

An Overview of Risk and Advantages of Peritoneal Dialysis and Hemodialysis

¹Albaraa Mohammad J Madkhali, ²Abdullatif Alhassan A Fathi,
³Albaraa Ahmed F Juraybi, ⁴Khalid Awaji M Jammali,
⁵Ahmed Abdullah Ahmed Hakami, ⁶Omar Abdulaziz Yahya Madkhali,
⁷Fahad Mousa Jawman Wasili, ⁸Ahmed Ibrahim Ibrahim Alkhawaji,
⁹Nasir Abdullah Mgboul, ¹⁰Rami Mohammed Yahya Alfaifi

Abstract: Peritoneal dialysis (PD) and hemodialysis (HD) are dialysis options for end-stage renal disease patients in whom preemptive kidney transplantation is not possible. The selection of PD or HD will usually be based on patient motivation, desire, and geographic distance from an HD unit, physician and/or nurse bias, and patient education. Unfortunately, many patients are not educated on PD before beginning dialysis. The main aim of this review is to list the advantages and risks of peritoneal dialysis and hemodialysis.

Keywords: Peritoneal dialysis (PD), chronic kidney disease (CKD).

1. INTRODUCTION

Integrated care models of chronic kidney disease (CKD) and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) stress shifts between treatment methods (hemodialysis [HD], peritoneal dialysis [PD], and kidney transplantation) and the possibility that a specific patient will, in his/her life time with CKD/ESRD, experience more than among these methods. For most patients, successful kidney transplant is the very best treatment for ESRD. The absence of available donor organs, comorbid conditions, and patient option prevent transplantation in many patients, thereby making chronic dialysis the only option for some beginning renal repositioning treatment. Medical and social conditions in addition to geographical considerations and patient choice ought to dictate the choice of PD (constant ambulatory PD or constant biking PD) or hemodialysis (HD), but patient choice need to always be the main consider that decision. Patient choice needs appropriate method education, which, sadly, is not always the case. As a consequence, physician choice and experience and reimbursement issues may also influence modality choice⁽¹⁻⁴⁾. Implicit in the decision to start HD or PD is a consideration of the threats and benefits of each method, and those concerns will be the focus of this discussion.

2. METHODOLOGY

We searched Ovid versions of MEDLINE, EMBASE and PUDMED up to 2015, As well as the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and Cochrane Controlled Trials Register. MESH terms used were 'PERITONEAL' and 'HEMODIALYSIS', 'DIALYSIS' and 'CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE'. Further terms were included as text words. A high sensitivity "therapy" (trials) filter was applied to the EMBASE search. No other limits were applied to any of the searches. In addition, we hand searched the reference lists of retrieved full-text papers.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Risks and Benefits of PD versus HD:

Table 1 reveals a few of the primary benefits of each modality. We are not particularly considering home HD, however much of the basic advantages of PD noted in the table also apply to house HD. Preliminary method choice need to for the

most parts be patient/family directed, with primary factors to consider concentrated on lifestyle and social problems such as patient autonomy, geographic place as it impacts transport to and from the dialysis center, living circumstance, patient motivation, and patient and family employment. Patient education about modality choices is needed for notified decision making and, in most cases, will be somewhat depending on physician input and motivation. Regrettably, United States nephrologist training in PD is often insufficient⁽⁵⁾, and although many nephrologists think at least 40% of ESRD patients should be on PD⁽⁶⁾, less than 10% of present US dialysis patients are on PD⁽⁷⁾. Bundling of dialysis services and repayment for pre-dialysis education might increase the varieties of patients on PD over the next few years⁽⁴⁾. In basics, when patients are needed to be seen regularly prior to dialysis and informed about PD, up to 45% of patients choose PD⁽⁸⁾. Distance from an HD center is a main factor in the option of PD, accounting for 25% of the variability of dialysis technique option in a 1996 to 1997 study of 3793 event dialysis patients⁽¹⁾. Younger, white, employed, more educated patients in this research study were likely to pick PD over in-center HD⁽¹⁾. Because patient survival and acceptable quality of life are the ultimate goals of renal replacement treatments, it is very important to compare mortality and morbidity in patients on PD and HD.

