

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Determinants of Patient Attitudes toward Advance Directives: A Comparison of 649 Private Practice Outpatients versus 2158 University Clinic Outpatients

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015708
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Pfirstinger, Jochen; Klinikum St. Marien, Medizinische Klinik II Bleyer, Bernhard; Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Amberg-Weiden, Institut für Nachhaltigkeit in Technik und Wirtschaft Blum, Christian; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik I Rechenmacher, Michael; Universitätsklinikum Regensburg Klinik und Poliklinik für Innere Medizin III Wiese, Christoph; Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Klinik für Anästhesiologie und Intensivmedizin Gruber, Hans; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik III
Primary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice, Ethics
Keywords:	end-of-life decisions, advance care planning, advance directive, living will, patient autonomy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

Determinants of Patient Attitudes toward Advance Directives: A Comparison of 649 Private
Practice Outpatients versus 2158 University Clinic Outpatients

Jochen Pfirstinger^{1,2*}, Bernhard Bleyer^{3,4}, Christian Blum⁵, Michael Rechenmacher²,
Christoph Wiese^{6,7}, and Hans Gruber^{5,8}

¹Department of Internal Medicine II, St. Marien Hospital Amberg, Germany

²Department of Hematology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

³Institute of Sustainability, OTH Amberg-Weiden, Germany

⁴Faculty of Catholic Theology, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁵Department of Educational Science, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁶Department of Anaesthesiology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

⁷Department of Anaesthesiology, Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Braunschweig, Germany

⁸Faculty of Education, University of Turku, Finland

Original Paper submitted to BMJ Open

*Corresponding author: Dr. med. Jochen Pfirstinger, Klinikum St. Marien Amberg,
Medizinische Klinik II, Mariahilfbergweg 7, D-92224 Amberg, Germany
email: pfirstinger.jochen@klinikum-amberg.de

Abstract

Objectives: To assess determinants of patient attitudes toward Advance Directives (AD), comparing participants from private practices and from university clinics with the assumptions, that both groups will not differ significantly and that prior experience with severe disease – own or in close relatives – as one of the strongest ways of gaining experience leads to an increase in completed living wills.

Setting: Group comparison of a) outpatients from private practices and from university clinics, b) participants with or without completed AD

Participants: 649 from private practices and 2158 from ten departments of a university hospital

Outcome measures: completed AD, AD information sources, consultation about AD, prior experiences with severe disease, motives for or against AD completion, socio-demographic data

Results: Attitudes towards AD did not differ between private practice vs. university hospital outpatients. Prior experience with severe disease lead to a significantly higher rate of completed living wills (33%/36% with vs. 24%/24% without experience with own disease/disease in close relatives). Participants with completed AD had more often received legal than medical consultation before completion, but participants without completed AD are rather aiming for medical consultation. The motives for or against completing an AD indicated inconsistent attitudes.

Conclusions: Attitudes towards AD are comparable in outpatients from private practices and from university hospitals. Only one third of patients with prior experience with severe disease had completed a living will (as expression of their autonomous volition). The participants' motifs for or against completing AD indicate that ADs are considered a kind of "negative autonomy" as instruments to prevent particular forms of therapy. Advance care planning as an interactive and situation based tool might reach a higher percentage of patients and concurrently enables personal volitions and thereby strengthens individual, "positive autonomy".

Trial registration: not applicable

Strengths and limitations of this study

Our study achieved a very high number of completed questionnaires comprising many different aspects that may influence patients' attitudes towards advance directives and advance care planning.

The questionnaire has been developed from a preliminary interview study with seven different interviewers who accomplished about ten patient interviews each, but has not run through a structured validation process.

The comparison between private practice patients and university hospital outpatients proofs that generalizations from university hospital findings can be made.

On the other hand our study was conducted in a medium-sized town with rural surroundings, so that our regional findings may be inapplicable in metropolitan areas with people from many different nationalities.

Determinants of Patient Attitudes toward Advance Directives: A Comparison of 649 Private Practice Outpatients versus 2158 University Clinic Outpatients

Introduction

The concept of patient autonomy and the necessity of an informed consent for all medical interventions are fundamental principles for every interaction between patients and medical professionals. In cases of impaired decision making capacity, advance directives (ADs) can be used to express the patient's will. In Germany, ADs are regulated by the third act amending German guardianship legislation, effective September 1st, 2009. As in many other countries, ADs comprise the following legal instruments: living will and health care proxy. By completing a living will, a patient can record legally binding instructions for or against future medical interventions that would otherwise be medically indicated. Patient autonomy can also be exercised by assigning a health care proxy, who makes healthcare decisions on behalf of the patient, when he or she is incapable of making those decisions.

Despite the considerable role of patient autonomy in all medical and legal decisions, only a minority of patients complete an AD (living will and/or a health care proxy). A rate of below 40% is found in cancer patients [1-3] as well as in the elderly population [4-7]. An even lower rate is found in the general population [8-12]. Educational interventions to promote AD slightly increase the completion rate, which still remains below 50% [13-15].

A prior investigation of our group published in 2014 revealed that in almost 400 cancer patients a substantial percentage of patients who had not yet completed an AD were willing to receive AD consultations "now" or "in a few weeks", but longitudinal analyses showed that in fact none of these patients made an appointment. The same percentage of cancer patients postponed AD consultations, because an AD "is not relevant" now or they "do not want to get involved with this issue". Only a small proportion completely rejected the offer of AD consultations [16]. In summary, only a minority of all patients who visit a private

1
2
3 practice or university outpatient clinic had in advance completed an AD (living will and/or
4 health care proxy). The majority either postpone AD completion or even refuse to engage in
5 discussion of AD issues. Two main determinants that impact AD completion are age (older
6 people are more likely to have completed an AD) and duration of a cancer diagnosis (longer
7 duration is positively associated with completion of an AD) [16-18].
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 It is plausible that several factors play a role in patient attitudes and decisions
15 regarding ADs, including the level and the source of information available as well as prior
16 experiences with own serious illness or with relatives in need of care. However little is known
17 from clinical studies about these determinants [19-22]. It is still an open question, whether
18 patients have stable end-of-life preferences [23].
19
20

21
22
23
24
25 Many investigations about AD completion use convenience samples. It is an open
26 question whether samples within university clinics can be compared to samples among private
27 practice patients. Duration of diagnoses, severity of illnesses, and the professional training of
28 medical staff might contribute to differences of patient selection and thus also of AD
29 completion. Therefore, studies using samples from university clinics are at risk of producing
30 results that are not widely applicable in other settings. To our knowledge, determinants of AD
31 completion have not yet been investigated in a study that compares university clinic
32 outpatients with private practice outpatients.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 We therefore conducted a large study in several different outpatient specialty clinics of
44 a university hospital compared to a number of private community family practices in the same
45 city. Measured were the level and the source of information available, the utilisation of
46 professional consultation, prior experiences, and the motivation for or against AD completion.
47
48
49
50

51 **Method**

52 **Participants**

53
54
55
56 Eligibility criteria for participation in the study included: a minimum age of 18 years,
57 the ability to provide informed consent, and being an outpatient or a health care proxy of an
58
59
60

1
2
3 outpatient. Participants were recruited from two samples, namely patients at university
4
5 hospital outpatient specialty clinics and patients from private community family practices.
6
7 The first was a convenience sample of 2158 patients cared for at ten outpatient departments
8
9 located at a German university hospital. These included clinics for: radiotherapy, haematology
10
11 and oncology, gastroenterology, endocrinology, rheumatology, infectious diseases, surgery,
12
13 trauma surgery, cranio- and maxillo-facial surgery, neurosurgery, otorhinolaryngology,
14
15 dermatology, ophthalmology, cardiology, nephrology, and pulmonology. The second sample
16
17 was comprised of 649 participants from 18 private practices in districts neighbouring the
18
19 university hospital. The overall sample size was 2807. Table 1 shows the absolute and relative
20
21 frequencies of age, gender, type of disease and sociodemographic characteristics (marital
22
23 status, education, qualification, location) of the participants in each group.
24
25
26
27

28 -----
29
30 Insert Table 1 about here
31
32 -----
33

34 Except for gender and type of disease, the groups did not significantly differ. In the
35
36 private practice group, there was a higher proportion of female participants than in the
37
38 university clinic group ($X^2(1) = 61.31; p = .001; \Phi = .148$). The university outpatient clinic
39
40 group included more participants with a malignancy and more participants after organ
41
42 transplantation. Most participants in the private practice group had never been seriously ill (X^2
43
44 (4) = 260.23; $p = .001; V = .345$). These two variables did not confound any of the following
45
46 results.
47
48

49 Procedure and instruments

50
51 We developed a structured questionnaire based on a previous investigation of ADs in
52
53 patients with cancer [16]. In six sections, the questionnaire comprised dichotomous questions
54
55 and multiple response questions: (1) Information about the purpose of the study and request
56
57 for informed consent; (2) Socio-demographic questions (see Table 1); (3) Knowledge about
58
59
60

1
2
3 and existence of living will and health care proxy; (4) Preferences regarding with whom the
4 patient would like to consult and the convenient date for completion of an AD; (5) Prior
5 experiences with serious diseases and with living wills or health care proxies; (6) Reasons for
6 considering or rejecting advance care planning. The study was approved by the institutional
7 ethics committee at Regensburg University Hospital.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 During the survey period all patients of the above mentioned clinics and private
15 practices received the questionnaire from the clinic staff or the doctor's assistant as they
16 signed up for their medical examination. The participants were requested to read the
17 introduction and to complete the questionnaire while waiting for their appointments. At the
18 end of their visits, they returned the filled questionnaires to the registration.
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 Statistical analysis

26
27 The analyses aimed at comparing the university clinic sample and the private practice
28 sample. Data are presented in the form of proportions for categorical variables and means
29 (and standard deviations) for continuous variables. X^2 tests, the Φ coefficient, Cramer's V and
30 the Odds Ratio (OR) were used to detect statistically significant and clinically relevant group
31 differences. All reported p values are two-sided, with $p < .05$ considered as significant. Data
32 were analysed with SPSS software, version 21.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 Results

42 43 Knowledge of and prior completion of AD

44
45 Among the sample, 2594 (92%) participants (university clinics: 1993; private
46 practices: 601) were familiar with living wills and 1826 (65%) participants (university clinics:
47 1374; private practices: 452) were familiar with health care proxies. Of those who were
48 familiar with the instruments of advance care planning, 781 (30%) participants (university
49 clinics: 600; private practices: 181) had completed a living will, and 617 (34%) participants
50 (university clinics: 467; private practices: 150) had completed a health care proxy. 1783
51 (64%) participants (university clinics: 1340; private practices: 443) were familiar with both
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 instruments, of which 559 (31%) persons (university clinics: 418; private practices: 141) had
4
5 completed both a living will and a health care proxy. Thus only about one third of the
6
7 participants had previously completed a living will and/or a health care proxy. The data show
8
9 that the sampled patients were more familiar with living wills than with health care proxies.
10
11 There was no difference in prior completion of ADs between the two groups. This is
12
13 remarkable as patients from the university clinic suffer from more serious diseases (see Table
14
15 1).
16

17
18 Table 2 shows for both groups the familiarity with and the presence of living wills and
19
20 health care proxies.
21

22
23 -----
24
25 Insert Table 2 about here
26
27 -----
28

29
30 There was no substantial difference between the groups in familiarity with living wills
31
32 ($X^2(1) = 1.36; p = .242$). However, the groups significantly differed with regard to familiarity
33
34 with health care proxies ($X^2(1) = 10.21; p = .001; \Phi = .061, OR = 1.37$). Due to the small
35
36 effect size, however, this difference was considered negligible.
37

38 Consultation before completing an AD

39
40 Before completing a living will, 715 (92%) participants informed themselves. Five-
41
42 hundred-nine (65%) participants stated that they had discussed their decision to complete an
43
44 AD with a confidant several times. Another 204 (26%) participants discussed their decision
45
46 only once, and 38 (5%) participants had no conversation at all with a confidant about their
47
48 AD. In both samples, the correlation proved significant between having an AD and having
49
50 had multiple discussions with a confidant (university clinics: $X^2(2) = 395.04; p < .001; V =$
51
52 $.433$; private practices: $X^2(2) = 115.64; p < .001; V = .434$). Whereas most participants talked
53
54 at least once to another person about completing an AD, only a minority asked for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 professional advice: 173 (22%) participants consulted a physician and 280 (36%) participants
4 consulted a lawyer.
5

6
7 Participants who had not yet completed an AD (1998) reported different preferred
8 sources of information. When asked by whom they want to be counselled, 1519 (76%)
9 participants wished to be informed by a physician, whereas only 115 (6%) participants wished
10 to be informed by a lawyer.
11
12

13
14 The comparison of the samples of patients from the university clinic and from private
15 practices revealed no significant differences regarding sources of information used before
16 completing a living will (see Table 3).
17
18

19
20
21
22
23 -----
24
25 Insert Table 3 about here
26
27
28 -----

29
30 More participants from the university clinic group (143; 24%) were counselled by a
31 physician than participants from the private practice group (30; 17%). However, this finding
32 did not reach statistical significance ($X^2(1) = 3.37; p = .066; \Phi = .07$). When only participants
33 without an AD were analysed, statistically significant differences between the two groups
34 were noted. A larger percentage of participants in the private practice group, compared to the
35 university clinic group, wanted to be informed about living wills by their family physician (X^2
36 (1) = 15.49; $p = .001; \Phi = .09$, OR = 1.55). In contrast, participants from the university clinic
37 group more often wanted to be informed about living wills by a clinician ($X^2(1) = 19.19; p =$
38 .001; $\Phi = .10$, OR = 2.43). However, the effect sizes were only small. No difference between
39 the two groups could be found as to their preference to be counselled by a lawyer.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 52 Prior experiences

53
54 Prior familiarity with the instruments of advance care planning was associated with a
55 higher rate of completed living wills and health care proxies (see Table 2). Also having either
56 suffered from a life-threatening disease or cared for a dying family member was positively
57
58
59

1
2
3 associated with completion of an AD (see Table 4). More participants who had cared for a
4 relative until her/his death had completed an AD compared to participants lacking such an
5 experience ($X^2(1) = 30.70$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .10$, OR = 1.61). Similarly, participants who had
6
7 suffered from a life-threatening disease had a higher rate of completion of ADs than
8
9 participants without this experience ($X^2(1) = 40.89$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .13$, OR = 1.77).
10
11
12

13
14 -----
15
16 Insert Table 4 about here
17
18 -----
19

20
21 Although there was no difference between the two sample groups in the presence of a
22 living will, there were some differences regarding prior experiences with severe disease. More
23 participants in the private practice group had cared for a family member until her/his death
24 than participants in the university clinic group. However, the effect size was small ($X^2(1) =$
25 8.62 ; $p = .003$; $\Phi = .06$, OR = 1.31). As expected, more participants from the university clinic
26
27 group earlier had suffered from a severe disease than participants from the private practice
28
29 group ($X^2(1) = 128.56$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .22$, OR = 3.75).
30
31

