

ISHLT CONSENSUS

The 2018 ISHLT/APM/AST/ICCAC/STSW recommendations for the psychosocial evaluation of adult cardiothoracic transplant candidates and candidates for long-term mechanical circulatory support



Mary Amanda Dew, PhD,^{a,1,2,3} Andrea F. DiMartini, MD,^{a,2} Fabienne Dobbels, PhD,^{b,1}
Kathleen L. Grady, PhD, RN,^{c,1} Sheila G. Jowsey-Gregoire, MD,^{d,2,3}
Annemarie Kaan, MCN, RN,^{e,1,4} Kay Kendall, MSW, LISW,^{f,5} Quincy-Robyn Young, PhD,^{e,1}
Susan E. Abbey, MD,^{g,2} Zeeshan Butt, PhD,^{c,3} Catherine C. Crone, MD,^{h,2}
Sabina De Geest, PhD, RN,^{b,i,1} Christina T. Doligalski, PharmD,^{j,1,3,6}
Christiane Kugler, PhD,^{k,1} Laurie McDonald, MSW,^{l,5} Linda Ohler, MSN,^{m,1,7}
Liz Painter, MA, MSc,^{n,1} Michael G. Petty, PhD, RN, CNS,^{o,1,4} Desiree Robson, BSc, RN,^{p,1,4}
Thomas Schlöglhofer, BSc,^{q,1,4} Terry D. Schneekloth, MD,^{d,2} Jonathan P. Singer, MD, MS,^{r,1}
Patrick J. Smith, PhD, MPH,^{s,1} Heike Spaderna, PhD,^{t,1} Jeffrey J. Teuteberg, MD,^{u,1,3}
Roger D. Yusen, MD, MPH,^{v,1} and Paula C. Zimbren, MD^{w,2}

From the ^aUniversity of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and Medical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA; ^bKatholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; ^cNorthwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA; ^dMayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA; ^eSt. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada; ^fCleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, USA; ^gUniversity of Toronto and University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; ^hINOVA Hospitals, Fairfax, Virginia, USA; ⁱUniversity of Basel, Basel, Switzerland; ^jTampa General Hospital, Tampa, Florida, USA; ^kUniversity of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany; ^lUniversity of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA; ^mGeorge Washington University, Washington, DC, USA; ⁿAuckland City Hospital, Auckland, New Zealand; ^oUniversity of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA; ^pSt. Vincent's Hospital, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia; ^qMedical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ^rUniversity of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA; ^sDuke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA; ^tTrier University, Trier, Germany; ^uStanford University, Stanford, California, USA; ^vWashington University, St. Louis, Missouri, USA; and ^wYale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA. See Appendix for a complete listing of Writing Committee members and independent reviewers.

¹International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) representative.

²Academy of Psychosomatic Medicine (APM) representative.

³American Society of Transplantation (AST) representative.

⁴International Consortium of Circulatory Assist Clinicians (ICCAC) representative.

⁵Society for Transplant Social Workers (STSW) representative.

⁶Current affiliation: University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC.

⁷Current affiliation: New York University Medical Center, New York, NY.

Reprint requests: Mary Amanda Dew, PhD, Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and Medical Center, 3811 O'Hara Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. Telephone: +412-624-3373. Fax: +412-586-9255.

E-mail address: dewma@upmc.edu

KEYWORDS:

heart transplantation;
lung transplantation;
mechanical circulatory
support;
psychosocial
evaluation;
psychosocial risk
factors

The psychosocial evaluation is well-recognized as an important component of the multifaceted assessment process to determine candidacy for heart transplantation, lung transplantation, and long-term mechanical circulatory support (MCS). However, there is no consensus-based set of recommendations for either the full range of psychosocial domains to be assessed during the evaluation, or the set of processes and procedures to be used to conduct the evaluation, report its findings, and monitor patients' receipt of and response to interventions for any problems identified. This document provides recommendations on both evaluation content and process. It represents a collaborative effort of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) and the Academy of Psychosomatic Medicine, American Society of Transplantation, International Consortium of Circulatory Assist Clinicians, and Society for Transplant Social Workers. The Nursing, Health Science and Allied Health Council of the ISHLT organized a Writing Committee composed of international experts representing the ISHLT and the collaborating societies. This Committee synthesized expert opinion and conducted a comprehensive literature review to support the psychosocial evaluation content and process recommendations that were developed. The recommendations are intended to dovetail with current ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements for the selection of candidates for cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS implantation. Moreover, the recommendations are designed to promote consistency across programs in the performance of the psychosocial evaluation by proposing a core set of content domains and processes that can be expanded as needed to meet programs' unique needs and goals.

J Heart Lung Transplant 2018;37:803–823

© 2018 International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation. All rights reserved.

Candidates for heart transplantation, lung transplantation, and long-term mechanical circulatory support (MCS) undergo a multifaceted assessment process. The psychosocial evaluation is integral to this process for several reasons. First, it provides information relevant for the selection of patients for transplantation and MCS. Second, it enables care planning and the provision of interventions to improve patients' viability as transplant and/or MCS candidates. Third, it facilitates referrals for care for patients deemed ineligible for transplantation or MCS. Fourth, for patients who undergo transplantation or device implantation (either as a bridge to transplantation or as permanent, "destination," therapy), information from the psychosocial evaluation facilitates post-transplantation/post-implantation care to support optimal psychosocial and medical outcomes.

The International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT), leading a collaboration with the Academy of Psychosomatic Medicine (APM), American Society of Transplantation (AST), International Consortium of Circulatory Assist Clinicians (ICCAC), and Society for Transplant Social Workers (STSW), convened a Writing Committee of international experts to produce this consensus document, which provides recommendations for: (a) the content of the psychosocial evaluation; and (b) the process of evaluation performance, reporting, and use by transplantation and MCS programs. The primary aim of the recommendations is to aid programs to construct evaluation protocols that comprehensively gather information on psychosocial factors recognized in ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements,^{1–3} and/or in the empirical literature as relevant to patient selection for transplantation or long-term MCS implantation. In addition, when psychosocial contraindications for selection are identified, the recommendations outline the implementation of referrals for treatments or

interventions that may improve patients' well-being and suitability as transplantation or MCS candidates.

Need for recommendations

Pre-transplant psychosocial factors, including patients' history of medical adherence, mental health, substance use, and social support, predict outcomes after cardiothoracic transplantation. As reviewed herein, these outcomes include post-transplant medical adherence and quality of life (QOL), as well as transplant-related morbidities and mortality. Although there are fewer studies, similar effects are observed in patients receiving long-term MCS. Transplantation and MCS programs perform evaluations to assess psychosocial factors as part of the patient selection process. However, despite recognition of the value of the psychosocial evaluation by ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements,^{1–3} these documents have not delineated the full range of psychosocial domains that should be assessed, or the set of processes and procedures to be used to conduct the evaluation, report its findings, and monitor patients' receipt of interventions for any identified problems. To the best of our knowledge, these issues have not been fully delineated in any other published professional society guidelines or recommendations.

The clinical literature developed over the past 30 years has included extensive expert advice and commentary on rationale, ethical underpinnings, and essential content of the psychosocial evaluation.^{4–28} This literature has also offered some heuristic tools to guide and summarize the evaluation.^{29–32} In addition, there is an empirical literature that identifies psychosocial risk factors for patient outcomes, suggesting that the evaluation should include such factors. In the absence of any previous synthesis of both expert opinion and the empirical literature into a consensus-based, comprehensive set of recommendations for practice, cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS

programs have been left to determine their own approach to the psychosocial evaluation. Anecdotal evidence indicates that programs—and individual psychosocial evaluators—vary in the range of psychosocial domains examined; the breadth of elements considered within each domain; and the processes used to report evaluation findings and implement evaluation recommendations.^{4,9,14,19,21,22,25,33–35} Variability in content and process may contribute to inequities in care and treatment options offered to patients. Conversely, greater consistency in the psychosocial evaluation both within and across programs may promote greater equity in both candidate selection and overall patient care.

How to use this document

This report represents a consensus of expert opinion and does not meet the criteria of “guidelines” as defined by the ISHLT. The Writing Committee judged that development of consensus-based recommendations was most appropriate for several reasons. First, guidance for decisions about the content and processes involved in psychosocial evaluation comes only in part from empirical literature; it also reflects expert experience. However, we note areas supported by robust empirical data in our discussion of the recommendations offered herein.

Second, the psychosocial evaluation of cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS candidates is complex because many domains of functioning and well-being are relevant for candidate selection and patient care. Moreover, the process of conducting the evaluation requires tailoring based on patients’ ability to provide requested information, given such factors as their medical status and capacity to participate actively in the evaluation. Thus, it would not be appropriate to list strict, prescriptive guidelines for universal application. Likewise, and similar to other consensus-based recommendations in the field of cardiothoracic transplantation,² the Writing Committee asserts that the recommendations offered should not be interpreted as standard of care by health-care providers, patients, or third-party payers, or in legal proceedings. Instead, the recommendations were developed to be flexible enough to accommodate the unique aspects of each patient, and each transplantation and MCS program across a wide spectrum of health-care delivery systems. The recommendations should be used to support programs’ efforts to conduct and utilize the results of comprehensive psychosocial evaluations.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the recommendations focus on psychosocial evaluation content and process issues that are independent of any psychometric instruments or measures that evaluators may choose to administer to patients as part of the evaluation. Psychometric instrumentation is an evolving field, with measures routinely undergoing revision and/or being discarded in favor of superior tools. However, the content areas that should be assessed, and basic procedures to be used in the evaluation process transcend specific psychometric instrumentation and thus are the focus of the recommendations.

Methods

At the 2015 annual scientific meeting of the ISHLT, the Nursing, Health Science and Allied Health (NHSAH) Council of the ISHLT agreed on the importance of developing consensus recommendations for the psychosocial evaluation of cardiothoracic transplantation and long-term MCS candidates. The Council solicited interest in this work from the ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Committee, and invited a Writing Committee chair who worked with the Council to propose a slate of Committee members. The Committee composition and plan of work were approved by the ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Committee in April 2016. The Writing Committee reflected diverse constituencies. It included NHSAH Council members as well as members of the ISHLT Heart Failure and Transplantation, MCS, and Pulmonary Transplantation Councils. Participation was also sought from 4 key organizations with relevant expertise: the APM, AST, ICCAC, and STSW. These organizations each approved the plan of work in April–May 2016 and contributed at least 2 representatives to the Writing Committee. In total, the Writing Committee consisted of 27 expert members and was diverse in disciplines represented (including psychology, psychiatry, nursing, social work, pharmacy, cardiology and pulmonology) and geography (with members from 23 programs across eight countries). The ISHLT Board of Directors approved the final consensus document in February 2018; each of the 4 participating organizations approved it in February–March 2018.

The Writing Committee adhered to the ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Document Development Protocol (September 2015 update). The Committee was organized into a leadership group, composed of the Committee chair and co-chairs of each of 3 Subcommittees. The Subcommittees were assigned areas of work, including: (a) synthesis of expert opinion on the *content* of the psychosocial evaluation; and (b) synthesis of expert opinion on the *processes and procedures* for conducting the evaluation, reporting its results, and implementing any additional testing or treatment; and (c) literature reviews of empirical evidence to support the Committee’s recommendations regarding *both* evaluation content and process.

The main strategy for the literature searches, reviewed by a medical librarian, was designed to identify empirical articles focused on psychosocial risk or protective factors for adverse post-transplantation/post-implantation clinical and behavioral outcomes (Table 1). In addition, the Committee consulted published expert reviews and commentaries. Because the consensus document provides recommendations and not guidelines, grading of levels of evidence for recommendations was not undertaken as per ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Protocol specifications.

The Writing Committee chair, working with Subcommittee co-chairs, was responsible for organizing monthly discussions of assigned work within each Subcommittee and for evaluating the literature searches’ completeness. Each Writing Committee member reviewed and provided input on multiple drafts of all recommendations and drafts of the entire consensus document.

Recommendations for the Content of the Psychosocial Evaluation

The broad rationale for the recommended domains to be assessed in the evaluation stems from the need to:

- (a) Assess risk factors for poor post-transplantation/post-implantation outcomes.
- (b) Collect information on factors related to patients’ knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in decision-making about transplantation and/or MCS.

Table 1 Inclusion Criteria and Search Strategy for Empirical Evidence Supporting Consensus Recommendations^a

Inclusion criteria

1. Peer-reviewed articles^b
2. Articles published in English^b
3. Articles focused on adults aged 18 and older
4. Publication dates between 2000 through mid-2017, inclusive
5. Seminal articles published before 2000 known to the Writing Committee members

Search term strategy

1. Combination of:

(a) Terms to identify the relevant patient populations ([title words: heart transplant* or lung transplant* or heart-lung transplant* or mechanical circulatory* or ventricular assist* or circulatory support or destination therapy] OR [key words: heart transplantation or lung transplantation or heart-lung transplantation or heart-assist devices or assisted circulation or heart, artificial]).

and

(b) Terms to identify relevant post-transplant/post-implantation clinical and behavioral outcomes that could be affected by psychosocial factors ([title words: survival or morbidity or mortality or graft rejection or infection or hospitalization or cancer or adheren* or complian* or medicat* or self-manage* or self-care or health-manage* or smok* or alcohol or tobacco or substance] OR [key words: health or survival or morbidity or mortality or neoplasms or graft rejection or infection or hospitalization or arrhythmias, cardiac or hemorrhage or stroke or patient compliance or medication adherence or self-care or alcohol drinking or substance-related disorders or tobacco use or smoking or smoking cessation]).

and

(c) Additional terms iteratively identified by Writing Committee members charged with examining the literature on specific psychosocial risk factors (e.g., medical adherence history, mental health history, substance use/abuse history). The work was iterative because Committee members simultaneously discussed what domains of psychosocial factors were essential to include in the psychosocial evaluation, drawing on their own expertise and review of existing ISHLT guidelines and consensus recommendations.

