.001
Evaluation criteria: yes, n (%)				
Adherence to recommended number of follow-up visits	144 (52.0)	61 (57.0)	83 (48.8)	0.184
Physician-reported adherence to clinical follow-up	145 (52.4)	71 (66.4)	74 (43.5)	<0.001
Patient-reported adherence to clinical follow-up	231 (83.4)	97 (90.7)	134 (78.8)	0.010
If under prophylaxis, adherence to recommended prophylactic treatment injections	184 (78.0)	89 (84.8)	95 (72.5)	0.024
If under prophylaxis, physician-reported adherence to the prophylaxis	145 (61.4)	80 (76.2)	65 (49.6)	<0.001
Patient-reported adherence to treatment	248 (89.5)	98 (91.6)	150 (88.2)	0.375
At least one hemorrhagic event	216 (78.0)	82 (76.6)	134 (78.8)	0.669

Table 5. Characteristics of the adherent and non-adherent people

	Non-adherent people (n=85) n/mean (%/SD)	Adherent people (n=192) n/mean (%/SD)	p-value	OR (95% CI)
<i>Sociodemographics</i>				
Group			<0.001	
Adolescents	19 (17.8)	88 (82.2)		
Young adults	66 (38.8)	104 (61.2)		0.34 (0.19-0.60)
Age, years	22.9 (4.4)	20.6 (5.2)	<0.001	0.91 (0.86-0.96)
Age group (if adolescent)			0.073	
14-15	5 (10.4)	43 (89.6)		
16-17	14 (23.7)	45 (76.3)		0.37 (0.11-1.07)
Age group (if young adult)			0.888	
20-24	31 (38.3)	50 (61.7)		
25-29	35 (39.3)	54 (60.7)		0.96 (0.51-1.77)
Sex			>0.999	
Male	84 (30.8)	189 (69.2)		
Female	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)		1.33 (0.17-27.17)
Living near the HTC			0.440	
No	44 (28.8)	109 (71.2)		
Yes	41 (33.1)	83 (66.9)		0.82 (0.49-1.37)
Socioeconomic status of the family			0.059	
Low or medium	48 (35.8)	86 (64.2)		
High	36 (25.4)	106 (74.6)		1.64 (0.98-2.77)
Academic difficulty (at least one grade repetition at school)			<0.001	
No	29 (19.3)	121 (80.7)		
Yes	55 (43.7)	71 (56.3)		0.31 (0.18-0.53)
Member of AFH			0.037	
No	54 (36.0)	96 (64.0)		
Yes	31 (24.4)	96 (75.6)		1.74 (1.04-2.97)
<i>Clinical characteristics</i>				
Type of haemophilia			0.712	
Haemophilia A	73 (30.3)	168 (69.7)		
Haemophilia B	12 (33.3)	24 (66.7)		0.87 (0.42-1.89)
At least one comorbidity			0.546	
No	76 (30.2)	176 (69.8)		
Yes	9 (36.0)	16 (64.0)		0.77 (0.33-1.89)
HIV infection			-	
No	85 (30.7)	192 (69.3)		
Yes	0	0		-
HBV infection			0.442	
No	82 (30.4)	188 (69.6)		
Yes	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)		0.58 (0.13-3.01)
HCV infection			0.555	
No	85 (30.7)	189 (69.3)		
Yes	0	3 (100.0)		3.16 (0.30-426.43)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cancer			0.520	
No	84 (30.6)	191 (69.4)		
Yes	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)		0.44 (0.02-11.2)
Other chronic pathology			0.999	
No	80 (30.7)	181 (69.3)		
Yes	5 (31.3)	11 (68.7)		0.97 (0.34-3.17)
Complication				
At least one complication			0.696	
No	60 (31.4)	131 (68.6)		
Yes	25 (29.1)	61 (70.9)		1.12 (0.65-1.97)
History of inhibitors			0.344	
No	69 (32.1)	146 (67.9)		
Yes	16 (25.8)	46 (74.2)		1.36 (0.73-2.63)
Current inhibitor status (if having history of inhibitors)			0.505	
Disappeared	11 (23.4)	36 (76.6)		
Always present	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)		0.61 (0.17-2.30)
History of intracranial hemorrhage			0.181	
No	84 (31.6)	182 (68.4)		
Yes	1 (9.1)	10 (90.9)		4.62 (0.86-85.39)
History of major orthopedic interventions			0.025	
No	72 (28.7)	179 (71.3)		
Yes	13 (50.0)	13 (50.0)		0.40 (0.18-0.92)
Current treatment regimen			0.007	
On-demand treatment	20 (48.8)	21 (51.2)		
Prophylaxis	65 (27.5)	171 (72.5)		2.51 (1.27-4.94)
Self-injection (if under prophylaxis)			0.429	
No (by family members and/or healthcare professionals)	20 (24.4)	62 (75.6)		
Yes	45 (29.2)	109 (70.8)		0.78 (0.42-1.43)
Number of injections per week (if under prophylaxis)			0.438	
1 injection	5 (20.8)	19 (79.2)		
2 or more than 2 injections	60 (28.3)	152 (71.7)		0.67 (0.21-1.74)
Psycho-behavioral factors				
Family functioning (score of FAD)	1.87 (0.6)	1.78 (0.6)	0.248	0.78 (0.51-1.19)
Participation in therapeutic education activities			0.949	
No	28 (30.4)	64 (69.6)		
Yes	57 (30.8)	128 (69.2)		0.98 (0.57-1.68)
Quality of life				
Physical health (PCS)	46.3 (10.7)	48.2 (10.2)	0.154	1.02 (0.99-1.04)
Mental health (MCS)	47.8 (10.7)	49.0 (9.2)	0.344	1.01 (0.99-1.04)
Haemophilia-specific quality of life (Haemo-QoL Index)	33.4 (24.9)	32.9 (21.9)	0.889	1.00 (0.99-1.01)
Coping strategies (scores of Brief COPE)				