32 Reported personal motives for completing a living will
33
34
35

36
37 The most frequent motive for the completion of a living will was to prevent
38 unnecessary suffering (68%), followed by the avoidance of being a burden for others (55%)
39
40 (see Table 5, multiple answers were possible).
41
42
43
44

45 -----
46
47 Insert Table 5 about here
48
49 -----
50

51
52 One third of the participants in each group reported wanting to make their own
53 decisions. A similar proportion of each group reported fearing overtreatment by physicians
54 who would otherwise be obligated to perform all possible life-preserving treatments. Further
55
56 motives were: distrust that physicians (24%) or relatives (12%) would decide in the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participant's best interest; experience with intense care for relatives (22%); and the
4
5 completion of a living will in the course of receiving legal advice (18%). No significant
6
7 differences were found between the university clinic group and the private practice group
8
9 except for the avoidance of being a burden, which was reported as a motive more often by
10
11 participants of the private practice group ($X^2(1) = 5.01$; $p = .025$; $\Phi = .08$, OR = 1.49). Due to
12
13 the small effect size there is only limited practical significance. Among those 130 participants
14
15 who completed a living will in the course of receiving legal advice, only 16 had consulted a
16
17 physician in addition.
18
19

20 21 Motives against completing a living will

22
23 "I currently do not want to deal with the issue" was the most frequently reported
24
25 motive (588; 35%) against completing a living will (see Table 6, multiple answers were
26
27 possible), followed by "I am too young" (321; 19%).
28
29

30
31 -----
32 Insert Table 6 about here
33
34 -----
35

36
37 A substantial number of participants reported that they had not completed a living will
38
39 because their "attitudes could possibly change during the progression of a disease" (279;
40
41 17%), because "medical treatment options could improve" (226; 14%), because they
42
43 "delegate the decision to specialists in an emergency" (215; 13%), because they "feel
44
45 confused by the legal regulation" (202; 12%), or because they "fear to give wrong
46
47 instructions" (176; 11%). The comparison of the patients from the university clinic group and
48
49 the patients from the private practice group revealed no relevant differences.
50

51
52 Inconsistent response patterns were revealed by cross tabulating the motives against
53
54 completing a living will with the question of when it is appropriate to complete one. Among
55
56 those participants who stated that they were currently not willing to address this issue ($N =$
57
58 555), 318 (57%) participants stated that the completion of a living will should be considered
59
60

1
2
3 early, and 145 (26%) participants agreed with the statement that a living will should be
4
5 completed no matter whether one is suffering from a disease or not. A similar pattern was
6
7 found among those who argued that they were too young to complete a living will ($N = 314$);
8
9 177 (56%) of them agreed that completing a living will should be done early, and 78 (25%)
10
11 indicated that one should complete a living will independently of the presence of a disease.
12
13

14 Discussion

15
16 The issue of patient autonomy, despite its undisputable relevance, still poses many
17
18 open questions. Many actors – both from policy and from medicine – are disappointed by the
19
20 low percentage of people who have already completed an AD. It is not trivial to investigate
21
22 the reasons preventing people from completion of an AD. In the present study, three research
23
24 questions were posed in order to get a better understanding of the issue. In order to increase
25
26 the reliability of the answers to these research questions, a large sample size was used: more
27
28 than 2800 participants were studied. First, it was investigated whether the reasons for (or
29
30 against) completing a living will resemble each other in two different groups of patients:
31
32 patients from several university clinics (many of whom suffer from serious diseases) and
33
34 patients from private practices. Attitudes toward ADs have previously been reported in
35
36 university hospital patients, but it is still an open question whether the results can easily be
37
38 generalised to a broader population. The experience of suffering from a serious disease
39
40 obviously influences the importance of making decisions related to patient autonomy [22].
41
42 Second, it was investigated to what degree professional consultation had been used before
43
44 completing an AD, and from which professional groups such advice had been acquired. In
45
46 addition, it was investigated whether those who had not completed an AD would like to
47
48 receive professional advice – and, again, by whom – before making a decision in favour of
49
50 completing a living will. Third, motives both for and against completion of a living will were
51
52 investigated.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Concerning the first research question (comparability of samples from a university
4 clinic and from private practices), few differences were found between the two groups
5 indicating that the results likely are generalisable. The sample from private practices was
6 slightly more familiar with health care proxies, but the effect size was very small. In general,
7 however, the groups did not differ significantly. These results, based on a large sample size,
8 are a strong indicator that future studies might rely on results from either of those two
9 samples. The percentage of those who had completed an AD (living will and/or health care
10 proxy) was of the same size (about 30 %) as in the general population. In both groups, the
11 percentage was a bit higher (33 %, and 36 %, respectively) among participants with prior
12 experiences of serious diseases. This matches findings from other studies [22], but still leaves
13 the question open why even those participants do not make much more use of the instruments
14 of patient autonomy. Prior experiences (either personal or related to close relatives or friends)
15 with life threatening diseases, intensive care treatment, nursing cases etc. only slightly
16 increased the rate of completed ADs, and only to a level still clearly below 50 per cent.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Concerning the second research question (professional consultation, both before
35 completion of an AD and desire in the future), our study was consistent with prior findings
36 that more than one third of the patients with completed AD received legal advice [16, 24, 25].
37 In some patients, legal consultation about living wills may be related to receiving legal
38 testament advice, as it has been shown, that patients were much more likely to complete a
39 living will or a health care proxy when asked by legal staff compared to medical staff [26].
40 Among those who have not yet completed an AD, many state their desire for professional
41 advice, with a large majority preferring medical consultation to legal advice. The results
42 match prior studies finding that almost every patient considers ADs as something very
43 important which should be completed early [1]. It should be noted that acceptance rates close
44 to 100 per cent can be found in interview data, which may reflect, what is socially desirable.
45 In contrast none of the multiple interventions to promote ADs increased the rate of completed
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ADs above 50 per cent, which may reflect that patient autonomy rests on a voluntary basis
4
5 [13]. The deviation of the patients' intention to their acting can be explained as an example of
6
7 the mind-behaviour-gap theory [27].
8

9
10 In the family practice setting patients named the family doctor as the preferred person
11
12 of trust for AD consultations. On the other hand in the university clinic setting the result was
13
14 in favour of hospital physicians. Therefore it can be concluded that patients are open to
15
16 receive AD consultations, wherever they are treated.
17

18
19 A first step to initiate discussions about ADs often is made as a by-product of other
20
21 issues, for example the case in a legal advice setting, when a testament consultation is
22
23 followed by a consultation about an AD. An important second step would be the trustful
24
25 interaction with the family doctor. The results show that many participants felt confused by
26
27 the legal regulation. In contrast to lawyers, however, family physicians do not receive a
28
29 financial incentive when they involve themselves in consultations about ADs. It is reported
30
31 that such consultation often takes a considerable amount of time, as it may easily exceed 30
32
33 minutes. Providing an adequate financial compensation to family physicians for consultation
34
35 around ADs could be a promising approach to promote completion of ADs.
36
37

38
39 Concerning the third research question (motives for or against completing a living
40
41 will), the study revealed some inconsistent response patterns that need further analysis.
42
43 Inconsistencies were revealed when cross tabulating the motives against completing a living
44
45 will with the question of when it is appropriate to complete a living will. Possible
46
47 explanations of these inconsistencies – although not deliberately investigated in the present
48
49 study – could be identified in comments which some of the participants provided voluntarily
50
51 in addition to the questionnaire answers. Among the 325 participants providing such
52
53 comments, 172 (53%) stated that they just postponed completing a living will or were simply
54
55 too idle. For example, one participant quoted: “Because I procrastinated completing a living
56
57 will up to now.” This finding was in line with the fact that among the 1998 participants, who
58
59 will up to now.” This finding was in line with the fact that among the 1998 participants, who
60

1
2
3 had not completed an AD, 1643 (82%) were willing to discuss this subject. Although most
4
5 people indicated being willing in principle to complete an AD, many did not initiate the
6
7 completion on their own. Furthermore, among those who already had completed an AD, only
8
9 231 (31%) indicated that they “wanted to make his/her own decisions”. The majority of
10
11 patients who had completed an AD had done so in reaction to distrust and fear around future
12
13 treatments [28].
14

15
16 These findings might pose new questions concerning the motivations for completing
17
18 an AD. It might be that the findings indicate a kind of “negative autonomy”: Living wills and
19
20 health care proxies might be seen mainly as instruments to prevent particular forms of
21
22 therapy, but not as instruments to design one’s own “positive autonomy”. Future studies could
23
24 investigate under which conditions patients are most motivated to think proactively about
25
26 future medical decisions. It is time for a paradigm shift in how the medical and legal
27
28 professions approach ADs. In theory, ADs provide an opportunity for patients to exercise
29
30 their autonomy and to actively engage in decisions about their future health care. In practice,
31
32 however, ADs are primarily used as a means to prevent certain unwanted treatments or in
33
34 negative reaction to prior personal experiences. The use of ADs has been largely reactive
35
36 instead of proactive. In order to increase the uptake of ADs amongst patients, it may be
37
38 necessary to reframe ADs as a means of engaging proactively in future health care decisions
39
40 rather than as a reactive tool used to prevent future unwanted experiences.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Up to this point, most attempts to increase uptake of ADs amongst patients have
47
48 focussed on educating medical or legal professionals [29, 30] rather than focusing on methods
49
50 to increase the patient’s autonomy. The empirical evidence clearly demonstrates that most of
51
52 these educational efforts have failed to successfully increase the usage of ADs by patients.
53
54 Further studies are needed to investigate whether a different approach, with a focus on
55
56 increasing patient autonomy and allowing patients to more proactively engage in decisions
57
58 about their future health care, may be more successful in increasing the number of patients
59
60

1
2
3 with a completed AD. Further investigation is also warranted into whether patients might be
4
5 more willing to engage in these decisions if the topic is presented by their trusted family
6
7 physician as part of a discussion of future autonomy.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3 I, Jochen Pfirstinger, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original
4 manuscript which includes any diagrams submitted (the “Contribution”) has the right to grant
5 on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a licence to the BMJ
6
7 Publishing Group Ltd and its licencees, to permit this Contribution (if accepted) to be
8
9 published in the BMJ and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights,
10
11 as set out in our licence set out at: [http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse)
12
13 [policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse.](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse)
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Beside the authors there are no further contributors to this work.
21
22
23

24
25 The corresponding author affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent
26
27 account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted;
28
29 and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been
30
31 explained.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Contributorship Statement

Jochen Pfirstinger initiated the study as a further development of a previous study [16], made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation, contributed to the data analysis and wrote large parts of the manuscript.

Bernhard Bleyer made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to theological and ethical aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Christian Blum conducted a preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He performed large parts of the data acquisition and of the statistical data analysis, contributed to the data interpretation, and helped correcting the manuscript.

Michael Rechenmacher and Christoph Wiese made significant contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation and helped correcting the manuscript.

Hans Gruber initiated und supervised the preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He supervised the statistical data analysis, made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to educational and learning aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

1
2
3 Funding
4
5
6

7 All authors declare that there was no funding for our study nor for the submission of our
8 manuscript.
9
10

11
12
13 Data Sharing Statement
14
15

16
17 All authors agree to make the relevant anonymised patient level data available for all
18 researchers on reasonable written request to the corresponding author.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1 Dow LA, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the
2 complex relationship of oncology patients, their physicians, and advance medical
3 directives. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:299-304.
- 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 2 McKinley ED, Garrett JM, Evans AT, Danis M. Differences in end-of-life decision making
among black and white ambulatory cancer patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1996;11:651-6.
- 3 Sahn S, Will R, Hommel G. What are cancer patients' preferences about treatment at the
end of life, and who should start talking about it? A comparison with healthy people and
medical staff. *Support Care Cancer*. 2005;13:206-14.
- 4 Eleazer GP, Hornung CA, Egbert CB, et al. The relationship between ethnicity and advance
directives in a frail older population. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44:938-43.
- 5 Morrison RS, Meier DE. High rates of advance care planning in New York City's elderly
population. *Arch Intern Med*. 2004 Dec 13-27;164(22):2421-6.
- 6 Samsi K, Manthorpe J. „I live for today“: a qualitative study investigating older people's
attitudes to advance planning. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2011 Jan;19(1):52-9. doi:
10.1111/j.1365-2524.2010.00948.x. Epub 2010 Sep 16.
- 7 Seymour J. Technology and „natural death“: a study of older people. *Z Gerontol Geriatr*.
2003 Oct;36(5):339-46.
- 8 Curtis JR. Communicating with patients and their families about advance care planning and
end-of-life care. *Respir Care*. 2000;45:1385-94.
- 9 Hickey DP. The disutility of advance directives: we know the problems, but are there
solutions? *J Health Law*. 2003 Summer;36(3):455-73.
- 10 Phipps E, True G, Harris D, et al. Approaching the end of life: attitudes, preferences, and
behaviors of African-American and white patients and their family caregivers. *J Clin
Oncol*. 2003;21:549-54.

