# SINGLE-DWELL TREATMENT WITH A LOW-NA SOLUTION IN HYPERTENSIVE PERITONEAL DIALYSIS PATIENTS

*Running title:* Low-Na PD solution in hypertensive patients

Simon Davies,1 Börje Haraldsson,2 François Vrtovsnik,3 Vedat Schwenger,4 Stanley Fan,5 Alexandre Klein,6 Saynab Atiye,7 and Adelheid Gauly7

1Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK, 2Department of Physiology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden, 3Department of Nephrology, Xavier Bichat Hospital, Paris, France, 4Department of Nephrology, Katharinenhospital, Stuttgart, Germany, 5Department of Nephrology, The Royal London Hospital, London, UK, 6Department of Nephrology, Hospital Louis Pasteur, Colmar, France, 7Fresenius Medical Care, Bad Homburg, Germany

*Acknowledgments:* The clinical trial was initially funded by Gambro AB and later by Fresenius Medical Care. The sponsors were involved in the study design; data collection, analysis, and interpretation; preparation of study report; and preparation of the manuscript.

**Supplemental Online Material**

Supplemental Table 1: Composition of low-Na and standard-Na dialysis solutions

Supplemental Figure 1: Study schedule

Supplemental Figure 2: Disposition of patients

*Corresponding Author:*

Simon Davies, Department of Nephrology, University Hospital of North Staffordshire, Princes Road, Hartshill, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 7LN, UK. Tel: +44-1782-554164; Fax: +44-1782-620759; Email: [simonj.davies55@gmail.com](mailto:simonj.davies55@gmail.com)

*Word count manuscript:* 3577 words

*Number of figures:* 2

*Number of tables:* 4

*Trial registration:* ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00794326

# ABSTRACT

***Background:*** Patients on peritoneal dialysis (PD) may suffer from Na and fluid overload, hypertension and increased cardiovascular risk. Low-Na dialysis solution, by increasing the diffusive removal of Na, might improve blood pressure (BP) management.

***Method*s:** A glucose-compensated, low-Na PD solution (112 mmol/l Na, 2% glucose) was compared to a standard-Na solution (133 mmol/l Na, 1.5% glucose) in a prospective, randomized, single-blind study in hypertensive patients on PD. One daily exchange of the standard dialysis regime was substituted by either of the study solutions for 6 months. The primary outcome (response) was defined as either a decrease of 24 h systolic BP by ≥6 mmHg or a fall in BP requiring a medical intervention (e. g. a reduction of antihypertensive medication) at 8 weeks.

***Result*s:** 123 patients were assessed for efficacy. Response criteria were achieved in 34.5% and 29.1% of patients using low- and standard-Na solutions, respectively (p=0.51). 24 h, office, and self-measured BP showed slightly more pronounced decreases under low-Na treatment, with significantly lower self-measured systolic BP compared to control. Total body water (TBW) decreased slightly in the low-Na group and increased slightly in the control group, but treatment group differences were not significant. Hypotension and dizziness occurred in 27.0% and in 11.1% of patients in the low-Na group and in 16.9% and 4.6% in the control group, respectively.

***Conclusions:*** Superiority of low-Na PD solution over standard-Na solution for control of blood pressure could not be shown. The once daily use of a low-Na PD solution was associated with more hypotensive episodes suggesting the need to reassess the overall concept of how Na reduced solutions might be incorporated within the treatment schedule.

KEY WORDS: Blood pressure; hypertension control; low-Na dialysis solution; peritoneal dialysis; randomized controlled trial.

# INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of arterial hypertension among patients with chronic kidney disease undergoing long-term dialysis treatment has been estimated at around 80% ([1](#_ENREF_1)). It is among the leading risk factors of atherosclerotic cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in dialysis ([2](#_ENREF_2), [3](#_ENREF_3)).

In dialysis patients, Na and water overload are the most important contributing factors to the pathogenesis of hypertension ([4](#_ENREF_4)). The impact of peritoneal Na elimination during peritoneal dialysis (PD) on blood pressure (BP) has been comprehensively described ([5](#_ENREF_5)), and the restoration of the Na balance has long been recognized as a primary aim of dialysis treatment ([6](#_ENREF_6)). However, although water and Na are removed continuously during PD, patients nevertheless remain in a state of overhydration related to net Na imbalance ([7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)).

By lowering the Na concentration of the dialysis fluid ([9-12](#_ENREF_9)) Na elimination can be improved through diffusive transport from blood to the peritoneal cavity. A previous clinical study investigated the most adequate composition (Na/glucose) in a 2-month treatment with Na concentrations of 115 and 102 mmol/l, with and without adjustment of glucose concentration. Only the Na concentration of 115 mmol/l with glucose compensation was effective on blood pressure, primarily through decrease of night-time blood pressure. Low-Na dialysis solutions require glucose augmentation to maintain an osmolarity that prevents a loss of ultrafiltration which could offset the gain in Na elimination achieved through diffusion ([13](#_ENREF_13)).

We performed a randomized, prospectively controlled trial to investigate the effect of a once-daily dwell with a glucose-compensated low-Na solution in hypertensive PD patients. The objective was to demonstrate superiority of the low-Na solution over a standard solution regarding the lowering of BP.

