# A PROPENSITY-MATCHED COMPARISON OF HARD OUTCOMES IN CHILDREN ON CHRONIC DIALYSIS: THE ITALIAN REGISTRY EXPERIENCE

Enrico Vidal<sup>^</sup>, Roberto Chimenz, Alberto Edefonti, Bruno Gianoglio, Giovanna Leozappa, Germana Longo, Silvio Maringhini, Francesca Mencarelli, Carmine Pecoraro, Flora Puteo, Ilse-Maria Ratsch, Rosa Maria Roperto, Enrico Verrina.

On behalf of the Italian Registry for Paediatric Chronic Dialysis.

^Pediatric Nephrology, Dialysis and Transplant Unit, Department of Women's and Children's Health, University-Hospital of Padova, Italy.



enrico.vidal@inwind.it

## **OBJECTIVES**

Data concerning outcomes of children on HD and PD are scarce and frequently refer to single pediatric dialysis center experiences. In this setting, observational studies represent the best design for survival comparisons, although the results might be influenced by treatment-selection biases.

To better investigate the association between dialysis treatment modality and patient outcomes, we sought to compare survival and transplantation rate among a large cohort of incident PD children propensity-matched to those on HD who received predialysis care.

# **METHODS**

We retrospectively reviewed the files of all patients starting a first dialysis cycle before the age of 16 years, collected over a 10-year period (from January 2004 to December 2013) by the Italian Registry of Pediatric Chronic Dialysis, a nationwide permanent chronic dialysis network involving all the 12 Italian pediatric dialysis centers.

For each patient, we estimated the propensity score to be assigned to PD *versus* HD as first dialysis modality with a logistic regression model that includes gender, age, primary cause of ESRD, number and type of comorbidities, and residual urine output as predictors. We then constructed matched pairs by selecting for each CPD patient a corresponding HD patient with score *p* between -0.1 and +0.1. We also considered a matching caliper with a maximum tolerance level of 0.04. Cox proportional hazard models were used to compare outcomes using an intent-to-treat (ITT) analysis. In the ITT analysis, patients were followed from the date of first dialysis until death and censored at the earliest of the following: transplantation, renal recovery, loss to follow-up or study end (December 2013).

### Before Matching After Matching HD PD HD Characteristic р 155 191 Female (%) a 42.5% 47.7% 0.28 47% 44.5% 0.65 13 (9.4-15.6) 10.2 (5.8-13.6) 12.8 (8.6-15.6) Age (years) a 5.1 (1.1-11.4) <0.001 10 (5.2%) 10 (6.5%) 84 (32.2%) 8 (5.2%) 2-5 46 (17.6%) 17 (8.9%) <0.01 18 (11.6%) 16 (10.3%) 164 (85.9%) 127 (81.9%) 131 (84.5%) 131 (50.2%) 15.5 (8.8-31) 38.2 (25-46) 25.8 (17-39.6) 28.9 (24.5-37.2) Body weight (kg) <sup>a</sup> <0.001 8 (4-10.3) eGFR<sup>a</sup> 6 (8-10) 7 (3.5-10) 0.26 8 (6-10) 0.45 0.45 Diuresis (ml/kg/day) a 0.9 (0.3-1.6) 1.0 (0.3-1.6) 1.4 (0.7-2.5) 0.0005 1.3 (0.8-2.1) Primary Renal Disease CAKUT 123 (47.1%) 69 (36.1%) 65 (41.9%) 59 (38.1%) Glomerulonephritis 56 (29.3%) 38 (24.5%) 46 (29.7%) 62 (23.8%) Cystic Kidney Disease 12 (4.6%) 9 (4.7%) 5 (3.2%) 7 (4.5%) Hereditary Nephropathy 20 (7.7%) 14 (7.3%) 17 (11%) 10 (6.5%) Ischemic Renal Failure 5 (1.9%) 3 (1.6%) 0.007 3 (1.9%) 3 (1.9%) 0.065 12 (7.7%) 15 (5.7%) 4 (2.1%) 4 (2.6%) Metabolic Disorder 3 (1.1%) 9 (4.7%) 3 (1.9%) 1 (0.6%) Vasculitis 0 (0%) 6 (3.1%) 0 (0%) 6 (3.9%) 5 (3.2%) Miscellaneous 7 (2.7%) 8 (4.2%) 6 (3.9%) Unknown 14 (5.4%) 13 (6.8%) 7 (4.5%) 13 (8.4%) N° of comorbidities 124 (80%) 187 (71.6%) 151 (79%) 110 (71%) 0.12 63 (24.1%) 38 (19.9%) 44 (28.4%) 29 (18.7%) 11 (4.3%) 2 (1.1%) 1 (0.6%) 2 (1.3%) Duration of RRT (months) a 20.6 (11-36.9) 0.66 19.3 (7.8-32.6) 17.7 (7-30) 19 (9.5-33.7) 0.49

### RESULTS

A total of 310 matched pairs (155 in each group) were obtained from 452 incident patients (261 PD and 191 HD). The characteristics of patients based on dialysis modality in the entire and the propensity score matched population are presented in the Table. After propensity score matching, covariates were well balanced between the two groups and the cumulative hazard ratio (cHR) for transplantation was 0.99 (95% CI 0.73-1.34; p=0.95) for HD relative to PD children. Transplantation rate at 3 years after the first dialysis cycle's initiation was 67% for PD and 62% for HD patients (p=0.49). The cHR for shifting dialysis modality was 1.39 (95% CI 0.78-2.50; p=0.26) and the cHR for death was 1.57 (95% CI 0.46-5.36; p=0.47) for HD as compared to PD patients. The cumulative survival probabilities for PD and HD patients were 98% and 97% at 12 months, 96.3% and 95% at 24 months, and 90% and 91.2% at 24 months (p=0.47).

## CONCLUSIONS

Incident children undergoing PD and HD have distinct characteristics, that may influence the interpretation of outcomes. After adjusting for potential confounders and controlling for treatment-selection biases, no single type of dialysis (HD or PD) seems to be superior to the other in terms of hard clinical endpoints.

## REFERENCES:

Barnieh L et al. *Propensity score methods and their application in nephrology research*. J Nephrol 2011;24(03):256-262.

James S et al. Registry-based Randomized Clinical Trials – a new clinical trial paradigm. Nat Rev Cardiol 2015;12(5):312-316.

Kumar VA et al. Survival of propensity matched incident peritoneal and hemodialysis patients in a United States health care system. Kidney Int 2014;86:1016-1022.









<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Data are expressed as median and interquartile range.