- 1
2
3 11 Rurup ML, Onwuteaka-Philipsen BD, van der Heide A, van der Wal G, Deeg DJ.
4
5 Frequency and determinants of advance directives concerning end-of-life care in the
6
7 Netherlands. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;62:1552-63.
8
9
10 12 Teno JM. Advance directives: time to move on. *Ann Intern Med*. 2004;141:159-60.
11
12 13 Bravo G, Dubois MF, Wagneur B. Assessing the effectiveness of interventions to promote
13
14 advance directives among older adults: a systematic review and multi-level analysis. *Soc*
15
16 *Sci Med*. 2008 Oct;67(7):1122-32. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.006. Epub 2008 Jul
17
18 20. Review.
19
20
21 14 Furman CD, Head B, Lazor B, Casper B, Ritchie CS. Evaluation of an educational
22
23 intervention to encourage advance directive discussions between medicine residents and
24
25 patients. *J Palliat Med*. 2006 Aug;9(4):964-7.
26
27
28 15 Meier DE, Fuss BR, O'Rourke D, Baskin SA, Lewis M, Morrison RS. Marked
29
30 improvement in recognition and completion of health care proxies: a randomized
31
32 controlled trial of counseling by hospital patient representatives. *Arch Intern Med*.
33
34 1996;156:1227-32.
35
36
37 16 Pfirstinger J, Kattner D, Edinger M, Andreesen R, Vogelhuber M. The impact of a tumor
38
39 diagnosis on patients' attitudes toward advance directives. *Oncology*. 2014;87(4):246-56.
40
41 17 Blackhall LJ, Frank G, Murphy ST, Michel V, Palmer JM, Azen SP. Ethnicity and
42
43 attitudes towards life sustaining technology. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999;48:1779-89.
44
45
46 18 Kierner KA, Hladschik-Kermer B, Gartner V, Watzke HH. Attitudes of patients with
47
48 malignancies towards completion of advance directives. *Support Care Cancer*.
49
50 2010;18:367-72.
51
52 19 Lang FR, Wagner GG. Patient living wills in Germany: conditions for their increase and
53
54 reasons for refusal. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr*. 2007; 132:2558-62.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
4
5 health care proxies: an examination of ethnic differences. *Arch Intern Med*.
6
7 1998;158:2493-7.
8
9
10 21 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
11
12 healthcare proxy forms: a qualitative analysis of ethnic differences. *J Clin Ethics*.
13
14 1998;9:118-26.
15
16 22 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Attitudes towards and barriers to writing advance directives
17
18 amongst cancer patients, healthy controls, and medical staff. *J Med Ethics*. 2005;31:437-
19
20 40.
21
22
23 23 Auriemma CL, Nguyen CA, Bronheim R, et al. Stability of end-of-life preferences: a
24
25 systematic review of the evidence. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014 Jul;174(7):1085-92. doi:
26
27 10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.1183.
28
29
30 24 Becker M, Jaspers B, King C, Radbruch L, Voltz R, Nauck F. Did you seek assistance for
31
32 writing your advance directive? A qualitative study. *Wien Klin Wochenschr*. 2010
33
34 Nov;122(21-22):620-5. doi: 10.1007/s00508-010-1470-6. Epub 2010 Nov 12.
35
36
37 25 Bleyer B, Dörfler T, Gruber H, Dietl B, Wiese, CHR, Pfirstinger J. Wer über mich verfügt,
38
39 entscheide ich – und ein Anderer. Die Patientenverfügung und das kommunizierte
40
41 moralische Urteil. *ZME* 2013;59:297-310.
42
43
44 26 Van Scoy LJ, Howrylak J, Nguyen A, Chen M, Sherman M. Family structure, experiences
45
46 with end-of-life decision making, and who asked about advance directives impacts
47
48 advance directive completion rates. *J Palliat Med*. 2014 Oct;17(10):1099-106.
49
50
51 27 Schwarzer, R. Modeling health behavior change: how to predict and modify the adoption
52
53 and maintenance of health behaviors. *Applied Psychology*. 2008;57(1):1-29.
54
55
56 28 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Would they follow what has been laid down? Cancer
57
58 patients' and healthy controls' views on adherence to advance directives compared to
59
60 medical staff. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2005;8:297-305.

1
2
3 29 Green MJ, Levi BH. Teaching advance care planning to medical students with a computer-
4
5 based decision aid. J Cancer Educ. 2011 Mar;26(1):82-91. doi: 10.1007/s13187-010-
6
7 0146-2.
8

9
10 30 Meyer RM. Using adult learning concepts to assist patients in completing advance
11
12 directives. J Contin Educ Nurs. 2000 Jul-Aug;31(4):174-8. Review.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1 | Characteristics of participants enrolled in the study, separately for the university clinic outpatient sample and the private practice outpatient sample. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For age, the means (standard deviation in brackets) in years are given. For all other variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

Characteristics	University Clinic Outpatients ($N_1 = 2158$)	Private Practice Outpatients ($N_2 = 649$)
Age ($n_1 = 2122$; $n_2 = 622$)	52 (15)	52 (17)
Women ($n_1 = 2151$; $n_2 = 648$)	1027 (48)	423 (65)
Type of disease ($n_1 = 1746$; $n_2 = 444$)		
Tumour disease	426 (24)	30 (7)
Donor organ	165 (10)	5 (1)
Never been seriously ill	438 (25)	280 (63)
Other chronic illness	580 (33)	118 (27)
Proxy	137 (8)	11 (2)
Marital status ($n_1 = 2153$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Never married	377 (18)	119 (19)
Married/cohabitation	1508 (70)	431 (67)
Divorced	153 (7)	45 (7)
Widowed	115 (5)	48 (7)
Education ($n_1 = 2119$; $n_2 = 630$)		
Secondary education (9 grades)	982 (46)	266 (42)
Secondary education (10 grades)	645 (31)	226 (36)
A level (13 grades)	423 (20)	118 (19)
Elementary (grades 1-4)	69 (3)	20 (3)
Qualification ($n_1 = 2081$; $n_2 = 619$)		
Non-academic professional	1598 (77)	482 (78)
Academic professional	318 (15)	92 (15)
No professional qualification	165 (8)	45 (7)
Location ($n_1 = 2127$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Urban area	588 (28)	213 (33)
Rural area	1539 (72)	430 (67)

Table 2 | Familiarity with and presence of living wills and health care proxies, separately for the university clinic outpatient sample and the private practice outpatient sample. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

	University Clinic Outpatients ($N_1 = 2158$)	Private Practice Outpatients ($N_2 = 649$)
Familiarity with living will ($n_1 = 2146$; $n_2 = 638$)	1993 (93)	601 (94)
Familiarity with health care proxy ($n_1 = 2132$; $n_2 = 634$)	1374 (64)	452 (71)
Presence of a living will ($n_1 = 1990$; $n_2 = 597$)	600 (30)	181 (30)
Presence of a health care proxy ($n_1 = 1366$; $n_2 = 443$)	467 (34)	150 (34)

Table 3 | Sources of information regarding living wills, separately for the university clinic outpatient sample and the private practice outpatient sample. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

	University Clinic Outpatients with Completed Living Will ($N_1 = 600$)	Private Practice Outpatients with Completed Living Will ($N_2 = 181$)
Participant self-informed before completing a living will ($n_1 = 567$; $n_2 = 174$)	548 (97)	167 (96)
Participant discussed her/his decision with a confidant ($n_1 = 581$; $n_2 = 170$)		
Once	154 (27)	50 (29)
Several times	398 (68)	111 (65)
Participant was counselled ($n_1 = 593$; $n_2 = 174$)		
By a physician	143 (24)	30 (17)
By a lawyer	215 (36)	65 (37)
	University Clinic Outpatients ($N_1 = 2158$)	Private Practice Outpatients ($N_2 = 649$)
Participant wants to be counselled ($n_1 = 1483$; $n_2 = 428$) (multiple answers possible)		
By her/his family physician	762 (51)	266 (62)
By a medical specialist	213 (14)	35 (8)
By a clinician	215 (15)	28 (6)
By a lawyer	87 (6)	28 (6)

Table 4 | Prior experience with disease and presence of a living will. For all variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

	No Living Will	Completed Living Will
Cared for a family member until her/his death (<i>N</i> = 2672)*		
No	1097 (76)	341 (24)
Yes	822 (67)	412 (33)
Suffered from a life threatening disease once before (<i>N</i> = 2636)*		
No	1333 (76)	419 (24)
Yes	568 (64)	316 (36)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

For peer review only

Table 5 | Motives in favour of completion of a living will (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant completed a living will because ...	Total (<i>N</i> = 736)*	University Clinic Outpatients (<i>n</i> ₁ = 567)	Private Practice Outpatients (<i>n</i> ₂ = 169)
She/he does not want to suffer unnecessarily	504 (68)	385 (68)	119 (70)
She/he does not want to be a burden to anyone	402 (55)	297 (52)	105 (62)
Physicians are instructed to do everything possible to preserve one's life	250 (34)	186 (33)	64 (38)
She/he wants to make her/his own decisions	231 (31)	183 (32)	48 (28)
She/he distrusts physicians to decide in her/his best interest	178 (24)	131 (23)	47 (28)
She/he has had experiences with intense care for relatives	164 (22)	127 (22)	37 (22)
She/he completed it in the course of receiving legal advice	130 (18)	95 (17)	35 (21)
She/he distrusts her/his relatives to decide in her/his best interest	88 (12)	68 (12)	20 (11)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

Table 6 | Motives against completion of a living will (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of patients (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant did not yet complete a living will because ...	Total (<i>N</i> = 1665)*	University Clinic Outpatients (<i>n</i> ₁ = 1285)	Private Practice Outpatients (<i>n</i> ₂ = 380)
She/he currently does not want to deal with this issue	588 (35)	468 (36)	120 (32)
She/he is too young	321 (19)	246 (19)	75 (19)
Her/his attitude could change during the progression of a disease	279 (17)	222 (17)	57 (17)
Medical treatment options could improve	226 (14)	186 (15)	40 (11)
She/he delegates the decision to a specialist in case of emergency	215 (13)	172 (13)	43 (11)
She/he feels insecure with legal regulations	202 (12)	160 (12)	42 (11)
She/he fears giving the wrong instructions	176 (11)	144 (11)	32 (8)
She/he cannot appraise the listed medical treatments	136 (8)	113 (9)	23 (6)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

BMJ Open

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649 Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015708.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Aug-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Pfirstinger, Jochen; Klinikum St. Marien, Medizinische Klinik II Bleyer, Bernhard; Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Amberg-Weiden, Institut für Nachhaltigkeit in Technik und Wirtschaft Blum, Christian; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik I Rechenmacher, Michael; Universitätsklinikum Regensburg Klinik und Poliklinik für Innere Medizin III Wiese, Christoph; Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Klinik für Anästhesiologie und Intensivmedizin Gruber, Hans; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik III
Primary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice, Ethics
Keywords:	end-of-life decisions, advance care planning, advance directive, living will, patient autonomy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649
Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Jochen Pfirstinger^{1,2*}, Bernhard Bleyer^{3,4}, Christian Blum⁵, Michael Rechenmacher²,
Christoph Wiese^{6,7}, and Hans Gruber^{5,8}

¹Department of Internal Medicine II, St. Marien Hospital Amberg, Germany

²Department of Hematology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

³Institute of Sustainability, OTH Amberg-Weiden, Germany

⁴Faculty of Catholic Theology, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁵Department of Educational Science, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁶Department of Anaesthesiology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

⁷Department of Anaesthesiology, Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Braunschweig, Germany

⁸Faculty of Education, University of Turku, Finland

*Corresponding author: Dr. med. Jochen Pfirstinger, Klinikum St. Marien Amberg,
Medizinische Klinik II, Mariahilfbergweg 7, D-92224 Amberg, Germany
email: pfirstinger.jochen@klinikum-amberg.de

Abstract

Objectives: To compare outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a university clinic regarding the determinants of completion of Advance Directives (AD) in order to generalise results of studies from one setting to the other. Five determinants of completion of AD were studied: familiarity, source of information, prior experiences with own life-threatening diseases, and motives in favour and against completion of AD.

Design: Observational cross-sectional study

Setting: Private practices and a university clinic in Germany in 2012

Participants: 649 outpatients from private practices and 2158 outpatients from ten departments of a university clinic

Outcome measures: Completion of AD, familiarity, sources of information, prior experiences (with life-threatening disease), motives in favour of or against completion, socio-demographic data

Results: Determinants of completion of AD did not differ between outpatients from private practices vs. university clinic outpatients. Prior experience with severe disease led to a significantly higher rate of completion of AD (33%/36% with vs. 24%/24% without prior experience). Participants with completion of AD had more often received legal than medical consultation before completion, but participants without completion of AD are rather aiming for medical consultation. The motives in favour of or against completion of AD indicated inconsistent patterns.

Conclusions: Determinants of completion of AD are comparable in outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a university clinic. Generalisations from university clinic samples towards a broader context thus seem to be legitimate. Only one third of patients with prior experience with life-threatening diseases had completed an AD as expression of their autonomous volition. The participants' motives for or against completion indicate that ADs are considered a kind of "negative autonomy" as instruments to prevent particular forms of therapy. Interactive, repeated and situation based AD discussions might reach a higher percentage of patients and concurrently enable personal volitions and thereby strengthen individual "positive autonomy".

Trial registration: not applicable

Strengths and limitations of this study

Our study includes a very large number of completed questionnaires regarding determinants of completion of AD.

The questionnaire had been developed from a previous study and had been refined in a preliminary interview study, but has not run through a structured validation process.

The comparison between outpatients from private practices and university clinic outpatients indicates that generalisations from university clinic samples towards a broader context seem to be legitimate.

On the other hand our study was conducted in a medium-sized town with rural surroundings, so that our regional findings may be inapplicable in metropolitan areas with people from many different nationalities.

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649 Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Introduction

Life threatening diseases and end of life decisions are an existential challenge for the relationship between patients and physicians. The physicians consider the indication of a medical intervention taking into account the principles of beneficence, best interests and futility. The relationship between patients and doctors has changed over the last decades from a paternalistic role model, where always the doctor decides what is best for a patient, to a patient centred model, where autonomous patients are being informed by their doctors and then reach their own decisions. However, in end of life situations clinical experience has shown that the majority of patients use their autonomy for the prevention of e.g. suffering or getting connected to machines representing a kind of “negative autonomy”. The concept of patient autonomy and the necessity of an informed consent for all medical interventions have become the fundamental principles for every interaction between patients and medical professionals. In cases of impaired decision making capacity, Advance Directives (ADs) can be used to express the patient’s will. In Germany, ADs are regulated by the third act amending German guardianship legislation, effective September 1st, 2009. As in many other countries, ADs comprise the following legal instruments: living will and health care proxy. By completing a living will, a patient can record legally binding instructions for or against future medical interventions that would otherwise be medically indicated. Patient autonomy can also be exercised by assigning a health care proxy, who makes healthcare decisions on behalf of the patient, when he or she is incapable of making those decisions.