1					
2					
3	Social support	3.8 (1.1)	3.7 (0.9)	0.251	0.86 (0.66-1.11)
4	Problem solving	5.1 (1.3)	5.0 (1.4)	0.803	0.98 (0.81-1.18)
5	Avoidance	3.6 (0.8)	3.4 (0.7)	0.147	0.77 (0.53-1.10)
6	Positive thinking	5.2 (1.1)	5.4 (1.2)	0.190	1.16 (0.93-1.44)
7					
8	Autonomy				
9	(scores of Noom questionnaire)				
10	Attitudinal autonomy	17.3 (4.0)	17.4 (4.4)	0.883	1.00 (0.94-1.07)
11	Functional autonomy	18.5 (3.8)	18.2 (4.1)	0.550	0.98 (0.92-1.05)
12	Emotional autonomy	18.1 (2.9)	18.0 (3.9)	0.910	1.00 (0.93-1.07)
13					
14	Time perspective (scores of ZTPI)				
15	Negative past	2.75 (0.7)	2.68 (0.7)	0.426	0.86 (0.59-1.24)
16	Future	3.29 (0.5)	3.29 (0.6)	0.973	0.99 (0.62-1.58)
17					
18	Satisfaction with the clinical follow-				
19	up of the HTC			0.228	
20	No	6 (46.2)	7 (53.8)		
21	Yes	79 (29.9)	185 (70.1)		2.01 (0.63-6.23)
22					
23	Organizational (HTC-related) factors				
24	Type of healthcare transition in the				
25	HTC			0.317	
26	Same hospital, two different				
27	services (pediatric/adult)	27 (27.0)	73 (73.0)		
28	Same hospital and service for				
29	adolescent and adults	58 (32.8)	119 (67.2)		0.76 (0.44-1.03)
30					
31	Pediatrician in the medical team of				
32	the HTC			0.395	
33	No	24 (34.8)	45 (65.2)		
34	Yes	61 (29.3)	147 (70.7)		1.29 (0.71-2.28)
35					
36	Setup of therapeutic education				
37	activities for transition by the HTC			0.896	
38	No	67 (30.9)	150 (69.1)		
39	Yes	18 (30.0)	42 (70.0)		1.04 (0.57-1.98)

Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; HTC, haemophilia treatment center; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; FAD, Family Assessment Device; AFH, French association for people with haemophilia; HRQoL, health-related quality of life; PCS, physical component summary; MCS, mental component summary; Brief COPE, Brief Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced; ZTPI, Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 6. Association of the determinants with two mediators of the structural equation model

