## Le modalità disponibili in Terapia Intensiva: Intermittenti, Continue o Ibride?

Stefano Romagnoli, MD, PhD





UO di Nefrologia, Dialisi e Trapianto Renale Ospedale San Bortolo - ULSS 8 Berica International Renal Research Institute Vicenza (IRRIV)









Videoconferenza LIVE per INFERMIERI NEFROLOGI INTENSIVISTI ...

e tutti i Medici in Formazione Specialistica! XI Edizione



Dip. di Scienze della Salute – Università di Firenze Dip. di Anestesia e Rianimazione - AOU Careggi - Firenze





IHD **SLED** CRRT **CVVH CVVHD CVVHDF** EARLY DELAYED BIOMARKERS **CITRATE HEPARIN** NO ANTICOA LATION . . .

































# OUTLINE . . .

- IHD, CRRT, HT (sled, sledd, sledd, sledd-f, edd, scd, avvh, avvhdf) nomenclature and definitions
- Evidence for the literature
- . . . And so what?

## Tandukar S & Palewsky PM. CHEST (2019)

## Continuous Renal Replacement Therapy Who, When, Why, and How

Srijan Tandukar, MD; and Paul M. Palevsky, MD

## Selection of RRT Modality

Although CRRT and PIRRT are most commonly used in hemodynamically unstable patients, there is marked variation in practice.

Some centers use CRRT (or PIRRT) in all ICU patients with renal failure regardless of hemodynamic status, whereas others use IHD, albeit with adjustments in prescription, even in vasopressordependent patients.

Continuous Renal Replacement The fapies (CRRT)

Intermittent Hemodialysis (IHD)

Although the benefit of a **slow, continuous modality** of renal support in hemodynamically unstable patients may seem <u>selfevident</u>, RCTs have failed to show differences with regard to either mortality or recovery of kidney function comparing CRRT with either IHD or PIRRT.

Mehta RL et al. Kidney Int (2001) Augustine JJ et al. Am J Kidney Dis (2004) Uehlinger DE et al. Nephrol Dial Transplant (2005) Vinsonneau C et al. Lancet (2006) Lins RL et al. Nephrol Dial Transplant (2009) Schefold JC et al. Crit Care (2014) Bagshaw SM et al. Crit Care Med (2008) Pannu N et al. JAMA (2008) Friedrich JO et al. Critical Care (2012) Zhang L et al. Am J Kidney Dis (2015) Kielstein JT et al. Am J Kidney Dis (2004) Schwenger V et al. Crit Care (2012)

Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapies (PIRRT)



# PIRRT

## **Prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy**

Acute RRTs include standard intermittent hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, continuous renal replacement therapies (CRRTs), and hybrid therapies such as prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapies (PIRRTs).

Other terms used to describe PIRRT include:

- Sustained low-efficiency (daily) dialysis (SLED or SLEDD)
- Sustained low-efficiency (daily) diafiltration (SLEDD-f)
- Extended daily dialysis (EDD)
- Slow continuous dialysis (SCD)
- Go slow dialysis
- Accelerated venovenous hemofiltration (AVVH) or hemodiafiltration (AVVHDF)

14 May 2020

# UpToDate®



PIRRT is an **alternative** to CRRT for <u>hemodynamically</u> <u>unstable patients</u>, although the <u>evidence is weak</u>





14 May 2020

# **Hybrid therapies**



PE. Thesapeutic plasma exchange: VHVHF, Very high volume hemofilitation

- Sustained low-efficiency dialysis (SLED)
- Slow low-efficiency extended daily dialysis (SLEDD)
- Prolonged intermittent RRT (PIRRT)
- Extended daily dialysis (EDD)
- Extended daily dialysis with filtration (EDDf)
- Extended dialysis (ED)
- "go slow dialysis"
- Accelerated veno-venous hemofiltration (AVVH).
- Si utilizza generalmente material di IHD (macchina, filtri, circuiti).
- La rimozione dei soluti avviene prevalemntemente con tecnica diffusiva.
- Esistono variant con tecnica convettiva (EDDf, AVVH)









# **Continuous (RRT)**

















# **Continuous (RRT)**







# Intermittent (HD)

# **Hybrid therapies**















All of these use relatively similar extracorporeal blood circuits and differ primarily with regard to <u>duration of therapy</u> and, consequently, the **rapidity of** <u>net</u> <u>ultrafiltration</u> and <u>solute clearance</u>.



Tandukar S & Palewsky PM. CHEST (2019) + Wang AY, Bellomo R. Curr Opin Crit Care (2018)

# IHD Renal replacement therapy in the ICU: hemodialysis, sustained low-efficiency dialysis or continuous renal replacement therapy? SLED CRRT

Wang AY, Bellomo R. Curr Opin Crit Care (2018)

## MODALITIES OF RENAL REPLACEMENT THERAPY USED IN ICU

**Indications for commencement** of RRT therapy for severe AKI patients are <u>the same for all modalities</u>, such as fluid overload, hyperkalemia, acidosis, and uremic syndrome that are refractory to medical therapy.

... there is still **controversy** on the advantages of one modality over the others on clinical outcomes of AKI patients...

Wang AY, Bellomo R. Curr Opin Crit Care (2018)

# IHD – Intermittent HemoDialysis

- Meccanismo principale per la rimozione dei solute è la DIFFUSIONE
- Ideale per PICCOLI SOLUTI



# Intermittent hemodialysis (IHD)

- IHD is often used in the setting of CKD where patients receive hemodialysis three times a week
- 3–5h each session, using higher flow rates than CRRT to maintain fluids, electrolytes, and acid–base balance
- It can also be administered for AKI patients, especially those who are hemodynamically stable
- It removes solutes by diffusion and may be more suited for patients who require rapid removal of dialyzable substances such as severe hyperkalemia and selected toxins

IHD is less expensive and requires less anticoagulation

In fact, it is likely the <u>most</u> <u>commonly used acute RRT</u> <u>modality in the United States</u>.



However, IHD may be associated with an **increased risk of hypotension** because of removal of large amount of fluid over a short period of time, potentially leading to **further renal ischemia** 

Vinsonneau C et al. Lancet (2006)

Nonetheless, IHD can be used as an alternative option for AKI requiring RRT, especially in **resource-limiting settings**.

Sankarasubbaiyan S et al. IndianJ Nephrol (2013)

**Continuous therapy**, compared with IHD, tends to be associated with **less** cerebral edema because of a more <u>physiological and slow removal of urea and</u> <u>other solutes</u>.

Clinical Trial > J Nephrol. May-Jun 1999;12(3):173-8.