Despite the considerable role of patient autonomy in all medical and legal decisions, only a minority of patients complete an AD. A rate of less than 40% is found in cancer patients [1-3] as well as in the elderly population [4-7]. An even lower rate is found in the

1
2
3 general population [8-12]. Educational interventions to promote AD slightly increase the
4
5 completion rate, which still remains below 50% [13-15].
6

7 A prior investigation of our group published in 2014 revealed that in almost 400
8
9 cancer patients a substantial percentage of patients who had not yet completed an AD were
10
11 willing to receive AD consultations “now” or “in a few weeks”, but longitudinal analyses
12
13 showed that in fact none of these patients made an appointment. The same percentage of
14
15 cancer patients postponed AD consultations, because an AD “is not relevant” now or they “do
16
17 not want to get involved with this issue”. Only a small proportion completely rejected the
18
19 offer of AD consultations [16]. In summary, only a minority of all patients who visit a private
20
21 practice or university outpatient clinic had in advance completed an AD. The majority either
22
23 postpone completion of AD or even refuse to engage in discussion of AD issues. Two main
24
25 determinants that impact completion of AD are age (older people are more likely to have
26
27 completed an AD) and duration of a cancer diagnosis (longer duration is positively associated
28
29 with completion of an AD) [16-18].
30
31
32
33

34 It is plausible that several other determinants play a role in patient decisions regarding
35
36 the completion of ADs, including the source of information and prior experience with own
37
38 life-threatening diseases or with family members in need of care. However little is known
39
40 from clinical studies about these determinants [19-22]. It is still an open question, whether
41
42 patients have stable end-of-life preferences [23].
43
44

45 Healthcare research is usually performed either in centres like university hospitals or
46
47 in a very decentralised setting. It is an open question whether samples from university clinics
48
49 legitimately can be compared to samples from private practices providing general primary
50
51 care. Duration of diagnoses, severity of illnesses, and the professional training of medical
52
53 staff might contribute to differences of patient selection and thus also of completion of AD.
54
55 On the other hand a longterm trusting relationship to a family doctor may be a good basis for
56
57 burdensome AD discussions leading to a higher completion rate. Therefore, studies using
58
59
60

1
2
3 samples from university clinics are at risk of producing results that are not widely applicable
4
5 in other settings. To our knowledge, determinants of completion of AD have not yet been
6
7 investigated in a study that compares outpatients from a university clinic with outpatients
8
9 from private practices.
10

11 We therefore conducted a study in a university clinic and in private practices in the
12 same city. The objectives were to compare outpatients from private practices and outpatients
13 from a university clinic regarding their familiarity with AD, their source of information about
14 AD, their prior experience with own life-threatening disease or family members in need for
15 care, and their motives in favour and against completion of AD.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Method**

23 **Design**

24
25 The study was conducted as an observational cross-sectional study. Two groups of
26
27 participants were compared, outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a
28
29 university clinic.
30
31

32 **Participants**

33
34 Eligibility criteria for participation in the study included: a minimum age of 18 years, the
35
36 ability to provide informed consent, and being an outpatient. Participants were either
37
38 outpatients from a university clinic or outpatients from private practices. The university clinic
39
40 group was a convenience sample of 2158 outpatients cared for at ten outpatient departments
41
42 located at a German university clinic. These included clinics for: radiotherapy, haematology
43
44 and oncology, gastroenterology, endocrinology, rheumatology, infectious diseases, surgery,
45
46 trauma surgery, cranio- and maxillo-facial surgery, neurosurgery, otorhinolaryngology,
47
48 dermatology, ophthalmology, cardiology, nephrology, and pulmonology. The private
49
50 practices group was a convenience sample of 649 outpatients from 18 private practices in the
51
52 same city as the university clinic. The overall sample size was 2807.
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Procedure and instruments**

1
2
3 Based on items from a literature search and from a previous investigation about ADs
4 in patients with cancer [16] we developed a preliminary questionnaire, which was applied in
5 an interview study with 70 patients. After deletion of redundant or inappropriate
6 questionnaire, which in six sections comprised dichotomous questions and multiple response
7 questions: (1) Information about the purpose of the study and request for informed consent;
8 (2) socio-demographic questions (see Table 1); (3) familiarity with and existence of AD; (4)
9 questions about preferences regarding sources of information (e.g. whom the patient would
10 like to consult about completion of an AD); (5) questions about prior experiences with own
11 life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care; (6) questions about motives in
12 favour of or against the completion of AD. The final version of the questionnaire listed 10
13 different motives in favour and 13 motives against the completion of AD with multiple
14 answers allowed. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee at the
15 Regensburg University Hospital.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 During March to June 2012, all patients of the above-mentioned university clinics and
33 private practices received the questionnaire from the clinic staff or the doctor's assistant as
34 they signed up for their medical examination. The participants were requested to read the
35 introduction and to complete the questionnaire while waiting for their appointment. At the end
36 of their visits, they returned the filled questionnaires to the registration.

37 38 39 40 41 42 43 Statistical analysis

44
45 The analyses aimed at comparing the university clinic group and the private practice
46 group regarding the determinants of completion of AD (familiarity with AD, source of
47 information about AD, prior experience with own life-threatening disease or family members
48 in need for care, and motives in favour of and against completion of AD). Data are presented
49 in the form of proportions for categorical variables and means (and standard deviations) for
50 continuous variables. X^2 tests, the Φ coefficient, Cramer's V and the Odds Ratio (OR) were
51 used to detect statistically significant and clinically relevant group differences. All reported p

values are two-sided, with $p < .05$ considered as significant. Data were analysed with SPSS software, version 21.

Results

The results are presented in the following order. After providing descriptive information on the two groups, outpatients from a university clinic and outpatients from private practices, the results concerning the comparison of the two group regarding determinants of completion of AD are displayed (familiarity with AD, source of information about AD, prior experience with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care, motives in favour of and against completion of AD).

Descriptives

Table 1 shows the absolute and relative frequencies of age, gender, type of disease and socio-demographic characteristics (marital status, education, qualification, location) of the participants in each group.

Insert Table 1 about here

Except for gender and type of disease, the groups did not significantly differ. In the private practice group, there was a higher proportion of female participants than in the university clinic group ($X^2(1) = 61.31; p = .001; \Phi = .148$). The university clinic group included more participants with a malignancy and more participants after organ transplantation. Most participants in the private practice group had never been seriously ill ($X^2(4) = 260.23; p = .001; V = .345$). These two variables did not confound any of the following results.

Familiarity with AD, completion of AD

Among the sample, 2594 (92%) participants (university clinic: 1993; private practices: 601) were familiar with living wills, 1826 (65%) participants (university clinic: 1374; private practices: 452) with health care proxies, the two forms of AD. Of those who were familiar

1
2
3 with the instruments of advance directives, 781 (30%) participants (university clinic: 600;
4 private practices: 181) had completed a living will, and 617 (34%) participants (university
5 clinic: 467; private practices: 150) had completed a health care proxy. 1783 (64%)
6 participants (university clinic: 1340; private practices: 443) were familiar with both
7 instruments, of which 559 (20%) persons (university clinic: 418; private practices: 141) had
8 completed both a living will and a health care proxy. Thus only about one third of the
9 participants had previously completed a living will and/or a health care proxy. The data show
10 that the sampled outpatients were more familiar with living wills than with health care
11 proxies. There was no difference in completion of AD between the two groups. .

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Table 2 shows for both groups the familiarity with AD and the presence of AD.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Table 2 about here

There was no substantial difference between the groups in familiarity with living wills ($X^2(1) = 1.36; p = .242$). However, the groups significantly differed with regard to familiarity with health care proxies ($X^2(1) = 10.21; p = .001; \Phi = .061, OR = 1.37$). Due to the small effect size, however, this difference was considered negligible.

Source of information for completion of AD

Before completion of AD, 715 (92%) participants informed themselves. Five-hundred-nine (65%) participants stated that they had discussed their decision to complete an AD with a confidant several times. Another 204 (26%) participants discussed their decision only once, and 38 (5%) participants had no conversation at all with a confidant about their AD. In both samples, the correlation proved significant between having an AD and having had multiple discussions with a confidant (university clinic: $X^2(2) = 395.04; p < .001; V = .433$; private practices: $X^2(2) = 115.64; p < .001; V = .434$). Whereas most participants talked at least once

1
2
3 to another person about completion of AD, only a minority asked for professional advice: 173
4
5 (22%) participants consulted a physician and 280 (36%) participants consulted a lawyer.

6
7 Participants who had not yet completed an AD (1998) reported different preferred
8
9 sources of information. When asked by whom they want to be counselled, 1519 (76%)
10
11 participants wished to be informed by a physician, whereas only 115 (6%) participants wished
12
13 to be informed by a lawyer.
14

15
16 The comparison of the samples of outpatients from a university clinic and outpatients
17
18 from private practices revealed no significant differences regarding sources of information
19
20 used before completion of AD (see Table 3).
21

22
23 -----
24
25 Insert Table 3 about here
26
27 -----
28

29
30 More participants from the university clinic group (143; 24%) were counselled by a
31
32 physician than participants from the private practice group (30; 17%). However, this finding
33
34 did not reach statistical significance ($X^2(1) = 3.37; p = .066; \Phi = .07$). When only participants
35
36 without completion of AD were analysed, statistically significant differences between the two
37
38 groups were noted. A larger percentage of participants in the private practice group, compared
39
40 to the university clinic group, wanted to be informed about AD by their family physician (X^2
41
42 (1) = 15.49; $p = .001; \Phi = .09$, OR = 1.55). In contrast, participants from the university clinic
43
44 group more often wanted to be informed about AD by a clinician ($X^2(1) = 19.19; p = .001; \Phi$
45
46 = .10, OR = 2.43). However, the effect sizes were only small. No difference between the two
47
48 groups could be found as to their preference to be counselled by a lawyer.
49

50 51 **Prior experiences with own life-threatening disease or family members in need for care**

52
53 Prior familiarity with the instruments of advance care planning was associated with a
54
55 higher rate of completion of AD (see Table 2). Also having either suffered from a life-
56
57 threatening disease or cared for a dying family member was positively associated with
58
59

1
2
3 completion of AD (see Table 4). More participants who had cared for a relative until her/his
4
5 death had completed an AD compared to participants lacking such an experience ($X^2(1) =$
6
7 $30.70; p = .001; \Phi = .10, OR = 1.61$). Similarly, participants who had suffered from an own
8
9 life-threatening disease had a higher rate of completion of AD than participants without this
10
11 experience ($X^2(1) = 40.89; p = .001; \Phi = .13, OR = 1.77$).
12

13
14 -----
15
16 Insert Table 4 about here
17
18 -----
19

20
21 Although there was no significant difference between the two sample groups in the
22
23 presence of an AD, differences were found regarding prior experience with own life-
24
25 threatening diseases. More participants in the private practice group had cared for a family
26
27 member until her/his death than participants in the university clinic group. However, the
28
29 effect size was small ($X^2(1) = 8.62; p = .003; \Phi = .06, OR = 1.31$). As expected, more
30
31 participants from the university clinic group earlier had suffered from a life-threatening
32
33 disease than participants from the private practice group ($X^2(1) = 128.56; p = .001; \Phi = .22,$
34
35 $OR = 3.75$).
36
37

38 **Motives in favour of completion of AD**

39
40 The most frequent motive in favour of completion of AD was to prevent unnecessary
41
42 suffering (68%), followed by the avoidance of being a burden for others (55%) (see Table 5,
43
44 multiple answers were possible).
45
46

47
48 -----
49
50 Insert Table 5 about here
51
52 -----
53

54
55 One third of the participants in each group reported wanting to make their own
56
57 decisions. A similar proportion of each group reported fearing overtreatment by physicians
58
59 who would otherwise be obligated to perform all possible life-preserving treatments. Further
60

1
2
3 motives were: distrust that physicians (24%) or relatives (12%) would decide in the
4 participant's best interest; experience with intense care for relatives (22%); and the
5 completion of a living will in the course of receiving legal advice (18%). No significant
6 differences were found between the university clinic group and the private practice group
7 except for the avoidance of being a burden, which was reported as a motive more often by
8 participants of the private practice group ($X^2(1) = 5.01; p = .025; \Phi = .08, OR = 1.49$). Due to
9 the small effect size there is only limited practical significance. Among those 130 participants
10 who completed an AD in the course of receiving legal advice, only 16 had consulted a
11 physician in addition.

22 **Motives against completion of AD**

23
24
25 "I currently do not want to deal with the issue" was the most frequently reported
26 motive (588; 35%) against completion of AD (see Table 6, multiple answers were possible),
27 followed by "I am too young" (321; 19%).
28
29
30

31
32 -----
33
34 Insert Table 6 about here
35
36 -----
37

38 A substantial number of participants reported that they had not completed an AD
39 because their "attitudes could possibly change during the progression of a disease" (279;
40 17%), because "medical treatment options could improve" (226; 14%), because they
41 "delegate the decision to specialists in an emergency" (215; 13%), because they "feel
42 confused by the legal regulation" (202; 12%), or because they "fear to give wrong
43 instructions" (176; 11%). The comparison of the patients from the university clinic group and
44 the patients from the private practice group revealed no relevant differences.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Inconsistent response patterns were revealed by cross tabulating the motives against
55 completion of AD with the question of when it is appropriate to complete one. Among those
56 participants who stated that they were currently not willing to address this issue ($N = 555$),
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 318 (57%) participants stated that the completion of AD should be considered early, and 145
4
5 (26%) participants agreed with the statement that an AD should be completed no matter
6
7 whether one is suffering from a disease or not. A similar pattern was found among those who
8
9 argued that they were too young to complete an AD ($N = 314$); 177 (56%) of them agreed that
10
11 completion of AD should be done early, and 78 (25%) indicated that one should complete an
12
13 AD independently of the presence of a disease.
14

15 **Discussion**

16
17 The issue of patient autonomy, despite its undisputable relevance, still poses many
18
19 open questions. Many actors – both from policy and from medicine – are disappointed by the
20
21 low percentage of people who have already completed an AD. It is not trivial to investigate
22
23 the reasons preventing people from completion of AD. In the present study, a number of
24
25 attempts were undertaken in order to better understand the issue. First, a large sample size was
26
27 used in order to increase the reliability and trustworthiness of the answers provided by the
28
29 participants: more than 2800 participants were studied. Second, the major research question
30
31 was to investigate whether the motives in favour of or against completion of AD resembled
32
33 each other in two different groups of patients: outpatients from a university clinic (many of
34
35 whom suffer from life-threatening diseases) and outpatients from private practices.
36
37 Determinants of completion of AD previously mainly have been studied with in university
38
39 clinic patients, but it is still an open question whether the results can legitimately be
40
41 generalised towards a broader population, thus addressing the societal need to broadly discuss
42
43 the issue of AD. A number of reasons were mentioned in prior research indicating that the
44
45 experience of suffering from a life-threatening disease might influence the importance of
46
47 making decisions related to patient autonomy [22]. The results show, however, that
48
49 outpatients from a university clinic do not significantly differ from outpatients from private
50
51 practices regarding most determinants of completion of AD. A broad number of such
52
53 determinants was investigated, among them the sources of information about AD, i.e. to what
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 degree professional consultation had been sought before completion of AD, and from which
4
5 professional groups such advice had been sought. In addition, it was investigated whether
6
7 those without completion of AD would like to receive professional advice – and, again, by
8
9 whom – before making a decision in favour of completion of AD. Motives both in favour of
10
11 and against completion of AD were investigated.
12

13
14 Concerning the comparability of samples from a university clinic and from private
15
16 practices, and thus of the generalisability of results, few differences were found between the
17
18 two groups indicating that the results legitimately may be generalised. The group of
19
20 outpatients from private practices was slightly more familiar with health care proxies, but the
21
22 effect size was very small. In general, however, the groups did not differ significantly. These
23
24 results, based on a large sample size, are a strong indicator that future studies might rely on
25
26 results from either of those two samples. The percentage of those who had completed an AD
27
28 was of the same size (about 30 %) as in the general population. In both groups, the percentage
29
30 was a bit higher (33 %, and 36 %, respectively) among participants with prior experience of
31
32 own life-threatening diseases. This matches findings from other studies [22], but still leaves
33
34 the question open why even those participants do not make much more use of the instruments
35
36 of patient autonomy. Prior experience (either individual or related to one's family) with life-
37
38 threatening diseases, intensive care treatment, nursing cases etc. only slightly increased the
39
40 rate of completion of ADs, and only to a level still clearly below 50 per cent.
41
42
43
44

45 Concerning the question of seeking professional consultation, both before completion
46
47 of AD and the intention of completion in the future, our study was consistent with prior
48
49 findings that more than one third of the patients with completion of AD had received legal
50
51 advice [16, 24, 25]. In some patients, legal consultation about AD may be related to receiving
52
53 legal testament advice, as it has been shown, that patients were much more likely to complete
54
55 an AD when asked by legal staff compared to medical staff [26]. Among those who have not
56
57 yet completed an AD, many stated their desire for professional advice, with a large majority
58
59
60

1
2
3 preferring medical consultation to legal advice. The results match prior studies finding that
4 almost every patient considers ADs as something very important which should be completed
5 early [1]. It should be noted that acceptance rates for completion of AD close to 100 per cent
6 can be found in interview data, which may reflect, what is socially desirable. In contrast none
7 of the multiple interventions to promote completion of AD increased the rate above 50 per
8 cent, which may reflect that patient autonomy rests on a voluntary basis [13]. The deviation of
9 the patients' intention to their acting can be explained as an example of the mind-behaviour-
10 gap theory [27].