2. Additional articles either found in the bibliographies of identified publications or authored by or known to Committee members. Included (especially when little to no literature was identified in cardiothoracic transplantation or in MCS) were seminal empirical articles from other areas of organ transplantation and from literature on advanced heart disease and advanced lung disease populations.

^aAlthough a formal systematic review or meta-analysis³⁶ for each recommended domain of the psychosocial evaluation was not feasible within the scope of the consensus document development process, the Writing Committee performed literature searches using a consistent approach to inclusion criteria and search-term strategies for each psychosocial domain considered, as per the ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Document Development Protocol. Published systematic reviews and meta-analyses are cited where available.

^bRequired by the ISHLT Standards and Guidelines Document Development Protocol.

- (c) Collect information to characterize patients' personal, social, and environmental resources and circumstances, including factors that may mitigate the impact of any psychosocial risk factors on post-transplantation/post-implantation outcomes.
- (d) Unique to MCS candidates, evaluate patients' knowledge about and capacity to operate the device.

Table 2 lists the recommendations for evaluation content, including 10 domains and the components comprising each. Although the Committee viewed these domains and their components as essential, transplantation and MCS programs may determine that additional elements require assessment, according to local protocols and/or regulatory bodies. Table 3 summarizes the empirical evidence supporting each recommended content domain.^{30,33,37-247}

A. Assessment of risk factors for poor post-transplantation/post-implantation outcomes

1. Treatment adherence and health behaviors

Background and recommendation. Repeated non-adherence to medications and other medical directives is a recognized

contraindication to cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS implantation¹⁻³. Thus, the psychosocial evaluation should assess patients' past and current medical adherence, knowledge about their regimen, and willingness to adhere to the regimen after transplantation/implantation.

*Evidence.*³⁷⁻⁵¹ Extensive data (Table 3) show that non-adherence to medications and other medical regimen components, either before or after cardiothoracic transplantation, increases risks for post-transplant morbidities and mortality. More limited evidence suggests similar effects for MCS patients.

2. Mental health history

Background and recommendation. Per ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements, psychiatric conditions are contraindications to transplantation/implantation insofar as they are uncontrolled, affect patients' ability to adhere to the medical regimen, and are not mitigated by factors such as social support.¹⁻³ Therefore, the evaluation must assess patients' mental health history and current status, as well as treatment history.

Evidence.^{15,27,34,39,45,47,48,52-79} Depressive and anxiety-related conditions are relatively common in transplant and MCS candidates and recipients. Depression predicts post-

Table 2 Consensus Recommendations on the Content of Psychosocial Evaluation of Adult Cardiothoracic Transplant Candidates and Long-term MCS Candidates: Domains to Be Assessed and Components to be Included Within Each Domain^a

Evaluation domain	Components within each domain
<i>A. Risk factors for poor outcomes after transplantation/implantation</i>	
1. Treatment adherence and health behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past and current level of adherence to the required medical regimen. • Knowledge and understanding of rationale and specific requirements of the current medical regimen (e.g., medication dosing; other self-management requirements; required clinical appointments and tests, etc.). • Willingness and intent to modify self-management and lifestyle behaviors to meet any changing regimen requirements.
2. Mental health history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past and current mood, anxiety, or other disorders including personality disorders. • Symptom severity and course, chronicity of symptoms. • Receipt, adherence, and response to psychiatric treatment; willingness to seek treatment. • Current or past suicidal ideation or self-injurious behaviors. • Mental health history of immediate family.
3. Substance use history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tobacco/alcohol/drug (licit and illicit) frequency, amount, duration of use, and length of abstinence. • Diagnosable disorder, level of impairment to health/work/relationships, legal issues. • Insight into any substance use problem, commitment to remain abstinent including prior attempts and periods of abstinence. • Prior and any current treatment for substance use, willingness to seek treatment, skills and supports for abstinence. • Substance use/abuse history of immediate family.
<i>B. Factors related to patients' knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in decision-making</i>	
4. Cognitive status and capacity to give informed consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of cognitive impairment that would compromise capacity to comprehend information and engage in decision-making about treatment options. • Capacity to make judgments and decisions voluntarily without undue pressure from others.
5. Knowledge and understanding of current illness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of the causes and course of the organ disease to date and its impact on daily functioning and outcomes. • Understanding of rationale for treatments received and inadequacy of treatments to manage symptoms/disease progression. • Understanding of reasons for referral for transplant and/or MCS.
6. Knowledge and understanding of current treatment options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of risks and benefits of the surgical intervention under consideration (i.e., transplant, MCS). • Understanding of post-intervention medical regimen, self-care and lifestyle requirements. • Attitudes about the intervention (e.g., receptiveness, expectations, concerns/fears, reservations, values, preferences, and goals).
<i>C. Factors specific to patients' personal, social, and environmental resources, and circumstances</i>	
7. Coping with illness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotional response to illness; acceptance or denial about severity of illness, prognosis and treatment options. • Coping strategies used to manage illness and its impact on daily life (e.g., problem solving strategies used, reliance on others, avoidance coping).
8. Social support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability, stability, and capacity of family and other sources to provide support. • Understanding and knowledge among family and other supports of treatment options and current care needs. • Expectations of family and other supports about care needs after intervention (i.e., transplant, MCS).
9. Social history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics, including religion/faith practices, education, literacy and health literacy. • Relationship history (e.g., marital status, other significant relationships, stability of relationships with others). • Employment experience and occupation. • Financial status, including insurance status or options for medical cost coverage, and living arrangements and number of dependents.

Continued on page 808

Table 2 (Continued)

Evaluation domain	Components within each domain
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of legal issues. • Concurrent life stressors and history of exposure to traumatic events.
<i>D. Factors specific to patients under consideration for MCS</i>	
10. Knowledge about and capacity to operate MCS device	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of basic device operation, including signs of device malfunction. • Evidence of cognitive limitations, or physical limitations or disabilities (including sensory loss), that would compromise capacity to operate the device or to perceive and respond to device alarms. • Safety of the home environment for device operation, including access to a reliable source of electricity and accessibility of the home by health-care or emergency personnel.

^aThe order of listing of the domains to be assessed in the psychosocial evaluation is based on conceptual distinctions (see subheadings in the table) and is not meant to imply any recommendation that the domains should be assessed in this order. MCS, mechanical circulatory support.

transplant mortality, likely due in part to its impact on behavioral outcomes, including medical adherence and coping strategies. It is unclear whether anxiety increases mortality risk. Neither condition has been examined relative to MCS recipient mortality.

Less common mental disorders such as psychosis and bipolar disorder may, but do not inevitably, lead to poor post-transplant clinical outcomes. This may reflect both careful candidate selection and close management of these conditions. Personality disorders do not appear to directly increase risk for poor post-transplant outcomes. Rather, they may have indirect effects by increasing risks for non-adherence, substance use, poor coping strategies, and poor social support. Psychosis and bipolar and personality disorders have not been studied in MCS recipients.

Finally, family history of mental disorder is relevant for evaluation because it is a known risk factor for patient psychiatric disorder, and it predicts disorder course and treatment efficacy. It can also affect family capacity to provide social support and caregiving.

3. Substance use history

Background and recommendation. Active alcohol abuse and drug abuse are contraindications to cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS implantation.¹⁻³ Active tobacco smoking is a contraindication to cardiothoracic transplantation.^{1,2} While smoking cessation before MCS implantation is recommended,³ guidelines state that if this cannot be accomplished before implantation due to patients' medical urgency, abstinence is required afterward if patients are to be considered for transplantation.³ ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements¹⁻³ address some aspects of marijuana use, which is now legal for medical and/or recreational purposes in some regions but remains controversial for patient selection.^{1,103,248,249} However, as for any substance, abuse is a contraindication for transplantation/implantation.¹⁻³ The psychosocial evaluation should assess history of use of all substances, current status, any treatments received, periods of abstinence, and insight and willingness to receive treatment.

Evidence.^{33,38,45,50,64,80-116} Tobacco use and alcohol/drug abuse before transplantation/implantation increase risks for

poor post-surgical clinical outcomes and mortality, primarily mediated by relapse to use after transplantation/implantation. Longer durations of abstinence before transplantation/implantation can reduce relapse risk. There is little evidence on marijuana use. Family substance use/abuse history is an important risk factor for patient substance use and for relapse after organ transplantation.

B. Assessment of factors related to patients' knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in decision-making

4. Cognitive status and capacity to give informed consent

Background and recommendation. Informed decision-making is predicated on patients' cognitive capacity to comprehend information and engage in decision-making discussions with health-care providers.^{16,21,126,250,251} Patients should be capable of understanding treatment requirements, risks, and benefits.¹⁻³ Dementia is a contraindication for transplantation/implantation.^{1,3} Although the informed consent process goes beyond the psychosocial evaluation, the evaluation should identify any evidence that cognitive status may compromise patients' ability to make decisions and give informed consent.

Evidence.^{51,52,117-146} Although dementia generally precludes informed consent, patients with milder degrees of cognitive impairment or with transient impairments that improve may have the capacity to give informed consent. In some other situations where patients cannot consent (e.g., due to intellectual disabilities), transplant outcomes may not be adversely affected. No studies have examined the impact of intellectual disabilities on outcomes after MCS. Beyond informed consent issues, patients' level of cognitive impairment before transplantation/implantation and residual impairments after surgery can increase risks for mortality and poor behavioral outcomes such as regimen non-adherence.

Table 3 Empirical Evidence Supporting the Inclusion of Each Domain of the Psychosocial Evaluation**A. Risk factors for poor outcomes after transplantation/implantation**

1. Treatment adherence and health behaviors

- Medication non-adherence before cardiothoracic and other solid-organ transplantation increases risk for post-transplant medication non-adherence,^{37,38} which, in turn, increases risks for acute and chronic graft rejection, and mortality.³⁸⁻⁴⁴
- Non-adherence to other components of the pre- or post-transplant regimen affects health outcomes.
 - Heart candidates with a history of general non-adherence to medical management have poorer survival post-transplant.⁴⁵
 - Heart recipients less adherent to clinical follow-up or to the general medical regimen post-transplant are at elevated risk for graft rejection^{46,47} and mortality.^{47,48}
 - Lung recipients less adherent to home spirometry requirements are at higher risk for bronchiolitis obliterans syndrome.⁴⁹
 - MCS patients with a history of non-adherence to medical directives are at higher risk for complications such as pump thrombosis.⁵⁰
 - Poorer adherence to care requirements after MCS implantation is associated with poorer QOL.⁵¹

2. Mental health history

- Depression and anxiety (both diagnosable disorders and clinically significant symptomatology) are the most common psychiatric conditions in transplant and MCS candidates and recipients.^{15,34,52}
- Pre-transplant depression predicts mortality after cardiothoracic transplantation, as does post-transplant depression^{45,53-56}; these effects are seen in other types of solid-organ transplantation as well.⁵⁷ Pre-transplant depression is a strong predictor of post-transplant depression.^{34,58}
- Anxiety may predict post-transplant mortality, but the evidence base is small and not definitive.⁵⁷
- Depression likely affects mortality in part through behavioral pathways.^{57,59} In cardiothoracic transplant and MCS patients:
 - Depression is associated with poorer medical adherence, poorer coping strategies, and higher risks for complications, such as infections.^{45,58,60-63}
 - Such intermediate outcomes, in turn, increase risks for rehospitalization, graft rejection and loss, and mortality.^{39,47,48,54,55,64}
- A small literature on epidemiologically rare psychiatric disorders (psychosis, bipolar disorder), including some reports on cardiothoracic transplant recipients, finds that these disorders do not commonly have any impact on risk for graft rejection, other morbidities, or mortality.⁶⁵⁻⁶⁹
 - Such findings may be due to careful screening of such patients for transplantation, and close management thereafter.²⁷
 - However, if management cannot be optimized, transplant outcomes can be adversely affected: risks for graft loss and mortality were increased in kidney recipients who required hospitalization for psychosis.⁷⁰
- A small literature suggests that personality disorders do not directly increase risk for post-transplant mortality,^{71,72} but may have indirect effects.
 - Personality disorders can increase the likelihood of maladaptive coping patterns and non-adherence, including return to substance use, in organ recipients.⁷²⁻⁷⁵
 - Transplant recipients with personality disorders can have poor interpersonal relationships, thus decreasing the likelihood that they will have stable social support.⁷⁶
- Family mental health history is rarely studied in transplant populations but is an established risk factor for many psychiatric disorders.⁷⁷ Family history can predict disorder course and what treatment is likely to be most effective.⁷⁸ Mental health problems and distress among family members may impair their ability to provide care and social support to the patient.⁷⁹