The influence of dialysis modality on patient survival is rather controversial, with early research studies showing a 19% greater adjusted death rate in PD patients⁽⁹⁾. However, subsequent research studies demonstrated similar survival in PD and HD patients and emphasized that patient comorbidity, age, and reason for ESRD were the primary factors impacting survival⁽¹⁰⁾. More current research studies have actually explained improved survival in PD patients, particularly in the very first 1 to 2 years of ESRD^(11,12). After 1.5 to 2 years on dialysis, the threat of death in PD patients ends up being equivalent to or greater than that in HD patients, depending on patient factors such as age, diabetes, and other comorbidities. Two current research studies revealed the negative results of main venous catheter (CVC) on patient survival.^(13,14) Perl and associates demonstrated comparable survival in PD and HD patients who started with an arteriovenous fistula (AVF) or arteriovenous graft (AVG) (90-day survival: 7.4% for PD and 6.1% for HD- AVF/AVG), but considerably even worse survival for HD patients starting dialysis with a CVC (15.6% survival, 13). Another little study of 123 patients beginning dialysis in an unintended style showed comparable 6-month survival for HD and PD patients however a greater relative threat of bacteremia in the HD patients, suggesting "acutestart PD" is a practical alternative for late recommendation patients⁽¹⁴⁾. The observed early PD survival benefit might in part be due to enhancing survival of PD patients in general, possibly due to technical advances and increasing experience of nurses and nephrologists with PD⁽⁴⁾. PD program experience stays an impact on patient and method success in PD, with more knowledgeable(big programs with more patients) programs reporting lower rates of strategy failure and patient mortality⁽¹⁵⁾. In addition, maintenance of residual kidney function might contribute to minimized death, and many studies report better conservation of residual kidney function in patients on PD compared with patients on HD⁽¹⁶⁾. Some research studies have actually reported higher death in PD patients with underlying heart disease^(17,18). Other studies have actually kept in mind a higher occurrence of hemorrhagic stroke in patients on HD although a USRDS analysis concluded that the risk of death from stroke was greater in PD patients despite a lower frequency of preexisting cerebrovascular disease⁽¹⁹⁾. Patient comorbidity, including diabetes and age, influences death.

Death might be lower in PD patients throughout the very first 1 to 2 years of dialysis, method failure with PD stays fairly high and adversely impacts patients' quality of life owing to the requirement for interventions (new access) and transfer to HD. Despite significant reductions in peritonitis rates, infection stays the primary reason for transfer to HD. In one prospective study of 28 dialysis centers, 25% of PD patients moved to HD, with 70% of those moving within 2 years of beginning PD⁽²⁰⁾. Re-current peritonitis may also lead to membrane failure, and ultrafiltration failure is the reason for 2% to 14% of transfers from PD⁽²¹⁾. An analysis of USRDS information recommends enhanced method survival in current accomplices of PD patients⁽²²⁾. Additional threats of PD are displayed in Table 1 and consist of weight patient, caretaker and gain burnout, and, with the loss of recurring kidney function, possible inadequate little solute clearance.

Dialysis adequacy is assessed on a routine basis in both HD and PD patients. Although the day-to-day small urea clearance on PD is significantly less than the urea clearance of a single HD treatment, the constant nature of PD supplies adequate total clearance as measured by weekly kt/V. Some would recommend that the more frequent physician sees of HD patients (PD patients are generally seen regular monthly and HD patients as much as 4 times each month) is a benefit of HD over PD. Nevertheless, there are no information revealing improved patient survival or reduced morbidity related to the frequency of physician sees. For some patients, HD offers a chance for socializing and advancement of a caring community of good friends and caretakers interested in the patient and his or her well-being. For numerous PD patients, the support of the home dialysis nurses may supply a comparable experience. Caregiver burnout and depression are less

with HD patients⁽²³⁾. As the dialysis population is significantly older and less functionally independent, caregiver requirements and action presume an essential consideration in dialysis results and should have more attention and research study.

A few research studies have revealed less postponed graft function after kidney hair transplant in PD patients compared with HD patients^(24,25). Factors involved may include patient volume status and recurring kidney function at the time of transplant. A recent study revealed a 10% lower (P 1/4.014) all-cause mortality in patients on PD compared with those on HD prior to transplantation⁽²⁶⁾.