11
12 In the group of outpatients from private practices, the family doctor frequently was
13 named as the preferred person of trust for AD consultations. On the other hand in the
14 university clinic setting the result was in favour of hospital physicians. Therefore it can be
15 concluded that patients are open to receive AD consultations, wherever they are treated.

16
17 A first step to initiate discussions about ADs often is made as a by-product of other
18 issues, for example the case in a legal advice setting, when a testament consultation is
19 followed by a consultation about an AD. An important second step would be the trustful
20 interaction with the family doctor. The results show that many participants felt confused by
21 the legal regulation. In contrast to lawyers, however, family physicians do not receive a
22 financial incentive when they involve themselves in consultations about ADs. It is reported
23 that such consultation often takes a considerable amount of time, as it may easily exceed 30
24 minutes. Providing an adequate financial compensation to family physicians for consultation
25 around ADs could be a promising approach to promote completion of ADs.

26
27 Concerning the motives in favour of or against completion of AD, the study revealed
28 some inconsistent response patterns that need further analysis or even a fresh theoretical
29 perspective on the issue. Inconsistencies were revealed when cross tabulating the motives
30 against completion of AD with the question of when it is appropriate to complete an AD.
31 Possible explanations of these inconsistencies – although not deliberately investigated in the

1
2
3 present study – could be identified in comments which some of the participants provided
4 voluntarily in addition to the questionnaire answers. Among the 325 participants providing
5 such comments, 172 (53%) stated that they just postponed completion of AD or were simply
6 too idle. For example, one participant quoted: “Because I procrastinated completing a living
7 will up to now.” This finding was in line with the fact that among the 1998 participants
8 without completion of AD, 1643 (82%) were willing to discuss this issue. Although most
9 participants indicated being willing in principle to complete an AD, many did not initiate the
10 completion on their own. Furthermore, among those who already had completed an AD, only
11 231 (31%) indicated that they “wanted to make his/her own decisions”. The majority of
12 patients who had completed an AD had done so in reaction to distrust and fear around future
13 treatments [28].

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

These findings might pose new questions concerning the motives for completion of AD. It might be that the findings indicate a kind of “negative autonomy”: Living wills and health care proxies might be seen mainly as instruments to prevent particular forms of therapy, but not as instruments to design one’s own “positive autonomy”. Our preceding interview study (not published) revealed, that the majority of patients consider living wills and health care proxies as something unpleasant, which must be done – somewhen in the future – but not as a chance to actively take control of their lives. The questionnaire items were developed as a result of the interviews and were formulated to elicit positive and negative motives concerning completion of AD. Our underlying intention was, to find out whether patients attitudes towards completion of AD could be influenced positively to achieve a higher completion rate. Future studies could investigate under which conditions patients are most motivated to think proactively about future medical decisions. This, however, would require a paradigm shift both in underlying research and in the practices how medical and legal professionals approach the issue of completion of AD. In theory, AD provide an opportunity for patients to exercise their autonomy and to actively engage in

1
2
3 decisions about their future health care. In practice, however, ADs are primarily used as a
4
5 means to prevent certain unwanted treatments or in negative reaction to prior personal
6
7 experiences. The use of ADs has been largely reactive instead of proactive. In order to
8
9 increase the uptake of ADs amongst patients, it may be necessary to reframe ADs as a means
10
11 of engaging proactively in future health care decisions rather than as a reactive tool used to
12
13 prevent future unwanted experiences.
14

15
16 Up to this point, most attempts to increase uptake of ADs amongst patients have
17
18 focussed on educating medical or legal professionals [29, 30] rather than focusing on methods
19
20 to increase the patient's autonomy. The empirical evidence clearly demonstrates that most of
21
22 these educational efforts have failed to successfully increase the usage of ADs by patients.
23
24 Further studies are needed to investigate whether a different approach, with a focus on
25
26 increasing patient autonomy and allowing patients to more proactively engage in decisions
27
28 about their future health care, may be more successful in increasing the number of patients
29
30 with a completion of AD. Further investigation is also warranted into whether patients might
31
32 be more willing to engage in these decisions if the topic is presented by their trusted family
33
34 physician as part of a discussion of future autonomy.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 I, Jochen Pfirstinger, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original
4 manuscript which includes any diagrams submitted (the “Contribution”) has the right to grant
5 on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a licence to the BMJ
6
7 Publishing Group Ltd and its licencees, to permit this Contribution (if accepted) to be
8
9 published in the BMJ and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights,
10
11 as set out in our licence set out at: [http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse)
12
13 [policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Beside the authors there are no further contributors to this work.
22
23

24
25 The corresponding author affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent
26
27 account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted;
28
29 and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been
30
31 explained.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Contributorship Statement

Jochen Pfirstinger initiated the study as a further development of a previous study [16], made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation, contributed to the data analysis and wrote large parts of the manuscript.

Bernhard Bleyer made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to theological and ethical aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Christian Blum conducted a preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He performed large parts of the data acquisition and of the statistical data analysis, contributed to the data interpretation, and helped correcting the manuscript.

Michael Rechenmacher and Christoph Wiese made significant contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation and helped correcting the manuscript.

Hans Gruber initiated und supervised the preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He supervised the statistical data analysis, made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to educational and learning aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

1
2
3 Funding
4
5
6

7 All authors declare that there was no funding for our study nor for the submission of our
8 manuscript.
9
10

11
12
13 Data Sharing Statement
14
15

16
17 All authors agree to make the relevant anonymised patient level data available for all
18 researchers on reasonable written request to the corresponding author.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1 Dow LA, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
1 Dow LA, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
complex relationship of oncology patients, their physicians, and advance medical
directives. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:299-304.
- 2 McKinley ED, Garrett JM, Evans AT, Danis M. Differences in end-of-life decision making
among black and white ambulatory cancer patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1996;11:651-6.
- 3 Sahn S, Will R, Hommel G. What are cancer patients' preferences about treatment at the
end of life, and who should start talking about it? A comparison with healthy people and
medical staff. *Support Care Cancer*. 2005;13:206-14.
- 4 Eleazer GP, Hornung CA, Egbert CB, et al. The relationship between ethnicity and advance
directives in a frail older population. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44:938-43.
- 5 Morrison RS, Meier DE. High rates of advance care planning in New York City's elderly
population. *Arch Intern Med*. 2004 Dec 13-27;164(22):2421-6.
- 6 Samsi K, Manthorpe J. „I live for today“: a qualitative study investigating older people's
attitudes to advance planning. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2011 Jan;19(1):52-9. doi:
10.1111/j.1365-2524.2010.00948.x. Epub 2010 Sep 16.
- 7 Seymour J. Technology and „natural death“: a study of older people. *Z Gerontol Geriatr*.
2003 Oct;36(5):339-46.
- 8 Curtis JR. Communicating with patients and their families about advance care planning and
end-of-life care. *Respir Care*. 2000;45:1385-94.
- 9 Hickey DP. The disutility of advance directives: we know the problems, but are there
solutions? *J Health Law*. 2003 Summer;36(3):455-73.
- 10 Phipps E, True G, Harris D, et al. Approaching the end of life: attitudes, preferences, and
behaviors of African-American and white patients and their family caregivers. *J Clin
Oncol*. 2003;21:549-54.

- 1
2
3 11 Rurup ML, Onwuteaka-Philipsen BD, van der Heide A, van der Wal G, Deeg DJ.
4
5 Frequency and determinants of advance directives concerning end-of-life care in the
6
7 Netherlands. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;62:1552-63.
8
9
10 12 Teno JM. Advance directives: time to move on. *Ann Intern Med*. 2004;141:159-60.
11
12 13 Bravo G, Dubois MF, Wagneur B. Assessing the effectiveness of interventions to promote
13
14 advance directives among older adults: a systematic review and multi-level analysis. *Soc*
15
16 *Sci Med*. 2008 Oct;67(7):1122-32. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.006. Epub 2008 Jul
17
18 20. Review.
19
20
21 14 Furman CD, Head B, Lazor B, Casper B, Ritchie CS. Evaluation of an educational
22
23 intervention to encourage advance directive discussions between medicine residents and
24
25 patients. *J Palliat Med*. 2006 Aug;9(4):964-7.
26
27
28 15 Meier DE, Fuss BR, O'Rourke D, Baskin SA, Lewis M, Morrison RS. Marked
29
30 improvement in recognition and completion of health care proxies: a randomized
31
32 controlled trial of counseling by hospital patient representatives. *Arch Intern Med*.
33
34 1996;156:1227-32.
35
36
37 16 Pfirstinger J, Kattner D, Edinger M, Andreesen R, Vogelhuber M. The impact of a tumor
38
39 diagnosis on patients' attitudes toward advance directives. *Oncology*. 2014;87(4):246-56.
40
41 17 Blackhall LJ, Frank G, Murphy ST, Michel V, Palmer JM, Azen SP. Ethnicity and
42
43 attitudes towards life sustaining technology. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999;48:1779-89.
44
45
46 18 Kierner KA, Hladschik-Kermer B, Gartner V, Watzke HH. Attitudes of patients with
47
48 malignancies towards completion of advance directives. *Support Care Cancer*.
49
50 2010;18:367-72.
51
52 19 Lang FR, Wagner GG. Patient living wills in Germany: conditions for their increase and
53
54 reasons for refusal. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr*. 2007; 132:2558-62.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
4
5 health care proxies: an examination of ethnic differences. *Arch Intern Med*.
6
7 1998;158:2493-7.
8
9
10 21 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
11
12 healthcare proxy forms: a qualitative analysis of ethnic differences. *J Clin Ethics*.
13
14 1998;9:118-26.
15
16 22 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Attitudes towards and barriers to writing advance directives
17
18 amongst cancer patients, healthy controls, and medical staff. *J Med Ethics*. 2005;31:437-
19
20 40.
21
22
23 23 Auriemma CL, Nguyen CA, Bronheim R, et al. Stability of end-of-life preferences: a
24
25 systematic review of the evidence. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014 Jul;174(7):1085-92. doi:
26
27 10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.1183.
28
29
30 24 Becker M, Jaspers B, King C, Radbruch L, Voltz R, Nauck F. Did you seek assistance for
31
32 writing your advance directive? A qualitative study. *Wien Klin Wochenschr*. 2010
33
34 Nov;122(21-22):620-5. doi: 10.1007/s00508-010-1470-6. Epub 2010 Nov 12.
35
36
37 25 Bleyer B, Dörfler T, Gruber H, Dietl B, Wiese, CHR, Pfirstinger J. Wer über mich verfügt,
38
39 entscheide ich – und ein Anderer. Die Patientenverfügung und das kommunizierte
40
41 moralische Urteil. *ZME* 2013;59:297-310.
42
43 26 Van Scoy LJ, Howrylak J, Nguyen A, Chen M, Sherman M. Family structure, experiences
44
45 with end-of-life decision making, and who asked about advance directives impacts
46
47 advance directive completion rates. *J Palliat Med*. 2014 Oct;17(10):1099-106.
48
49
50 27 Schwarzer, R. Modeling health behavior change: how to predict and modify the adoption
51
52 and maintenance of health behaviors. *Applied Psychology*. 2008;57(1):1-29.
53
54
55 28 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Would they follow what has been laid down? Cancer
56
57 patients' and healthy controls' views on adherence to advance directives compared to
58
59 medical staff. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2005;8:297-305.
60

1
2
3 29 Green MJ, Levi BH. Teaching advance care planning to medical students with a computer-
4
5 based decision aid. J Cancer Educ. 2011 Mar;26(1):82-91. doi: 10.1007/s13187-010-
6
7 0146-2.
8

9
10 30 Meyer RM. Using adult learning concepts to assist patients in completing advance
11
12 directives. J Contin Educ Nurs. 2000 Jul-Aug;31(4):174-8. Review.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1 | Characteristics of participants enrolled in the study, separately for outpatients of a university clinic and outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For age, the means (standard deviation in brackets) in years are given. For all other variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Characteristics	Outpatients from a university clinic ($N_1 = 2158$)	Outpatients from Private Practices ($N_2 = 649$)
Age ($n_1 = 2122$; $n_2 = 622$)	52 (15)	52 (17)
Women ($n_1 = 2151$; $n_2 = 648$)	1027 (48)	423 (65)
Type of disease ($n_1 = 1746$; $n_2 = 444$)		
Tumour disease	426 (24)	30 (7)
Donor organ	165 (10)	5 (1)
Never been seriously ill	438 (25)	280 (63)
Other chronic illness	580 (33)	118 (27)
Proxy	137 (8)	11 (2)
Marital status ($n_1 = 2153$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Never married	377 (18)	119 (19)
Married/cohabitation	1508 (70)	431 (67)
Divorced	153 (7)	45 (7)
Widowed	115 (5)	48 (7)
Education ($n_1 = 2119$; $n_2 = 630$)		
Secondary education (9 grades)	982 (46)	266 (42)
Secondary education (10 grades)	645 (31)	226 (36)
A level (13 grades)	423 (20)	118 (19)
Elementary (grades 1-4)	69 (3)	20 (3)
Qualification ($n_1 = 2081$; $n_2 = 619$)		
Non-academic professional	1598 (77)	482 (78)
Academic professional	318 (15)	92 (15)
No professional qualification	165 (8)	45 (7)
Location ($n_1 = 2127$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Urban area	588 (28)	213 (33)
Rural area	1539 (72)	430 (67)

Table 2 | Familiarity with and presence of AD (separate for living wills and for health care proxies), separately for outpatients from a university clinic and for outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	Outpatients from a University Clinic ($N_1 = 2158$)	Outpatients from private Practices ($N_2 = 649$)
Familiarity with living will ($n_1 = 2146$; $n_2 = 638$)	1993 (93)	601 (94)
Familiarity with health care proxy ($n_1 = 2132$; $n_2 = 634$)	1374 (64)	452 (71)
Presence of a living will ($n_1 = 1990$; $n_2 = 597$)	600 (30)	181 (30)
Presence of a health care proxy ($n_1 = 1366$; $n_2 = 443$)	467 (34)	150 (34)