3. Substance use history

- Tobacco use and alcohol/drug abuse before cardiothoracic transplantation or MCS implantation increases the risk for use of these substances after transplantation/implantation.^{64,80-86}
- Smoking tobacco increases the risks for post-transplant/post-implantation morbidities and mortality, including:
 - Cardiac allograft disease, cancers, hypertension, and acute kidney injury in heart recipients.⁸⁷⁻⁹³
 - Cancers and kidney disease in lung recipients.^{85,89,94-98}
 - Pump thrombosis and gastrointestinal bleeding in MCS recipients.^{50,97}
 - Mortality in transplant and MCS recipients.^{90,98-102}
- Alcohol abuse and drug abuse increase the risks for post-transplant/post-implantation morbidities and mortality, including:
 - Drive-line infections and hospital readmissions in MCS recipients.^{64,81}
 - Mortality in transplant and MCS recipients.^{45,81}
- Heavy inhaled cannabis use in organ transplant recipients has been linked to increased post-transplant infection risks in case reports;^{103,104} inhaled/vaporized marijuana may be the source of fungal lung infections.¹⁰⁵ Cannabis may alter the metabolism of immunosuppressive medications but insufficient in vivo data exist to confirm this effect.¹⁰⁶ Cohort studies in kidney recipients and liver recipients have not demonstrated associations between marijuana use pre- or post-transplant and survival rates or (in kidney recipients) indices of graft function.^{103,107,108}
- Some studies did not find substance use/abuse to be associated with clinical outcomes after transplantation/implantation.^{38,109-113} This may reflect programs' selection criteria and requirements regarding abstinence from use.^{33,38,110}

Continued on page 810

Table 3 (Continued)

- Abstinence affects risks:
 - The shorter the period of abstinence from tobacco use before heart, lung or other types of transplantation, the higher the risk of relapse post-transplant.^{84–86,114,115}
 - While duration of abstinence from alcohol/drug use has received little empirical attention in cardiothoracic transplantation or MCS, it is a strong predictor of relapse to use in other types of solid-organ transplantation.⁸²
 - Alcohol and drug abuse run in families,¹¹⁶ and increase the risk for relapse to substance use in transplant populations.⁸²
- B. Factors related to patients' knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in decision-making*
4. Cognitive status and capacity to give informed consent
- At least some cognitive impairment is common in patients being evaluated for cardiothoracic transplant and/or MCS.^{117–130} However, absent moderate or severe dementia, other conditions including milder cognitive impairment and transient conditions (e.g., delirium/encephalopathy) that resolve do not necessarily preclude capacity to give informed consent.¹³¹
 - A small literature suggests that patients with intellectual disabilities can achieve medical outcomes after solid-organ transplantation similar to other patients, provided they have the social support necessary for medical adherence.^{52,132}
 - Aside from its role in capacity to give consent, cognitive status can affect cardiothoracic transplant and MCS patient outcomes.
 - Cognitive functioning can improve with transplantation/implantation^{117,121,122,133–136} and show continued gains over time.^{125,137,138} However, some impairments may remain and/or worsen in the long term.^{118,122,133,139,140}
 - Greater cognitive impairment increases mortality risk both before and after cardiothoracic transplantation.^{134,141}
 - Cognitive impairment increases risk for medication non-adherence in community samples;¹⁴² and in patients undergoing evaluation for cardiothoracic transplantation, it is associated with impairments in activities of daily living, including medication management and treatment regimen adherence.^{143–146}
 - In MCS patients, poorer cognitive function has been associated with reduced confidence in ability to manage the regimen and poorer QOL, but not with poorer medical adherence.⁵¹ The latter result may have been due to related findings that more cognitively impaired patients relied more heavily on others for their care.⁵¹
5. Knowledge and understanding of current illness
- Level of knowledge in patients with advanced heart or lung disease (some of whom are considering transplantation) has frequently been found to be deficient.^{147–150} Patients often report uncertainty about disease course and prognosis.^{150–152}
 - Inadequate knowledge and understanding is associated with poorer self-care and medical adherence.^{153–157}
 - Higher levels of knowledge in advanced heart or lung disease patients, including MCS candidates, can lead to improved self-care and thereby to fewer hospital readmissions, reduced mortality, and better psychosocial and QOL outcomes.^{30,158–163}
6. Knowledge and understanding of current treatment options
- Patients report gaps in understanding the range of treatment options and associated risks and benefits,^{164–166} as well as required self-care responsibilities after cardiothoracic transplantation/MCS implantation.^{164,165,167–170}
 - Understanding and decision-making about transplantation and/or MCS implantation can be driven more by attitudes and emotional factors (fears, expectations, and hopes) than by a systematic weighing of risks and benefits.^{167,171–173}
 - Patients may feel substantial decisional conflict (i.e., uncertainty about how to choose or what choice to make¹⁷⁴) when faced with transplantation, MCS, or other medical options.^{166,170,175}
 - Similar to other patient populations choosing among treatment options,¹⁷⁶ when patients considering cardiothoracic transplantation and/or MCS understand their treatment options and have their decisional conflict reduced (e.g., through use of decision aids^{173,177,178}), they feel more prepared to make treatment choices, and more involved and satisfied with the decision-making process.^{177,179}
 - Although not examined in cardiothoracic transplant or MCS patients, studies in heart and lung disease populations show that greater understanding and lower decisional conflict can lead to improved medication adherence and health outcomes.^{180,181}
- C. Factors specific to patients' personal, social, and environmental resources and circumstances*
7. Coping with illness
- Patients' coping strategies are associated with outcomes before and after cardiothoracic transplantation.
 - Positive expectations, an optimistic outlook before transplant, feelings of self-efficacy, and a sense of control predict better subsequent mood, medical adherence, health status, and QOL in transplant recipients.^{40,182–188}
 - Use of passive or avoidant coping strategies to manage health problems, having a low sense of mastery or personal control, and focusing on and expressing negative emotions are associated with increased risk for mental health problems and impaired QOL after transplantation.^{188–195}
 - Denial, avoidant coping, and emotion-venting strategies are linked to higher fatigue, pain, anxiety, depression, difficulties in daily activities, and impaired QOL during the wait for transplant.^{196–200}
 - Engaging in denial, failure to use available resources (medical, financial, family supports) to manage one's illness before transplantation, and feelings of little personal control over one's health increase post-transplant mortality risks.^{185,201,202}
 - Patients themselves describe optimism as an important resource for coping and recovery.²⁰³

Continued on page 811

Table 3 (Continued)

- In the smaller evidence base for MCS patients, coping after implantation is associated with other psychosocial outcomes.
 - A greater sense of self-efficacy—that is, feeling more capable of engaging in MCS self-care management—is linked to better adherence and better QOL during MCS support.⁵¹
 - Patients who have difficulties psychologically accepting the need for MCS or engaging in problem-solving in daily life, and patients who use denial and avoidant coping are more likely to have self-care difficulties and poorer QOL after MCS implantation.²⁰⁴
8. Social support
- No matter whether social support is defined in terms of social network size and availability, or by quality of practical and emotional support provided, large literatures in cardiothoracic and other solid-organ transplant recipients show that patients with poorer support are at increased risk for post-transplant medication non-adherence⁸³ and relapse to substance use.^{82,84}
 - Organ recipients themselves describe social support to be critical for their adherence and well-being.^{203,205}
 - In cardiothoracic transplantation:
 - Stronger support is associated with better outcomes during the waiting period before heart transplantation, including longer survival time, lower likelihood of requiring MCS, and greater likelihood of stable or improving clinical status.^{206–208}
 - Stronger social support before or shortly after heart or lung transplantation—particularly from the primary family support person—is associated with: better adherence to and perceived ability to manage the medical regimen^{38,183,209,210}; lower risk of substance use relapse²¹¹; lower risk of graft failure^{38,212}; longer survival time^{71,212,213}; lower risk of mental health problems^{47,189,214,215}; and increased satisfaction and QOL.^{182,184,188}
 - Mortality risk after MCS implantation is lower among patients with stronger social support before MCS.²¹⁶ MCS recipients whose primary family support person exited the caregiver role have a higher 30-day hospital readmission rate.²¹⁷
 - Social support can mitigate the impact of other risk factors for poor outcomes, including cognitive impairments and intellectual disability,¹³² and mental health problems.²⁰⁶ For example, depression symptoms have been found to increase both mortality risk on the waitlist and delisting due to clinical deterioration in heart transplant candidates with low social support. In contrast, depressive symptoms did not affect these risks in patients with higher support.²⁰⁶
9. Social history
- Lower educational attainment, and poor literacy and health literacy (i.e., the capacity to obtain, process, and understand health information²¹⁸):
 - Affect patients' degree of understanding of their current illness and treatment options.^{219–221}
 - May, but do not always, predict poorer outcomes after cardiothoracic and other types of organ transplantation, as well as MCS implantation. Such outcomes include reduced QOL, general health behaviors and medical adherence,^{222–227} and increased morbidity and mortality risks.^{44,48,113,228–231}
 - May show variable impact on outcomes due to differences between programs in the nature and degree of education and other care services provided to patients.^{113,229}
 - Lower SES and reliance on public (rather than private) health insurance:
 - Predict poorer outcomes after cardiothoracic transplantation in the United States, including medical non-adherence, hospital readmissions, morbidity, and mortality.^{39,44,183,228,229,231–236}
 - Show inconsistent effects on outcomes during MCS.^{230,232,237}
 - After transplantation, the impact of SES—particularly insurance status—on outcomes has been attributed in part to limitations in the organization and financing of health-care services in the United States, where health-care costs may not be reimbursed to patients and may be beyond their means.^{183,228}
 - However, even under the universal health care coverage in many other countries, patients with lower SES and fewer financial resources may be at risk for poorer outcomes.²³⁴
 - Lifetime exposure to traumatic events, including adverse childhood experiences:
 - Is a known risk factor in the general population for physical morbidity and mortality, due in part to impact on risk for mental and substance use disorders.^{238–242}
 - Increases mortality risk in lung recipients.²⁴³
- D. Factors specific to patients under consideration for MCS
10. Knowledge about and capacity to operate MCS device
- Patients face complex care requirements for managing the device and their general medical regimen after implantation, and it is essential to have family members or other support persons available and willing to assist in this process.^{244–247}
 - A small empirical literature indicates that:
 - MCS patients who perceive themselves to have more cognitive limitations and are less adherent to requirements for operation and monitoring of their device at home are at risk for poorer QOL.⁵¹
 - Assistance from family caregivers may help to mitigate patient limitations in capacity to operate the MCS device or adhere to related care requirements.^{216,217}

5. Knowledge and understanding of current illness

Background and recommendation. A determination of patients' level of knowledge regarding their illness helps to delineate educational needs, guide the informed consent process, and facilitate shared decision-making.^{16,151,252,253} It can also lead to recommendations for supportive resources (e.g., greater involvement of family members with patient care) needed to promote optimal patient outcomes before and after transplantation/implantation.^{16,17,254} Thus, the psychosocial evaluation should review patients' knowledge and understanding of their illness and why they were referred for evaluation.

Evidence.^{30,147–163} In patients with advanced heart or lung disease, knowledge deficiencies about their condition are common and are associated with poorer self-care and medical adherence. Conversely, enhanced knowledge can lead to improved self-care and better health.

6. Knowledge and understanding of current treatment options

Background and recommendation. Shared decision-making between patients and transplantation/MCS teams depends on patients' understanding, values, and preferences regarding treatment options.^{151,175,250,255} The psychosocial evaluation should assess patients' knowledge about risks and benefits of transplantation and/or MCS implantation; alternative treatments; and post-surgical medical regimen, self-care, and lifestyle requirements. Patients' attitudes about treatment options (e.g., receptiveness to transplantation/MCS, expectations, fears) should be assessed.

Evidence.^{164–181} When faced with possible cardiothoracic transplantation and/or MCS implantation, patients' knowledge of their options and responsibilities for self-care is often incomplete. Even with complete knowledge and understanding, attitudes and emotional factors can cloud decision-making about treatment options, and feelings of decisional conflict (i.e., uncertainty about how to choose between options) are common. Lower decisional conflict can lead patients to feel more prepared to make decisions and more satisfied with decisions.

C. Assessment of patients' personal, social, and environmental resources and circumstances

7. Coping with illness

Background and recommendation. The possession of limited skills for coping with health issues and stressors is a recognized contraindication to MCS, given the complex care regimen and related lifestyle changes after device implantation.³ Coping skills are not discussed in ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements for cardiothoracic transplant candidates.^{1,2} However, their regimens are also complex, and adaptation to post-transplant life can be

demanding, thus necessitating a determination that patients possess adequate coping skills.^{12,22,256}

Evidence.^{40,51,182–204} Patients' approach to coping with their illness and prognosis is linked to psychological and behavioral outcomes before and after cardiothoracic transplantation or MCS implantation. Coping characterized by optimism, active problem-solving, and having a strong sense of self-efficacy is associated with better psychological, behavioral, and clinical outcomes. Use of denial and avoidant coping can lead to poorer outcomes.