## Brain Density Changes During Renal Replacement in Critically Ill Patients With Acute Renal Failure. Continuous Hemofiltration Versus Intermittent Hemodialysis

C Ronco<sup>1</sup>, R Bellomo, A Brendolan, V Pinna, G La Greca







## **Continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT)**

- CRRT provides continuous support
- Continuous venovenous hemofiltration (CVVH)  $\rightarrow$  convection
- Continuous venovenous hemodialysis (CVVHD)  $\rightarrow$  diffusion
- Continuous venovenous hemodiafiltration (CVVHD) → diffusion + convection

provides a . . . *slow, gentle*, and *continuous* kidney support

...preferentially used approach for critically ill patients with *hemodynamic instability* 



continuous kidney support → hemodynamic instability

More gradual fluid removal and solute clearance over prolonged treatment times

 Continuous venovenous hemodiafiltration (CVVHDF)
 – diffusion and convection

## **Continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT)**



The modes differ in whether the primary driver of <u>solute removal</u> is convection, diffusion, or both, the <u>reinfusion site</u> (pre-post-both) and the <u>anticoagulation</u> modality (heparin, citrate  $\rightarrow$  pre).

## CRRT

Continuous Renal Replacement Therapies



CRRT provides a **slow, gentle**, and **continuous** kidney support → **hemodynamic instability** 

More gradual fluid removal and solute clearance over prolonged treatment times

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

Although the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) Clinical Practice Guideline for AKI recommends the use of CRRT for patients who are hemodynamically unstable, the strength of this recommendation is low.

Observational data, however, do suggest that CRRT is more effective in **achieving net** <u>negative fluid balance</u> than IHD.

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

- CRRT is usually a more appropriate modality in those ICU patients with increased intracranial pressure (e.g. acute brain injury, fulminant hepatic failure, at risk of increased intracranial pressure).
  - CRRT, compared with IHD or SLED, can remove fluid steadily <u>over a longer period of time</u> and is available 24 h/day for the prevention of fluid overload, should large amounts of fluids and blood products require rapid infusion.
  - Therefore, CRRT is also often used in the setting of severe volume overload or during massive transfusion in patients with AKI.

# Indications and management of mechanical fluid removal in critical illness

M. H. Rosner<sup>1†</sup>, M. Ostermann<sup>2†\*</sup>, R. Murugan<sup>3</sup>, J. R. Prowle<sup>4</sup>, C. Ronco<sup>5</sup>, J. A. Kellum<sup>3</sup>, M. G. Mythen<sup>6</sup> and A. D. Shaw<sup>7</sup> for the ADQI XII Investigators Group

BJA 2014

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

Rapid early fluid removal may be indicated in cardio-renal syndrome (A), but a slower removal may be required for haemodynamic tolerance after resolution of pulmonary oedema. Patients with single organ renal failure (B) may tolerate more rapid fluid removal than those with AKI complicating severe sepsis (C) or septic shock (D).

# **Hybrid therapies**

Sono modalità che cercano di ottimizzare i vantaggi e **minimizzare** gli svantaggi di entrambe:

- Efficiente rimozione dei soluti
- Più lenta quota di ultrafiltrazione (ultrafiltration rate) → stabilità emodinamica
- Minore esposizione all'anticoagulazione
- Più breve **durata**
- Minori costi
- Minore carico di lavoro infermieristico
- Migliore "ICU workflow"

![](_page_29_Picture_9.jpeg)

## PIRRTs

Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapies

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

# SLED

Sustained Low Efficiency Dialysis PIRRT can be performed on most **machines** that are used for standard intermittent hemodialysis.

**Standard** extracorporeal circuit tubing and hemodialyzers are used for PIRRT.

PIRRT should be performed at least **three** times per week to provide an adequate dialysis dose. The time per session ranges from **6 to 18** hours but is typically approximately **8** hours.

The length of the dialysis session depends on the **needs of the patient** (usually the volume that needs to be removed) and hemodynamic stability

RONCO | BELLOMO | KELLUM | RICCI

# CARE THE Editor

https://t.me/MedicalBooksStore

![](_page_31_Picture_3.jpeg)

Claudio Ronco, MD Disater, Department of Nephiolo and Transplantation and Intern Renol Research Institute (IRRN Sen Bortolo Hospital Vicenza, Italy

Pritoburgh, Pennspinania MD, Zaocaria Ricci, MD Pediatric Cardiau Internativo Caro Unit Department of Pediatric Caselac Suspens sospital Banteiro Desi Children's Hespital (RCf

Department of Intensive Care Audit Hospital and Royal Mebourne Hospita Audit Hospital and Royal Mebourne Hospita Research Centre School of Public Health and Premetive Medicine Monahi University and School of Medicine The University of Mebourne Medicine RONCO | BELLOMO | KELLUM | RICCI

### CRITICAL CARE Trid Edition NEPHROLOGY

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

The technical elements of HT are not novel. In the extreme, it can be argued that Kolff actually performed the first HT treatments more than **50 years ago**.

However, the clinical context of HT is novel as a conceptual and logistic compromise between the modern applications of IHD and CRRT

# There is agreement among opinion leaders that the nomenclature must be standardized

RONCO | BELLOMO | KELLUM | RICCI

However, this is proving difficult, owing to lack of a common perspective between nephrologists and intensivists

 Hybrid therapy is "low efficiency" and "prolonged" to nephrologists . .

 but "high efficiency" and "foreshortened" to intensivists

![](_page_33_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Intermittent versus continuous renal replacement therapy for acute renal failure in adults (Review)

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

Rabindranath K et al. rane Database Syst Rev (2007)

- 15 trials comparing intermittent RRT (IRRT) versus CRRT
- Comparing intermittent RRT (IRRT) versus CRRT and <u>did not show differences</u> in ICU and in-hospital mortality, the number of patients who became RRT independent, hemodynamically instable, or hypotensive.
- Patients Patients on CRRT were likely to have significantly higher mean arterial pressure and higher risk of clotting dialysis filters

#### Extended Daily Dialysis in Acute Kidney Injury Patients: Metabolic and Fluid Control and Risk Factors for Death

Daniela Ponce\*, Juliana Maria Gera Abrão, Bianca Ballarin Albino, André Luis Balbi

#### University São Paulo State-UNESP, Distrito de Rubiao Junior, Botucatu, São Paulo, Brazil

#### Abstract

Intermittent hemodialysis (IHD) and continuous renal replacement therapies (CRRT) are used as Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) therapy and have certain advantages and disadvantages. Extended daily dialysis (EDD) has emerged as an alternative to CRRT in the management of hemodynamically unstable AKI patients, mainly in developed countries.

Objectives: We hypothesized that EDD is a safe option for AKI treatment and aimed to describe metabolic and fluid control of AKI patients undergoing EDD and identify complications and risk factors associated with death.

Study Selection: This is an observational and retrospective study describing introduction of EDD at our institution. A total of 231 hemodynamically unstable ARD statements (noradrenalin dose between 0.3 and 1.0 ucg/kg/mln) were assigned to 1367 EDD session. EDD consisted of 6-8 h of HD 6 days a week, with blood flow of 200 m/min, diskyste flows of 300 m/m/min.