Table 3 | Sources of information about AD, separately for outpatients of a university clinic and outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1, n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1, N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	Outpatients of a University Clinic with Completion of AD ($N_1 = 600$)	Outpatients of Private Practices with Completion of AD ($N_2 = 181$)
Participant self-informed before completion of AD ($n_1 = 567; n_2 = 174$)	548 (97)	167 (96)
Participant discussed her/his decision with a confidant ($n_1 = 581; n_2 = 170$)		
Once	154 (27)	50 (29)
Several times	398 (68)	111 (65)
Participant was counselled ($n_1 = 593; n_2 = 174$)		
By a physician	143 (24)	30 (17)
By a lawyer	215 (36)	65 (37)
	University Clinic Outpatients ($N_1 = 2158$)	Private Practice Outpatients ($N_2 = 649$)
Participant wants to be counselled ($n_1 = 1483; n_2 = 428$) (multiple answers possible)		
By her/his family physician	762 (51)	266 (62)
By a medical specialist	213 (14)	35 (8)
By a clinician	215 (15)	28 (6)
By a lawyer	87 (6)	28 (6)

Table 4 | Prior experience with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care and presence of AD. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	No AD	Completion of AD
Cared for a family member until her/his death (<i>N</i> = 2672)*		
No	1097 (76)	341 (24)
Yes	822 (67)	412 (33)
Suffered from a life threatening disease once before (<i>N</i> = 2636)*		
No	1333 (76)	419 (24)
Yes	568 (64)	316 (36)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

For peer review only

Table 5 | Motives in favour of completion of AD (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant completed an AD because ...	Total (<i>N</i> = 736)*	Outpatients of a University Clinic (<i>n</i> ₁ = 567)	Outpatients of Private Practices (<i>n</i> ₂ = 169)
She/he does not want to suffer unnecessarily	504 (68)	385 (68)	119 (70)
She/he does not want to be a burden to anyone	402 (55)	297 (52)	105 (62)
Physicians are instructed to do everything possible to preserve one's life	250 (34)	186 (33)	64 (38)
She/he wants to make her/his own decisions	231 (31)	183 (32)	48 (28)
She/he distrusts physicians to decide in her/his best interest	178 (24)	131 (23)	47 (28)
She/he has had experiences with intense care for relatives	164 (22)	127 (22)	37 (22)
She/he completed it in the course of receiving legal advice	130 (18)	95 (17)	35 (21)
She/he distrusts her/his relatives to decide in her/his best interest	88 (12)	68 (12)	20 (11)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

Table 6 | Motives against completion of AD (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant did not yet complete an AD because ...	Total (<i>N</i> = 1665)*	Outpatients of a University Clinic (<i>n</i> ₁ = 1285)	Outpatients of Private Practices (<i>n</i> ₂ = 380)
She/he currently does not want to deal with this issue	588 (35)	468 (36)	120 (32)
She/he is too young	321 (19)	246 (19)	75 (19)
Her/his attitude could change during the progression of a disease	279 (17)	222 (17)	57 (17)
Medical treatment options could improve	226 (14)	186 (15)	40 (11)
She/he delegates the decision to a specialist in case of emergency	215 (13)	172 (13)	43 (11)
She/he feels insecure with legal regulations	202 (12)	160 (12)	42 (11)
She/he fears giving the wrong instructions	176 (11)	144 (11)	32 (8)
She/he cannot appraise the listed medical treatments	136 (8)	113 (9)	23 (6)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
✓ Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
✓ Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
✓ Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
✓ Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
✓ Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
✓ Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case
✓ Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
✓ Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
✓ Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
✓ Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
✓ Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
✓ Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

Continued on next page

Results

✓	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
✓	Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
✓	Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
✓	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
✓	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

Discussion

✓	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
✓	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
✓	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
✓	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results

Other information

✓	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based
---	---------	----	---

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649 Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015708.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Oct-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Pfirstinger, Jochen; Klinikum St. Marien, Medizinische Klinik II Bleyer, Bernhard; Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Amberg-Weiden, Institut für Nachhaltigkeit in Technik und Wirtschaft Blum, Christian; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik I Rechenmacher, Michael; Universitätsklinikum Regensburg Klinik und Poliklinik für Innere Medizin III Wiese, Christoph; Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Klinik für Anästhesiologie und Intensivmedizin Gruber, Hans; Universität Regensburg, Lehrstuhl für Pädagogik III
Primary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice, Ethics
Keywords:	end-of-life decisions, advance care planning, advance directive, living will, patient autonomy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649
Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Jochen Pfirstinger^{1,2*}, Bernhard Bleyer^{3,4}, Christian Blum⁵, Michael Rechenmacher²,
Christoph Wiese^{6,7}, and Hans Gruber^{5,8}

¹Department of Internal Medicine II, St. Marien Hospital Amberg, Germany

²Department of Hematology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

³Institute of Sustainability, OTH Amberg-Weiden, Germany

⁴Faculty of Catholic Theology, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁵Department of Educational Science, University of Regensburg, Germany

⁶Department of Anaesthesiology, Regensburg University Hospital, Germany

⁷Department of Anaesthesiology, Herzogin Elisabeth Hospital, Braunschweig, Germany

⁸Faculty of Education, University of Turku, Finland

*Corresponding author: Dr. med. Jochen Pfirstinger, Klinikum St. Marien Amberg,
Medizinische Klinik II, Mariahilfbergweg 7, D-92224 Amberg, Germany
email: pfirstinger.jochen@klinikum-amberg.de

Abstract

Objectives: To compare outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a university clinic regarding the determinants of completion of Advance Directives (AD) in order to generalise results of studies from one setting to the other. Five determinants of completion of AD were studied: familiarity with AD, source of information about AD, prior experiences with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care, and motives in favour and against completion of AD.

Design: Observational cross-sectional study

Setting: Private practices and a university clinic in Germany in 2012

Participants: 649 outpatients from private practices and 2158 outpatients from ten departments of a university clinic

Outcome measures: Completion of AD, familiarity with AD, sources of information about AD (consultation), prior experiences (with own life-threatening disease and family members in need of care), motives in favour of or against completion of AD, socio-demographic data

Results: Determinants of completion of AD did not differ between outpatients from private practices vs. university clinic outpatients. Prior experience with severe disease led to a significantly higher rate of completion of AD (33%/36% with vs. 24%/24% without prior experience). Participants with completion of AD had more often received legal than medical consultation before completion, but participants without completion of AD are rather aiming for medical consultation. The motives in favour of or against completion of AD indicated inconsistent patterns.

Conclusions: Determinants of completion of AD are comparable in outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a university clinic. Generalisations from university clinic samples towards a broader context thus seem to be legitimate. Only one third of patients with prior experience with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care had completed an AD as expression of their autonomous volition. The participants' motives for or against completion of AD indicate that ADs are considered a kind of "negative autonomy" as instruments to prevent particular forms of therapy. Interactive, repeated and situation based AD discussions might reach a higher percentage of patients and concurrently enable personal volitions and thereby strengthen individual "positive autonomy".

Trial registration: not applicable

Strengths and limitations of this study

Our study includes a very large number of completed questionnaires regarding determinants of completion of AD. Data on the response rate to the survey were not collected.

The questionnaire had been developed from a previous study and had been refined in a preliminary interview study, but has not run through a structured validation process.

The comparison between outpatients from private practices and university clinic outpatients indicates that generalisations from university clinic samples towards a broader context seem to be legitimate.

On the other hand our study was conducted in a medium-sized town with rural surroundings, so that our regional findings may be inapplicable in metropolitan areas with people from many different nationalities.

Determinants of Completion of Advance Directives: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of 649 Outpatients from Private Practices versus 2158 Outpatients from a University Clinic

Introduction

Life threatening diseases and end of life decisions are an existential challenge for the relationship between patients and physicians. The physicians consider the indication of a medical intervention taking into account the principles of beneficence, best interests and futility. The relationship between patients and doctors has changed over the last decades from a paternalistic role model, where always the doctor decides what is best for a patient, to a patient centred model, where autonomous patients are being informed by their doctors and then reach their own decisions. However, in end of life situations clinical experience has shown that the majority of patients use their autonomy for the prevention of e.g. suffering or getting connected to machines representing a kind of “negative autonomy”. The concept of patient autonomy and the necessity of an informed consent for all medical interventions have become the fundamental principles for every interaction between patients and medical professionals. In cases of impaired decision making capacity, Advance Directives (ADs) can be used to express the patient’s will. In Germany, ADs are regulated by the third act amending German guardianship legislation, effective September 1st, 2009. As in many other countries, ADs comprise the following legal instruments: living will and health care proxy. By completing a living will, a patient can record legally binding instructions for or against future medical interventions that would otherwise be medically indicated. Patient autonomy can also be exercised by assigning a health care proxy, who makes healthcare decisions on behalf of the patient, when he or she is incapable of making those decisions.

Despite the considerable role of patient autonomy in all medical and legal decisions, only a minority of patients complete an AD. A rate of less than 40% is found in cancer patients [1-3] as well as in the elderly population [4-7]. An even lower rate is found in the

1
2
3 general population [8-12]. Educational interventions to promote AD slightly increase the
4
5 completion rate, which still remains below 50% [13-15].
6

7 A prior investigation of our group published in 2014 revealed that in almost 400
8
9 cancer patients a substantial percentage of patients who had not yet completed an AD were
10
11 willing to receive AD consultations “now” or “in a few weeks”, but longitudinal analyses
12
13 showed that in fact none of these patients made an appointment. The same percentage of
14
15 cancer patients postponed AD consultations, because an AD “is not relevant” now or they “do
16
17 not want to get involved with this issue”. Only a small proportion completely rejected the
18
19 offer of AD consultations [16]. In summary, only a minority of all patients who visit a private
20
21 practice or university outpatient clinic had in advance completed an AD. The majority either
22
23 postpone completion of AD or even refuse to engage in discussion of AD issues. Two main
24
25 determinants that impact completion of AD are age (older people are more likely to have
26
27 completed an AD) and duration of a cancer diagnosis (longer duration is positively associated
28
29 with completion of an AD) [16-18].
30
31
32
33

34 It is plausible that several other determinants play a role in patient decisions regarding
35
36 the completion of ADs, including the source of information and prior experience with own
37
38 life-threatening diseases or with family members in need of care. However, little is known
39
40 from clinical studies about these determinants [19-22]. Whether patients have stable end-of-
41
42 life preferences is still an open question [23].
43
44

45 Healthcare research is usually performed either in centres like university hospitals or
46
47 in a very decentralised setting. Whether samples from university clinics legitimately can be
48
49 compared to samples from private practices providing general primary care is an open
50
51 question. Duration of diagnoses, severity of illnesses, and the professional training of medical
52
53 staff might contribute to differences of patient selection and thus also of completion of AD.
54
55 On the other hand a long-term trusting relationship to a family doctor may be a good basis for
56
57 burdensome AD discussions leading to a higher completion rate. Therefore, studies using
58
59
60

1
2
3 samples from university clinics are at risk of producing results that are not widely applicable
4
5 in other settings. To our knowledge, determinants of completion of AD have not yet been
6
7 investigated in a study that compares outpatients from a university clinic with outpatients
8
9 from private practices.
10

11 We therefore conducted a study in a university clinic and in private practices in the
12
13 same city. The objectives were to compare outpatients from private practices and outpatients
14
15 from a university clinic regarding their familiarity with AD, their source of information about
16
17 AD, their prior experience with own life-threatening disease or family members in need for
18
19 care, and their motives in favour and against completion of AD.
20
21

22 **Method**

23 **Design**

24
25 The study was conducted as an observational cross-sectional study. Two groups of
26
27 participants were compared, outpatients from private practices and outpatients from a
28
29 university clinic.
30
31

32 **Participants**

33
34 Eligibility criteria for participation in the study included: a minimum age of 18 years, the
35
36 ability to provide informed consent, and being an outpatient. Participants were either
37
38 outpatients from a university clinic or outpatients from private practices. The university clinic
39
40 group was a convenience sample of 2158 outpatients cared for at ten outpatient departments
41
42 located at a German university clinic. These included clinics for: radiotherapy, haematology
43
44 and oncology, gastroenterology, endocrinology, rheumatology, infectious diseases, surgery,
45
46 trauma surgery, cranio- and maxillo-facial surgery, neurosurgery, otorhinolaryngology,
47
48 dermatology, ophthalmology, cardiology, nephrology, and pulmonology. The private
49
50 practices group was a convenience sample of 649 outpatients from 18 private practices in the
51
52 same city as the university clinic. The overall sample size was 2807. Data on the response rate
53
54 to the survey were not collected.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Procedure and instruments

Based on items from a literature search and from a previous investigation about ADs in patients with cancer [16] we developed a preliminary questionnaire, which was applied in an interview study with 70 patients. After deletion of redundant or inappropriate items we established a final questionnaire, which in six sections comprised dichotomous questions and multiple response questions: (1) Information about the purpose of the study and request for informed consent; (2) socio-demographic questions (see Table 1); (3) familiarity with and existence of AD; (4) questions about preferences regarding sources of information (e.g. whom the patient would like to consult about completion of an AD); (5) questions about prior experiences with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care; (6) questions about motives in favour of or against the completion of AD. The final version of the questionnaire listed 10 different motives in favour and 13 motives against the completion of AD with multiple answers allowed. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee at the Regensburg University Hospital.

During March to June 2012, patients of the above-mentioned university clinics and private practices received the questionnaire from the clinic staff or the doctor's assistant as they signed up for their medical examination. The participants were requested to read the introduction and to complete the questionnaire while waiting for their appointment. At the end of their visits, they returned the filled questionnaires to the registration.

Statistical analysis

The analyses aimed at comparing the university clinic group and the private practice group regarding the determinants of completion of AD (familiarity with AD, source of information about AD, prior experience with own life-threatening disease or family members in need for care, and motives in favour of and against completion of AD). Data are presented in the form of proportions for categorical variables and means (and standard deviations) for continuous variables. χ^2 tests, the Φ coefficient, Cramer's V and the Odds Ratio (OR) were

1
2
3 used to detect statistically significant and clinically relevant group differences. All reported p
4
5 values are two-sided, with $p < .05$ considered as significant. Data were analysed with SPSS
6
7 software, version 21.

9 10 **Results**

11 The results are presented in the following order. After providing descriptive information on
12
13 the two groups, outpatients from a university clinic and outpatients from private practices, the
14
15 results concerning the comparison of the two group regarding determinants of completion of
16
17 AD are displayed (familiarity with AD, source of information about AD, prior experience
18
19 with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care, motives in favour of
20
21 and against completion of AD).

22 23 24 25 **Descriptives**

26
27 Table 1 shows the absolute and relative frequencies of age, gender, type of disease and
28
29 socio-demographic characteristics (marital status, education, qualification, location) of the
30
31 participants in each group.

32
33
34 -----
35
36 Insert Table 1 about here
37
38 -----
39

40
41 Except for gender and type of disease, the groups did not significantly differ. In the private
42
43 practice group, there was a higher proportion of female participants than in the university
44
45 clinic group ($X^2(1) = 61.31; p = .001; \Phi = .148$). The university clinic group included more
46
47 participants with a malignancy and more participants after organ transplantation. Most
48
49 participants in the private practice group had never been seriously ill ($X^2(4) = 260.23; p =$
50
51 $.001; V = .345$). These two variables did not confound any of the following results.