# METHODS

## STUDY DESIGN

We report on a prospective, single-blind, controlled, randomized, parallel-group, multi-centre phase III study in hypertensive patients suffering from chronic renal failure and being treated with CAPD (continuous ambulatory PD) or APD (automated PD), with or without anti-hypertensive drugs, including diuretics. The study compared the effect on blood pressure of an investigational low-Na PD solution to that of a standard-Na solution. The procedures started with a 4- to 8-week preparation phase during which the patients’ eligibility for participation was confirmed. They were stabilized on their currently prescribed standard dialysis treatment regimen using the reference standard-Na solution and on blood pressure medication. At the end of the preparation phase eligible patients were randomized and entered a 6-month single-blind treatment phase during which the standard glucose bag of a single daytime dwell was replaced by either the low-Na solution or the standard-Na solution as control. Individual study participation ended with a 2-month follow-up phase on standard PD prescription (Supplemental Figure 1). Assessments were performed monthly until the end of follow-up.

ETHICAL CONDUCT

The trial was conducted in 30 centres in Sweden, France, Germany, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. The study protocol and its attachments and amendments were reviewed and approved by the competent independent ethics committees in the participating countries. All patients provided written informed consent. The principles of Good Clinical Practice and the Declaration of Helsinki were adhered to.

## PARTICIPANTS AND RANDOMIZATION

Eligible patients were ≥18 years old and suffered from chronic kidney disease treated with CAPD or APD for at least 3 months. Participants on CAPD had to have ≥3 bag exchanges per day. For both modalities, at least one exchange of 1.5% glucose with a dwell time of 4‑6 h was required to correspond to the investigational product at low glucose strength. Moreover, patients either had to present with an office systolic blood pressure (SBP) ≥140 mmHg or with a diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ≥90 mmHg or had to be stabilized on antihypertensive medication (including diuretics). Patients with low BP (office SBP <120 mmHg and confirmed by an average 24 h SBP ≤105 mmHg determined by ambulatory blood pressure measurement (ABPM) as well as those with orthostatic hypotension (i. e., fall in office SBP of ≥20 mmHg after standing for ≥1 minute) or with hyponatremia <130 mmol/l were excluded. Patients were also ineligible if they suffered from chronic arrhythmia, had had peritonitis within 1 month before enrolment, or had a life expectancy <9 months. Patients were allocated to the investigational treatments at a ratio of 1:1 using a concealed, centralized block randomization stratified by country and mean 24 h SBP >130 mmHg vs. ≤130 mmHg as determined by ABPM.

## INTERVENTIONS

The composition of the investigational products is given in Supplemental Table 1. The products were available in 3‑compartment bags of which only compartments A and C were to be used (the inadvertent use of compartment B was prevented by means of an unbreakable pin). After mixing of the compartments the composition of both products was identical except for Na and glucose with 112 mmol/l Na and 2.0% glucose in the low-Na and 133 mmol/l Na and 1.5% glucose in the standard-Na solution, respectively.

During randomized treatment one daytime dwell of the standard PD prescription (preferably the last dwell during the day, with a dwell time of 4 ± 1 h) was replaced by the investigational product. For patients on APD mode the investigational product was applied by a manual CAPD exchange before the nightly treatment. Adjustments in the standard PD treatment were allowed if considered necessary by the investigator during the run-in and again after month 2 of randomized treatment.

## OUTCOMES

The assessment of efficacy was based upon the first 8 weeks of randomized treatment (‘efficacy period’) following regulatory guidance for efficacy assessment of antihypertensive drugs ([14](#_ENREF_14)). The primary outcome measure for efficacy was the proportion of treatment responders. Response was defined as either (a) a decrease of the mean 24 h SBP from baseline to week 8 by at least 6 mmHg, a difference shown to be relevant for reducing cardiovascular events ([3](#_ENREF_3)), without modifications in antihypertensive medication or (b) a fall in blood pressure requiring a medical intervention such as a decrease of antihypertensive medication, and confirmed by the study’s Data Safety Monitoring Board. The board periodically reviewed the data for BP, antihypertensive medication, adverse events (AEs), and PD prescriptions based on blinded data.

Secondary outcomes for BP included 24 h ABPM of daytime and night-time SBP and DBP.

ABPM was performed twice using a Spacelabs 24 h-ABPM 90207/90217 device (validated by the British Hypertension Society ([15](#_ENREF_15))) with readings at 15 minute intervals between 6 AM and 10 PM and at 30 minute intervals otherwise, i.e. once before randomization as well as once after 8 weeks (within a window between 7 and 9 weeks after start of randomized treatment). Office blood pressure measurements (mean of at least two measurements in sitting position after at least 5 minutes of rest with Omron HEM‑907 device) and a check for orthostatic hypotension were performed at each study visit. Moreover, the subjects had to perform self-measurements of BP using an Omron M10-IT device on the same arm and site used for measuring office BP. Self-measurements were averaged from 6 daily measurements recorded in the patient diary performed in the morning (before breakfast, intake of antihypertensive medication, and first PD bag exchange) and evening (close to bedtime, before intake of antihypertensive medication, and as far as possible after the last PD bag exchange) in a sitting position on the three days preceding each visit. Single-dwell and estimated 24 h Na removal, total body water (TBW), extracellular water (ECW) and intracellular water (ICW) were determined by whole body bio-impedance spectroscopy (BCM Body Composition Monitor, Fresenius Medical Care) as well as by measuring body weight.

Safety outcomes were spontaneously reported AEs, solicited AEs of special interest (hyponatremia, hypotension, dizziness, asthenia, peritonitis, any events leading to changes in treatment during the study), safety laboratory measures and vital signs, as well as residual renal function.