Data Synthesis: Mean age was 60.6:15.8 years, 97.4% of patients were in the intensive care unit, and sepsis was the main etiology of AKI (76.2). BUN and creatinine levels stabilized after four sessions at around 38 and 2.4 mg/dl, respectively. Fluid balance decreased progressively and stabilized around zero after five sessions. Weekly delivered KIV was 554:0.7. Hypotension and filter dotting occurred in 47.5 and 12.4% of treatment session, respectively. Regarding AKI outcome, 25% of patients presented renal function recovery, 56% of patients remained on dialysis after 30 days, and 71.9% of patients died. Age and focus abdominal sepsis were identified as risk factors for death. Unite output and negative fluid balance were identified as protective factors.

Conclusions: EDD is effective for ANI patients, allowing adequate metabolic and fluid control. Age, focus abdominal sepsis, and lower urine output as well as positive fluid balance after two EDD sessions were associated significantly with death.

Citation: Ponce D, Abriao JMG, Albino BB, Balbi AL (2013) Extended Daily Dialysis in Acute Kidney Injury Patients: Metabolic and Fluid Control and Risk Factors for Desth. PLoS ONE 8(12): e9(697, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.008(697

Editors Jorge I.F. Salluh, D'or Institute of Research and Education, Brazil

Received July 1, 2013; Accepted October 15, 2013; Published December 11, 2013

Copyright: © 2013 Ponce et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: The authors have no support or funding to report.

Comparing Interests: Conside Ponce is a PLOS ONE Editorial Board member and this does not after the authors' adherence to all the PLOS ONE publicles on sharing data and meterials. \*\* \* E-main dependential-aureput

Background

The high mortality rate among critically ill acute kidney injury (AKJ) patients remains an unsolved problem in intensive care units (ICU) in spite of the considerable technological progress in renal replacement herapy (RKT) [1-3]. Diabity imagagement of these

replacement therapy (RRT) [1–3]. Dialytic management of these patients is difficult because of associated hemodynamic instability and multiple organ dysfunction, with mortality rates reaching 50– 70% [4]. There is no consensus in literature on the best dialysis method

There is no consensus in interature on the test massiss method and intermittent hemodiskys (IHD) and continuous renal replacement therapies (CRRT) have been used in AKI. Several studies have not revealed a definitive advantage in terms of patient survival for CRRT compared with HHD [5–10].

Both conventional IHD and CRRTs have certain advantages, but also several disadvantages. IHD is often complicated by hypotension and inadequate fluid removal, and CRRT by high cost of solutions and problems with anticcapathin. A hybrid therapy called sustained low efficiency dialysis (SLED) or extended dialysis (SLD) has emerged as an alternative to CRRT in the management of hemodynamically unstable patients with AKJ, mainly in developed countries [11,12].

The studies in the literature on EDD in AKI patients are few and insolve a small number of patients [9, 13–16]. They have demonstrated that EDD is well tolerated in critically ill patients, with comparable ultrafiltration and solute removal to CKRT and peritoneal dialysis [13,16].

This prospective study was designed to describe the introduction of EDD at our institution. We focused on metabolic and fluid control, complications and risk factors associated with death.

#### **Patients and Methods**

#### Study Population

This was an observational and retrospective study describing our experience of introducing EDD as a new HD modality in two Brazilian University Hospitals (Botucatu School of Merdicine and Bauru State of Sao Paulo). In our units, conventional IHD and pertitioneal dialysis had previously been the standard of care for AKL

Ponce D et al. PloS one (2013)

- Single-center retrospective study
- 231 hemodynamically unstable AKI patients (NE 0.3-1.0 mcg/Kg/min) – 76.2% sepsis
- SLED (6–8h of hemodialysis 6 days a week, with blood flow of 200 ml/min, dialysate flows of 300 ml/min) 1367 sessions.

#### SLED

appeared to be able to provide adequate metabolic and fluid control.

<u>Age</u> and focus <u>abdominal sepsis</u> were identified as risk factors for <u>death</u>. <u>Urine output</u> and <u>negative fluid balance</u> were identified as **protective** factors.

## AJKD Original Investigation

## Extended Daily Dialysis Versus Continuous Renal Replacement Therapy for Acute Kidney Injury: A Meta-analysis

Ling Zhang, MD,<sup>1,2</sup> Jiqiao Yang, MD,<sup>3</sup> Glenn M. Eastwood, MD,<sup>2</sup> Guijun Zhu, MD,<sup>2,4</sup> Aiko Tanaka, MD,<sup>2</sup> and Rinaldo Bellomo, MD, PhD<sup>2</sup>

		Design of Study	Modality	N	Mean Age (y)	Male Sex (%)	Duration (h/d)			
Study	Country						EDD	CRRT	Main Outcomes	Funding
Kielstein <sup>6</sup> (2004)	DE	RCT	EDD vs CVVH	39	50.5	62.9	11.7	23.3	Mortality, fluid removal	Industry
Baldwin <sup>18</sup> (2007)	AU	RCT	EDD vs CVVH	16	69.5	56.3	7.3	18.4	Fluid removal	NR
Abe <sup>7</sup> (2010)	JP	RCT	EDDF vs CVVHDF	60	68.7	65.0	6.5	20.3	Mortality, kidney recovery, ICU days	NR
Abe <sup>19</sup> (2011)	JP	RCT	EDDF vs CVVHDF	50	65.9	66.0	6.0	15.2	Mortality, kidney recovery, ICU days	NR
Shin <sup>20</sup> (2011)	KR	RCT	SLED vs CVVH	46	63	63.0	10	NR	Mortality	NR
Schwenger <sup>8</sup> (2012)	DE	RCT	SLED vs CVVH	232	66.2	67.7	14.9	19.9	Mortality, fluid removal, ICU days	NR
Badawy <sup>21</sup> (2012)	EG	RCT	EDD vs CVVHDF	80	47.5	65.0	6-8	NR	Mortality, fluid removal, ICU days	NR
Kumar <sup>22</sup> (2000)	US	Retrospective	EDD vs CVVH	42	50	64.3	7.5	19.5	Mortality	NR
Kumar <sup>23</sup> (2004)	US	Prospective	EDD vs CVVHD	54	52	63.0	6.7	16.8	Mortality, kidney recovery	NR
Berbece <sup>24</sup> (2006)	CA	Prospective	SLED vs CVVHDF	34	58.4	61.8	7.5	21.3	Mortality, fluid removal	NR
Marcelino <sup>25</sup> (2006)	PT	Retrospective	SLED vs CVVHDF	53	59.1	NR	6.8	22.1	Mortality	NR
Lu <sup>29</sup> (2008)	CN	Prospective	SLED vs CVVH	12	49.7	66.7	10	18	Mortality, kidney recovery	Public
Birne <sup>30</sup> (2009)	PT	Retrospective	SLED vs CVVHDF	63	63.3	49.2	6-12	NR	Mortality, fluid removal	NR
Fieghen <sup>26</sup> (2010)	CA	Retrospective	SLED vs CVVHDF	43	62.1	76.7	6.8	19.7	Mortality, fluid removal	NR
Wu <sup>9</sup> (2010)	TW	Retrospective	SLED vs CVVH	101	67.4	65.3	8.0	NR	Mortality, kidney recovery	NR
Khanal <sup>27</sup> (2012)	NZ	Retrospective	SLEDF vs CVVHDF	166	58.5	62.0	7.2	NR	Mortality, ICU days	NR
Chen <sup>28</sup> (2014)	CN	Retrospective	SLEDF vs CVVH	107	59.5	NR	8.8	23.5	Mortality, kidney recovery	NR