52 53 54 **Familiarity with AD, completion of AD**

55
56 Among the sample, 2594 (92%) participants were familiar with living wills, and 1826
57
58 (65%) participants were familiar with health care proxies, the two forms of AD. Of those who
59
60

1
2
3 were familiar with the instruments of advance directives, 781 (30%) participants had
4
5 completed a living will, and 617 (34%) participants had completed a health care proxy. 1783
6
7 (64%) participants (university clinic: 1340; private practices: 443) were familiar with both
8
9 instruments, of which 559 (20%) persons (university clinic: 418; private practices: 141) had
10
11 completed both a living will and a health care proxy. Thus only about one third of the
12
13 participants had previously completed a living will and/or a health care proxy. The data show
14
15 that the sampled outpatients were more familiar with living wills than with health care
16
17 proxies.
18
19

20
21 Table 2 shows the familiarity with AD and the presence of AD for both groups.
22

23 -----
24
25 Insert Table 2 about here
26
27 -----
28

29
30 There was no substantial difference between the groups in completion of AD (living
31
32 will: $X^2(1) = 0.006$; $p = .938$; health care proxy: $X^2(1) = 0.02$; $p = .899$), and in familiarity
33
34 with living wills ($X^2(1) = 1.36$; $p = .242$). However, the groups significantly differed with
35
36 regard to familiarity with health care proxies ($X^2(1) = 10.21$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .061$, $OR = 1.37$).
37

38 **Source of information for completion of AD**

39

40
41 Before completion of AD, 715 (92%) participants informed themselves. Five-hundred-
42
43 nine (65%) participants stated that they had discussed their decision to complete an AD with a
44
45 confidant several times. Another 204 (26%) participants discussed their decision only once,
46
47 and 38 (5%) participants had no conversation at all with a confidant about their AD. In both
48
49 samples, the correlation proved significant between having an AD and having had multiple
50
51 discussions with a confidant (university clinic: $X^2(2) = 395.04$; $p < .001$; $V = .433$; private
52
53 practices: $X^2(2) = 115.64$; $p < .001$; $V = .434$). Whereas most participants talked at least once
54
55 to a confidant about completion of AD, only a minority asked for professional advice: 173
56
57 (22%) participants consulted a physician and 280 (36%) participants consulted a lawyer.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Participants who had not yet completed an AD (1998) reported different preferred
4 sources of information. When asked by whom they want to be counselled, 1519 (76%)
5 participants wished to be informed by a physician, whereas only 115 (6%) participants wished
6 to be informed by a lawyer (see Table 3).
7
8
9
10

11 -----
12
13 Insert Table 3 about here
14
15 -----
16
17

18 The comparison of the samples of outpatients from a university clinic and outpatients
19 from private practices revealed no significant differences regarding sources of information
20 before completion of AD (all p -values $> .05$). When only participants without completion of
21 AD were analysed, statistically significant differences between the two groups were noted. A
22 larger percentage of participants in the private practice group, compared to the university
23 clinic group, wanted to be informed about AD by their family physician ($X^2(1) = 15.49$; $p =$
24 $.001$; $\Phi = .09$, OR = 1.55). In contrast, participants from the university clinic group more
25 often wanted to be informed about AD by a clinician ($X^2(1) = 19.19$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .10$, OR =
26 2.43). However, the effect sizes were only small. No difference between the two groups could
27 be found as to their preference to be counselled by a lawyer.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Prior experiences with own life-threatening disease or family members in need for care**

41
42 Prior familiarity with the instruments of advance care planning was associated with a
43 higher rate of completion of AD (see Table 2). Also having either suffered from a life-
44 threatening disease or cared for a dying family member was positively associated with
45 completion of AD (see Table 4). More participants who had cared for a relative until her/his
46 death had completed an AD compared to participants lacking such an experience ($X^2(1) =$
47 30.70 ; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .10$, OR = 1.61). Similarly, participants who had suffered from an own
48 life-threatening disease had a higher rate of completion of AD than participants without this
49 experience ($X^2(1) = 40.89$; $p = .001$; $\Phi = .13$, OR = 1.77).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Table 4 about here

Although there was no significant difference between the two sample groups in the presence of an AD, differences were found regarding prior experience with own life-threatening diseases. More participants in the private practice group had cared for a family member until her/his death than participants in the university clinic group. However, the effect size was small ($X^2(1) = 8.62; p = .003; \Phi = .06, OR = 1.31$). As expected, more participants from the university clinic group earlier had suffered from a life-threatening disease than participants from the private practice group ($X^2(1) = 128.56; p = .001; \Phi = .22, OR = 3.75$).

Motives in favour of completion of AD

The most frequent motives in favour of completion of AD were to prevent unnecessary suffering (68%), followed by the avoidance of being a burden for others (55%). For additional but less frequently reported motives see Table 5 (multiple answers were possible).

Insert Table 5 about here

No significant differences were found between the university clinic group and the private practice group except for the avoidance of being a burden, which was reported as a motive more often by participants of the private practice group ($X^2(1) = 5.01; p = .025; \Phi = .08, OR = 1.49$). Due to the small effect size there is only limited practical significance. Among those 130 participants who completed an AD in the course of receiving legal advice, only 16 had consulted a physician in addition. Furthermore, among those who already had

1
2
3 completed an AD, only 231 (31%) indicated that they “wanted to make his/her own
4
5 decisions”.

6 7 **Motives against completion of AD**

8
9 “I currently do not want to deal with the issue” was the most frequently reported
10
11 motive (588; 35%) against completion of AD, followed by “I am too young” (321; 19%). For
12
13 additional but less frequently reported motives see Table 6 (multiple answers were possible).
14
15

16
17 -----
18
19 Insert Table 6 about here
20
21 -----
22

23 The comparison of the patients from the university clinic group and the patients from
24
25 the private practice group revealed no relevant differences.
26

27 Inconsistent response patterns were revealed by cross tabulating the motives against
28
29 completion of AD with the question of when it is appropriate to complete one. Among those
30
31 participants who stated that they were currently not willing to address this issue ($N = 555$),
32
33 318 (57%) participants stated that the completion of AD should be considered early, and 145
34
35 (26%) participants agreed with the statement that an AD should be completed no matter
36
37 whether one is suffering from a disease or not. A similar pattern was found among those who
38
39 argued that they were too young to complete an AD ($N = 314$); 177 (56%) of them agreed that
40
41 completion of AD should be done early, and 78 (25%) indicated that one should complete an
42
43 AD independently of the presence of a disease.
44
45

46
47 Some of the participants voluntarily provided comments in addition to the
48
49 questionnaire answers. Among the 325 participants providing such comments, 172 (53%)
50
51 stated that they just postponed completion of AD or were simply too idle. On the other hand
52
53 among the 1998 participants without completion of AD, 1643 (82%) were willing to discuss
54
55 this issue.
56
57

58 **Discussion**

1
2
3 The issue of patient autonomy, despite its undisputable relevance, still poses many
4 open questions. Many actors in Germany – both from policy and from medicine – are
5 disappointed by the low percentage of people who have already completed an AD. It is not
6 trivial to investigate the reasons preventing people from completion of AD. In the present
7 study, a number of attempts were undertaken in order to better understand the issue. First, a
8 large sample size was used in order to increase the reliability and trustworthiness of the
9 answers provided by the participants: more than 2800 participants were studied. Second, the
10 major research question was to investigate whether the motives in favour of or against
11 completion of AD resembled each other in two different groups of patients: outpatients from a
12 university clinic (many of whom suffer from life-threatening diseases) and outpatients from
13 private practices. Determinants of completion of AD previously mainly have been studied
14 within university clinic patients. Whether the results can legitimately be generalised towards a
15 broader population is still an open question, thus addressing the societal need to broadly
16 discuss the issue of AD. A number of reasons were mentioned in prior research indicating that
17 the experience of suffering from a life-threatening disease might influence the importance of
18 making decisions related to patient autonomy [22]. The results show, however, that
19 outpatients from a university clinic do not significantly differ from outpatients from private
20 practices regarding most determinants of completion of AD. A broad number of such
21 determinants was investigated, among them the sources of information about AD, i.e. to what
22 degree professional consultation had been requested before completion of AD, and from
23 which professional groups such advice had been requested. In addition, it was investigated
24 whether those without completion of AD would like to receive professional advice – and,
25 again, by whom – before making a decision in favour of completion of AD. Motives both in
26 favour of and against completion of AD were investigated.

27
28 Concerning the comparability of samples from a university clinic and from private
29 practices, and thus of the generalizability of results, few differences were found between the

1
2
3 two groups indicating that the results legitimately may be generalised. The group of
4
5 outpatients from private practices was slightly more familiar with health care proxies, but the
6
7 effect size was very small. In general, however, the groups did not differ significantly. These
8
9 results, based on a large sample size, are a strong indicator that future studies might rely on
10
11 results from either of those two samples. The percentage of those who had completed an AD
12
13 was of the same size (about 30 %) as in the general population. In both groups, the percentage
14
15 was a bit higher (33 %, and 36 %, respectively) among participants with prior experience of
16
17 own life-threatening diseases. This matches findings from other studies [22], but still leaves
18
19 the question open why even those participants do not make much more use of the instruments
20
21 of patient autonomy. Prior experience (either individual or related to one's family) with life-
22
23 threatening diseases, intensive care treatment, nursing cases etc. only slightly increased the
24
25 rate of completion of ADs, and only to a level still clearly below 50 per cent.
26
27
28

29
30 Concerning the question of seeking professional consultation, both before completion
31
32 of AD and the intention of completion in the future, our study was consistent with prior
33
34 findings that more than one third of the patients with completion of AD had received legal
35
36 advice [16, 24, 25]. In some patients, legal consultation about AD may be related to receiving
37
38 legal testament advice, as it has been shown, that patients were much more likely to complete
39
40 an AD when asked by legal staff compared to medical staff [26]. Among those who have not
41
42 yet completed an AD, many stated their desire for professional advice, with a large majority
43
44 preferring medical consultation to legal advice. The results match prior studies finding that
45
46 almost every patient considers ADs as something very important which should be completed
47
48 early [1]. It should be noted that acceptance rates for completion of AD close to 100 per cent
49
50 can be found in interview data, which may reflect, what is socially desirable. In contrast none
51
52 of the multiple interventions to promote completion of AD increased the rate above 50 per
53
54 cent, which may reflect that patient autonomy rests on a voluntary basis [13]. The deviation of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the patients' intention to their acting can be explained as an example of the mind-behaviour-
4
5 gap theory [27].
6

7
8 In the group of outpatients from private practices, the family doctor frequently was
9
10 named as the preferred person of trust for AD consultations. On the other hand in the
11
12 university clinic setting the result was in favour of hospital physicians. Therefore it can be
13
14 concluded that patients are open to receive AD consultations, wherever they are treated.
15

16
17 A first step to initiate discussions about ADs often is made as a by-product of other
18
19 issues, for example the case in a legal advice setting, when a testament consultation is
20
21 followed by a consultation about an AD. An important second step would be the trustful
22
23 interaction with the family doctor. The results show that many participants felt confused by
24
25 the legal regulation. In contrast to lawyers, however, family physicians do not receive a
26
27 financial incentive when they involve themselves in consultations about ADs. It is reported
28
29 that such consultation often takes a considerable amount of time, as it may easily exceed 30
30
31 minutes. Providing an adequate financial compensation to family physicians for consultation
32
33 around ADs could be a promising approach to promote completion of ADs.
34
35

36
37 Concerning the motives in favour of or against completion of AD, the study revealed
38
39 some inconsistent response patterns that need further analysis or even a fresh theoretical
40
41 perspective on the issue. Inconsistencies were revealed when cross tabulating the motives
42
43 against completion of AD with the question of when it is appropriate to complete an AD.
44
45 Possible explanations of these inconsistencies – although not deliberately investigated in the
46
47 present study – could be identified in comments, which 325 of the participants provided
48
49 voluntarily in addition to the questionnaire answers. More than half of them stated that they
50
51 just postponed completion of AD or were simply too idle. For example, one participant
52
53 quoted: “Because I procrastinated completing a living will up to now.” This finding was in
54
55 line with the fact that more than 80% of the participants without completion of AD were
56
57 willing to discuss this issue. Although most participants indicated being willing in principle to
58
59
60

1
2
3 complete an AD, many did not initiate the completion on their own. The majority of patients
4
5 who had completed an AD had done so in reaction to distrust and fear of future treatments
6
7 [28]. Less than one third of the participants who had completed an AD stated that they
8
9 “wanted to make his/her own decisions”.

10
11
12 These findings might pose new questions concerning the motives for completion of
13
14 AD. It might be that the findings indicate a kind of “negative autonomy”: Living wills and
15
16 health care proxies might be seen mainly as instruments to prevent particular forms of
17
18 therapy, but not as instruments to design one’s own “positive autonomy”. Our preceding
19
20 interview study (not published) revealed, that the majority of patients consider living wills
21
22 and health care proxies as something unpleasant, which must be done – sometime in the
23
24 future – but not as a chance to actively take control of their lives. The questionnaire items
25
26 were developed as a result of the interviews and were formulated to elicit positive and
27
28 negative motives concerning completion of AD. Our underlying intention was, to find out
29
30 whether patients attitudes towards completion of AD could be influenced positively to
31
32 achieve a higher completion rate. Future studies could investigate under which conditions
33
34 patients are most motivated to think proactively about future medical decisions. This,
35
36 however, would require a paradigm shift both in underlying research and in the practices how
37
38 medical and legal professionals approach the issue of completion of AD. In theory, AD
39
40 provide an opportunity for patients to exercise their autonomy and to actively engage in
41
42 decisions about their future health care. In practice, however, ADs are primarily used as a
43
44 means to prevent certain unwanted treatments or in negative reaction to prior personal
45
46 experiences. The use of ADs has been largely reactive instead of proactive. In order to
47
48 increase the uptake of ADs amongst patients, it may be necessary to reframe ADs as a means
49
50 of engaging proactively in future health care decisions rather than as a reactive tool used to
51
52 prevent future unwanted experiences.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Up to this point, most attempts to increase uptake of ADs amongst patients have
4 focussed on educating medical or legal professionals [29, 30] rather than focusing on methods
5 to increase the patient's autonomy. The empirical evidence clearly demonstrates that most of
6 these educational efforts have failed to successfully increase the usage of ADs by patients.
7 Further studies are needed to investigate whether a different approach, with a focus on
8 increasing patient autonomy and allowing patients to more proactively engage in decisions
9 about their future health care, may be more successful in increasing the number of patients
10 with a completion of AD. Further investigation is also warranted into whether patients might
11 be more willing to engage in these decisions if the topic is presented by their trusted family
12 physician as part of a discussion of future autonomy.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Limitations: Some few limitations to the present research also warrant attention. First,
26 the psychometrics of the used questionnaire are unknown. The questionnaire had been
27 employed in previous research and had been revised in a preliminary interview study,
28 nevertheless a structured validation process is still lacking. Second, no information on the
29 response rate to the survey was gathered. Thus the representativeness of the study's sample is
30 uncertain. In light of these caveats and despite the large sample size, the study results have to
31 be interpreted cautiously.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 I, Jochen Pfirstinger, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original
4 manuscript which includes any diagrams submitted (the “Contribution”) has the right to grant
5 on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a licence to the BMJ
6
7 Publishing Group Ltd and its licences, to permit this Contribution (if accepted) to be
8
9 published in the BMJ and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights,
10
11 as set out in our licence set out at: [http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse)
12
13 [policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse.](http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse)
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Beside the authors there are no further contributors to this work.
21
22
23

24
25 The corresponding author affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent
26 account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted;
27
28 and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been
29
30 explained.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Contributorship Statement

Jochen Pfirstinger initiated the study as a further development of a previous study [16], made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation, contributed to the data analysis and wrote large parts of the manuscript.