## STATISTICAL METHODS, SAMPLE SIZE

The primary analysis of efficacy was based upon the full analysis set (FAS) which included all randomized patients who attended the baseline visit. As pre-specified in the statistical analysis plan a Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test stratified for mean screening 24 h SBP (≤130 mmHg vs. >130 mmHg) was computed for comparing the treatment groups’ response rates using a 2‑sided type I error level of α=0.05. A 95% confidence interval (CI) for the difference in response rates between treatment groups was provided additionally using the Newcombe-Wilson score method. For the confirmatory analysis of the primary outcome measure no missing data imputation was performed, i. e. the primary analysis was based on patients with valid BP response data. Sensitivity analyses were performed in the FAS in which all patients with missing data were considered either responders or non-responders as well as in the per-protocol analysis data set (PPS) which included all FAS-eligible patients who completed the first 2 months of randomized treatment without major protocol deviations or who had a medically important fall in blood pressure during the first 2 months.

Secondary efficacy and safety outcomes were analyzed using applicable methods of descriptive data analysis depending upon their level of measurement. For metric secondary efficacy outcomes descriptive analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) models were computed using the baseline value of the dependent variable as a covariate and treatment, mean 24 h SBP (≤130 mmHg vs. >130 mmHg), and country as factors. For secondary outcomes, p-values ≤0.05 were considered descriptively significant without multiplicity adjustment.

The sample size estimation was based on expected response rates of 65% and 40% for low-Na and standard-Na solution, respectively. Using a χ2-test model, a type I error level of α=0.05 (2-sided), and 1:1 randomization, a total of at least 125 efficacy evaluable subjects were required to assure a power of 80% for demonstrating superiority of the low-Na solution.

# RESULTS

## RECRUITMENT, PARTICIPANT FLOW

Between August 2008 and December 2014, a total of 158 patients were enrolled and 128 were randomized (low-Na 63, standard-Na 65). All randomized patients were evaluated for safety (Safety Analysis Set). Five randomized patients were withdrawn from the trial due to an adverse event before the baseline visit and were thus removed from the FAS, which included 60 patients assigned to low-Na and 63 patients assigned to standard-Na. A total of 88 patients (low-Na 45, standard-Na 43) completed the randomized part of the study as scheduled (Supplemental Figure 2).

Thirty-six patients in each treatment group qualified for the PPS. The most frequent protocol deviations leading to exclusion from the PPS (multiple responses) were conduct of the visit scheduled at week 8 outside the acceptable window (low-Na 9, standard-Na 12), missing response assessment (7 and 12 patients) and discrepancies between the date of ABPM assessment and the applicable visit date (10 and 5 patients).

## PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND PD HISTORY

The characteristics of the patients in the FAS are shown in Table 1. Despite some slight differences between both treatment groups at baseline demographic and anthropometric characteristics were essentially comparable as well as measures that might impact efficacy like e.g. renal function. For creatinine clearance, the baseline mean value difference was attributable to individual outlying values while the groups’ medians were comparable.

There was a slight imbalance between the treatment groups regarding PD modality (see Table 1), but the treatment groups were essentially comparable with regard to all relevant parameters of the PD prescription (mean glucose concentration, dwell time, number of exchanges).

## EFFICACY

### *Improvement of hypertension (primary outcome measure):* The number and percentage of patients who met the response criteria for improvement of hypertension are shown in Table 2. Superiority of the new formulation over standard-Na solution could not be confirmed statistically (p=0.512). Our sensitivity analysis in which patients with missing response data were counted as either responders or non-responders, as well as the analysis in the PPS (p=0.296), led to the same conclusion.

Table 2 also shows that a fall in blood pressure necessitating a medical intervention such as a reduction of antihypertensive medication was observed only in patients receiving low-Na solution whereas fewer patients on low-Na were counted for the ≥6 mmHg SBP decrease criterion as compared to standard-Na. In a subgroup analysis, patients with screening 24 h SBP ≤130 mmHg 7/21 evaluable subjects (33.3%) in the low-Na group were responders (6 of them requiring a reduction of antihypertensive medication) as compared to 1/19 patients in the standard-Na group (p=0.03). No appreciable treatment group difference in response rates was observed in patients with initial 24 h SBP >130 mmHg (p=0.57). Further post-hoc subgroup analysis performed to assess possible influences of baseline treatment group differences regarding PD modality and the percentage of patients with diabetes (see Table 1) on the primary outcome measure revealed no indication of bias (data not shown).

### *Serial blood pressure measurements, antihypertensive medication:* During the 8-week efficacy period both treatment groups showed slight but non-significant decreases of SBP and DBP according to 24 h ABPM and office measurements whereas the patients’ self-measurements showed significant decreases for low-Na (p=0.01) but increases for standard-Na (Table 3, Figure 1), with significant differences between the treatment groups (p=0.01). According to 24 h ABPM, SBP and DBP decreases in the low-Na group were slightly more pronounced during night-time following the application of the study bag as last bag of the day, than during day-time while the opposite was the case in the standard-Na group.

Whereas the office BP measurements suggest that the reductions observed during the efficacy period abated during the remainder of randomized treatment, the patients’ self-measurements of BP indicate that the decreases in the low-Na group were preserved until at least month 6 after which the patients were switched back to their previous prescription (Figure 2).