 17 studies (7 RCTs and 10 observational) of 1208 patients compared the effect of SLED with CRRT on clinical outcomes
 Zhang L et al. AJKD (2015)

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

**No significant differences** in recovery of renal function, fluid removal, days of ICU stay, and biochemical clearance between SLED and CRRT.

# **OUTCOMEREA** study

- Prospective observational multicenter cohort database study
- Assessed an association of dialysis modality with 30-day mortality and dialysis dependence in patients with AKI who underwent RRT between 2004 and 2014.
- 1360 patients
- No difference was seen in the composite outcome of 30-day mortality and dialysis dependence between the CRRT and IHD group.
- However, CRRT was associated with lower mortality and better recovery of renal function in patients with higher weight gain at the initiation of RRT and was associated with increased mortality in patients without shock.

Intensive Care Med (2016) 42:1408-1417 DOI 10.1007/s00134-016-4404-6

#### ORIGINAL

Continuous renal replacement therapy versus intermittent hemodialysis in intensive care patients: impact on mortality and renal recovery

Anne-Sophie Truche<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Michael Darmon<sup>4,5</sup>, Sébastien Bailly<sup>1,6</sup>, Christophe Clec'h<sup>1,7,8</sup>, Claire Dupuis<sup>19</sup>, Benoit Misset<sup>10,11</sup>, Elie Azoulay<sup>12,13</sup>, Carolé Schwebel<sup>2</sup>, Lila Bouadma<sup>3</sup>, Hatem Kallel<sup>14</sup>, Christophe Adrie<sup>15</sup>, Anne-Sylvie Dumenil<sup>16</sup>, Laurent Argaud<sup>17</sup>, Guillaume Marcotte<sup>18</sup>, Samir Jamali<sup>19</sup>, Philippe Zaoui<sup>3</sup>, Virginie Lauren<sup>20</sup>, Dary Goldgran-Toledano<sup>21</sup>, Romain Sonneville<sup>9</sup>, Bertrand Souweine<sup>22</sup>, Jean-Francois Timsit<sup>1,9,23\*</sup> and OUTCOMEREA Study group<sup>1</sup>

0 2016 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg and ESICM.

![](_page_40_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### mroduction

Morvision: ALL acue isday agosy ANGET I, Actor Physiology and Chener Health Foldation III. C. unificience internal: CMR, antioneus result registerated Physical Chener and Comparison for an antiparticle and RL and reporting TMML (Andrezel Separating tracing for Spectra (Device), and Mean March Internalistic Morrison (Device) and Mean andreast to well internalistic and the Antipartic Spectra (Device), and Mean andreast to well internalistic and the Antipartic Spectra andreast to well internalistic and the Antipartic Spectra (Device). And main physicistic Devices (Device) and Mean and Antipartic Spectra and registerior Devices (TS), and andreast (Device). Device (Device). III: 115 – 400 - Devicespectral guardine and (Device). Device (Device). III: 115 – 400

mai replacement biology (38, menguardir zarga, 4 Consequenting and an all control mobile Sciences Centre, 813–216 – 900 Derenstowen BJ, E. London, Kranstin RA 425, Canada, E-mail colleges, danie Rei et Biol Biologica (2018, Moli), what is an architeria Cang Dia CS, Temoriti, waldelineria al K. Walt), et Biolineria (2016), 2016 (2014). March 1990, 2016 (2016), 201

architeconstructs (1): D16-Ny).
3: Schlads Hungma): 36 Boost Street, Streets, Omaris, Canada, NDE TWB,
<sup>1</sup> Programs So: Anoresteric et of Technology in Hodds (1973H). Knowsch Institute, 25 Main.
Street West, Sate: 2008, Harribes, Ordanis, Canada, LEP 1111.

Approximately 5.5 of patients addition to the interview care user COU protective error (and patients of theory) (MT) (L2), and in-hospital mortality is generally above 502 (15.5). For least of schrapes after an erlow of a care balance to patient and patients of schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and the mortality of the schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and annotation that and the schrapes and the schrapes and the patients in the full community compared to individual while and annotation that the schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and annotation that the schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and annotation that the schrapes and the schrapes and the schrapes and annotation that the schrapes and the schrapes and the patients in the full community compared patients where the schrapes and the schrapes are schrapes and the schrapes an

#### Nash DM et al. JCC (2017)

- 21 trials comparing RRT modalities in the ICU
- 16 studies were RCTs
- No single RRT modality carried definitive advantages on mortality and dialysis dependence at 30 days
- However, there was a trend toward better patient and kidney survival for CRRT versus IHD

	CRR	B	IND OF 3	SLED		RISK Ratio	RISK Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
3.1.1 IHD							
Augustine 2004	27	40	28	40	5.5%	0.96 [0.72, 1.30]	+
Lins 2009	100	172	90	144	19.3%	0.93 [0.78, 1.11]	+
Mehta 2001	55	84	39	82	7.8%	1.38 [1.05, 1.81]	-
Noble 2006	49	64	44	53	9.5%	0.92 [0.77, 1.11]	+
Schefold	67	122	77	128	14.8%	0.91 [0.74, 1.13]	+
Uehlinger 2005	33	70	28	55	6.2%	0.93 [0.65, 1.33]	+
Vinsonneau 2006	107	175	107	184	20.6%	1.05 (0.89, 1.25)	+
Subtotal (95% CI)		727		686	83.8%	1.00 [0.92, 1.09]	•
Total events	438		413				8
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	7.82, df =	6 (P = (	0.25); P =	23%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.01 (	P=0.9	9)				
3.1.2 SLED							
Abe 2010	11	30	5	30	1.0%	2.20 [0.87, 5.57]	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Abe 2011	9	25	5	25	1.0%	1.80 [0.70, 4.62]	
Kumar 2004	20	28	14	26	2.9%	1.33 [0.87, 2.03]	+
Schwenger	62	117	57	115	11.4%	1.07 (0.83, 1.37)	+
Subtotal (95% CI)		200		196	16.2%	1.23 [1.00, 1.51]	•
Total events	102		81				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	3.44, df =	3 (P=(	0.33); I <sup>2</sup> =	13%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.93 (	P = 0.0	5)				
Total (95% CI)		927		882	100.0%	1.04 [0.96, 1.12]	
Total events	540		494				2
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	14.24, df =	10 (P	= 0.16); I <sup>2</sup>	= 30%			ter et de un
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.90 (	P = 0.3	7)	1.1.1.1.1			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for subarrun diffe	ronces C	hill = 3	21 41-1	10-00	7) 17 - 69	08	Pavours GRRT Favours IHD/SLED

