

Relationship between fill volume and transport in peritoneal dialysis

Carl M. Öberg, MD, PhD ^{1*}

¹ Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Skåne University Hospital, Lund, SE-21185, SWEDEN.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Supplemental Table 1	page 2
Supplemental Table 2	page 3
Supplemental Table 3	page 6
Supplemental Table 4	page 8
ISTAT-1 Calibration	page 9
Segmented linear regression	page 10
Mathematical theorems	page 12
References	page 14

Supplemental Table 1 A. Hemodynamic and routine lab parameters before and after dialysis.

Parameter	Before dialysis	After dialysis
Mean arterial pressure, mmHg	119 (110 – 128)	103 (86 – 114) *
Heart rate	387 (360 – 402)	325 (310 – 345) ***
Plasma sodium, mmol/L	135 (135 – 136)	137 (137 – 138) ***
Plasma potassium, mmol/L	4.5 (4.3 – 4.6)	4.3 (3.9 – 4.4) **
Plasma total CO ₂ , mmol/L	26 (25 – 27)	24 (23 – 24) ***
Plasma chloride, mmol/L	99 (98 – 100)	104 (103 – 105) ***
Plasma ionized calcium, mmol/L	1.38 (1.34 – 1.40)	1.40 (1.37 – 1.42) *
Blood hemoglobin, g/L	143 (139 – 146)	136 (133 – 139) ***

Values are median (IQR). * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Supplemental Table 1 B. Treatment parameters.

Parameter	Value
Dialysis fluid glucose, mmol/L ^a	83.2
Dialysis fluid sodium, mmol/L ^a	134
Dialysis fluid potassium, mmol/L ^a	0
Dialysis fluid chloride, mmol/L ^a	100.5
Dialysis fluid lactate, mmol/L ^a	35
Dialysis fluid calcium, mmol/L ^a	1.25
Dialysis fluid magnesium, mmol/L ^a	0.5
Total fluid filled (group 1), mL	24
Total fluid filled (group 2), mL	36
Total fluid drained (group 1), mL	26.8
Total fluid drained (group 2), mL	39.6

^a Nominal values from the manufacturer (Balance, Fresenius Medical Care, Bad Homburg, Germany).

Supplemental Table 2

Group	Intra-peritoneal volume (IPV)	UF rate	Creatinine MTAC	Glucose MTAC	Potassium MTAC	tCO2 MTAC
Cumulative fill volume	mL	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$
First dwell phase						
8 mL	9.4 (9.3 – 9.6)	15 (12 – 17)	149 (139 – 174)	108 (98 – 131)	319 (293 – 409)	191 (158 – 217)
12 mL	13.2 (12.6 – 13.3)	19 (18 – 24)	196 (155 – 221)	122 (88 – 135)	347 (333 – 412)	213 (180 – 228)
Second dwell phase						
8+8 mL	17.4 (17.3 – 17.6)	21 (20 – 26)	331 (238 – 476)	146 (125 – 165)	369 (342 – 459)	302 (260 – 335)
12+12 mL	25.2 (24.6 – 25.3)	32 (28 – 38)	570 (320 – 725)	194 (152 – 212)	505 (468 – 595)	375 (335 – 416)
Third dwell phase						
8+8+8 mL	25.4 (25.3 – 25.6)	17 (14 – 21)	609 (503 – 886)	210 (182 – 229)	469 (442 – 523)	336 (301 – 388)
12+12+12 mL	37.2 (36.6 – 37.3)	27 (25 – 29)	482 (436 – 891)	242 (200 – 251)	613 (510 – 702)	512 (463 – 540)
Spearman rank test (IPV vs column)						

Correlation coefficient, ρ	0.45	0.77	0.69	0.69	0.89
Correlation coefficient (regularized), ρ	0.53	0.90	0.81	0.91	0.91
<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

Group	Urea MTAC	Calcium ion MTAC	Sodium MTAC	Chloride MTAC
Cumulative fill volume	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$	$\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$
First dwell phase				
8 mL	200 (175 – 222)	175 (113 – 233)	140 (134 – 156)	118 (96 – 133)
12 mL	208 (186 – 225)	222 (206 – 248)	170 (148 – 188)	123 (92 – 160)
Second dwell phase				
8+8 mL	331 (318 – 379)	358 (292 – 473)	248 (184 – 299)	192 (168 – 210)
12+12 mL	430 (392 – 467)	423 (355 – 463)	297 (263 – 348)	233 (202 – 309)
Third dwell phase				
8+8+8 mL	405 (375 – 479)	498 (403 – 736)	248 (184 – 299)	170 (139 – 201)