Decreases in antihypertensive medication were reported for 7 patients (11.7%) in the low-Na group during the first 4 weeks of randomized treatment and again for 7 patients (11.7%) some of whom were the same individuals between weeks 5 and 8, compared to 2 (3.2%) and 1 (1.6%) patient for standard-Na. During the same periods increases were documented in 1 (1.7%) and 2 (3.3%) patients in the low-Na group and in 2 (3.2%) and 6 (9.5%) patients for standard-Na. During months 3 through 6 the average change of number of antihypertensive drugs (including diuretics) per patient was from 3.3 (1.5) (mean, standard deviation (SD)) to 3.0 (1.4) for low-Na and from 3.3 (1.4) to 3.4 (1.5) for standard-Na.

### *Na removal, hydration, body weight:* Data for Na removal were available for fewer than 15 patients in each group and were thus considered to be not representative for the study population. TBW decreased slightly in the low-Na group but not in the standard-Na group whereas slight but statistically significant decreases of the ECW/ ICW ratio were observed in both groups between baseline and week 8 (ANCOVA models: p<0.05; Table 3). Treatment group differences for TBW and ECW/ ICW ratio were not significant. Both groups showed no relevant changes in body weight.

## SAFETY/ TOLERABILITY

Table 4 provides an overview of adverse events with onset between the beginning and end of randomized treatment. Even though the overall numbers of events and of patients with events were comparable between the study groups, a larger percentage of patients had potentially treatment-related events and special interest events in the low-Na group. One event in each group was fatal. Subjects experiencing serious adverse events were mostly affected by infections (peritonitis), gastrointestinal and vascular disorders (hypotension).

Among the special interest events, hypotension and dizziness were more common in patients on low-Na treatment than in the standard-Na group whereas the other event incidences, including hyponatremia, differed by not more than 2 affected patients. Three cases of hypotension in the low-Na group and 4 cases of peritonitis in each group were serious.

With respect to shifts in the mean, there were no noteworthy changes in safety laboratory measures or vital signs, and no important differences between the study groups. Compared to baseline, mean plasma Na in the low‑Na group decreased by 1.3 (3.6) and by 1.0 (3.2) mmol/l at 2 and 8 weeks of randomized treatment, respectively, compared to increases by 0.2 (2.7) and 0.2 (2.8) mmol/l in the control group. Between baseline and month 6 decreases by 0.44 (3.73) mmol/l and by 0.50 (2.54) mmol/l were observed for low‑Na and control, respectively.

There were also no significant differences between both study groups regarding residual renal function which was measured at baseline, after 2 (p=0.56) and 6 (p=0.70) month treatment (Table 3).

# DISCUSSION

The optimum electrolyte composition of a PD solution is that which best serves the homeostatic needs of the body ([12](#_ENREF_12)). Since patients with chronic kidney disease, notably those on dialysis, tend to be fluid and salt overloaded and are thus at an increased risk of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality related to hypertension ([2-4](#_ENREF_2)), the correction of the Na balance must be a primary aim of long-term dialysis treatment ([6](#_ENREF_6)). This study investigated whether BP could be lowered by once-daily dwells of a low-Na, glucose-compensated dialysis solution ([11](#_ENREF_11), [13](#_ENREF_13), [16](#_ENREF_16)).

For the composite primary endpoint including a ≥6 mmHg decrease of 24 h SBP or a fall in blood pressure necessitating a medical intervention, superiority of the low-Na solution over standard-Na solution could not be established. With 34.5% and 29.1% for low-Na and standard-Na, respectively, the observed response rates in both groups fell considerably short of the rates of 65% and 40% assumed during sample size planning. The observation that fewer patients in the low-Na group met the criterion of a ≥6 mmHg SBP decrease during ABPM at week 8 is likely explained by the fact that 9 patients in this group developed a fall in blood pressure before week 8 that necessitated a clinical decision to reduce antihypertensive medication, which then might have returned the BP to the pre-intervention level. It is important to note that BP decreases that required a medical intervention were observed only in the low‑Na group, which might indicate that the single-dwell administration of the 112 mmol/l Na solution led to a sharp BP decrease in some of the subjects, notably in those with an initial 24 h SBP ≤130 mmHg ([4](#_ENREF_4)). This observation is consistent with the study’s safety results and one might hypothesize that the investigated PD regimen may lead to undesirable effects such as hypotension that might result from excessive Na removal which has been identified as a major mortality risk factor in patients undergoing PD ([17-20](#_ENREF_17)). A more gradual introduction of the low-Na solution could improve the tolerance. Accordingly the study of Rutkowski et al. ([21](#_ENREF_21), [22](#_ENREF_22)) achieved BP decreases without an appreciable risk of hypotensive episodes using an uncompensated 125 mmol/l Na solution for all daily exchanges. Comparable safety issues were not observed in this study.

During the initial 8 weeks of randomized treatment, when antihypertensive medication changes were permitted only in case of hypotension, arterial BP mean values measured with 3 different methods (24 h ABPM, office measurements, patients’ self-measurements) consistently showed more pronounced decreases in the low-Na group as compared to standard-Na although the treatment group differences were smaller than anticipated. BP decreases may have been partly compensated by reductions of antihypertensive medication in hypotensive patients and, after the end of the efficacy period, in other patients as well, when a decrease in the average number of antihypertensive drugs was observed in the low-Na group but not in the standard-Na group.