8. Social support

Background and recommendation. Lack of sufficient social support is a contraindication to cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS implantation.^{1–3} The requirement that social supports be in place stems from the need to ensure that patients can adhere to the medical regimen after these procedures.^{1–3} The psychosocial evaluation should ascertain the availability, stability, and capacity of patients' support resources. The evaluation should also consider support persons' understanding of patients' treatment options and care requirements after transplantation/implantation.

Evidence.^{38,47,71,82–84,132,182–184,188,189,203,205–217} Better social support predicts better behavioral, psychological, and clinical outcomes in cardiothoracic and other solid-organ transplant recipients; such effects are observed no matter whether support is defined by social network characteristics or by support quality. A small literature shows similar findings for MCS recipients. Social support can mitigate the impact of other risk factors (e.g., mental health problems, cognitive or intellectual disability), and thus play an important protective role.

9. Social history

Background and recommendation. Obtaining a social history reflects the importance of understanding the personal and cultural context of patients' lives.^{22,26} Assessment of education, literacy, and health literacy is relevant for optimizing teaching strategies,^{126,219,222} and assessment of patients' key relationships can identify potential support resources. Occupational status and work history are relevant for post-surgical vocational rehabilitation.³⁵ Patients' socioeconomic circumstances, including financial resources and health insurance coverage, require review, particularly to identify patients likely to need financial supports for long-term care.³⁵ The evaluation should assess past and current legal issues. Although candidacy decisions should not be based on social worth or characteristics such as conviction history,^{257,258} legal history is pertinent for determining personal constraints or financial responsibilities due to parole requirements, pending charges, and possible imprisonment.^{11,30} Assessment of exposures to traumatic events is important for determining patients' adaptations to major stressors, and whether current stressors are affecting—and perhaps amplifying—any distress they have regarding their health.^{9,11,17,19}

Evidence.^{39,44,48,113,183,218–243} Aside from expert experience, empirical evidence exists for 3 broad areas. First,

lower educational attainment, poor literacy, and poor health literacy can affect patients' understanding of their current illness and treatment options, and can predict poorer outcomes after transplantation/implantation. Second, lower socioeconomic status and related financial constraints have been associated with poorer behavioral and clinical outcomes after cardiothoracic transplantation. Third, lifetime exposure to traumatic events increases morbidity and mortality risks in the general population; evidence in lung recipients suggests similar effects.

D. Assessment specific to patients under consideration for MCS

10. Knowledge about and capacity to operate MCS device

Background and recommendation. Per ISHLT guidelines, MCS is contraindicated if patients have physical or cognitive limitations rendering them unable to operate the device, or if they live in unsafe environments.³ MCS teams' education and clinical monitoring of MCS patients,^{24,246,247,259} as required under ISHLT guidelines,³ aim to minimize risks of adverse events resulting from patient and caregiver problems in managing the device. Although the full assessment and education of patients and their caregivers regarding device operation, patient capacity to operate it, and home safety extend beyond the psychosocial evaluation, the evaluation provides an opportunity to screen patients to identify permanent or remediable deficiencies in these areas.

Evidence.^{51,216,217,244–247} Despite sparse empirical research, it is well-known that MCS patients have complex self-care requirements. A small evidence base indicates that social support and assistance are essential for promoting optimal device management and related care, especially if patients have limitations in their capacity to operate the device.

Recommendations for psychosocial evaluation process

The broad rationale for recommendations for process and procedural issues associated with the psychosocial evaluation stems from the need to delineate a consistent approach to:

- (a) Identifying who should conduct the evaluation.
- (b) Conducting the evaluation and determining when additional testing or consultation is indicated.
- (c) Reporting evaluation findings to the transplantation or MCS teams.
- (d) Monitoring the receipt and impact of treatments or interventions to remove or mitigate contraindications to transplantation/implantation or other problems identified in the evaluation.

Table 4 lists the recommendations. As reviewed in what follows, they are based largely on the expert opinion and experience of the Writing Committee, as well as published expert reviews and commentaries. Little to no empirical work

exists on processes and procedures associated with the psychosocial evaluation. Such work is noted where available.

1. Qualifications and experience of the evaluator

Patients undergoing psychosocial evaluation are medically complex and the evaluation can be psychologically stressful.^{7,12,19,22} Evaluation findings and recommendations are relevant to programs' decisions about patient selection for transplantation and/or MCS. The evaluator must therefore have competence—by virtue of qualifications, knowledge, and experience—to sensitively and accurately assess and report on the multiple domains encompassed by the evaluation. There is no one discipline or training path that is necessarily best for the individual serving in this role. The evaluator should have training in a health-care discipline directly relevant to the evaluation's content. The evaluator should be registered or licensed as required by local regulations, and receive an orientation to the evaluator role before becoming responsible for conducting evaluations.^{260–262} Ongoing educational opportunities should be encouraged so that the evaluator can continue to build skills and meet professional and local credentialing requirements.^{260–264}

2. Performance of the psychosocial evaluation

Expert reviews and commentaries support a set of central tenets for the process of performing the evaluation.^{7,9–11,17,19–22,24–26,265} The evaluator must inform patients about the evaluation's purpose and that it is only one component of the assessment for cardiothoracic and/or MCS candidacy. Patients must be given the opportunity to participate fully, without language barriers. The psychosocial evaluation should encompass multiple meetings if patients' medical status precludes its completion in a single interview and/or because additional questioning or testing is necessary. Consistent with general ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements for candidate selection,^{1,2} patients should be re-evaluated at regular intervals while awaiting transplantation/implantation in order to update psychosocial information.

Direct patient interview is the centerpiece of the psychosocial evaluation. However, the evaluator should also consider collecting collateral information from medical records, health-care providers, family members, and other sources, to corroborate or supplement patient reports. Although in most situations collateral information is highly desirable, the evaluator should weigh the potential reliability and utility of such information before seeking it. For example, some patients, particularly if socioeconomically disadvantaged, may have had few health-care contacts and no long-standing relationships with health-care providers. Thus, intensive attempts to obtain records may provide little yield.

When the psychosocial evaluation can be only partially completed through patient interview (due, e.g., to patients' medical status), priority areas for assessment are those most

Table 4 Consensus Recommendations on Processes and Procedures Related to Psychosocial Evaluation of Adult Cardiothoracic Transplant Candidates and Long-term MCS Candidates

Process factor	Specific recommendations
1. Qualifications and experience of the evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should have training in a health-care discipline relevant to the content of the psychosocial evaluation. • The evaluator should be registered or licensed in their discipline, according to local regulations; additional specialized credentialing is encouraged when available. • For individuals new to the evaluator role, orientation to the transplant and/or MCS program, including familiarization with local policies and procedures and ISHLT guidelines, should occur before evaluations are conducted independently. • Ongoing evaluator education and training should be encouraged by the transplant or MCS program and should be in accordance with any local credentialing requirements.
2. Performance of the psychosocial evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient should be informed about the evaluation's purpose and goals and that its results will be considered in the context of other information collected by the transplant or MCS team. • The evaluation interview should be conducted in a language in which the patient can engage in interactive conversation. Interpreter services (via a source with no personal connection to the patient) should be utilized for patients with language comprehension barriers. • The evaluation interview should be expanded beyond a one-time meeting with the patient if complex issues are uncovered that require additional questioning or assessments by other specialists. • After the initial evaluation, patients who are waitlisted for transplantation or do not immediately undergo MCS implantation should be re-evaluated at regular intervals to update their psychosocial status. • The patient should be directly interviewed when possible in order to complete the psychosocial evaluation. In these circumstances, the evaluator should also consider whether collateral information is needed from medical records, other care providers, family members, or other parties. • When the patient can be directly interviewed but it is unlikely that a full psychosocial interview can be completed (e.g., due to the patient's medical status), priority should be given to key elements, including treatment adherence, mental health status, current substance use/abuse, cognitive status, social support, and (for MCS) capacity to manage the device. • When the patient cannot complete the full interview or is unable to be interviewed, the evaluator should collect collateral information to address as many elements of the psychosocial evaluation as possible. • Given that transplant and MCS teams commonly require that the patient have a primary support person (i.e., an individual available to provide ongoing assistance and support to the patient after hospital discharge), this individual should be interviewed to determine his/her understanding of the patient's needs and his/her willingness and ability to provide assistance.
3. Use of templates or checklists as adjuncts for completing the psychosocial evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should consider routinely using a standard template or checklist that includes each element of the psychosocial evaluation, in order to systematically address, record notes, and prepare a summary of all components of the evaluation.
4. Screening for capacity to give informed consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If, based on the evaluation or patient history, cognitive impairment is suspected, use of a standardized, validated screening tool should be considered in order to aid in assessing cognitive status and in decisions about whether to refer the patient for more extensive evaluation. • Because language, health literacy and medical conditions may complicate assessment of cognitive status and the capacity to give informed consent, the evaluator should consider whether additional steps (use of interpreter, additional education at literacy level of patient, treatment for medical

Continued on page 815

Table 4 (Continued)

Process factor	Specific recommendations
	<p>conditions) are needed before capacity can be determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal evaluation of the patient's capacity to make medical decisions may be pursued, according to the local standard of practice, if deemed necessary by the evaluator.
5. Communication with the transplantation or MCS team about psychosocial evaluation findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written evaluation report should be placed within the patient's medical record. • The report should contain a concise summary of findings and recommendations for additional testing and/or interventions, with a more detailed narrative appended as needed. • The report should be prepared with specific reference to the type of procedure for which the patient is being considered (transplantation or long-term MCS). • When psychosocial risk factors are identified, the report should state whether the risk factors can be ameliorated and, if so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Make recommendations for treatment or intervention (both of which could include referrals for specific services), and — Make recommendations regarding the timing of such treatments or interventions (i.e., whether they should occur before transplant or MCS, or whether it is acceptable for them to be carried out after transplant or MCS if the patient's medical status is precarious). • Recommendations stated in the report regarding treatments or interventions should be based on best available evidence and should take into account what is feasible. • The report should be an integral part of multidisciplinary meetings when transplant listing decisions or MCS decisions are discussed. The evaluator or his/her delegate should be present at these meetings in order to communicate evaluation results and recommendations.
6. Coordination of recommended psychosocial treatments or interventions, and assessment of progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should coordinate all intervention activities, or designate another team member to coordinate recommended interventions. • The evaluator should identify who will monitor intervention progress and who (if not the evaluator) will communicate progress to the team. • The evaluator should specify before an intervention is initiated how progress/success will be defined; standardized measures that specify progress/success criteria may be considered when available. • The evaluator should provide specific criteria (e.g., a time line or clinical benchmarks) indicating when any psychosocial re-evaluation should be performed to determine whether interventions have been effective.

MCS, mechanical circulatory support.

pertinent to candidate selection based on ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements¹⁻³ (e.g., adherence history, mental health, and substance use/abuse). Collateral information should be obtained when patients cannot be interviewed fully. In medically urgent circumstances when no patient interview is possible, the evaluator should rigorously search for collateral information on as many content domains of the psychosocial evaluation as possible.

Given ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements,¹⁻³ transplantation and MCS teams commonly require patients to have a designated primary support person (i.e., a family member or friend taking on "caregiver" responsibilities). This individual should be interviewed to determine understanding, willingness, and ability to assist with the patient's care needs and medical regimen before and after transplantation/implantation.

3. Use of templates or checklists as adjuncts for completing the psychosocial evaluation

Tools such as standard templates or checklists can be useful for guiding the evaluation and summarizing results.^{9,12,17,19,21,22,28} These tools are not completed by patients; they are instruments that evaluators should consider for their own use to ensure that all evaluation content domains are assessed and accurately summarized.

The evaluator may create a template or checklist, or may use or adapt one of the published tools for transplant candidates^{29,31,32} or MCS candidates.³⁰ There is insufficient evidence for the superiority of any given tool over the others.^{11,12,28} Furthermore, the Writing Committee does not endorse the use of any of these tools to generate a numerical "score" or "rating" of a patient's psychosocial suitability for

transplantation/implantation, given very limited information on such metrics' validity. However, they can be useful when used as heuristic tools to aid in evaluation completion and reporting.^{9,11,12,17,19,22,28}

4. Screening for capacity to give informed consent

Because informed decision-making and consent are vital for cardiothoracic transplantation and MCS,¹⁻³ consideration of patients' capacity to give consent is relevant for not only the content but the process of the psychosocial evaluation.^{21,22,250,251} Although the evaluation need not include a full neurocognitive assessment, the evaluator should consider augmenting his/her questioning on patients' history or perceptions of cognitive limitations by administering a valid, reliable screening tool.^{17,21,131,251} Among valid tools, selection may be guided by evaluator training and experience.

Factors such as language barriers, low health literacy and the patient's medical condition may hinder determinations of capacity to give consent.^{7,11,19,21,126,255,265} The evaluator should consider modifications to the psychosocial evaluation process to remove or limit these factors' impact.¹³¹ For example, the evaluator may require that patients receive decision aids (which typically address literacy and health literacy barriers^{173,177-179}) and/or other educational strategies before the psychosocial evaluation is conducted. Beyond requiring education or cognitive testing, the evaluator should have the option to refer patients for formal evaluation of capacity if there are any doubts about patients' ability to understand their health situation, engage in informed decision-making, and provide voluntary, informed consent.¹³¹

5. Communication with transplant or MCS team about psychosocial evaluation findings

The written report summarizing evaluation findings, as entered into the patient's medical record, provides the starting point for effective communication regarding findings.^{9,20,264} It is important that the evaluator or his/her delegate attend candidate selection meetings in order to discuss report conclusions.