	CRR	т	IHD or !	SLED		Risk Ratio		Ris	k Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	1	M-H, Rat	ndom, 95%	6 CI	
3.2.1 IHD	0.000	01100-010				31. A 10/13 MeX 9004. PO200 A 194904		00000000000000		1450101	
Davenport 1989	1	3	2	4	0.5%	0.67 [0.10, 4.35]			-		
Gasparovic 2003	37	52	31	52	19.3%	1.19 [0.90, 1.58]			-		
John 2001	14	20	7	10	6.5%	1.00 [0.61, 1.64]		<i>2</i> 2	+		
Mehta 2001	50	84	34	82	16.0%	1.44 [1.05, 1.96]					
Noble 2006	46	64	39	53	30.1%	0.98 [0.78, 1.22]			+		
Uehlinger 2005	24	70	21	55	7.3%	0.90 [0.56, 1.43]		1	-		
Subtotal (95% CI)		293		256	79.7%	1.10 [0.95, 1.28]			*		
Total events	172		134								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 5.43	df = 5 (F)	= 0.37)	; l² = 8%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.25 (	P = 0.2	1)								
3.2.2 SLED											
Abe 2010	10	30	5	30	1.8%	2.00 [0.78, 5.15]			+	2	
Abe 2011	7	25	4	25	1.4%	1.75 [0.58, 5.24]				-	
Schwenger	49	117	49	115	17.1%	0.98 [0.73, 1.33]			+		
Subtotal (95% CI)		172		170	20.3%	1.23 [0.77, 1.95]					
Total events	66		58								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.06; Chi2	= 2.81	, df = 2 (F	= 0.25)	; i² = 29%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.86 (	P = 0.3	(9)								
Total (95% CI)		465		426	100.0%	1.10 [0.97, 1.25]			•		
Total events	238		192						ĭ.		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi*	= 8.24	, df = 8 (F	= 0.41)	; F# = 3%		1	1	1	1	4.04
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.42 (	P = 0.1	6)				0.01	U.1	T Foundation	10	100
Test for subgroup diffs	mances: C	$bi^2 = 0$	10 df = 1	(P=0.6	(A) # = 09	6		rayours GRR	i ravour	s inu/st	EU

Fig. 2. In-hospital mortality comparing continuous renal replacement therapy and intermittent hemodialysis/sustained low efficiency dialysis.

Fig. 3. ICU mortality comparing continuous renal replacement therapy and intermittent hemodialysis/sustained low efficiency dialysis.

## Large studies assessing effects of RRT modalities on both short-term and long-term renal outcomes of AKI patients.

End-stage renal disease patients on renal replacement therapy in the intensive care unit: Short- and long-term outcome\*

Max Bell, MD; Fredrik Granath, PhD; Staffan Schön, MD; Erland Löfberg, PhD; SWING; Anders Ekbom, PhD; Claes-Roland Martling, PhD

Objective: The number of patients with end-stage renal disease has increased during the last decades. Data shows that 10% of the renal replacement therapy population in the intensive care unit are patients with end-stage renal disease. We aimed to describe the short- and long-term outcome of these patients after renal replacement therapy in the intensive care unit.

Design: Nationwide cohort study between the years 1995 and 2004. Follow-up up to 5 years. Setting: Swedish general intensive care units and Swedish

hospitals.

Patients: Eligible subjects were end-stage renal disease patients treated with renal replacement therapy in 32 Swedish general intensive care units. In total, 245 patients were studied. Interventions: None.

Measurements and Main Results: Short- and long-term mortality was studied. Logistic regression was used to analyze short-term mortality. Long-term mortality was compared with the mortality of end-stage renal disease patients outside the intensive care unit and the mortality in the population.

he number of patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD) has increased during the last decades. Some studies indicate that the incidence of ESRD may double in complications and the associated vulner the next 10 years (1). In Sweden, data from ability of ESRD patients increase the risk the Swedish Registry for Active Treatof intensive care unit (ICU)-related organ

ment of liremia (SRAII) reveal that the prevalence of patients on dialysis and transplantation was ~815 per million population in 2005. During the 12-yr perind between 1991 and 2002 it increased by 75% (2). The number of patients on hemodialysis more than doubled from 1991 to 2005, from 1099 to 2591 patients.

"See also p. 2939.

From the Departments of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care (MB, C-RM); Department of Medicine (FG, AE), Clinical Epidemiology Unit; and Department of Nephrology (FI) Kandinska University Hospital Salna Sweden Department of Physiology and Pharmacology (MB, C-RM), Karolinska institutot, Stockholm, Sweden; Swedish Reglater of Active Uremia (SRAU), Department of Nephrology (SS), Kämhospital, Skövde, Sweden; and Swedish intensive care Nephrology Group (SWNG).

This work was performed at the Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Karolinska University Hospital, Soine, Sweden and the Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, The authors have not disclosed any potential conflicts

of interest. Contrict to 2008 by the Society of Critical Care Medicine and Lippincoft Williams & Wikins DOI- 10 1097/0000 05013e318187815

Bell M et al. Crit Care Med (2008)

Diabetes and heart failure are significant risk factors for 90-day mortality, with an odds ratio of 1.9 and 2.0, respectively The intensive care unit end-stage renal disease cohort had increased long-term mortality as compared with non-intensive care unit end-stage renal disease patients, relative risk of death 2.32 (confidence interval 1.84-2.92). A comparison with the mortality rate in the general population yielded a standardized mortality ratio of 25 (95% confidence interval: 19.6-31.4).

Conclusions: For end-stage renal disease patients in the intensive care unit, age, diabetes mellitus, and heart failure are risk factors for 90-day mortality. Long-term mortality is associated with age and heart failure. The long-term mortality of end-stage renal disease patients surviving the intensive care unit stay is significantly higher compared with end-stage renal disease patients without a known intensive care unit admission. (Crit Care Med 2008; 36: 2773-2778)

Key Worps: end-stage renal disease; outcome; intensive care; renal replacement therapy; epidemiology

The mean age of ESRD subjects has that close to 10% of the specific ICU increased over the last decade (2). A large population receiving renal replacement proportion of these older patients have therapy (RRT) consisted of patients with nonrenal complicating diseases. These FSRD (5).