A potential BP lowering effect of sodium reduced PD solutions might be supported by the observation that patients receiving the low‑Na solution, unlike those in the control group, showed more pronounced BP decreases during nocturnal readings, i.e., following the low-Na exchange, than during the day, an effect that was also reported by Davies and colleagues using a similar treatment regimen ([13](#_ENREF_13)). It is also worth mentioning in this context that significant advantages for the low‑Na solution were observed in self-measured BP, the only BP assessment performed under blinded conditions. There is evidence that patients’ BP self-measurements may offer advantages over routine dialysis unit measurements for determining cardiovascular risk ([23](#_ENREF_23), [24](#_ENREF_24)).

The results raise some questions regarding the appropriateness of the composite primary endpoint, one of whose efficacy criteria was actually an important adverse reaction in PD (hypotension). The fact that the two efficacy criteria included in the primary endpoint were competitive (patients who required a reduction of antihypertensive medication were counted for this criterion even if they also showed a ≥6 mmHg SBP decrease) complicated the interpretation of the results. Given that clinicians were not blinded to the intervention it is possible that the need to reduce antihypertensive medication represents performance bias. Moreover, the reduction of antihypertensive medication likely counteracted the blood pressure decrease induced by Na removal and thus should probably be included into future investigations as an efficacy criterion. Another limiting factor is that neither Na sensitivity and other predispositions nor nutritional factors (e. g. salt intake, thirst) were assessed.

# CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, superiority of the low-Na solution over standard-Na solution in BP control could not be confirmed. Some results of this study indicate to a potential of low-Na PD solutions for improving BP while reducing the antihypertensive treatment burden, however, the overall concept of Na concentration and treatment schedule needs to be reassessed. Although the 112 mmol/l low-Na solution was generally well tolerated and showed a safety profile similar to that of the standard‑Na solution, the single-dwell administration was associated with an increased risk of hypotension. A comparison of our results with those of Davies et al. ([13](#_ENREF_13)) and of Rutkowski et al. ([21](#_ENREF_21), [22](#_ENREF_22)) thus shows that a BP lowering effect can be achieved either by using a glucose-compensated very low-Na solution in one daily exchange or by an uncompensated, modestly low-Na solution during all dwells. The latter approach has the benefit of not increasing glucose exposure while providing increased Na removal in a continuous manner rather than intermittently ([6](#_ENREF_6)).

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the commitment and dedication of the investigators and their clinical teams at the participating centers during the trial: B.Haraldsson, Sahlgrenska University Hospital Gothenburg, Sweden; O. Simonson, N. Clyne, University Hospital Lund, Sweden; A.-C. Johansson, University Hospital Malmö, Sweden; H. Hadimeri, Skövde Hospital, Sweden; F.-D. Nielsen, Södra Älvsborgs Sjukhus Borås, Sweden; P. Dahlberg, Nord Älvsborg County Hospital, Trollhättan, Sweden; O. Heimburger, Karolinska University Hospital Stockholm, Sweden; H. Furuland, Uppsala University Hospital, Sweden; T. Elung-Jensen, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark; P. Rössel, Aalborg Hospital, Denmark; E. Randers, Viborg Hospital, Denmark; F. Vrtovsnik, Bichat – Claude Bernard Hospital Paris, France; B. Morel, Chambéry Hospital, France; B. Faller, A. Klein, Hospital Pasteur Colmar, France; F. Heibel, University Hospital, Strasbourg, France; J.-P. Ryckelynck, University Hospital Center, Caen, France; C. Courivaud, C. Bresson-Vautrin, CHRU – Hospital Saint-Jacques, Besançon, France; S. Lavaud, E. Canivet, ARPDD Reims, France; A. Caillette-Baudoin, CALYDIAL Vienne, Irigny, France; V. Schwenger, University Hospital Heidelberg, Germany; M. Haag-Weber, St. Elisabeth Hospital, Straubing, Germany; R. Brunkhorst, Hospital Oststadt-Heidehaus, Hannover, Germany; M. Nebel, B. Kitsche, KFH-Nierenzentrum Köln-Merheim, Germany; I. Quack, University Hospital Düsseldorf, Germany; S. Nunnenkamp, KFH-Nierenzentrum Passau, Germany; S. Ludewig, KFH-Nierenzentrum Eberswalde, Germany; S. Weiner, N. Wirtz, Krankenhaus der Barmherzigen Brüder Trier, Germany; C. Hugo, S. Parmentier, University Hospital Dresden, Germany; T. Schneider, Internistische Gemeinschaftspraxis – Nephrologisches Zentrum Stuttgart, Germany; S. Davies, University Hospital of North Staffordshire, United Kingdom; S. Fan, London Royal Barts Hospital, United Kingdom; S. Ramakrishna, Royal Shrewsbury Hospital, United Kingdom; K. S. Sandhu, New Cross Hospital Wolverhampton, United Kingdom; I. Dasgupta, Heartlands Hospital Birmingham, United Kingdom; U. Udayaraj, Southmead Hospital, Bristol; R. Asghar, Royal Preston Hospital, United Kingdom; A. Davenport, London Royal Free Hospital, United Kingdom. The authors would like to thank B. Rippe, Department of Nephrology, University Hospital Lund, Sweden, recently deceased, for his scientific contribution and advice to the design and performance of the study as part of the Steering Committee. Furthermore the support from the following persons being part of the Data Safety Monitoring Board is gratefully acknowledged: A. Slingeneyer, Montpellier, France; M. Lichodziejewska-Niemierko, Department of Nephrology Medical University Gdańsk, Poland; S. Konings, Catharina Ziekenhuis Eindhoven, Netherlands; G. Bobrie, Hypertension Unit of Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France.