Access in PD and HD:

Table 1 highlights the risks of HD and PD, and amongst the most common are access-related concerns. HD is practically constantly utilized as preliminary treatment when patients present with acutely found CKD, mostly because of the obtain-capability and suitability of CVC for instant HD access. The dangers associated with CVC are substantial, with a 2- to 3-fold boost in mortality, a 5- to 10-times increase in severe infection, and increased rates of hospitalization in HD patients using CVC for HD access⁽²⁷⁾. In addition, long-lasting CVC usage is associated with a greater number of vascular procedures and higher incidence of insufficient dialysis^(28,29). Some researchers have suggested that catheters may likewise contribute indirectly to high patient mortality by acting as an instigator of a persistent inflammatory condition that predisposes to morbidity and death^(30,31). The finding of higher CRP levels in HD patients without obvious infection but with CVC has actually raised this possibility and issue^(30,31). Moreover, long-term CVC gain access to for HD is associated with osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, endocarditis, bad quality of life, and central vein stenosis that may limit future alternatives for arteriovenous access^(27,29). Efforts to decrease the risk of catheters for HD gain access to have focused on early nephrology recommendation, development of a multidisciplinary dialysis access team, and patient and nephrologist education^(27,32) but CVC use remains high in the United States. Some have actually recommended that patients who decline production of an arteriovenous fistula or graft and decide to continue using a CVC as HD access need to be needed to sign an in- formed rejection of AVF type and ultimately be referred to another nephrologist for care⁽²⁷⁾. In such instances, a quality care issue is cited as the factor for refusing ongoing care of a patient who declines AVF or AVG placement⁽²⁷⁾. Although such action may be more extreme than numerous nephrologists are willing to consider, it is incumbent on nephrologists as a group to make all efforts to reduce using dialysis catheters.

Although a range of PD catheters are offered, the distinctions amongst them are minor, and the decision to use one catheter over another depends primarily on the choices of the physician placing the catheter. Function and infection rates are usually comparable for all available PD catheters although fairly little studies may advocate for certain catheters or implantation techniques(eg, Tenckhoff vs swan-neck catheters, surgical vs laparoscopically implanted, buried vs nonburied)^(33,35) The absence of surgical training in PD catheter placement might be a concern for some programs⁽³⁶⁾. PD catheters are placed in the abdominal area, but for some patients (obese, those with ostomies, children), the presternal catheter exit site area might be more effective⁽³⁷⁾. Complications related to PD catheters may include bad drainage and infection. Infection stays the most typical cause for transfer to HD, but in effective PD programs, peritonitis rates are now 1 every 20 to 37 mo/patient^(4,38). Moreover, compared with CVC-associated infections, PD-associated catheter infections hardly ever result in death and are less regularly connected with hospitalization⁽⁴⁾. Quality enhancement programs to analyze infection rates, triggers, and preventive procedures are essential to any PD program and are significantly being adjusted by HD programs to lower infection rates.

Table 1 Risks and Benefits of PD and HD

Benefits		Risks
PD	-Survival years 1–2 -Patient autonomy -Patient satisfaction -Maintenance of RRF -Lower cost -Less delayed graft function post transplant	-High technique failure (membrane failure, infection) -Weight gain -Patient and caregiver burnout
HD	- Less patient responsibility -Community/socialization	-Infection (bacteremia, sepsis) -Access complications

Costs and Patient Satisfaction in PD and HD:

Although there are few research studies analyzing dialysis patients' fulfillment, PD patients normally report higher satisfaction than in-center HD patients^(39,40). Explanations for this might connect to the patients themselves and their viewed quality of life and self-reliance (typically greater among PD patients) but might likewise show fundamental qualities in patients that lead them to choose a home-based technique. Surprisingly, PD patients are also more pleased with their treatment providers (nurse and physician) in spite of less direct exposure to nephrologists than that experienced by in-center HD patients who are typically seen weekly. The accessibility of the PD nurse and the close relationship that typically establishes in between PD nurses and their patients may foster patient self-confidence and assistance in a manner that leads to more complete satisfaction than that experienced by in-center HD patients. The lack of regulated studies examining patient satisfaction and the confounding problem of choice predisposition recommends additional study of this problem is required.

The expense of treatment to society is relevant since dialysis is a Medicare benefit in the United States. PD remains less costly than in-center HD, with each year patient expenses of \$53,446 and \$73,008, respectively, as exposed by Medicare data.⁷ Under personal insurance coverage, PD was also significantly less costly than HD (\$173,507 vs \$129,997, P 1/4.03) in the first year after starting dialysis in 463 dialysis patients, in part because hospitalization rate was lower amongst PD patients⁽⁴¹⁾. However, before January 2011, the expense of medications administered throughout dialysis was generally higher for HD patients. With the inception of dialysis services bundling, costs of intravenous medications given throughout HD will likely fall, and hence, The total treatment expense of HD need to likewise fall. Owing to the costs of devices and, notably, staff required in the HD unit, PD treatment costs are most likely to remain lower than HD costs, but the overall expense difference between the 2 modalities may narrow. There is a specific payment for professional services provided during training for house dialysis that can be billed by nephrologists and might act as a financial reward to develop house dialysis programs. There is no comparable payment for in-center HD.