Data on ESRD patients in the ICU is limited. Three single center studies including 38 (4), 92 (6), and 93 patients (7) dysfunction (3). Thus, an obvious conclurespectively, detailed the validity of ICU sion is that an aging ESRD population, scoring systems and outcome for this pa increasing in numbers, will result in tient population. One multicentered more admissions to the ICU from this study investigated the impact of acute population. One Australian study showed renal failure (ARF) (254 cases) as comthat 2% of patients on chronic dialysis pared with ESRD (57 cases) on ICU outrequire ICU admission every year (4). A come (8). A recent very large database recent Swedish nationwide study revealed study from the United Kingdom looked into the outcome of ESRD patients and found that L3% of all patients admitted to the ICU were receiving chronic renal dialysis before ICU admission (3). All these investigations have focused on short-term mortality. The present study investigates the short- and the long-term outcome of a cohort of 245 ESRD patients needing RRT in the ICU. We detail their comorbidity risk factors and their

The Association Between Renal Replacement Therapy Modality and Long-Term Outcomes Among Critically III Adults With Acute Kidney Injury: A Retrospective Cohort Study\*

Ron Wald, MDCM, MPH, FRCPC14; Salimah Z, Shariff, PhD3; Neill K, I Adhikari, MDCM, MSc, FRCPC15; Sean M. Bagshaw, MD, FRCPC5; Karen E. A. Burns, MD, MSc, FRCPC257; Jan O. Friedrich, MD, MSc, DPhil, FRCPC25.7; Amit X. Garg, MD, PhD, FRCPC3.8; Ziv Harel, MD, MSc, FRCPC1.2; Abhijat Kitchlu, MD12; Joel G. Ray, MD, MSc, FRCPC239

#### "See also p. 990

Division of Nephrology, St. Michael's Hospital and University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Keenan Research Centre in the Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute of St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada

Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, ON, Canada \*Department of Critical Care Medicine and Sunnybrook Research Institute, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto, ON, Canada, Interdepartmental Division of Critical Care, University of Toronto, Toronto,

ON Canada \*Division of Critical Care Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, Uni-

versity of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada Departments of Critical Care and Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital,

Toronto ON Canada "Division of Nephrology, London Health Sciences Centre, London, ON,

Canada. "Division of General Internal Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada,

This work was conducted at the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences @Western Expansion Site.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's website (http://journals.lww.com/ comiournal

Supported by Physicians' Services Incorporated Foundation, Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES) is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care. ICES@Western is funded by an operating grant from the Academic Medical Organization of Southwostern Ontario.

Dr. Wald consulted for Thrasos, lectured for Alere, and received grant support from Alere. His institution received grant support from the Physician por non-Nete. This instructor received grant support non-the Physican Services Incorporated Foundation (peer reviewed grant). Dr. Bagshaw has served as a paid consultant for Gambro and lectured for Alere and Spectral Diagnostics. The remaining authors have declosed that they do not have any potontial conflicts of interest.

For information regarding this article, E-mail: waldr@smh.ca

Williams & Wilkins

Objective: Among critically ill patients with agute kidney injury. the impact of renal replacement therapy modality on long-term kidney function is unknown. Compared with conventional intermittent hemodialysis, continuous renal replacement therapy may promote kidney recovery by conferring greater hemodynamic stability; yet continuous renal replacement therapy may not enhance patient survival and is resource intense. Our object tive was to determine whether continuous renal replacement therapy was associated with a lower risk of chronic dialysis as compared with intermittent hemodialysis, among survivors of acute kidney injury.

Design: Retrospective cohort study

Setting: Linked population-wide administrative databases in Ontario, Canada,

Patients: Critically ill adults who initiated dialysis for acute kidney injury between July 1996 and December 2009. In the primary analysis, we considered those who survived to at least 90 days after renal replacement therapy initiation

Interventions: Initial receipt of continuous renal replacement therapy versus intermittent hemodialysis

Measurements and Main Results: Continuous renal replacement therapy recipients were matched 1:1 to intermittent hemodialysis recipients based on a history of chronic kidney disease, receipt of mechanical ventilation, and a propensity score for the likelihood of receiving continuous renal replacement therapy. Cox proportional hazards were used to evaluate the relationship between initial renal replacement therapy modality and the primary outcome of chronic dialysis, defined as the need for dialysis for a consecutive period of 90 days. We identified 2,315 continuous renal replacement therapy recipients of whom 2,004 (87%) were successfully matched to 2,004 intermittent hemodialveis recipients. Participants were followed over a median duraion of 3 years. The risk of chronic dialysis was

Wald R et al. Crit Care Med (2014)

Copyright © 2013 by the Society of Critical Care Medicine and Lippincott DOI: 10.1097/CCM

# percentages of patients who were survived and **remained dialysis dependent**

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

Bell M et al. Crit Care Med (2008)

Wald R et al. Crit Care Med (2014)

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Renal Replacement Therapy Modality in the ICU and Renal Recovery at Hospital Discharge\*

Martin Bonnassieux, MD1-2; Antoine Duclos, MD, PhD3; Antoine G, Schneider, MD, PhD4; Aurélie Schmidt, MS5; Stève Bénard, PharmD5; Charlotte Cancalon, MS5; Olivier Joannes-Bovau, MD6; Carole Ichai, MD, PhD78; Jean-Michel Constantin, MD, PhD8; Jean-Yves Lefrant, MD, PhD10; John A. Kellum, MD, FACP, MCCM11; Thomas Rimmelé, MD, PhD12; for the AzuRéa Group

#### "See also p. 340.

Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, Edouard Herriot hospital, Lyon, France,

EA 7426 (Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1 - Hospices Civils de Lyon - bioMérieux) "Pathophysiology of Injury-induced Immunosupression -PI3," Joint Research Unit, Edouard Herriot Hospital, Lyon, France. "Hospices Civils de Lyon, Pôle Information Médicale Evaluation Recher-

che, University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Health Services and Performance Research Lab (EA 7425), Lyon, France. <sup>4</sup>Adult Intensive Care Unit and Burn Center, Centre Hospitalier Universi-

taire Vaudois, Lausanne, Switzerland, \*St[è]ve consultants, Oullins, France.

Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care II, Magellan Hospital, University Hospital of Bordeaux, University of Bordeaux 2, Pessac, France. <sup>7</sup>Medicosurgical Intensive Care Unit, Pasteur 2, Nice, France,

FIRCAN Unit, UMR INSERM U1081 - CNRS 7284, Nice Sophia-Antipolis University, Nice, France,

Department of perioperative medicine, University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, Clermont-Ferrand, France.