Bernhard Bleyer made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to theological and ethical aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Christian Blum conducted a preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He performed large parts of the data acquisition and of the statistical data analysis, contributed to the data interpretation, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Michael Rechenmacher and Christoph Wiese made significant contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation and helped correcting the manuscript.

Hans Gruber initiated und supervised the preliminary interview study (not published), the results of which have been integrated into the questionnaire. He supervised the statistical data analysis, made major contributions to the questionnaire and to the data interpretation in particular with respect to educational and learning aspects, and helped writing and correcting the manuscript.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

1
2
3 Funding
4
5
6

7 All authors declare that there was no funding for our study nor for the submission of our
8
9 manuscript.
10

11
12
13 Data Sharing Statement
14
15

16
17 All authors agree to make the relevant anonymised patient level data available for all
18
19 researchers on reasonable written request to the corresponding author.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1 Dow LA, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
1 Dow LA, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
complex relationship of oncology patients, their physicians, and advance medical
directives. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:299-304.
- 2 McKinley ED, Garrett JM, Evans AT, Danis M. Differences in end-of-life decision making
among black and white ambulatory cancer patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1996;11:651-6.
- 3 Sahn S, Will R, Hommel G. What are cancer patients' preferences about treatment at the
end of life, and who should start talking about it? A comparison with healthy people and
medical staff. *Support Care Cancer*. 2005;13:206-14.
- 4 Eleazer GP, Hornung CA, Egbert CB, et al. The relationship between ethnicity and advance
directives in a frail older population. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44:938-43.
- 5 Morrison RS, Meier DE. High rates of advance care planning in New York City's elderly
population. *Arch Intern Med*. 2004 Dec 13-27;164(22):2421-6.
- 6 Samsi K, Manthorpe J. ,I live for today': a qualitative study investigating older people's
attitudes to advance planning. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2011 Jan;19(1):52-9. doi:
10.1111/j.1365-2524.2010.00948.x. Epub 2010 Sep 16.
- 7 Seymour J. Technology and „natural death“: a study of older people. *Z Gerontol Geriatr*.
2003 Oct;36(5):339-46.
- 8 Curtis JR. Communicating with patients and their families about advance care planning and
end-of-life care. *Respir Care*. 2000;45:1385-94.
- 9 Hickey DP. The disutility of advance directives: we know the problems, but are there
solutions? *J Health Law*. 2003 Summer;36(3):455-73.
- 10 Phipps E, True G, Harris D, et al. Approaching the end of life: attitudes, preferences, and
behaviors of African-American and white patients and their family caregivers. *J Clin
Oncol*. 2003;21:549-54.

- 1
2
3 11 Rurup ML, Onwuteaka-Philipsen BD, van der Heide A, van der Wal G, Deeg DJ.
4
5 Frequency and determinants of advance directives concerning end-of-life care in the
6
7 Netherlands. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;62:1552-63.
8
9
10 12 Teno JM. Advance directives: time to move on. *Ann Intern Med*. 2004;141:159-60.
11
12 13 Bravo G, Dubois MF, Wagneur B. Assessing the effectiveness of interventions to promote
13
14 advance directives among older adults: a systematic review and multi-level analysis. *Soc*
15
16 *Sci Med*. 2008 Oct;67(7):1122-32. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.006. Epub 2008 Jul
17
18 20. Review.
19
20
21 14 Furman CD, Head B, Lazor B, Casper B, Ritchie CS. Evaluation of an educational
22
23 intervention to encourage advance directive discussions between medicine residents and
24
25 patients. *J Palliat Med*. 2006 Aug;9(4):964-7.
26
27
28 15 Meier DE, Fuss BR, O'Rourke D, Baskin SA, Lewis M, Morrison RS. Marked
29
30 improvement in recognition and completion of health care proxies: a randomized
31
32 controlled trial of counseling by hospital patient representatives. *Arch Intern Med*.
33
34 1996;156:1227-32.
35
36
37 16 Pfirstinger J, Kattner D, Edinger M, Andreesen R, Vogelhuber M. The impact of a tumor
38
39 diagnosis on patients' attitudes toward advance directives. *Oncology*. 2014;87(4):246-56.
40
41 17 Blackhall LJ, Frank G, Murphy ST, Michel V, Palmer JM, Azen SP. Ethnicity and
42
43 attitudes towards life sustaining technology. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999;48:1779-89.
44
45
46 18 Kierner KA, Hladschik-Kermer B, Gartner V, Watzke HH. Attitudes of patients with
47
48 malignancies towards completion of advance directives. *Support Care Cancer*.
49
50 2010;18:367-72.
51
52 19 Lang FR, Wagner GG. Patient living wills in Germany: conditions for their increase and
53
54 reasons for refusal. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr*. 2007; 132:2558-62.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
4
5 health care proxies: an examination of ethnic differences. *Arch Intern Med*.
6
7 1998;158:2493-7.
8
9
10 21 Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of
11
12 healthcare proxy forms: a qualitative analysis of ethnic differences. *J Clin Ethics*.
13
14 1998;9:118-26.
15
16 22 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Attitudes towards and barriers to writing advance directives
17
18 amongst cancer patients, healthy controls, and medical staff. *J Med Ethics*. 2005;31:437-
19
20 40.
21
22
23 23 Auriemma CL, Nguyen CA, Bronheim R, et al. Stability of end-of-life preferences: a
24
25 systematic review of the evidence. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014 Jul;174(7):1085-92. doi:
26
27 10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.1183.
28
29
30 24 Becker M, Jaspers B, King C, Radbruch L, Voltz R, Nauck F. Did you seek assistance for
31
32 writing your advance directive? A qualitative study. *Wien Klin Wochenschr*. 2010
33
34 Nov;122(21-22):620-5. doi: 10.1007/s00508-010-1470-6. Epub 2010 Nov 12.
35
36
37 25 Bleyer B, Dörfler T, Gruber H, Dietl B, Wiese, CHR, Pfirstinger J. Wer über mich verfügt,
38
39 entscheide ich – und ein Anderer. Die Patientenverfügung und das kommunizierte
40
41 moralische Urteil. *ZME* 2013;59:297-310.
42
43 26 Van Scoy LJ, Howrylak J, Nguyen A, Chen M, Sherman M. Family structure, experiences
44
45 with end-of-life decision making, and who asked about advance directives impacts
46
47 advance directive completion rates. *J Palliat Med*. 2014 Oct;17(10):1099-106.
48
49
50 27 Schwarzer, R. Modeling health behavior change: how to predict and modify the adoption
51
52 and maintenance of health behaviors. *Applied Psychology*. 2008;57(1):1-29.
53
54
55 28 Sahm S, Will R, Hommel G. Would they follow what has been laid down? Cancer
56
57 patients' and healthy controls' views on adherence to advance directives compared to
58
59 medical staff. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2005;8:297-305.
60

1
2
3 29 Green MJ, Levi BH. Teaching advance care planning to medical students with a computer-
4
5 based decision aid. *J Cancer Educ.* 2011 Mar;26(1):82-91. doi: 10.1007/s13187-010-
6
7 0146-2.
8

9
10 30 Meyer RM. Using adult learning concepts to assist patients in completing advance
11
12 directives. *J Contin Educ Nurs.* 2000 Jul-Aug;31(4):174-8. Review.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1 | Characteristics of participants enrolled in the study, separately for outpatients of a university clinic and outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For age, the means (standard deviation in brackets) in years are given. For all other variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Characteristics	Outpatients from a university clinic ($N_1 = 2158$)	Outpatients from Private Practices ($N_2 = 649$)
Age ($n_1 = 2122$; $n_2 = 622$)	52 (15)	52 (17)
Women ($n_1 = 2151$; $n_2 = 648$)	1027 (48)	423 (65)
Type of disease ($n_1 = 1746$; $n_2 = 444$)		
Tumour disease	426 (24)	30 (7)
Donor organ	165 (10)	5 (1)
Never been seriously ill	438 (25)	280 (63)
Other chronic illness	580 (33)	118 (27)
Proxy	137 (8)	11 (2)
Marital status ($n_1 = 2153$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Never married	377 (18)	119 (19)
Married/cohabitation	1508 (70)	431 (67)
Divorced	153 (7)	45 (7)
Widowed	115 (5)	48 (7)
Education ($n_1 = 2119$; $n_2 = 630$)		
Secondary education (9 grades)	982 (46)	266 (42)
Secondary education (10 grades)	645 (31)	226 (36)
A level (13 grades)	423 (20)	118 (19)
Elementary (grades 1-4)	69 (3)	20 (3)
Qualification ($n_1 = 2081$; $n_2 = 619$)		
Non-academic professional	1598 (77)	482 (78)
Academic professional	318 (15)	92 (15)
No professional qualification	165 (8)	45 (7)
Location ($n_1 = 2127$; $n_2 = 643$)		
Urban area	588 (28)	213 (33)
Rural area	1539 (72)	430 (67)

Table 2 | Familiarity with and presence of AD (separate for living wills and for health care proxies), separately for outpatients from a university clinic and for outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1 , n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1 , N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	Outpatients from a University Clinic ($N_1 = 2158$)	Outpatients from private Practices ($N_2 = 649$)
Familiarity with living will ($n_1 = 2146$; $n_2 = 638$)	1993 (93)	601 (94)
Familiarity with health care proxy ($n_1 = 2132$; $n_2 = 634$)	1374 (64)	452 (71)
Presence of a living will ($n_1 = 1990$; $n_2 = 597$)	600 (30)	181 (30)
Presence of a health care proxy ($n_1 = 1366$; $n_2 = 443$)	467 (34)	150 (34)

Table 3 | Sources of information about AD, separately for outpatients of a university clinic and outpatients from private practices. Sample sizes (n_1, n_2) for particular variables differ from the total sample sizes (N_1, N_2) due to missing values. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	Outpatients of a University Clinic with Completion of AD ($N_1 = 600$)	Outpatients of Private Practices with Completion of AD ($N_2 = 181$)
Participant self-informed before completion of AD ($n_1 = 567; n_2 = 174$)	548 (97)	167 (96)
Participant discussed her/his decision with a confidant ($n_1 = 581; n_2 = 170$)		
Once	154 (27)	50 (29)
Several times	398 (68)	111 (65)
Participant was counselled ($n_1 = 593; n_2 = 174$)		
By a physician	143 (24)	30 (17)
By a lawyer	215 (36)	65 (37)
	University Clinic Outpatients ($N_1 = 2158$)	Private Practice Outpatients ($N_2 = 649$)
Participant wants to be counselled ($n_1 = 1483; n_2 = 428$) (multiple answers possible)		
By her/his family physician	762 (51)	266 (62)
By a medical specialist	213 (14)	35 (8)
By a clinician	215 (15)	28 (6)
By a lawyer	87 (6)	28 (6)

Table 4 | Prior experience with own life-threatening diseases or family members in need for care and presence of AD. For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

	No AD	Completion of AD
Cared for a family member until her/his death (<i>N</i> = 2672)*		
No	1097 (76)	341 (24)
Yes	822 (67)	412 (33)
Suffered from a life threatening disease once before (<i>N</i> = 2636)*		
No	1333 (76)	419 (24)
Yes	568 (64)	316 (36)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

For peer review only

Table 5 | Motives in favour of completion of AD (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant completed an AD because ...	Total (N = 736)*	Outpatients of a University Clinic (n ₁ = 567)	Outpatients of Private Practices (n ₂ = 169)
She/he does not want to suffer unnecessarily	504 (68)	385 (68)	119 (70)
She/he does not want to be a burden to anyone	402 (55)	297 (52)	105 (62)
Physicians are instructed to do everything possible to preserve one's life	250 (34)	186 (33)	64 (38)
She/he wants to make her/his own decisions	231 (31)	183 (32)	48 (28)
She/he distrusts physicians to decide in her/his best interest	178 (24)	131 (23)	47 (28)
She/he has had experiences with intense care for relatives	164 (22)	127 (22)	37 (22)
She/he completed it in the course of receiving legal advice	130 (18)	95 (17)	35 (21)
She/he distrusts her/his relatives to decide in her/his best interest	88 (12)	68 (12)	20 (11)

* N on this variable differs from the total N due to missing values.

Table 6 | Motives against completion of AD (multiple answers possible). For all variables the numbers of participants (percentages in brackets) are given.

Participant did not yet complete an AD because ...	Total (<i>N</i> = 1665)*	Outpatients of a University Clinic (<i>n</i> ₁ = 1285)	Outpatients of Private Practices (<i>n</i> ₂ = 380)
She/he currently does not want to deal with this issue	588 (35)	468 (36)	120 (32)
She/he is too young	321 (19)	246 (19)	75 (19)
Her/his attitude could change during the progression of a disease	279 (17)	222 (17)	57 (17)
Medical treatment options could improve	226 (14)	186 (15)	40 (11)
She/he delegates the decision to a specialist in case of emergency	215 (13)	172 (13)	43 (11)
She/he feels insecure with legal regulations	202 (12)	160 (12)	42 (11)
She/he fears giving the wrong instructions	176 (11)	144 (11)	32 (8)
She/he cannot appraise the listed medical treatments	136 (8)	113 (9)	23 (6)

* *N* on this variable differs from the total *N* due to missing values.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract [within the title page 1 and design section of the abstract page 2] (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found [page 2]
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported [pages 5 - 6]
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses [page 6]
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper [page 6]
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection [pages 6 - 7]
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants [pages 6]
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable [page 7]
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group [page 7]
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias [N/A]
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at [N/A]
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why [pages 7 - 8]
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding [pages 7 - 8] (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions [pages 7 - 8] (c) Explain how missing data were addressed [N/A] (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy [N/A] (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses [N/A]
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers

		potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed [page 8]
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage [N/A]
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram [N/A]
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders [pages 8]
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest [N/A]
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures [pages 8 - 13]
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included [pages 8 - 13]
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized [N/A]
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period [N/A]
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses [pages 8 - 13]
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives [pages 14 - 17]
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias [page 18]
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence [pages 14 - 15]
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results []
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based [page 21]

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.