The report provides a key opportunity to recommend treatments and interventions to ameliorate any identified psychosocial contraindications to transplantation and/or MCS. For example, many evidence-based interventions are available for mental health and substance use/abuse problems: pharmacologic and psychotherapeutic strategies can be used safely and effectively to treat mental health issues before and after transplantation and during MCS.^{4,6,10-12,15,27,34,60,256,266,267} Addiction treatment plans can lower substance use relapse risk before and after transplantation,^{4,11,12,21,22} and help patients to achieve programs' abstinence requirements. Although not yet tested in transplantation or MCS candidates, behavioral interventions can improve medical adherence in cardiothoracic^{268,269} and other organ transplant recipients.^{270,271} If

patients' medical status precludes immediate intervention participation, treatment recommendations should note whether it is acceptable to begin treatment after transplantation/implantation.

6. Coordination of recommended psychosocial treatments or interventions, and assessment of progress

Implementation, progress, and outcomes of recommended treatments or interventions should be monitored to allow timely updates to the transplantation or MCS team.^{12,21,265} This is particularly important for treatments implemented to ameliorate psychosocial contraindications to transplantation/implantation. Whether the psychosocial evaluator or another transplant/MCS team member will monitor treatment progress and completion, and who will communicate this information to the team, should be delineated at the time of referral. Taking these steps will help to avoid problems related to diffusion of responsibility and will foster identification of the most appropriate team member to monitor progress. Regardless of who monitors treatment progress, the psychosocial evaluator, by virtue of his/her expertise and judgment that a referral was needed, should specify what constitutes treatment success, and whether those criteria were met. For example, success may be defined by remission of psychiatric disorder, or by months of abstinence from substance use. Criteria for success may need to consider the patient's medical urgency,^{10,15,21} with deferral of treatment completion requirements until after transplantation/implantation. Re-evaluation of the patient's psychosocial status may be required after treatments are initiated; the evaluator should indicate what factors will determine when re-evaluation is warranted.

Conclusions

This document provides the first set of consensus-based recommendations on the content and process of the psychosocial evaluation of candidates for heart transplantation, lung transplantation, and long-term MCS implantation. The recommendations dovetail with ISHLT guidelines and consensus statements for candidate selection. The recommendations are intended to promote consistency across programs in conducting the psychosocial evaluation. Because the recommendations are for international use, they must be considered in the context of local requirements, and transplantation and MCS programs may require additional elements of content and process as part of standard operating procedures. The recommendations delineated herein form a core set of elements that should be employed but can be expanded as necessary to meet programs' needs and goals.

Disclosure statement

Thomas Schlöglhofer is a consultant for Medtronic/HeartWare, Inc., and Abbott, Inc. Jeffrey J. Teuteberg is on the advisory boards and has been a speaker for Medtronic/HeartWare, CareDx, and

Abiomed. He is on the HeartMate 3 Clinical Events Committee for Abbott/Thoratec. Roger D. Yusen is a consultant for Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Portola Pharmaceuticals Inc., and Spiration/Olympus. He is a legal consultant for Ortho Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Organon, Inc., and Merck. The remaining authors have no financial interests or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Appendix

Writing Committee chair: Mary Amanda Dew, PhD; *Writing Subcommittee co-chairs:* Andrea F. DiMartini, MD, Fabienne Dobbels, PhD, Kathleen L. Grady, PhD, RN, Sheila G. Jowsey-Gregoire, MD, Annemarie Kaan, MCN, RN, Kay Kendall, MSW, LISW, Quincy-Robyn Young, PhD; *Writing Committee members:* Susan E. Abbey, MD, Zeeshan Butt, PhD, Catherine C. Crone, MD, Sabina De Geest, PhD, RN, Christina T. Doligalski, PharmD, Christiane Kugler, PhD, Laurie McDonald, MSW, Linda Ohler, MSN, Liz Painter, MA, MSc, Michael G. Petty, PhD, RN, CNS, Desiree Robson, BSc, RN, Thomas Schlöglhofer, BSc, Terry D. Schneekloth, MD, Jonathan P. Singer, MD, MS, Patrick J. Smith, PhD, MPH, Heike Spaderna, PhD, Jeffrey J. Teuteberg, MD, Roger D. Yusen, MD, MPH, and Paula C. Zimbrea, MD. *Independent reviewers:* Margaret S. Blood, MSN, RN (on behalf of the ICCAC), Cynthia Gries, MD (ISHLT), Jane Harrison, LCSW, CCTSW (STSW), Kristin Kuntz, PhD (AST), James L. Levenson, MD (APM), Jane MacIver, PhD, NP, RN (ISHLT), and Connie White-Williams, PhD, RN, NE-BC (ISHLT).

References

- Mehra MR, Canter CE, Hannan MM, et al. The 2016 International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation listing criteria for heart transplantation: a 10-year update. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:1-23.
- Weill D, Benden C, Corris PA, et al. A consensus document for the selection of lung transplant candidates: 2014—an update from the Pulmonary Transplantation Council of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1-15.
- Feldman D, Pamboukian SV, Teuteberg JJ, et al. The 2013 International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation guidelines for mechanical circulatory support: Executive summary. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2013;32:157-87.
- Barbour KA, Blumenthal JA, Palmer SM. Psychosocial issues in the assessment and management of patients undergoing lung transplantation. *Chest* 2006;129:1367-74.
- Blumenthal N, Petty MG, McCorkle R. Missing domains of lung transplant patient selection. *Prog Transplant* 2017;27:90-7.
- Caro MA, Rosenthal JL, Kendall K, et al. What the psychiatrist needs to know about ventricular assist devices: a comprehensive review. *Psychosomatics* 2016;57:229-37.
- Collins CA, Labott SM. Psychological assessment of candidates for solid organ transplantation. *Prof Psychol Res Pr* 2007;38:150-7.
- Crone CC, Wise TN. Psychiatric aspects of transplantation. I: Evaluation and selection of candidates. *Crit Care Nurs* 1999;19:79-87.
- Dew MA, Switzer GE, DiMartini AF, et al. Psychosocial assessments and outcomes in organ transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2000;10:239-61.
- DiMartini AF, Crone C, Fireman M, et al. Psychiatric aspects of organ transplantation in critical care. *Crit Care Clin* 2008;24:949-81.
- DiMartini AF, Dew MA, Crone CC. Organ transplantation. In: Sadock BJ, Sadock VA, Ruiz P, editors. *Kaplan and Sadock's comprehensive textbook of psychiatry*. 10th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2017. p. 2357-73.
- DiMartini AF, Shenoy A, Dew MA. Organ transplantation. In: Levenson JL, editor. *The American Psychiatric Publishing textbook of psychosomatic medicine: psychiatric care of the medically ill*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing, in press.
- Dobbels F, De Geest S, Cleemput I, et al. Psychosocial and behavioral selection criteria for solid organ transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2001;11:121-32.
- Dobbels F, Verleden G, Dupont L, et al. To transplant or not? The importance of psychosocial and behavioural factors before lung transplantation. *Chronic Respir Dis* 2006;3:39-47.
- Eshelman A, Mason S, Neme H, et al. LVAD destination therapy: applying what we know about psychiatric evaluation and management from cardiac failure and transplant. *Heart Fail Rev* 2009;14:21-8.
- Grady KL, Dew MA. Psychosocial and quality-of-life issues in mechanical circulatory support. In: Kirklin JK, Rogers J, editors. *Mechanical circulatory support: a companion to Braunwald's Heart disease*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Saunders; in press.
- Jowsey SG, Taylor ML, Schneekloth TD, Clark MM. Psychosocial challenges in transplantation. *J Psychiatr Practice* 2001;7:404-14.
- Kay J, Bienenfeld D. The clinical assessment of the cardiac transplant candidate. *Psychosomatics* 1991;32:78-87.
- Kendall K, Ansley K, Skillman M. Psychosocial issues in transplantation. In: Cupples S, Lerret S, McCalmont V, Ohler L, editors. *Core curriculum for transplant nursing*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2017. p. 769-806.
- Klapheke MM. The role of the psychiatrist in organ transplantation. *Bull Menninger Clin* 1999;63:13-35.
- Kuntz K, Weinland SR, Butt Z. Psychosocial challenges in solid organ transplantation. *J Clin Psychol Med Settings* 2015;22:122-35.
- Olbrisch ME, Benedict SM, Ashe K, et al. Psychological assessment and care of organ transplant patients. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2002;70:771-83.
- Olbrisch ME, Levenson JL. Psychosocial assessment of organ transplant candidates: current status of methodological and philosophical issues. *Psychosomatics* 1995;36:236-43.
- Petty M, Bauman L. Psychosocial issues in ventricular assist device implantation and management. *J Thorac Dis* 2015;7:2181-7.
- Prager LM. Organ transplantation: pre-transplant assessment and post-transplant management. In: Stern TA, Fava M, Wilens TE, Rosenbaum JF, editors. *Massachusetts General Hospital comprehensive clinical psychiatry*. 2nd ed. New York: Elsevier; 2016. p. 638-44.
- Rivard AL, Hellmich C, Sampson B, et al. Preoperative predictors for postoperative problems in heart transplantation: psychiatric and psychosocial considerations. *Prog Transplant* 2005;15:276-82.
- Surman OS, Cosimi AB, DiMartini AF. Psychiatric care of patients undergoing organ transplantation. *Transplantation* 2009;87:1753-61.
- Zimbrea P, Crone C, Sher Y, et al. Transplant psychiatry, Part 1: An introduction. *Psychiatr. Times* 2016;33(Sept 28): 40A-40C.
- Maldonado JR, Dubois HC, David EE, et al. The Stanford Integrated Psychosocial Assessment for Transplantation (SIPAT): a new tool for the psychosocial evaluation of pre-transplant candidates. *Psychosomatics* 2012;53:123-32.
- Maltby MC, Flattery MP, Burns B, et al. Psychosocial assessment of candidates and risk classification of patients considered for durable mechanical circulatory support. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2014;33:836-41.
- Olbrisch ME, Levenson JL, Hamer R. The PACT: a rating scale for the study of clinical decision-making in psychosocial screening of organ transplant candidates. *Clin Transplant* 1989;3:164-9.
- Twillman RK, Manetto C, Wellisch DK, et al. The Transplant Evaluation Rating Scale. A revision of the psychosocial levels system