<sup>10</sup>Department of Critical Care Medicine, CHU Nimes, Nimes, France, 14Center for Critical Care Nephrology, The CRISMA (Clinical Research, Investigation, and Systems Modeling of Acute Illness) Center, Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

A complete list of hoard members of the AxuRéa Group is as follows: Pierre-Francois Perrigault, Matthieu Jabaudon, Bernard Allacuchiche, Marc Leone, Jean-Christophe Orban, Matthieu Legrand, Sebastien Perbet, Claire Roger, Jean-Michel Julia, Serge Molliex, Russell Chabanne, François Antonini, Sophie Kauffmann, Pierre-Eric Danin, Thomas Godet, Olivier Langeron, Arnaud Friggen, Thomas Geeraerts, Laurent Muller, Jacques Ripart, Olivier Baldesi, Saber Barbar, Jerôme Morel, Alain Lepape, Pierre-Marie Bertrand, Jean-Etienne Bazin, Ali Mofredj, Béatrice Riu-Poulenc, Karim Lakhal, Vincent Minville, Emmanuel Futier Philippe Guerci, Emmanuel Novy, Pierre Bouzat, Qin Lu, and Karim Debbat.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's website (http://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal). Dr. Bonnassieux disclosed that the study received financial support from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, however, Gambro-Hospal-Baxter had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval

of the article. Dr. Schneider's institution received funding from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, Fresenius Medical Care, and BBraun Avitum, Drs. Schmidt, Bénard, Cancalon's, and Ichai institutions received funding from Copyright @ 2017 by the Society of Critical Care Medicine and Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

DOI: 10.1097/CCM.000000000002796

Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, Dr. Joannes-Boyau's institution received funding from Asahi Kasei, and he received funding from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, BBraun, Merck Sharp and Dohme, and Fresenius Medical Care. Dr. Constantin has received consulting fees or speaker honorarium from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter. Dr. Kellum received tunding from Baxter and NxStage Dr. Rimmelé received consulting fees or speaker honorarium from Gam bro-Hospal-Baxter and Fresenius Medical Care. The remaining authors have disclosed that they do not have any potential conflicts of interest. For information regarding this article, E-mail: martin.bonnassieux@chu-lyon.tr

Objectives: Acute kidney injury requiring renal replacement therapy is a major concern in ICUs. Initial renal replacement therapy modality, continuous renal replacement therapy or intermittent hemodialysis, may impact renal recovery. The aim of this study was to assess the influence of initial renal replacement therapy modality on renal recovery at hospital discharge.

Design: Retrospective cohort study of all ICU stays from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2013, with a "renal replacement therapy for acute kidney injury" code using the French hospital discharge database.

Setting: Two hundred ninety-one ICUs in France.

Patients: A total of 1,031,120 stays: 58,635 with renal replacement therapy for acute kidney injury and 25,750 included in the main analysis.

#### Interventions: None

Measurements Main Results: PPatients alive at hospital discharge were grouped according to initial modality (continuous renal replacement therapy or intermittent hemodialysis) and included in the main analysis to identify predictors of renal recovery. Renal recovery was defined as greater than 3 days without renal replacement therapy before hospital discharge. The main analysis was a hierarchical logistic regression analysis including patient demographics, comorbidities, and severity variables; as well as center characteristics. Three sensitivity analyses were performed. Overall mortality was 56.1%, and overall renal recovery was 86.2%. Intermittent hemodialysis was associated with a lower likelihood of recovery at hospital discharge; odds ratio, 0.910 (95% Cl. 0.834-0.992) p value equals to 0.0327. Results were consistent across all sensitivity analyses with odds/hazards ratios ranging from 0.883 to 0.958.

Renal Replacement Therapy Modality in the ICU and Renal Recovery at Hospital Discharge\*

- **Retrospective cohort study**
- France; 291 centers
- 58 635 patients with AKI receiving **RRT** in ICU

#### Bonnassieux M et al.CCM (2018)

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

Renal Replacement Therapy Modality in the ICU and Renal Recovery at Hospital Discharge\*

#### Renal Replacement Therapy Modality in the ICU and Renal Recovery at Hospital Discharge\*

Martin Bonnassieux, MD<sup>1,2</sup>; Antoine Duclos, MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Antoine G. Schneider, MD, PhD<sup>4</sup>; Aurélie Schmidt, MS<sup>5</sup>; Stève Bénard, PharmD<sup>5</sup>; Charlotte Cancalon, MS<sup>5</sup>; Olivier Joannes-Boyau, MD<sup>6</sup>; Carole Ichai, MD, PhD<sup>2,8</sup>; Jean-Michel Constantin, MD, PhD<sup>9</sup>; Jean-Yves Lefrant, MD, PhD<sup>10</sup>; John A. Kellum, MD, FACP, MCCM<sup>11</sup>; Thomas Rimmelé, MD, PhD<sup>12</sup>; for the AzuRéa Group

#### "See also p. 340.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, Edouard Herriot hospital, Lyon, France.

\*EA 7426 (Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1 – Hospices Civils de Lyon – bioMéneux) "Pathophysiology of Injury-induced Immunosupression – Pi37 joint Research Unit, Edouard Hernit Hospital, Lyon, France. "Hospices Civils de Lyon, Pôle Information Médicale Evaluation Recher-

che, University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Health Services and Performance Research Lab (EA 7425), Lyon, France. <sup>4</sup>Adult Intensive Care Unit and Burn Center, Centre Hospitalier Universi-

taire Vaudois, Lausanne, Switzerland. \*St[è]ve consultants, Oullins, France.

St[e]ve consultants, Oullins, France.

\*Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care II, Magellan Hospital, University Hospital of Bordeaux, University of Bordeaux 2, Pessac, France. \*Medicosurgical Intensive Care Unit, Pasteur 2, Nice, France.

RCAN Unit, UMR INSERM U1081 - CNRS 7284, Nice Sophia-Antipolis University, Nice, France.

<sup>6</sup>Department of perioperative medicine, University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, Clermont-Ferrand, France.

<sup>10</sup>Department of Critical Care Medicine, CHU Nimes, Nimes, France.
<sup>10</sup>Center for Critical Care Nephrology, The CRISMA (Clinical Research, Investigation, and Systems Modeling of Acute Illness) Center, Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, PAttsburgh, PAtt

A complete list of board members of the AxuRea Group is as follows: Perre-François Perrigaut, Matthieu Jabaudon, Bornard Allacuchica Parto Lonce, Lean-Christopher Orban, Matthieu Logrand, Sebastien Parbet, Claire Roger, Jean-Michel Julis, Sorge Mollise, Russell Chabanno, François Antonini, Sophie Kautimann, Pierre-Fro Danin, Thomas Godet, Olivier Lungeron, Annaud Frigger, Thomas Gerearsts, Laurent Muller, Jacques Ripart, Olivier Baldenis, Saber Barbar, Jeôme Morel, Alain Lepape, Pierre-Marie Bortrand, Jean-Etionno Bazin, Ali Mofrodi, Béatrice Riu-Poulanc, Karim Lakhal, Vincent Minville, Emmanuel Futler Philipes Guerci, Emmanuel Nory, Pierre Bouzd, Oni Lu, and Karim Debalt.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and POF versions of this article website (http://prumasi.vwc.com/ccmjournal). Dr. Bonnassieux disclosed that the study received financial support

from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, however, Gambro-Hospal-Baxter had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection; management; analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the article. Dr. Schneider's institution received funding from Gambor-Hospal-Baxter, Freeenius Medical Care, and BBrana Avitum. Dra. Schmidt, Bénard, Cancelon's, and Ichai institutions neceived funding from Copyright © 2017 by the Society of Critical Care Medicine and Wolters Kiwer Health, no. All Rights Reserved.

