

Effect of Sevelamer on Bone Profile in High Flux Regular Haemodialysis Patients

Thesis

*Submitted for partial fulfillment of the master degree
in Nephrology*

By:

Emad Mohamed Kotb Abu-Elyazid

(M. B., B.Ch)

Diploma Internal Medicine
Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Yasser Suliman Ahmed

*Professor of Internal Medicine and Nephrology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Prof. Dr. Mona Hosny Abd El-salam

*Professor of internal medicine and Nephrology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Dr. Cherry Reda Kamel

*Lecturer of internal medicine and Nephrology
Faculty of Medicine, Ain shams University*

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University**

2015

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgement

*First and foremost, praise and thanks to **Allah** who guides us throughout the life.*

*I would like to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Yasser Suliman Ahmed**, Professor of internal medicine and Nephrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his kind continuous encouragement and great support throughout the work. It was a great honor to work under his meticulous supervision.*

*Also, I am deeply grateful to **Dr. Mona Hosny Abd El Salam**, Professor of Internal Medicine and Nephrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for her great and valuable help, close supervision and continuous advices.*

*I am also greatly indebted to **Dr. Cherry Reda Kamel** Lecturer of Internal Medicine and Nephrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for her valuable help and great support, she guided me towards the best and did big effort to emerge this work to the light.*

Last but not least, I dedicate this work to my family, whom without their sincere emotional support, pushing me forward this work would not have ever been completed.



Emad Mohamed Kotb Abu-Elyazid

Contents

List of Abbreviations	i
List of Tables	ii
List of Figuers	iii
Introduction and Aim of the Work.....	1
Review of Literature	3
Hemodialysis.....	4
Metabolic Bone Disease	25
Phosphate Binders	40
Patient and Methods	55
Results	65
Discussion	82
Summary	90
Conclusions	92
Recommendation	93
References	94
Arabic Summary	--

List of Abbreviations

25-OHD	:	25-hydroxyvitamin D
ABD	:	Adynamic bone disease
ALP	:	Alkaline phosphatase
BMC	:	Bone mineral content
BMD	:	Bone mineral density
BSA	:	Body surface area
CI	:	Confidence interval
CKD	:	Chronic kidney disease
Da	:	Dalton
DCOR	:	Dialysis Clinical Outcomes Revisited
DOPPS	:	Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study
ESKD	:	End stage kidney disease
FGF	:	Fibroblast growth factor
GH	:	Growth hormone
HD	:	Hemodialysis
HDF	:	High-efficiency haemodiafiltration
kD	:	Kilodalton
KDIGO	:	Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes
LMWPs	:	Low-molecular weight proteins
LPS	:	Lipopolysaccharide
MBD	:	Mineral and bone disorder
MW	:	Molecular weight
NCDS	:	National Cooperative Dialysis Study

List of Abbreviations (Cont.)

PCR	: Protein catabolic rate
PTH	: Parathyroid hormone
QCT	: Quantitative computed tomography
SEN	: Spanish Society of Nephrology
spKt/V	: Single pool Kt/V
TACurea	: Time-averaged concentration of urea
tHcy	: Total homocysteine
UKM	: Urea kinetic model
URR	: Urea reduction rate
VC	: Vascular calcification
VDR	: Vitamin D Receptor
Wnt	: Wingless-int

List of tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
1	Comparison of Years on dialysis among studied groups	69
2	Comparison of Body mass index among studied groups	69
3	Comparison of Calcium before treatment among studied groups	69
4	Comparison of Calcium after treatment among studied groups	70
5	Comparison of Calcium before and after treatment among studied groups	70
6	Comparison of Phosphorus before treatment among studied groups	70
7	Comparison of Phosphorus after treatment among studied groups	71
8	Comparison of Phosphorus before and after treatment among studied groups	71
9	Comparison of Ca/Ph before treatment among studied groups	71
10	Comparison of Ca/Ph after treatment among studied groups	72
11	Comparison of Calcium/Phosphorus before and after treatment among studied groups	72
12	Comparison of Pre-session urea before treatment among studied groups	72
13	Comparison of Pre-session urea after treatment among studied groups	73
14	Comparison of Pre-Session urea before and after treatment among studied groups	73

List of tables (Cont.)

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
15	Comparison of Post-session urea before treatment among studied groups	73
16	Comparison of Post-session urea after treatment among studied groups	74
17	Comparison of Post-Session urea before and after treatment among studied groups	74
18	Comparison of Pre-session creatinine before treatment among studied groups	74
19	Comparison of Pre-session creatinine after treatment among studied groups	75
20	Comparison of Pre-session creatinine before and after treatment among studied groups	75
21	Comparison of Post-session creatinine before treatment among studied groups	75
22	Comparison of Post-session creatinine after treatment among studied groups	67
23	Comparison of Post-Session creatinine before and after treatment among studied groups	67
24	Comparison of URR (pre study) before treatment among studied groups	67
25	Comparison of URR (post study) among studied groups	77
26	Comparison of URR before and after treatment among studied groups	77
27	Comparison of kt/v (pre study) before treatment among studied groups	77
28	Comparison of k/vt (post study) among studied groups	78

List of tables (Cont.)

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
29	Comparison of Kt/V before and after treatment among studied groups	78
30	Comparison of Albumin before treatment among studied groups	78
31	Comparison of Albumin after treatment among studied groups	79
32	Comparison of Albumin before and after treatment among studied groups	79
33	Comparison of Alkaline phosphatase before treatment among studied groups	78
34	Comparison of Alkaline phosphatase after treatment among studied groups	80
35	Comparison of Alkaline phosphatase before and after treatment among studied groups	80
36	Comparison of Parathormone before treatment among studied groups	80
37	Comparison of Parathormone after treatment among studied groups	81
38	Comparison of Parathormone before and after treatment among studied groups	81
39	Comparison of Cholesterol among studied groups	81
40	Comparison of Triglycerides among studied groups	82
41	Comparison of HDL among studied groups	82
42	Comparison of LDL among studied groups	82
43	Comparison of HB% among studied groups	83

List of tables (Cont.)