Special thanks to Andreas Völp, Psy Consult Scientific Services, Frankfurt, Germany for his contribution to the final analysis and the compilation of the manuscript.

The clinical trial was initially funded by Gambro AB and later by Fresenius Medical Care.

# DISCLOSURES

We have read and understood *Peritoneal Dialysis International’s* policy on conflicts of interest disclosure and declare the following interests: François Vrtovsnik has received lecture fees and travel funding to research meetings from Alexion, Amgen, Baxter and Fresenius Medical Care. Stanley Fan received consulting, lecture fees, and travel funding by Baxter and Vifor. Vedat Schwenger received lecture fees from Fresenius Medical Care. Simon Davies has received research funding and advisory committee fees from Baxter HealthCare. Adelheid Gauly and Saynab Atiye are full-time employees at Fresenius Medical Care. The other authors declare that they have no other relevant financial interests.

# REFERENCES

1. Ortega LM, Materson BJ: Hypertension in peritoneal dialysis patients: epidemiology, pathogenesis, and treatment. *J Am Soc Hypertens,* 5**:** 128-136, 2011

2. Longenecker JC, Coresh J, Powe NR, Levey AS, Fink NE, Martin A, et al.: Traditional cardiovascular disease risk factors in dialysis patients compared with the general population: the CHOICE Study. *J Am Soc Nephrol,* 13**:** 1918-1927, 2002

3. Heerspink HJ, Ninomiya T, Zoungas S, de Zeeuw D, Grobbee DE, Jardine MJ, et al.: Effect of lowering blood pressure on cardiovascular events and mortality in patients on dialysis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet,* 373**:** 1009-1015, 2009

4. Kooman JP, van der Sande FM, Leunissen KM: Role of sodium and volume in the pathogenesis of hypertension in dialysis patients. Reflections on pathophysiological mechanisms. *Blood Purif,* 22**:** 55-59, 2004

5. Ates K, Nergizoglu G, Keven K, Sen A, Kutlay S, Erturk S, et al.: Effect of fluid and sodium removal on mortality in peritoneal dialysis patients. *Kidney Int,* 60**:** 767-776, 2001

6. Blake PG: Sodium Levels in Peritoneal Dialysis Solution: How Low Should We Go? *Am J Kidney Dis,* 67**:** 719-721, 2016

7. Nakayama M, Kasai K, Imai H, Group TRMS: Novel low Na peritoneal dialysis solutions designed to optimize Na gap of effluent: kinetics of Na and water removal. *Perit Dial Int,* 29**:** 528-535, 2009

8. Chen W, Cheng LT, Wang T: Salt and fluid intake in the development of hypertension in peritoneal dialysis patients. *Ren Fail,* 29**:** 427-432, 2007

9. Cheng HH, Wang T, Heimburger O, Bergstrom J, Lindholm B: Fluid and solute transport using different sodium concentrations in peritoneal dialysis solutions. *Perit Dial Int,* 21**:** 65-71, 2001

10. Nakayama M, Hasegawa T, Kubo H, Yamamoto H, Shigematsu T, Kawaguchi Y, et al.: Low Na concentration solution for CAPD. *Clin Nephrol,* 45**:** 66-68, 1996

11. Nakayama M, Kawaguchi Y, Yokoyama K, Kubo H, Miura Y, Watanabe S, et al.: Anti-hypertensive effect of low Na connection (120 mEq/l) solution for CAPD patients. *Clin Nephrol,* 41**:** 357-363, 1994

12. Rippe B, Venturoli D: Optimum electrolyte composition of a dialysis solution. *Perit Dial Int,* 28 Suppl 3**:** S131-136, 2008

13. Davies S, Carlsson O, Simonsen O, Johansson AC, Venturoli D, Ledebo I, et al.: The effects of low-sodium peritoneal dialysis fluids on blood pressure, thirst and volume status. *Nephrol Dial Transplant,* 24**:** 1609-1617, 2009

14. Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products. Note for guidance on clinical investigation of medicinal products in the treatment of hypertension. *European Medicines Agency*, 2004

15. O'Brien E, Pickering T, Asmar R, Myers M, Parati G, Staessen J, et al.: Working Group on Blood Pressure Monitoring of the European Society of Hypertension International Protocol for validation of blood pressure measuring devices in adults. *Blood Press Monit,* 7**:** 3-17, 2002

16. Charra B: Fluid balance, dry weight, and blood pressure in dialysis. *Hemodial Int,* 11**:** 21-31, 2007

17. Al-Chidadi A, Nitsch D, Davenport A: The Effect of Serum Sodium on Survival in Patients Treated by Peritoneal Dialysis in the United Kingdom. *Perit Dial Int*, 2016

18. Bansal N, McCulloch CE, Rahman M, Kusek JW, Anderson AH, Xie D, et al.: Blood pressure and risk of all-cause mortality in advanced chronic kidney disease and hemodialysis: the chronic renal insufficiency cohort study. *Hypertension,* 65**:** 93-100, 2015

19. Goldfarb-Rumyantzev AS, Baird BC, Leypoldt JK, Cheung AK: The association between BP and mortality in patients on chronic peritoneal dialysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant,* 20**:** 1693-1701, 2005

20. Ravel VA, Streja E, Mehrotra R, Sim JJ, Harley K, Ayus JC, et al.: Serum sodium and mortality in a national peritoneal dialysis cohort. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*, 2016

21. Rutkowski B, Tam P, van der Sande FM, Vychytil A, Schwenger V, Himmele R, et al.: Low-Sodium Versus Standard-Sodium Peritoneal Dialysis Solution in Hypertensive Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Kidney Dis,* 67**:** 753-761, 2016