DOI: 10.1097/CCM.000000000002796

Gambro-Hospal-Baxter. Dr. Joannes-Boyau's institution received tunding from Asahi Kasai, and he received funding from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter, BBraun, Merck Sharp and Dohme, and Fresenius Medical Care. Dr. Constartini has received consulting fees or spaaker honorarium from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter. Dr. Kellum received tunding from Baxter and NuStage. Dr. Rimmele received consulting fees or spaaker honorarium from Gambrohospal-Baxter. Dr. Kellum received funding trom Baxter and NuStage. Dr. Rimmele received consulting fees or spaaker honorarium from Gambro-Hospal-Baxter and Fresenius Medical Care. The remaining authors: have disclosed that they do not have any potential conflicts of interest. For information regarding this article. E-mail: martin.bornassieu@clu-lyon.tr

**Objectives:** Acute kidney injury requiring renal replacement therapy modality, continuous renal replacement therapy or intermittent homodialysis, may impact renal recovery. The aim of this study was to assess the influence of initial renal replacement therapy modality on renal recovery at hospital discharge.

**Design:** Retrospective cohort study of all ICU stays from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2013, with a "renal replacement therapy for acute kidney injury" code using the French hospital dischargo database.

Setting: Two hundred ninety-one ICUs in France.

Patients: A total of 1,031,120 stays: 58,635 with renal replacement therapy for acute kidney injury and 25,750 included in the main analysis.

#### Interventions: None

Measurements Main Results: PPatients alive at hospital discharge were grouped according to initial modality (continuous renal replacement therapy or intermittent hemodialysis) and included in the main analysis to identify predictors of renal recovery. Renal recovery was defined as greater than 3 days without renal replacement therapy belore hospital discharge. The main analysis was a hierarchical logistic regression analyais including patient demographics, comorbidities, and sever ity variables, as well as center characteristics. Three sensitivity analyses were performed. Overall mortality was 56.1%, and overall renal recovery was 86.2%. Intermittent hemodialysis was associated with a lower likelihood or recovery at hospital discharge; odds ratio, 0.910 (95% CI, 0.834–0.992) p value equals to 0.0327. Results were consistent across all sensitivity analyses with odds/hazards ratios ranging from 0.883 to 0.958.

- Overall hospital mortality of 56.1%.
- Of these, 13.2% patients were still dialysis dependent at the time of discharge.
- Among these 58 635 patients, the use of IHD as the initial modality of dialysis was associated with lower rates of recovery of renal function at hospital discharge

Bonnassieux M et al.CCM (2018)

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

# RRT in the ICU setting: continuous or intermittent (or HYBRID, SLED, PIRRT ...)

✓ To date, no modality of RRT shows clear superiority over the others in terms of survival and recovery of renal function.

✓ However:

- ✓ CRRT → a slow, gentle, and continuous kidney support → hemodynamic instability + fluid balance
- ✓ CRRT → less cerebral edema (more physiological and slow removal of urea and other solutes).
- ✓ Initial or exclusive use of IHD → decreased likelihood of renal recovery in the short and medium term compared with initial or exclusive use of CRRT.

 ... additional studies are a key priority in the field of critical care nephrology ...

# **CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT**

![](_page_48_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

The mental flexibility of the wise man permits him to keep an open mind and enables him to readjust himself whenever it becomes necessary for a change.

— Malcolm X —

![](_page_49_Picture_3.jpeg)

... availability ... timing .... timeliness ... materials . . .

![](_page_50_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

Nephrologist Dialysis nurse (technician)

Intensivist ICU nurse

![](_page_51_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Le modalità disponibili in Terapia Intensiva: Intermittenti, Continue o Ibride?

Stefano Romagnoli, MD, PhD

UO di Nefrologia, Dialisi e Trapianto Renale Ospedale San Bortolo - ULSS 8 Berica International Renal Research Institute Vicenza (IRRIV)

![](_page_53_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_6.jpeg)

Videoconferenza LIVE per INFERMIERI NEFROLOGI INTENSIVISTI ... e tutti i Medici in Formazione Specialistica! XI E dizione

![](_page_53_Picture_8.jpeg)

Dip. di Scienze della Salute – Università di Firenze Dip. di Anestesia e Rianimazione - AOU Careggi - Firenze

	STUDY										
	SCHLAEPER ET AL. <sup>19</sup>	FINKEL AND FORINGER <sup>12</sup>	LONNEMANN ET AL. <sup>15</sup>	MARSHALL ET AL. <sup>16</sup>	MARSHALL ET AL. <sup>17</sup>	NAKA ET AL. <sup>18</sup>	KUMAR ET AL. <sup>13,14</sup>				
Hemodialysis machine	Fresenius 2008H	Fresenius 2008H	Fresenius GENIUS	Fresenius 2008H	Fresenius 4008S ARrT-Plus	Fresenius 4008S ARrT- Plus	Fresenius 2008H				
Hemodialyzer	Fresenius F40	Fresenius F7	Fresenius F60S	Fresenius F8	Fresenius AV600S	Fresenius AV600S	Toray 1.0				
Membrane composition	Polysulfone	Polysulfone	Polysulfone	Polysulfone	Polysulfone	Polysulfone	Polymethyl methacrylate				
Area (m²)	0.7	1.6	1.25	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.0				
Flux	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High				
Duration (hours)	Continuous	Continuous	8-18	12	8-10	8-10	8				
Time of day	Continuous	Continuous	Nocturnal	Nocturnal	Nocturnal/Diurnal	Diurnal	Diurnal				
Frequency	Continuous	Continuous	Daily	Daily/5–6 days per week	Daily/5–6 days per week	Daily/5–6 days per week	Daily/6 days per week				
Blood flow rate (Q <sub>s</sub> ) (mL/min)	150-200	150	70	200	200-350	100	150-200				
Dialysate flow rate (Q <sub>D</sub> ) (mL/min)	100	100	70	100	200	200	300				
Filtration rate (Q <sub>F</sub> ) (mL/min)	0	0	0	0	100	25	0				
Dialysate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate	Bicarbonate				