- for evaluating organ transplant candidates. *Psychosomatics* 1993;34:144-53.
33. Bruce CR, Delgado E, Kostick K, et al. Ventricular assist devices: a review of psychosocial risk factors and their impact on outcomes. *J Card Fail* 2014;20:996-1003.
 34. Corbett C, Armstrong MJ, Parker R, et al. Mental health disorders and solid-organ transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 2013;96:593-600.
 35. Skotzko CE, Stowe JA, Wright C, et al. Approaching a consensus: psychosocial support services for solid organ transplantation programs. *Prog Transplant* 2001;11:163-8.
 36. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009;62:1006-12.
 37. De Geest S, Burkhalter H, Bogert L, et al. Describing the evolution of medication nonadherence from pretransplant until 3 years post-transplant and determining pretransplant medication nonadherence as risk factor for post-transplant nonadherence to immunosuppressives: the Swiss Transplant Cohort Study. *Transpl Int* 2014;27:657-66.
 38. Dobbels F, Vanhaecke J, Dupont L, et al. Pretransplant predictors of posttransplant adherence and clinical outcome: an evidence base for pretransplant psychosocial screening. *Transplantation* 2009;87:1497-504.
 39. Castelberry AW, Bishawi M, Worni M, et al. Medication nonadherence after lung transplantation in adult recipients. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2017;103:274-80.
 40. De Geest S, Abraham I, Moons P, et al. Late acute rejection and subclinical noncompliance with cyclosporine therapy in heart transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 1998;17:854-63.
 41. Dew MA, Kormos RL, Roth LH, et al. Early post-transplant medical compliance and mental health predict physical morbidity and mortality one to three years after heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 1999;18:549-62.
 42. Dobbels F, De Geest S, van Cleemput J, et al. Effect of late medication non-compliance on outcome after heart transplantation: a 5-year follow-up. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2004;23:1245-51.
 43. Korb-Savoldelli V, Sabatier B, Gillaizeau F, et al. Non-adherence with drug treatment after heart or lung transplantation in adults: a systematic review. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010;81:148-54.
 44. Morris AA, Kalogeropoulos AP, Zhao L, et al. Race and ethnic differences in the epidemiology and risk factors for graft failure after heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:825-31.
 45. Owen JE, Bonds CL, Wellisch DK. Psychiatric evaluations of heart transplant candidates: predicting post-transplant hospitalizations, rejection episodes, and survival. *Psychosomatics* 2006;47:213-22.
 46. De Geest S, Dobbels F, Martin S, et al. Clinical risk associated with appointment noncompliance in heart transplant recipients. *Prog Transplant* 2000;10:162-8.
 47. Favaro A, Gerosa G, Caforio AL, et al. Posttraumatic stress disorder and depression in heart transplantation recipients: the relationship with outcome and adherence to medical treatment. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2011;33:1-7.
 48. Farmer SA, Grady KL, Wang E, et al. Demographic, psychosocial, and behavioral factors associated with survival after heart transplantation. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2013;95:876-83.
 49. Kugler C, Fuehner T, Dierich M, et al. Effect of adherence to home spirometry on bronchiolitis obliterans and graft survival after lung transplantation. *Transplantation* 2009;88:129-34.
 50. Kirklin JK, Naftel DC, Pagani FD, et al. Pump thrombosis in the Thoratec HeartMate II device: an update analysis of the INTERMACS Registry. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1515-26.
 51. Casida JM, Wu HS, Abshire M, et al. Cognition and adherence are self-management factors predicting the quality of life of adults living with a left ventricular assist device. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2017;36:325-30.
 52. Rosenberger EM, Fox KR, DiMartini AF, et al. Psychosocial factors and quality-of-life after heart transplantation and mechanical circulatory support. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2012;17:558-63.
 53. Havik OE, Sivertsen B, Relbo A, et al. Depressive symptoms and all-cause mortality after heart transplantation. *Transplantation* 2007;84:97-103.
 54. Rosenberger EM, DiMartini AF, DeVito Dabbs AJ, et al. Psychiatric predictors of long-term transplant-related outcomes in lung transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 2016;100:239-47.
 55. Smith PJ, Blumenthal JA, Trulock EP, et al. Psychosocial predictors of mortality following lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2016;16:271-7.
 56. Spaderna H, Zittermann A, Reichenspurner H, et al. The role of depression and social isolation at time of waitlisting for survival eight years after heart transplantation. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2017;6:e007016.
 57. Dew MA, Rosenberger EM, Myaskovsky L, et al. Depression and anxiety as risk factors for morbidity and mortality after organ transplantation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transplantation* 2016;100:988-1003.
 58. Dew MA, DiMartini AF. Psychological disorders and distress after adult cardiothoracic transplantation. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2005;20(suppl):S51-6.
 59. Smith PJ, Blumenthal JA, Snyder LD, et al. Depressive symptoms and early mortality following lung transplantation: a pilot study. *Clin Transplant* 2017;31:e12874.
 60. De Geest S, Dobbels F, Fluri C, et al. Adherence to the therapeutic regimen in heart, lung, and heart-lung transplant recipients. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2005;20(suppl):S88-98.
 61. Fine RN, Becker Y, De Geest S, et al. Nonadherence consensus conference summary report. *Am J Transplant* 2009;9:35-41.
 62. Gordon RJ, Weinberg AD, Pagani FD, et al. Prospective, multicenter study of ventricular assist device infections. *Circulation* 2013;127:691-702.
 63. Swetz KM, Ottenberg AL, Freeman MR, et al. Palliative care and end-of-life issues in patients treated with left ventricular assist devices as destination therapy. *Curr Heart Fail Rep* 2011;8:212-8.
 64. Snipelsky D, Stulak JM, Schettle SD, et al. Psychosocial characteristics and outcomes in patients with left ventricular assist device implanted as destination therapy. *Am Heart J* 2015;170:887-94.
 65. Butler MI, McCartan D, Cooney A, et al. Outcomes of renal transplantation in patients with bipolar affective disorder and schizophrenia: a national retrospective cohort study. *Psychosomatics* 2015;58:69-76.
 66. Coffman KL, Crone C. Rational guidelines for transplantation in patients with psychotic disorders. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2002;7:385-8.
 67. Evans LD, Stock EM, Zeber JE, et al. Posttransplant outcomes in veterans with serious mental illness. *Transplantation* 2015;99:e57-65.
 68. Price A, Whitwell S, Henderson M. Impact of psychotic disorder on transplant eligibility and outcomes. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2014;19:196-200.
 69. Zimbrea P, Emre S. Patients with psychotic disorders in solid-organ transplant. *Prog Transplant* 2015;25:289-96.
 70. Abbott KC, Agodoa LY, O'Malley PG. Hospitalized psychoses after renal transplantation in the United States: incidence, risk factors, and prognosis. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2003;14:1628-35.
 71. Chacko RC, Harper RG, Gotto J, et al. Psychiatric interview and psychometric predictors of cardiac transplant survival. *Am J Psychiatry* 1996;153:1607-12.
 72. Shapiro PA, Williams DL, Foray AT, et al. Psychosocial evaluation and prediction of compliance problems and morbidity after heart transplantation. *Transplantation* 1995;60:1462-6.
 73. Askgaard G, Tolstrup JS, Gerds TA, et al. Predictors of heavy drinking after liver transplantation for alcoholic liver disease in Denmark (1990-2013): a nationwide study with competing risks analyses. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2016;51:225-35.
 74. Dobbels F, Put C, Vanhaecke J. Personality disorders: a challenge for transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2000;10:226-32.
 75. Smith C, Kesinger S, Nelson D, et al. Psychosocial sequelae of a heart-transplant recipient with a histrionic personality disorder. *Prog Transplant* 2001;11:88-9.

76. Yates WR, LaBrecque DR, Pfab D. Personality disorder as a contraindication for liver transplantation in alcoholic cirrhosis. *Psychosomatics* 1998;39:501-11.
77. Allardyce J, van Os J. Examining gene-environment interplay in psychiatric disorders. In: Tsuang MT, Tohen M, Jones P, editors. *Textbook of psychiatric epidemiology*. 3rd ed. New York: Wiley; 2011. p. 53-72.
78. McMahon FJ. Prediction of treatment outcomes in psychiatry—where do we stand? *Dialogues Clin Neurosci* 2014;16:455-64.
79. Reinhard SC, Given B, Petlich NH, et al. Supporting family caregivers in providing care. AHRQ Publication No. 08-0043. In: Hughes RG, editor. *Patient safety and quality: an evidence-based handbook for nurses*. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; March 2008.
80. Botha P, Peaston R, White K, et al. Smoking after cardiac transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2008;8:866-71.
81. Cogswell R, Smith E, Hamel A, et al. Substance abuse at the time of left ventricular assist device implantation is associated with increased mortality. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2014;33:1048-55.
82. Dew MA, DiMartini AF, Steel J, et al. Meta-analysis of risk for relapse to substance use after transplantation of the liver or other solid organs. *Liver Transplant* 2008;14:159-72.
83. Dew MA, DiMartini AF, DeVito Dabbs A, et al. Rates and risk factors for nonadherence to the medical regimen after adult solid organ transplantation. *Transplantation* 2007;83:858-73.
84. Duerinckx N, Burkhalter H, Engberg SJ, et al. Correlates and outcomes of posttransplant smoking in solid organ transplant recipients: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Transplantation* 2016;100:2252-63.
85. Ruttens D, Verleden SE, Goeminne PC, et al. Smoking resumption after lung transplantation: standardised screening and importance for long-term outcome. *Eur Respir J* 2014;43:300-3.
86. Vos R, Vanaudenaerde BM, Ottevaere A, et al. Long-term azithromycin therapy for bronchiolitis obliterans syndrome: divide and conquer? *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2010;29:1358-68.
87. Crespo-Leiro MG, Villa-Arranz A, Manito-Lorite N, et al. Lung cancer after heart transplantation: results from a large multicenter registry. *Am J Transplant* 2011;11:1035-40.
88. Gultekin B, Beyazpinar DS, Ersoy O, et al. Incidence and outcomes of acute kidney injury after orthotopic cardiac transplant: a population-based cohort. *Exp Clin Transplant* 2015;13(suppl 3):26-9.
89. Na R, Laaksonen MA, Grulich AE, et al. High azathioprine dose and lip cancer risk in liver, heart, and lung transplant recipients: a population-based cohort study. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2016;74:1144-52.
90. Nagele H, Kalmar P, Rodiger W, et al. Smoking after heart transplantation: an underestimated hazard? *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 1997;12:70-4.
91. Radovancevic B, Poindexter S, Birovljev S, et al. Factors for development of accelerated coronary artery disease in cardiac transplant recipients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 1990;4:309-12.
92. Sanchez-Lazaro IJ, Martinez-Dolz L, Almenar-Bonet L, et al. Predictor factors for the development of arterial hypertension following heart transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2008;22:760-4.
93. Yagdi T, Sharples L, Tsui S, et al. Malignancy after heart transplantation: analysis of 24-year experience at a single center. *J Card Surg* 2009;24:572-9.
94. Barraclough K, Menahem SA, Bailey M, et al. Predictors of decline in renal function after lung transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2006;25:1431-5.
95. Dickson RP, Davis RD, Rea JB, et al. High frequency of bronchogenic carcinoma after single-lung transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2006;25:1297-301.
96. Hellemons ME, Agarwal PK, van der Bij W, et al. Former smoking is a risk factor for chronic kidney disease after lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2011;11:2490-8.
97. Singh G, Albeldawi M, Kalra SS, et al. Features of patients with gastrointestinal bleeding after implantation of ventricular assist devices. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2015;13:107-14.
98. Arora S, Aukrust P, Andreassen A, et al. The prognostic importance of modifiable risk factors after heart transplantation. *Am Heart J* 2009;158:431-6.
99. Copeland JG, Smith RG, Bose RK, et al. Risk factor analysis for bridge to transplantation with the CardioWest total artificial heart. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2008;85:1639-44.
100. Mateen FJ, Dierkhsing RA, Rabinstein AA, et al. Neurological complications following adult lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2010;10:908-14.
101. Roussel JC, Baron O, Perigaud C, et al. Outcome of heart transplants 15 to 20 years ago: graft survival, post-transplant morbidity, and risk factors for mortality. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2008;27:486-93.
102. Sanchez-Lazaro IJ, Almenar L, Martinez-Dolz L, et al. Impact of smoking on survival after heart transplantation. *Transplant Proc* 2007;39:2377-8.
103. Rai HS, Winder GS. Marijuana use and organ transplantation: a review and implications for clinical practice. *Curr Psychiatry Rep* 2017;19:91.
104. Coffman KL. The debate about marijuana usage in transplant candidates: recent medical evidence on marijuana health effects. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2008;13:189-95.
105. Thompson GR 3rd, Tuscano JM, Dennis M, et al. A microbiome assessment of medical marijuana. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2017;23:269-70.
106. Stout SM, Cimino NM. Exogenous cannabinoids as substrates, inhibitors, and inducers of human drug metabolizing enzymes: a systematic review. *Drug Metab Rev* 2014;46:86-95.
107. Greenan G, Ahmad SB, Anders MG, et al. Recreational marijuana use is not associated with worse outcomes after renal transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2016;30:1340-6.
108. Ranney DN, Acker WB, Al-Holou SN, et al. Marijuana use in potential liver transplant candidates. *Am J Transplant* 2009;9:280-5.
109. Freystaetter K, Andreas M, Bilban M, et al. The recipient's heme oxygenase-1 promoter region polymorphism is associated with cardiac allograft vasculopathy. *Transpl Int* 2017;30:510-8.
110. Kopp BT, Groner J, Tobias JD, et al. Cigarette smoking effect on survival after lung transplant in cystic fibrosis. *Exp Clin Transplant* 2015;13:529-34.
111. Moon S, Park MS, Lee JG, et al. Risk factors and outcome of primary graft dysfunction after lung transplantation in Korea. *J Thorac Dis* 2016;8:3275-82.
112. Poston RS, Husain S, Sorce D, et al. LVAD bloodstream infections: therapeutic rationale for transplantation after LVAD infection. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2003;22:914-21.
113. Sponga S, Travaglini C, Pisa F, et al. Does psychosocial compliance have an impact on long-term outcome after heart transplantation? *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2016;49:64-72.
114. Basile A, Bernazzali S, Diciolla F, et al. Risk factors for smoking abuse after heart transplantation. *Transplant Proc* 2004;36:641-2.
115. Mehra MR, Uber PA, Prasad A, et al. Recrudescence tobacco exposure following heart transplantation: clinical profiles and relationship with athero-thrombosis risk markers. *Am J Transplant* 2005;5:1137-40.
116. Dawson DA, Hingson RW, Grant BF. Epidemiology of alcohol use, abuse and dependence. In: Tsuang MT, Tohen M, Jones P, editors. *Textbook of psychiatric epidemiology*. 3rd ed. New York: Wiley; 2011. p. 361-80.
117. Bhat G, Yost G, Mahoney E. Cognitive function and left ventricular assist device implantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1398-405.
118. Cohen DG, Christie JD, Anderson BJ, et al. Cognitive function, mental health, and health-related quality of life after lung transplantation. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2014;11:522-30.
119. Crews WD Jr, Jefferson AL, Broshek DK, et al. Neuropsychological dysfunction in patients with end-stage pulmonary disease: lung transplant evaluation. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol* 2003;18:353-62.
120. Cupples SA, Stillely CS. Cognitive function in adult cardiothoracic transplant candidates and recipients. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2005;20(suppl):S74-87.