22. Rutkowski B, Tam P, van der Sande FM, Vychytil A, Schwenger V, Klein G, et al.: Residual Renal Function and Effect of Low-Sodium Solution on Blood Pressure in Peritoneal Dialysis Patients. *Perit Dial Int,* 39**:** 335-343, 2019

23. Roberts MA, Pilmore HL, Tonkin AM, Garg AX, Pascoe EM, Badve SV, et al.: Challenges in blood pressure measurement in patients treated with maintenance hemodialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis,* 60**:** 463-472, 2012

24. Taniyama Y: Management of hypertension for patients undergoing dialysis therapy. *Renal Replacement Therapy,* 2**:** 1-6, 2016

# FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Systolic blood pressure change between screening (24 h ambulatory) or baseline (office, self-measured) and week 8 (full analysis set; means and 95% confidence intervals)

Figure 2. Blood pressure time course – office (A systolic; B diastolic) and self-measured (C systolic; D diastolic) (full analysis set; means and 95% confidence intervals)

# TABLES

Table 1. Patient characteristics at baseline (full analysis set)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Low Na (n=60) | Standard Na (n=63) |
| Sex | Female (n, %) | 14 (23.3%) | 18 (28.6%) |
| Age (years) | Mean (SD) | 60.6 (12.7) | 56.0 (14.5) |
| Median (range) | 61.0 (31-84) | 55.0 (23-83) |
| Dry weight (kg) | Mean (SD) | 80.7 (16.7) | 75.8 (13.9) |
| Median (range) | 81.8 (42-128) | 76.7 (42-102) |
| 24h total creatinine clearance (mL/min/1.73 m2) | Valid n | 39 | 27 |
| Mean (SD) | 13.2 (15.5) | 7.9 (6.6) |
| Median (Range) | 8.9 (3-75) | 7.2 (1-38) |
| Total weekly Kt/V | Valid n | 44 | 49 |
| Mean (SD) | 2.3 (0.6) | 2.3 (0.5) |
| Median (range) | 2.2 (1-4) | 2.3 (1-3) |
| Residual Renal Function  (mL/min/1.73 m2) | Valid n | 53 | 53 |
| Mean (SD) | 5.0 (3.27) | 4.9 (3.61) |
| Median (range) | 4.5 (0-13) | 4.0 (0-16) |
| Use of antihypertensive medication | Antihypertensive agents (n, %) | 58 (96.7%) | 62 (98.4%) |
| Diuretics (n, %) | 54 (90.0%) | 50 (79.4%) |
| Diabetes, types I and II | n (%) | 24 (40.0%) | 20 (31.7%) |
| PD modality | CAPD (n, %) | 52 (86.7%) | 42 (66.7%) |
| APD (n, %) | 8 (13.3%) | 21 (33.3%) |
| Time on PD (years) | Mean (SD) | 1.7 (1.7) | 1.7 (1.5) |
| Median (range) | 1.3 (0.1-8.0) | 1.3 (0.2-6.9) |

PD – peritoneal dialysis; APD – automated PD; CAPD – continuous ambulatory PD

Table 2. Improvement of hypertension – responders (full analysis set; number and % of patients with valid data, rate difference and 95% confidence interval (CI), Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test p-value stratified by screening 24 h systolic blood pressure ≤130 mmHg vs. >130 mmHg)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Low Na (n=60) | Standard Na (n=63) | Rate difference [95% CI] | p |
| Valid n | 58 (100%) | 55 (100%) |  |  |
| Responders | 20 (34.5%) | 16 (29.1%) | 5.4% [-11.6%; 21.9%] | 0.512 |
| Response defined by … |  |  |  |  |
| (a) Mean 24 h systolic blood pressure decrease from baseline ≥6 mmHga | 11 (19.0%) | 16 (29.1%) |  |  |
| (b) Fall in blood pressure requiring medical interventionb | 9 (15.5%) | 0 (0.0%) |  |  |

a patients without modification of antihypertensive medication only

b e. g., a decrease of antihypertensive medication. Fulfilment of this criterion had to be confirmed by the Data Safety Monitoring Board

**Table 3**. Secondary efficacy outcomes – baseline / screening value and absolute intra-individual change (full analysis set; mean (standard deviation) and patients with valid values