Clinical summary
A PD survival advantage is seen early in the course of renal replacement therapy, but after 1 to 2 years, patient survival on PD or HD is equivalent and influenced by comorbidity and age.
The high rate of technique failure in PD remains primarily a function of infectious complications although peritonitis rates are now low in experienced PD programs. Infection and access issues are the most common problems for patients on HD, and, especially for HD patients using CVC, high mortality and morbidity are to be expected.
Recent changes in reimbursement for dialysis education as well as bundling of dialysis services may lead to a renewed interest in PD in the United States. Nephrologists' efforts should be focused on educating themselves and their patients about the opportunities for home modality therapies and reducing the reliance on catheters for long- term HD access.

4. CONCLUSION

The choice of PD or HD will normally be based upon patient motivation, desire, geographical distance from an HD unit, nurse and/or doctor bias, and patient education. A PD survival advantage is seen early in the course of renal replacement therapy, but after 1 to 2 years, patient survival on PD or HD is comparable and influenced by comorbidity and age. The high rate of strategy failure in PD remains mainly a function of contagious problems although peritonitis rates are now low in experienced PD programs. Infection and access issues are the most common problems for patients on HD, and, especially for HD patients using CVC, high mortality and morbidity are to be anticipated. Factor to consider of PD as a bridge for gain access to maturation and initial treatment in late recommendation patients should be entertained in an effort to prevent CVC. Recent modifications in reimbursement for dialysis education in addition to bundling of dialysis services might result in a renewed interest in PD in the United States. Nephrologists' efforts need to be focused on educating themselves and their patients about the chances for home method therapies and minimizing the dependence on catheters for long-term HD gain access to.

REFERENCES

- [1] Stack AG. Determinants of modality selection among incident US dialysis patients: results from a national study. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2002;13:1279-1287.
- [2] Miskulin DC, Meyer KB, Athienites NV, et al. Comorbidity and other factors associated with modality selection in incident dialysis patients: the CHOICE study. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2002;39:324-336.
- [3] Jager KJ, Korevaar JC, Dekker FW. The effect of contraindications and patient preference on dialysis modality selection in ESRD patients in the Netherlands. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2004;43:891-899.
- [4] Chaudhary K, Sangha H, Khanna R. Peritoneal dialysis first: rationale. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:447-456.
- [5] Linas S. Dialysis training in the United States. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2002;40:208-209.
- [6] Ledebro I, Ronco C. The best dialysis therapy? Results from an international survey among nephrology professionals. *Nephrol Dial Transplant Plus.* 2008;1:403-408.
- [7] U.S. Renal Data System. USRDS 2009 Annual data report: atlas of chronic kidney disease and end-stage renal disease in the United States. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disease; 2009.
- [8] Golper T. Patient education: can it maximize the success of therapy? *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2001;16:S20-S24.
- [9] Bloembergen WE, Port FK, Mauger EA, Wolfe RA. A comparison of mortality between patients treated with hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 1995;6:177-183.
- [10] Vonesh EF, Snyder JJ, Foley RN, Collins AJ. The differential impact of risk factors on mortality in hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis. *Kidney Int.* 2004;66:2389-2401.
- [11] Heaf JG, Lokkegaard H, Madsen M. Initial survival advantage of peritoneal dialysis relative to hemodialysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2002;17:112-117.
- [12] Weinhandl ED, Foley RN, Gilbertson DT, et al. Propensity-matched mortality comparison of incident hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis patients. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2010;21:499-506.
- [13] Perl J, Wald R, McFarlane P, et al. Hemodialysis vascular access modifies the association between dialysis modality and survival. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;22:1113-1121.
- [14] Koch M, Kohnle M, Trapp R, Haastert B, Rump LC, Akers S. Comparable outcome of acute unplanned peritoneal dialysis and haemodialysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* In press.
- [15] Schaubel DE, Blake PG, Fenton SS. Effect of renal center characteristics on mortality and technique failure on peritoneal dialysis. *Kidney Int.* 2001;60:1517-1524.
- [16] Moist LM, Port FK, Orzol SM, et al. Predictors of loss of residual renal function among new dialysis patients. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2000;11:556-564.
- [17] Stack AG, Molony DA, Rahman NS, Dosekun A, Murthy B. Impact of dialysis modality on survival of new ESRD patients with congestive heart failure in the United States. *Kidney Int.* 2003;64:1071-1079.
- [18] Ganesh SK, Hulbert-Shearon T, Port FK, Eagle K, Stack AG. Mortality differences by dialysis modality among incident ESRD patients with and without coronary artery disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2003;14:415-424.
- [19] Mattana J, Effiong C, Gooneratne R, Singhal PC. Risk of fatal cerebrovascular accident in patients on peritoneal dialysis versus hemodialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 1997;8:1342-1347.
- [20] Jaar BG, Plantinga LC, Crews DC, et al. Timing, causes, predictors, and prognosis of switching from peritoneal dialysis to hemodialysis: a prospective study. *BMC Nephrol.* 2009;10:3.
- [21] Margetts PJ, Churchill DN. Acquired ultrafiltration dysfunction in peritoneal dialysis patients. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2002;13:2787-2794.
- [22] Mehrotra R, Chiu YW, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Vonesh E. The outcome of continuous ambulatory and automated peritoneal dialysis are similar. *Kidney Int.* 2009;76:97-107.