121. Deshields TL, McDonough EM, Mannen RK, et al. Psychological and cognitive status before and after heart transplantation. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 1996;18(suppl):62S-9.
122. Hoffman BM, Blumenthal JA, Carney RC, et al. Changes in neurocognitive functioning following lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2012;12:2519-25.
123. Jha SR, Hannu MK, Chang S, et al. The prevalence and prognostic significance of frailty in patients with advanced heart failure referred for heart transplantation. *Transplantation* 2016;100:429-36.
124. Mapelli D, Bardi L, Mojoli M, et al. Neuropsychological profile in a large group of heart transplant candidates. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e28313.
125. Mapelli D, Cavazzana A, Cavalli C, et al. Clinical psychological and neuropsychological issues with left ventricular assist devices (LVADs). *Ann Cardiothorac Surg* 2014;3:480-9.
126. Miller-Matero LR, Hyde-Nolan ME, Eshelman A, et al. Health literacy in patients referred for transplant: do patients have the capacity to understand? *Clin Transplant* 2015;29:336-42.
127. Parekh PI, Blumenthal JA, Babyak MA, et al. Gas exchange and exercise capacity affect neurocognitive performance in patients with lung disease. *Psychosom Med* 2005;67:425-32.
128. Putzke JD, Williams MA, Daniel JF, et al. Neuropsychological functioning among heart transplant candidates: a case control study. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* 2000;22:95-103.
129. Roman DD, Holker EG, Missov E, et al. Neuropsychological functioning in heart transplant candidates. *Clin Neuropsychologist* 2017;31:118-37.
130. Smith PJ, Rivelli S, Waters A, et al. Neurocognitive changes after lung transplantation. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2014;11:1520-7.
131. Appelbaum PS. Assessment of patients' competence to consent to treatment. *New Engl J Med* 2007;357:1834-40.
132. Samelson-Jones E, Mancini DM, Shapiro PA. Cardiac transplantation in adult patients with mental retardation: do outcomes support consensus guidelines? *Psychosomatics* 2012;53:133-8.
133. Fendler TJ, Spertus JA, Gosch KL, et al. Incidence and predictors of cognitive decline in patients with left ventricular assist devices. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2015;8:285-91.
134. Smith PJ, Blumenthal JA, Carney RM, et al. Neurobehavioral functioning and survival following lung transplantation. *Chest* 2014;145:604-11.
135. Slaughter MS, Sobieski MA, Gallagher C, Dia M, Silver MA. Low incidence of neurological events during long-term support with the HeartMate XVE left ventricular assist device. *Tex Heart Inst J* 2008;35:245-9.
136. Roman DD, Kubo SH, Ormaza S, et al. Memory improvement following cardiac transplantation. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* 1997;19:692-7.
137. Petrucci RJ, Wright S, Naka Y, et al. Neurocognitive assessments in advanced heart failure patients receiving continuous-ow left ventricular assist devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2009;28:542-9.
138. Petrucci RJ, Rogers JG, Blue L, et al. Neurocognitive function in destination therapy patients receiving continuous-ow vs pulsatile-ow left ventricular assist device support. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2012;31:27-36.
139. Burkner BS, Gullestad L, Gude E, et al. Cognitive function after heart transplantation: comparing everolimus-based and calcineurin inhibitor-based regimens. *Clin Transplant* 2017;31:e12927.
140. Dew MA, Kormos RL, Winowich S, et al. Quality of life outcomes after heart transplantation in individuals bridged to transplant with ventricular assist devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2001;20:1199-212.
141. Jha SR, Hannu MK, Gore K, et al. Cognitive impairment improves the predictive validity of physical frailty for mortality in patients with advanced heart failure referred for heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:1092-100.
142. Smith D, Lovell J, Weller C, et al. A systematic review of medication non-adherence in persons with dementia or cognitive impairment. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0170651.
143. Alosco ML, Spitznagel MB, Cohen R, et al. Cognitive impairment is independently associated with reduced instrumental activities of daily living in persons with heart failure. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2012;27:44-50.
144. Alosco ML, Spitznagel MB, van Dulmen M, et al. Cognitive function and treatment adherence in older adults with heart failure. *Psychosom Med* 2012;74:965-73.
145. Hawkins LA, Kilian S, Firek A, et al. Cognitive impairment and medication adherence in outpatients with heart failure. *Heart Lung* 2012;41:572-82.
146. Putzke JD, Williams MA, Daniel JF, et al. Activities of daily living among heart transplant candidates: neuropsychological and cardiac function predictors. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2000;19:995-1006.
147. Artinian NT, Magnan M, Christian W, et al. What do patients know about their heart failure? *Appl Nurs Res* 2002;15:200-8.
148. Huang B, Moser D, Dracup K. Knowledge is insufficient for self-care among heart failure patients with psychological distress. *Health Psychol* 2014;33:588-96.
149. Kessler R, Stahl E, Vogelmeier C, et al. Patient understanding, detection, and experience of COPD exacerbations: an observational, interview-based study. *Chest* 2006;130:133-42.
150. Sawicki GS, Sellers DE, McGuffie K, et al. Adults with cystic fibrosis report important and unmet needs for disease information. *J Cystic Fibros* 2007;6:411-6.
151. Allen LA, Stevenson LW, Grady KL, et al. Decision making in advanced heart failure. A scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2012;125:1928-52.
152. Allen LA, Yager J, Funk MJ, et al. Discordance between patient-predicted and model-predicted life expectancy among ambulatory patients with heart failure. *JAMA* 2008;299:2533-42.
153. Barnason S, Zimmerman L, Young L. An integrative review of interventions promoting self-care of patients with heart failure. *J Clin Nurs* 2012;21:448-75.
154. Bourbeau J, Bartlett SJ. Patient adherence in COPD. *Thorax* 2008;63:831-8.
155. Macabasco-O'Connell A, DeWalt DA, Brouksou KA, et al. Relationship between literacy, knowledge, self-care behaviors, and heart failure-related quality of life among patients with heart failure. *J Gen Intern Med* 2011;26:979-86.
156. Reigel B, Moser D, Anker S, et al. State of the science. Promoting self-care in persons with heart failure. A statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2009;120:1141-63.
157. Siabani S, Leeder SR, Davidson PM. Barriers and facilitators to self-care in chronic heart failure: a meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Springer Plus* 2013;2:320.
158. Bentsen SB, Langeland E, Holm AL. Evaluation of self-management interventions for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *J Nurs Manage* 2012;20:802-13.
159. Bourbeau J, Lavoie KL, Sedeno M. Comprehensive self-management strategies. *Sem Respir Crit Care Med* 2015;36:630-8.
160. Boyde M, Turner C, Thompson DR, Stewart S. Educational interventions for patients with heart failure. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2011;26:E27-35.
161. Ditewig JB, Blok H, Havers J, et al. Effectiveness of self-management interventions on mortality, hospital readmissions, chronic heart failure hospitalization rate and quality of life in patients with chronic heart failure: a systematic review. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010;78:297-315.
162. Juilliere Y, Jourdain P, Suty-Selton C, et al. Therapeutic patient education and all-cause mortality in patients with chronic heart failure: a propensity analysis. *Int J Cardiol* 2013;168:388-95.
163. Kommuri NV, Johnson ML, Koelling TM. Relationship between improvements in heart failure patient disease specific knowledge and clinical events as part of a randomized controlled trial. *Patient Educ Couns* 2012;86:233-8.
164. Davis LA, Ryszkiewicz E, Schenk E, et al. Lung transplant or bust: patients' recommendations for ideal lung transplant education. *Prog Transplant* 2014;24:132-41.
165. Edlund JE, Edlund AE, Carey MG. Patient understanding of potential risk and benefit with informed consent in a left ventricular assist device population: a pilot study. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2015;30:435-9.

166. Ivarsson B, Ekmeahag B, Sjoberg T. Heart or lung transplanted patients' retrospective views on information and support while waiting for transplantation. *J Clin Nurs* 2013;22:1620-8.
167. Blumenthal-Barby JS, Kostick KM, Delgado ED, et al. Assessment of patients' and caregivers' informational and decisional needs for left ventricular assist device placement: implications for informed consent and shared decision-making. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1182-9.
168. David V, Feldman D, Danner-Boucher I, et al. Identifying the educational needs of lung transplant recipients with cystic fibrosis. *Prog Transplant* 2015;25:18-25.
169. Kostick KM, Minard CG, Wilhelms LA, et al. Development and validation of a patient-centered knowledge scale for left ventricular assist device placement. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:768-76.
170. Moloney S, Cicutto L, Hutcheon M, et al. Deciding about lung transplantation: informational needs of patients and support persons. *Prog Transplant* 2007;17:183-92.
171. Matlock DD, Nowels CT, Bekelman DB. Patient perspectives on decision making in heart failure. *J Card Fail* 2010;16:823-6.
172. McIlvennan CK, Allen LA, Nowels C, et al. Decision making for destination therapy left ventricular assist devices: "there was no choice" versus "I thought about it an awful lot.". *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2014;7:374-80.
173. Thompson JS, Matlock DD, McIlvennan CK, et al. Development of a decision aid for patients with advanced heart failure considering a destination therapy left ventricular assist device. *JACC Heart Fail* 2015;3:965-76.
174. LeBlanc A, Kenny DA, O'Connor AM, et al. Decisional conflict in patients and their physicians: a dyadic approach to shared decision making. *Med Decis Making* 2009;29:61-8.
175. Vandemheen KL, Aaron SD, Poirier C, et al. Development of a decision aid for adult cystic fibrosis patients considering referral for lung transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2010;20:81-7.
176. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017(4):: CD001431.
177. Vandemheen KL, O'Connor A, Bell SC, et al. Randomized trial of a decision aid for patients with cystic fibrosis considering lung transplantation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2009;180:761-8.
178. Kostick K, Delgado ED, Wilhelms LA, et al. Development and pilot-testing of a patient decision aid for left ventricular assist device placement. *Ventr Assist Dev J* 2016:1-21.
179. McIlvennan CK, Thompson JS, Matlock DD, et al. A multicenter trial of a shared decision support intervention for patients and their caregivers offered destination therapy for advanced heart failure: DECIDE-LVAD: rationale, design, and pilot data. *J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2016;31:E8-20.
180. Wilson SR, Strub P, Buist AS, et al. Shared treatment decision making improves adherence and outcomes in poorly controlled asthma. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2010;181:566-77.
181. Morgan MW, Deber RB, Llewellyn-Thomas HA, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of an interactive videodisc decision aid for patients with ischemic heart disease. *J Gen Intern Med* 2000;15:685-93.
182. Bohachick P, Taylor MV, Sereika S, et al. Social support, personal control, and psychosocial recovery following heart transplantation. *Clin Nurs Res* 2002;11:34-51.
183. Dew MA, DiMartini AF, DeVito Dabbs AJ, et al. Adherence to the medical regimen during the first two years after lung transplantation. *Transplantation* 2008;85:193-202.
184. Goetzmann L, Klaghofer R, Wagner-Huber R, et al. Psychosocial vulnerability predicts psychosocial outcome after an organ transplant: results of a prospective study with lung, liver, and bone-marrow patients. *J Psychosom Res* 2007;62:93-100.
185. Harper RG, Chacko RC, Kotik-Harper D, et al. Self-report evaluation of health behavior, stress vulnerability, and medical outcome of heart transplant recipients. *Psychosom Med* 1998;60:563-9.
186. Jowsey SG, Cutshall SM, Colligan RC, et al. Seligman's theory of attributional style: optimism, pessimism, and quality of life after heart transplant. *Prog Transplant* 2012;22:49-55.
187. Leedham B, Meyerowitz BE, Muirhead J, et al. Positive expectations predict health after heart transplantation. *Health Psychol* 1995;14:74-9.
188. Myaskovsky L, Dew MA, McNulty ML, et al. Trajectories of change in quality of life in 12-month survivors of lung or heart transplant. *Am J Transplant* 2006;6:1939-47.
189. Dew MA, DiMartini AF, DeVito Dabbs AJ, et al. Onset and risk factors for anxiety and depression during the first 2 years after lung transplantation. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2012;34:127-38.
190. Dew MA, Roth LH, Schulberg HC, et al. Prevalence and predictors of depression and anxiety-related disorders during the year after heart transplantation. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 1996;18(suppl):S48-61.
191. Dobbels F, De Geest S, Martin S, et al. Prevalence and correlates of depression symptoms at 10 years after heart transplantation: continuous attention required. *Transpl Int* 2004;17:424-31.
192. Evangelista LS, Moser D, Dracup K, et al. Functional status and perceived control in uence quality of life in female heart transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2004;23:360-7.
193. Kugler J, Tenderich G, Stahlhut P, et al. Emotional adjustment and perceived locus of control in heart transplant patients. *J Psychosom Res* 1994;38:403-8.
194. Sanchez R, Bailles E, Peri JM, et al. Assessment of psychosocial factors and predictors of psychopathology in a sample of heart transplantation recipients: a prospective 12-month follow-up. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2016;38:59-64.
195. Stillely CS, Dew MA, Stukas AA, et al. Psychological symptom levels and their correlates in lung and heart-lung transplant recipients. *Psychosomatics* 1999;40:503-9.
196. Burkner EJ, Madan A, Evon D, et al. Educational level, coping, and psychological and physical aspects of quality of life in heart transplant candidates. *Clin Transplant* 2009;23:233-40.
197. Burkner EJ, Evon DM, Sedway JA, et al. Appraisal and coping as predictors of psychological distress and self-reported physical disability before lung transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2004;14:222-32.
198. Myaskovsky L, Dew MA, Switzer GE, et al. Quality of life and coping strategies among lung transplant candidates and their family caregivers. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;60:2321-32.
199. Spaderna H, Smits JM, Rahmel AO, et al. Psychosocial and behavioural factors in heart transplant candidates—an overview. *Transpl Int* 2007;20:909-20.
200. Taylor JL, Smith PJ, Babyak MA, et al. Coping and quality of life in patients awaiting lung transplantation. *J Psychosom Res* 2008;65:71-9.
201. Burkner EJ, Evon DM, Galanko J, et al. Health locus of control predicts survival after lung transplant. *J Health Psychol* 2005;10:695-704.
202. Young LD, Schweiger J, Beitzinger J, et al. Denial in heart transplant candidates. *Psychother Psychosom* 1991;55:141-4.
203. Conway A, Schadowaldt V, Clark R, et al. The psychological experiences of adult heart transplant recipients: a systematic review and meta-summary of qualitative findings. *Heart Lung* 2013;42:449-55.
204. Abshire M, Prichard R, Cajita M, et al. Adaptation and coping in patients living with an LVAD: a metasynthesis. *Heart Lung* 2016;45:397-405.
205. Tong A, Howell M, Wong G, et al. The perspectives of kidney transplant recipients on medicine taking: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2011;26:344-54.
206. Spaderna H, Mendell NR, Zahn D, et al. Social isolation and depression predict 12-month outcomes in the "waiting for a new heart study.". *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2010;29:247-54.
207. Spaderna H, Weidner G, Koch KC, et al. Medical and psychosocial predictors of mechanical circulatory support device implantation and competing outcomes in the Waiting for a New Heart Study. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2012;31:16-26.