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Low Na (n=60) | | | | Standard Na (n=63) | | |
| Screening / baseline a | Change, Week 8 | Change, Month 6 | Screening / baseline a | | Change, Week 8 | Change, Month 6 |
| 24 h ABPM SBP (mmHg) | 138.3 (16.4) n=60 | -2.3 (15.9) n=57 | – | 140.5 (16.2) n=63 | | -1.2 (14.5) n=49 | – |
| 24 h ABMP DBP (mmHg) | 83.6 (12.2) n=60) | -1.0 (10.3) n=57 | – | 85.6 (10.6) n=63 | | -1.0 (8.6) n=49 | – |
| 24 h ABPM SBP (mmHg) day b | 139.1 (16.3) n=60 | -1.9 (15.5) n=57 | – | 141.9 (15.8) n=63 | | -1.7 (15.1) n=49 | – |
| 24 h ABMP DBP (mmHg) dayb | 84.5 (12.1) n=60) | -0.7 (10.4) n=57 | – | 87.1 (10.7) n=63 | | -1.3 (9.4) n=49 | – |
| 24 h ABPM SBP (mmHg) night b | 135.3 (18.9) n=60 | -3.5 (16.1) n=57 | – | 135.3 (20.6) n=63 | | +0.6 (15.0) n=49 | – |
| 24 h ABMP DBP (mmHg) night b | 80.4 (13.8) n=60 | -2.1 (11.2) n=57 | – | 80.2 (12.4) n=63 | | +0.3 (7.9) n=49 | – |
| Office SBP (mmHg) | 138.3 (20.5) n=58 | -5.0 (16.7) n=56 | -0.3 (20.5) n=48 | 142.7 (17.9) n=62 | | -3.3 (15.9) n=55 | -1.2 (24.2) n=47 |
| Office DBP (mmHg) | 78.3 (15.4) n=58 | -1.8 (8.7) n=56 | +2.2 (14.3) n=48 | 83.9 (12.0) n=62 | | -0.6 (12.8) n=55 | +0.9 (13.8) n=47 |
| Self-measured SBP (mmHg) | 140.8 (17.1) n=58 | -5.6 (14.6) n=56 | -5.3 (14.2) n=47 | 138.0 (16.4) n=60 | | +3.6 (13.3) n=53 | -0.4 (19.5) n=47 |
| Self-measured DBP (mmHg) | 84.5 (10.8) n=58 | -3.2 (8.3) n=56 | -2.7 (7.8) n=47 | 85.2 (9.9) n=60 | | +1.7 (9.4) n=53 | +0.3 (10.8) n=47 |

**Table 3**, cont’d

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total body water (l) | 40.8 (8.6) n=46 | -0.9 (3.4) n=43 | -0.7 (4.5) n=34 | 38.6 (7.4) n=51 | +0.5 (2.9) n=44 | +0.1 (2.4) n=38 |
| ECW / ICW ratio | 0.93 (0.14) n=46 | -0.03 (0.12) n=43 | -0.01 (0.17) n=34 | 0.92 (0.15) n=51 | -0.02 (0.09) n=44 | -0.02 (0.07) n=38 |
| Body weight (kg) | 79.3 (16.4) n=52 | 0.0 (2.2) n=47 | -0.1 (3.2) n=32 | 76.6 (13.4) n=55 | +0.2 (1.7) n=42 | +0.5 (2.5) n=35 |
| RRF (mL/min/1.73 m2) | 5.0 (3.27) n=53 | –0.9 (1.25) n=44 | –1.4 (2.70) n=35 | 4.9 (3.61) n=53 | –0.7 (1.40) n=41 | –1.1 (2.58) n=37 |

a Screening for 24 h blood pressure measurement; baseline for all other outcomes

b Day: 6 h AM – 10 h PM; night: 10 h PM – 6 h AM

SBP – systolic blood pressure; DBP – diastolic blood pressure; ABPM – ambulatory blood pressure measurement; ECW – extracellular water; ICW – intracellular water

Table 4. Overview of adverse events with onset between the start and end of randomized treatment (safety analysis set; number of events or patients and %)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Low Na | Standard Na |
| Event-related data | All events | 135 (100%) | 141 (100%) |
| Potentially related events a | 45 (33.3%) | 10 (7.1%) |
| Special interest events b | 45 (33.3%) | 16 (11.3%) |
| Serious events | 22 (16.3%) | 30 (21.3%) |
| Patient-related data: | All patients | 63 (100%) | 65 (100%) |
| Patients with … | Any events | 47 (74.6%) | 47 (72.3%) |
| Potentially related events a | 23 (36.5%) | 9 (13.8%) |
| Special interest events b | 22 (34.9%) | 9 (13.8%) |
| Hyponatremia | 3 (4.8%) | 1 (1.5%) |
| Hypotension | 17 (27.0%) | 11 (16.9%) |
| Dizziness | 7 (11.1%) | 3 (4.6%) |
| Asthenia | 2 (3.2%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Peritonitis | 8 (12.7%) | 9 (13.8%) |
| Serious events | 16 (25.4%) | 19 (29.2%) |
| Events leading to treatment discontinuation | 6 (9.5%) | 5 (7.7%) |
| No. of events per patient year | | 5.3 | 5.5 |

a Investigator’s single-blind causality assessment: possible, probably, or definite

b Hyponatremia, hypotension, dizziness, asthenia, peritonitis, any events leading to changes in treatment

# FIGURES

**Figure 1**



**Figure 2**



**Supplemental Online Material**

Supplemental Table 1: Composition of low-Na and standard-Na dialysis solutions


Supplemental Figure 1: Study schedule

Supplemental Figure 2: Consort Diagram showing run in, randomisation and disposition of patients.

Supplemental Table 1: Composition of low-Na and standard-Na dialysis solutions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Low Na | Standard Na |
| Sodium (Na) | 112 mmol/l | 133 mmol/l |
| Calcium (Ca++) | 1.37 mmol/l | 1.35 mmol/l |
| Magnesium (Mg++) | 0.25 mmol/l | 0.25 mmol/l |
| Chloride (Cl‑) | 74.8 mmol/l | 95.4 mmol/l |
| Lactate | 40 mmol/l | 40 mmol/l |
| Glucose | 111 mmol/l | 85 mmol/l |
| Osmolarity | 340 mOsm/l | 356 mOsm/l |
| pH | 5.5 – 6.5 | 5.5 – 6.5 |

**Supplemental Figure 1:** Study schedule

****

**Supplemental Figure 2:** Consort Diagram showing run in, randomisation and disposition of patients.