- [23] Belasco A, Barbosa D, Bettencourt AR, et al. Quality of life of family caregivers of elderly patients on hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2006;48:955-963.
- [24] Vanholder R, Herring P, Loo AV, et al. Reduced incidence of acute renal graft failure in patients treated with peritoneal dialysis compared with hemodialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 1999;33: 934-940.
- [25] Goldfarb-Rumyantzev AS, Hurdle JF, Scandling JD, et al. The role of pretransplantation renal replacement therapy modality in kidney allograft and recipient survival. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2005;46: 537-549.
- [26] Schwenger V, Dohler B, Morath C, Zeier M, Opelz G. The role of pretransplant dialysis modality on renal allograft outlook. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* In press.
- [27] Rehman R, Schmidt RJ, Moss AH. Ethical and legal obligation to avoid long-term tunneled catheter access. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2009;4:456-460.
- [28] Polkinghorne KR, McDonald SP, Atkins RC, et al. Vascular access and all-cause mortality: a propensity score analysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2004;15:477-486.
- [29] Marr KA, Sexton DJ, Conlon PJ, et al. Catheter-related bacteremia and outcome of attempted catheter salvage in patients undergoing hemodialysis. *Ann Intern Med.* 1997;127:275-277.
- [30] Hung A, Pupim L, Yu C, et al. Determinants of C-reactive protein in chronic hemodialysis patients: relevance of dialysis catheter utilization. *Hemodial Int.* 2008;12:236-243.
- [31] Lacson E, Lazarus JM, Himmelfarb J, et al. Balancing fistula first with catheters last. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2007;50:379-395.
- [32] Lok CE. Fistula first initiative: advantages and pitfalls. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2007;2:1043-1053.
- [33] Strippoli GF, Tong A, Johnson D, et al. Catheter-related interventions to prevent peritonitis in peritoneal dialysis: a systematic review of randomized, controlled trials. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2004;15:2735-2746.
- [34] Crabtree JH. Selected best demonstrated practices in peritoneal dialysis access. *Kidney Int.* 2006;103:S27-S37.
- [35] Brown PA, McCormick BB, Knoll G, et al. Complications and catheter survival with prolonged embedding of peritoneal dialysis catheters. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2008;23:2299-2303.
- [36] Wong LP, Liebman SE, Wakefield KA, Messing S. Training of surgeons in peritoneal dialysis catheter placement in the United States: a national survey. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2010;5:1439-1446.
- [37] Zimmerman DG. Presternal catheter design: an opportunity to capitalize on catheter immobilization. *Adv Perit Dial.* 2009;26:91-95.
- [38] Neissim SJ, Bargman JM, Jassal SV. Relationship between double-cuffed and single-cuffed PD catheters and the risk of peritonitis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2010;25:2310-2314.
- [39] Rubin HR, Fink NE, Plantinga LC, et al. Patient ratings of dialysis care with peritoneal dialysis vs hemodialysis. *JAMA.* 2004;291: 697-703.
- [40] Fadem SZ, Walker DR, Abbott G, et al. Satisfaction with renal replacement therapy and education: the American Association of Kidney Patients survey. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:605-612.
- [41] Berger A, Edelsberg J, Inglese GW, et al. Cost comparison of peritoneal dialysis versus hemodialysis in end-stage renal disease. *Am J Manag Care.* 2009;15:509-518.