208. Weidner G, Zahn D, Mendell NR, et al. Patients' sex and emotional support as predictors of death and clinical deterioration in the Waiting for a New Heart Study: results from the 1-year follow-up. *Prog Transplant* 2011;21:106-14.
209. DeVito Dabbs A, Terhorst L, Song MK, et al. Quality of recipient-caregiver relationship and psychological distress are correlates of self-care agency after lung transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2013;27:113-20.
210. Teichman BJ, Burkner EJ, Weiner M, et al. Factors associated with adherence to treatment regimens after lung transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2000;10:113-21.
211. Evon DM, Burkner EJ, Sedway JA, et al. Tobacco and alcohol use in lung transplant candidates and recipients. *Clin Transplant* 2005;19:207-14.
212. Mollberg NM, Farjah F, Howell E, et al. Impact of primary caregivers on long-term outcomes after lung transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:59-64.
213. Tam V, Arnaoutakis GJ, George TJ, et al. Marital status improves survival after orthotopic heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2011;30:1389-94.
214. Dew MA, Kormos RL, DiMartini AF, et al. Prevalence and risk of depression and anxiety-related disorders during the first three years after heart transplantation. *Psychosomatics* 2001;42:300-13.
215. Dew MA, Myaskovsky L, Switzer GE, et al. Profiles and predictors of the course of psychological distress across four years after heart transplantation. *Psychol Med* 2005;35:1215-27.
216. Bruce CR, Minard CG, Wilhelms LA, et al. Caregivers of patients with left ventricular assist devices: possible impacts on patients' mortality and Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support–defined morbidity events. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2017;10:e002879.
217. Koeckert M, Vining P, Reyentovich A, et al. Caregiver status and outcomes after durable left ventricular assist device implantation. *Heart Lung* 2017;46:74-8.
218. Institute of Medicine. In: Nielsen-Bohlman L, Panzer AM, Kindig DA, editors. *Health literacy: a prescription to end confusion*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2004.
219. Evangelista LS, Rasmusson KD, Laramie AS, et al. Health literacy and the patient with heart failure—implications for patient care and research: a consensus statement of the Heart Failure Society of America. *J Card Fail* 2010;16:9-16.
220. Sadeghi S, Brooks D, Stagg-Peterson S, et al. Growing awareness of the importance of health literacy in individuals with COPD. *J Chron Obstruct Pulm Dis* 2013;10:72-8.
221. Wu JR, Holmes GM, DeWalt DA, et al. Low literacy is associated with increased risk of hospitalization and death among individuals with heart failure. *J Gen Intern Med* 2013;28:1174-80.
222. Cajita MI, Denhaerynck K, Dobbels F, et al. Health literacy in heart transplantation: prevalence, correlates and associations with health behaviors—findings from the international BRIGHT study. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2017;36:272-9.
223. Gordon EJ, Wolf MS. Health literacy skills of kidney transplant recipients. *Prog Transplant* 2009;19:25-34.
224. Grady KL, Wang E, Higgins R, et al. Symptom frequency and distress from 5 to 10 years after heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2009;28:759-68.
225. Serper M, Patzer RE, Reese PP, et al. Medication misuse, nonadherence, and clinical outcomes among liver transplant recipients. *Liver Transplant* 2015;21:22-8.
226. Weng FL, Chandwani S, Kurtyka KM, et al. Prevalence and correlates of medication non-adherence among kidney transplant recipients more than 6 months post-transplant: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Nephrol* 2013;14:261.
227. White-Williams C, Grady KL, Naftel DC, et al. The relationship of socio-demographic factors and satisfaction with social support at five and 10 yr after heart transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2013;27:267-73.
228. Allen JG, Arnaoutakis GJ, Orens JB, et al. Insurance status is an independent predictor of long-term survival after lung transplantation in the United States. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2011;30:45-53.
229. Allen JG, Weiss ES, Arnaoutakis GJ, et al. Insurance and education predict long-term survival after orthotopic heart transplantation in the United States. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2012;31:52-60.
230. Emami S, Tumin D, Foraker RE, et al. Impact of insurance status on heart transplant wait-list mortality for patients with left ventricular assist devices. *Clin Transplant* 2017;31:e12875.
231. Foraker RE, Tumin D, Smith S, et al. Insurance status by region at the time of heart transplantation: implications for survival. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:1480-6.
232. Clerkin KJ, Garan AR, Wayda B, et al. Impact of socioeconomic status on patients supported with a left ventricular assist device: an analysis of the UNOS database (United Network for Organ Sharing). *Circ Heart Fail* 2016;9:e003215.
233. DuBay DA, MacLennan PA, Reed RD, et al. Insurance type and solid organ transplantation outcomes: a historical perspective on how Medicaid expansion might impact transplantation outcomes. *J Am Coll Surg* 2016;223:611-20.
234. Evans JD, Kaptoge S, Caleyachetty R, et al. Socioeconomic deprivation and survival after heart transplantation in England: an analysis of the United Kingdom Transplant Registry. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2016;9:695-703.
235. Merlo CA, Clark SC, Arnaoutakis GJ, et al. National healthcare delivery systems in unence lung transplant outcomes for cystic fibrosis. *Am J Transplant* 2015;15:1948-57.
236. Singh TP, Givertz MM, Semigran M, et al. Socioeconomic position, ethnicity, and outcomes in heart transplant recipients. *Am J Cardiol* 2010;105:1024-9.
237. Smith SA, Hasan A, Binkley PF, et al. The impact of insurance and socioeconomic status on outcomes for patients with left ventricular assist devices. *J Surg Res* 2014;191:302-8.
238. Brown DW, Anda RF, Tiemeier H, et al. Adverse childhood experiences and the risk of premature mortality. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;37:389-96.
239. Campbell JA, Walker RJ, Egede LE. Associations between adverse childhood experiences, high-risk behaviors, and morbidity in adulthood. *Am J Prev Med* 2016;50:344-52.
240. Husarewycz MN, El-Gabalawy R, Logsetty S, et al. The association between number and type of traumatic life experiences and physical conditions in a nationally representative sample. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;36:26-32.
241. Kershaw KN, Brenes GA, Charles LE, et al. Associations of stressful life events and social strain with incident cardiovascular disease in the Women's Health Initiative. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2014;3:e000687.
242. Su S, Jimenez MP, Roberts CTF, et al. The role of adverse childhood experiences in cardiovascular disease risk: a review with emphasis on plausible mechanisms. *Curr Cardiol Rep* 2015;17:88.
243. Kennedy CC, Zubair A, Clark MM, et al. Childhood abuse is associated with worse survival following lung transplantation. *Prog Transplant* 2016;26:178-82.
244. Casida JM, Peters RM, Mangan MA. Self-care demands of persons living with an implantable left-ventricular assist device. *Res Theory Nurs Pract* 2009;23:279-93.
245. Gandhi J, McCue A, Cole R. Nonadherence in the advanced heart failure population. *Curr Heart Fail Rep* 2016;13:77-85.
246. Kato N, Jaarsma T, Ben Gal T. Learning self-care after left ventricular assist device implantation. *Curr Heart Fail Rep* 2014;11:290-8.
247. Slaughter MS, Pagani FD, Rogers JG, et al. Clinical management of continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices in advanced heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2010;29(suppl):S1-39.
248. Allen LA, Ambardekar AV. Hashing it out over cannabis: moving toward a standard guideline on substance use for cardiac transplantation eligibility that includes marijuana. *Circ Heart Fail* 2016;9:e003330.
249. Neyer J, Uberoi A, Hamilton M, et al. Marijuana and listing for heart transplant: a survey of transplant providers. *Circ Heart Fail* 2016;9:002851.
250. Boothroyd LJ, Lambert LJ, Ducharme A, et al. Challenge of informing patient decision making: what can we tell patients considering long-term mechanical circulatory support about out-

- comes, daily life, and end-of-life issues? *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2014;7:179-87.
251. Gaviria M, Pliskin N, Kney A. Cognitive impairment in patients with advanced heart failure and its implications on decision-making capacity. *Congest Heart Fail* 2011;17:175-9.
252. McIlvannan CK, Allen LA. Palliative care in patients with heart failure. *BMJ* 2016;353:i1010.
253. Wong JS, Gottwald M. Advance care planning discussions in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a critical review. *J Palliative Care* 2015;31:258-64.
254. Clark AM, Wiens KS, Banner D, et al. A systematic review of the main mechanisms of heart failure disease management interventions. *Heart* 2016;102:707-11.
255. Gordon EJ, Butt Z, Jensen SE, et al. Opportunities for shared decision making in kidney transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2013;13:1149-58.
256. Fusar-Poli P, Lazzaretti M, Ceruti M, et al. Depression after lung transplantation: causes and treatment. *Lung* 2007;185:55-65.
257. McKneally MF, Sade RM. The prisoner dilemma; Should convicted felons have the same access to heart transplantation as ordinary citizens? Opposing views. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2003;125:451-3.
258. United Network for Organ Sharing/Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Ethics Committee. Convicted criminals and transplant evaluation. Ethics Committee Position Statement. 2015. <https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/resources/ethics/convicted-criminal-s-and-transplant-evaluation/>. Accessed January 22, 2018.
259. Widmar SB, Dietrich MS, Minnick AF. How self-care education in ventricular assist device programs is organized and provided: a national study. *Heart Lung* 2014;43:25-31.
260. Allmon AL, Shaw K, Martens JL, et al. Organ transplantation: issues in assessment and treatment. The register report: Spring, 2010. The National Register of Health Service Psychologists. <https://www.nationalregister.org/pub/the-national-register-report-pub/the-register-report-spring-2010/organ-transplantation-issues-in-assessment-and-treatment/>. Accessed January 22, 2018.
261. NATCO. Core competencies for the advanced practice transplant professional. 2010. http://www.natco1.org/Professional-Development/files/Competencies/Advanced%20Practice%20%20Core%20Competencies_Final%20Web.pdf. Accessed January 22, 2018.
262. Society for Transplant Social Workers. Professional standards: core competences. <http://www.stsw.org/resources/professional-standards/>. Accessed January 22, 2018.
263. American Psychological Association. Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2017.
264. Leentjens AF, Rundell JR, Diefenbacher A, et al. Psychosomatic medicine and consultation-liaison psychiatry: scope of practice, processes, and competencies for psychiatrists or psychosomatic medicine specialists. A consensus statement of the European Association of Consultation-Liaison Psychiatry and the Academy of Psychosomatic Medicine. *Psychosomatics* 2011;52:19-25.
265. Skillings JL, Lewandowski AN. Team-based biopsychosocial care in solid organ transplantation. *J Clin Psychol Med Settings* 2015;22:113-21.
266. Crone CC, Marcangelo MJ, Shuster JL. An approach to the patient with organ failure: transplantation and end-of-life treatment decisions. *Med Clin N Am* 2010;94:1241-54.
267. Fusar-Poli P, Picchioni M, Martinelli V, et al. Anti-depressive therapies after heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2006;25:785-93.
268. DeVito Dabbs A, Song MK, Myers BA, et al. A randomized controlled trial of a mobile health intervention to promote self-management after lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2016;16:2172-80.
269. Dobbels F, De Bleser L, Berben L, et al. Efficacy of a medication adherence enhancing intervention in transplantation: the MAESTRO-Tx trial. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2017;36:499-508.
270. De Bleser L, Matteson M, Dobbels F, et al. Interventions to improve medication-adherence after transplantation: a systematic review. *Transpl Int* 2009;22:780-97.
271. Nevins TE, Nickerson PW, Dew MA. Understanding medication nonadherence after kidney transplant. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017;28:2290-301.