	Standardized coefficient (β)	p-value
<i>Mental health concerns</i>[†]		
Sociodemographics		
High socioeconomic status of family	-0.04	0.608
At least one grade repetition at school	-0.08	0.337
Member of AFH	-0.07	0.397
Clinical characteristics		
Being young adult	0.13	0.153
At least one comorbidity	0.23	0.099
At least one complication	0.09	0.287
Current treatment: Prophylaxis	-0.01	0.925
Psycho-behavioral factors		
Social support	0.09	0.022
Autonomy [‡]	-0.10	<0.001
<i>Haemophilia-specific quality of life</i>[§]		
Sociodemographics		
High socioeconomic status of family	-0.14	0.295
At least one grade repetition at school	0.19	0.119
Member of AFH	-0.06	0.653
Clinical characteristics		
Being young adult	0.04	0.628
At least one comorbidity	0.41	0.062
At least one complication	0.21	0.098
Current treatment: Prophylaxis	0.24	0.216
Psycho-behavioral factors		
Social support	0.12	0.051
Autonomy [‡]	-0.09	<0.001

Abbreviations: AFH, French association for people with haemophilia.

[†]Latent variable manifested by Past-negative perspective of ZTPI, Avoidance of Brief COPE, Mental component summary (MCS) of SF-12.

[‡]Latent variable manifested by attitudinal, functional and emotional autonomy of the Noom questionnaire.

[§]Latent variable manifested by item 2-feeling, item 3-view, item 4-family, item 5- friends, item 6-others, item 7-sports of the Haemo-QoL Index.

Table 7. Determinants of the adherence to healthcare

	Direct Effect	Total Indirect Effect[†]	Total Effect
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Sociodemographics			
High socioeconomic status of family	1.10 (0.73–1.67)	0.99 (0.85–1.14)	1.09 (0.73–1.61)
At least one grade repetition at school	0.47 (0.31–0.71)	1.16 (0.96–1.41)	0.56 (0.38–0.81)
Member of AFH	1.00 (0.68–1.48)	1.05 (0.91–1.20)	1.05 (0.71–1.54)
Clinical characteristics			
Being young adult	0.64 (0.41–0.99)	0.91 (0.76–1.10)	0.55 (0.38–0.80)
At least one comorbidity	1.06 (0.50–2.22)	0.94 (0.71–1.23)	1.01 (0.50–2.04)
At least one complication	1.47 (0.94–2.31)	1.00 (0.86–1.15)	1.46 (0.95–2.25)
Current treatment: Prophylaxis	1.58 (0.93–2.68)	1.11 (0.90–1.38)	1.75 (1.05–2.91)
Psycho-behavioral factors			
Mental health concerns [‡]	0.37 (0.15–0.94)	-	-
Haemophilia-specific quality of life [§]	1.49 (0.95–2.33)	-	-
Social support	0.96 (0.78–1.17)	0.96 (0.88–1.04)	0.92 (0.75–1.12)
Autonomy [¶]	0.94 (0.85–1.03)	1.06 (0.99–1.14)	0.99 (0.93–1.05)
Organizational (HTC-related) factors			
Same hospital and service for adolescents and adults	0.76 (0.51–1.14)	-	-
Pediatrician in the medical team of the HTC	0.86 (0.53–1.40)	-	-
Setup of therapeutic education activities for transition by the HTC	0.81 (0.49–1.33)	-	-

Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; AFH, French association for people with haemophilia; HTC, haemophilia treatment center.

[†]Indirect effect via Mental health concerns and Haemophilia-specific quality of life

[‡] Latent variable manifested by Past-negative perspective of ZTPI, Avoidance of Brief COPE, Mental component summary (MCS) of SF-12.

[§]Latent variable manifested by item 2-feeling, item 3-view, item 4-family, item 5-friends, item 6-others, item 7-sports of the Haemo-QoL Index.

[¶]Latent variable manifested by attitudinal, functional and emotional autonomy of the Noom questionnaire.

Figure 1. Model specification for the determinants of the adherence to healthcare.

Rectangles represent observed variables, ovals represent latent variables, single-headed arrows represent direct effects, and double-headed row represents correlation.




Figure 2. Results of the structural equation model.

Associations of the determinants with mental health concerns and haemophilia-specific quality of life are presented by standardized coefficients (β). Effects on adherence to healthcare are presented by odds ratios (ORs). Dashed arrows represent non-significance.

a: associations of the determinants with two mediators are presented in Table 6.

b: factor loadings of the latent variable “Autonomy” manifested by attitudinal, functional and emotional autonomy of the Noom questionnaire are 0.80; 0.74; 0.47, respectively.

