## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

**Table S1.** Studies reporting results of potential living kidney donor evaluations.

		Number Evaluated and Outcomes (N)			Reasons for Not Donating (%)						
City, Country and Publication Year	Study Years	Evalu- ated	Donated (%)	Not Donated	Pend- ing	Medical Risk <sup>a</sup>	Psycho- social <sup>b</sup>	Better Donor <sup>c</sup>	Incom- patible <sup>d</sup>	Not Needed <sup>e</sup>	Other
Leicester, UK 2000 <sup>6</sup>	94-98	269	35 (13)	225	9	11	14	33	27	14	1
Mansoura, Egypt 2004 <sup>7</sup>	93-01	1661	847 (51)	814	0	64	8		16		
London, UK 20048	97-01	189	34 (18)	155	0	24	27		30	15	3
Cape Town, South Africa 2005 <sup>9</sup>	00-03	117	20 (17)	97	0	19	9	7	30	4	
Charleston, SC, USA 2006 <sup>10</sup>	00-04	1169	119 (10)	1050	0	43	5		10	41	
Philadelphia, PA, USA 2010 <sup>11</sup>	00-05	982	452 (46)	525	5	19	2%		32	23	
Ann Arbor, MI, USA 2011 <sup>12</sup>	96-06	2519	1156 (46)	1350	13	50	13	2	6	16	11
Winston-Salem, NC, USA 2009 <sup>13</sup>	03-06	654	85 (13)	541	0	55	7	15	27	4	2
Rotterdam, Netherlands 2009 <sup>14</sup>	00-07	1059	581 (55)	458	20	18	1	26	25	16	3
Nashville, TN, USA 2012 <sup>15</sup>	04-09	706	324 (46)	382	0	59	6%		0	9	
Palo Alto, CA, USA 2011 <sup>16</sup>	07-09	484	39 (8)	341	104	42	6	1	17	16	1%
Warsaw, Poland 2013 <sup>17</sup>	07-11	124	49 (40)	68	7	33	10		24	25	
Rome, Italy 2013 <sup>18</sup>	05-12	79	24 (30)	45	10	36	16		18	24	7
Dublin, Ireland 2016 <sup>19</sup>	00-14	883	176 (20)	707	0	8	13	37	21	1	
Melbourne, Australia 2018 <sup>20</sup>	07-15	148	89 (60)	59	0	90	0		3	0	

Dammam, Saudi Arabia 2019 <sup>21</sup>	08-16	2090	675 (32)	1415	0	29	4		11	12	
Total	93-16	13,133	4705 (36)	8232	168	38	1	10	15	16	12

<sup>a Risk to the donor was considered too high.
b Psychosocial reasons, including that the donor decided not to donate for unspecified reasons.</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> A better donor was found.

d Donor and recipient were immunologically incompatible, and paired exchange was not available.
e Recipient no longer wanted or needed a living donor.
f Other reasons were given or not specified.

**Table S2.** Relationship to the intended recipient.

•	Candidates	Donation Decision Made			
Relationship	Evaluated n = 2107 (%)	Not Accepted n = 788 (%)	Accepted to Donate n = 790 (%)	P-value Accepted vs Not Accepted	
Biological, blood related	925 (43.9)	356 (45.2)	335 (42.4)	0.31	
Non-biological	1178 (55.9)	429 (54.4)	454 (57.5)		
Unknown/missing	4 (0.2)	3 (0.4)	1 (0.1)		
Biological, blood-related parent	212 (10.1)	70 (8.9)	86 (10.9)	0.017 <sup>a</sup>	
Biological, blood-related child	237 (11.3)	82 (10.4)	74 (9.4)		
Identical twin	1 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)		
Biological, blood-related full sibling	278 (13.2)	116 (14.7)	111 (14.1)		
Biological, blood-related half sibling	24 (1.1)	9 (1.1)	7 (0.9)		
Biological, blood-related other relative	173 (8.2)	78 (9.9)	57 (7.2)		
Non-biological, spouse	219 (10.4)	54 (6.9)	102 (12.9)		
Non-biological, life partner	21 (1.0)	8 (1.0)	5 (0.6)		
Non-biological, unrelated: paired donation	119 (5.7)	39 (4.9)	39 (4.9)		
Non-biological, unrelated: non-directed donation	114 (5.4)	38 (4.8)	41 (5.2)		
Non-biological, living/deceased donation	1 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)		
Non-biological, unrelated: domino	2 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)		
Non-biological, other unrelated, directed donation	364 (17.3)	149 (18.9)	146 (18.5)		
Non-biological, other	338 (16.0)	139 (17.6)	120 (15.2)		

Unknown/missing 4 (0.2) 3 (0.4) 1 (0.1)

*P*-values are from the chi-square test. <sup>a</sup> *P*-value from Fisher's exact test.