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
44	Comparison of HCT% among studied groups	83
45	Comparison of CRP among studied groups	83
46	Comparison of Epo/week among studied groups	84
47	Comparison of Iron among studied groups	84
48	Comparison of Vit D /week among studied groups	84
49	Comparison of Calcium/week among studied groups	85

List of Figures

<i>Fig.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
1	The interrelated nature of biochemical abnormalities, bone disease, and extraskeletal calcification in chronic kidney disease-mineral and bone disorder	26
2	Estimated urea distribution volume V in male dialysis patients	60
3	Estimated V in female dialysis patients	61
4	Relationship between nominal blood flow rate (QB) and blood water urea clearance (Ktotw) as a function of dialyzer	62
5	Actual relationship between fractional urea clearance (Kt/V) and urea reduction ratio (URR), taking into account urea generation and the effects of volume contraction. To use, start with the URR on the vertical axis. Move right until you intersect with the proper UF/W line, then dropdown to the horizontal axis for the Kt/V (http://www.hdcn.com)	63

Introduction

Standard hemodialysis is a far from ideal treatment for uremia since the morbidity and mortality of patients on hemodialysis are still significantly higher than those of non-hemodialysed subjects with similar demographic characteristics. Because it has been suggested that the cause could lie in the inadequate removal of "middle molecules" by standard hemodialysis, two alternative treatments have been proposed: high-efficiency hemodialysis and high-flux hemodialysis (*Manzoni et al., 2009*).

Currently, high-flux hemodialysis is the most common mode of dialysis therapy worldwide. Its steadily increasing use is largely based on the desire to reduce the excessively high morbidity and mortality of end-stage renal disease patients maintained on conventional dialysis (low-flux, mostly cellulosic membranes) by offering better biocompatibility and enhanced removal of uremic toxins (*Schiffl, 2011*).

High-flux dialysis membranes are more efficient in removal of intact PTH and they might help in minimizing the consequences of bone disease associated with hyperparathyroidism in patients with ESRD) (*Makar et al., 2010*).

It was also suggested that high flux dialysis improves plasma lipoprotein profiles, especially lowering plasma triglyceride concentrations, and also increases HDL cholesterol. (*Goldberg et al., 1996*).

The major disadvantage of high-flux hemodialysis relates to the use of dialysis fluid, which is commonly not pure and may endanger patients treated with high-flux hemodialysis. Endotoxin fragments and other bacterial

substances derived from bacteriologically contaminated dialysis fluid may, even at bacterial counts or endotoxin concentrations within the limits of accepted standards of dialysis fluid purity, enter from the dialysate into the patient's blood either by convective transfer (backfiltration) or by movement down the concentration gradient (backdiffusion) (*Schiffl and Lang, 2010*).

Sevelamer hydrochloride, as a phosphate binder that contains neither aluminum nor calcium, is expected to improve the prognosis of dialysis patients. However, sevelamer hydrochloride has been reported to lower the serum bicarbonate level (*Oka et al., 2007*).

Oka et al. (2008) reported that sevelamer hydrochloride exacerbated metabolic acidosis in hemodialysis patients, depending on the dosage.

De Santo et al. (2006) reported that a 24-week sevelamer administration caused a statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) reduction (0.8g/dL) in serum albumin concentration, without affecting iPTH. And, *Ohno et al (2009)* reported sevelamer to reduce the serum urate concentration in maintenance hemodialysis patients

Inoue et al. (2007) reported that Sevelamer was useful for reducing the serum calcium level and calcium x phosphate product.

Akatsuka et al. (2008) recommended the use of sevelamer hydrochloride in combination with calcium carbonate in hemodialysis patients.

Yet, it is important to mention that sevelamer hydrochloride binds bacterial endotoxin in the intestinal tract, leading to lower circulating endotoxin levels, and offering a novel anti-inflammatory mechanism (*Sun et al., 2009*).

Aim of the Work

Study of the effect of sevelamer on bone profile in high flux regular haemodialysis patients.

Hemodialysis

Patients with end stage kidney disease (ESKD) are progressively increasing and the demand for renal replacement therapies is expanding (*Lysaght, 2002*). Hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis represent reliable forms of therapy leading to significant and longlasting survival times (*Ledebo and Ronco, 2008*). Nevertheless, hemodialysis is still performed intermittently leading to a significant degree of unphysiology due to fluid and electrolyte shifts during intra and interdialytic periods.

I. Solute Removal by Dialysis:

Uremia could theoretically be treated by reducing solute production, but this is not part of current practice. High protein intake increases the production of many solutes, including various guanidines, indoles, and phenols. Patients with kidney failure tend to reduce their protein intake spontaneously, and before dialysis became available, physicians found that marked protein restriction relieved uremic symptoms (*Kopple et al., 2000*).

Protein restriction can have ill effects, however, and it is now recommended that patients undergoing dialysis receive 1.2 g of protein per kilogram of body weight per day, which is nearly the amount provided by an average diet in the United States. Since a number of the best-known uremic solutes-such as aliphatic amines, D-amino acids, methylguanidine, hippurate, and many indoles and phenols-are produced entirely or in part by gut bacteria, the use of sorbents to reduce the load of such solutes has been considered but has not been systematically studied.