12+12+12 mL	543 (515 – 591)	657 (532 – 716)	297 (263 – 348)	266 (222 – 294)
Spearman rank test (IPV vs column)				
Correlation coefficient (raw), ρ	0.90	0.87	0.66	0.69
Correlation coefficient (regularized), ρ	0.91	0.91	0.86	0.88
<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

Supplemental Table 3. Monte Carlo cross-validation results

	Small solute diffusion capacity (MTAC) †			Osmotic conductance to glucose (OCG)		
Experimental data	RMSE	Break-point, mL	MTAC ± μL/min	RMSE	Break-point, mL	OCG ± nL/min/mmHg
Square-Cube law	52.1 (42.0 – 57.5)	-	120 (116 – 124)	9.1 (7.8 – 11.1)	-	48 (47 – 48)
Break-point model	50.8 (41.8 – 56.6)	25.8 (25.2 – 26.4)	149 (143 – 156)	9.0 (7.8 – 11.0)	27.8 (25.7 – 30.7)	61 (59 – 65)
T-test, <i>p</i> -value	< 0.001			< 0.001		
Clinical data	RMSE	Break-point, mL	MTAC ± mL/min	RMSE	Break-point, mL	OCG ± μL/min/mmHg
Square-Cube law	0.22 (0.20 – 0.25)	-	9.1 (8.9 – 9.3)	1.007 (0.84 – 1.17)	-	2.8 (2.5 – 3.2)
Break-point model	0.21 (0.19 – 0.24)	2,286	9.5 (9.2 – 9.8)	1.005 (0.82 – 1.19)	2,286	3.3 (2.9 – 3.7)
T- test, <i>p</i> -value	< 0.001			< 0.001		

RMSE, Root-mean-square error between model predictions and the validation datasets

† ^{51}Cr -EDTA diffusion capacity (for experimental data), or creatinine diffusion capacity (clinical data)

‡ Value at the break-point or at 20/2000 mL (experimental data/clinical data).

Supplemental Table 4. Clinical scenarios simulated using the three-pore model

Regimen	Dwell time	Initial intra-peritoneal volume	D/P creatinine	Trans-peritoneal UF volume †	Net UF ‡
Conventional PET using 2.3% glucose	240	2,300 mL	0.73	296 mL	224 mL
Shorter PET using 2.3% glucose	190	1,150 mL	0.74	146 mL	89 mL
Shorter PET using 2.3% glucose	151	575 mL	0.74	73 mL	27 mL

Dwell time for the shorter treatments were calculated by multiplying 240 min by $(1,150/2,300)^{1/3}$ and $(575/2,300)^{1/3}$, respectively.

† Net water transport across the peritoneal membrane (does not include reabsorption rate/lymphatic flow)

‡ Net water transport including a fixed reabsorption rate/lymphatic flow of 0.3 mL/min

Calibration of analytical methods using the iSTAT-1

Sodium and chloride

Na⁺ and Cl⁻ were measured with the CHEM8 cassette (Abbott, Abbott Park, IL) utilizing ion-selective electrode potentiometry as described by the manufacturer. Bland-Altman analysis was performed using twenty-seven reference solutions, showing a variation coefficient (VC) of 0.8% for sodium and a VC 1.7% for chloride. There were small matrix effects for sodium when spiking with glucose as well as bicarbonate (both increased apparent sodium concentration). Correction was performed using:

$$f^{-1} = a + b \cdot \text{glu} + c \cdot \text{bic}$$

where **actual Na** = $f \times$ **measured Na** [$a = 0.9815$, $b = 7.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $c = 9.2 \cdot 10^{-4}$]. One can see that f equals ~ 1 for a glucose concentration (normal) of 5 mmol/L and a bicarbonate concentration (normal) of 25 mmol/L, illustrating that the iSTAT-1 device is calibrated for blood plasma measurements. There were matrix effects for chloride, also for glucose and bicarbonate (both led to the apparent chloride concentration being lower than actual, again **actual Cl** = $f \times$ **apparent Cl**:

$$f^{-1} = a + b \cdot \text{glu} + c \cdot \text{bic}$$

Here, $a = 0.93$, $b = -1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$, $c = -1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$.

Bicarbonate

Bicarbonate was estimated on the basis of the Henderson-Hasselbach equation from pH, $p\text{CO}_2$, and ionic strength (Na⁺) measurements (according to the manufacturer, CHEM8 cassette), and calibrated to the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry (IFCC) TCO₂ reference method ¹. Bland-Altman analysis performed on the basis of twenty samples of standard fluids (reference) with known amounts of bicarbonate, lactate, and glucose concentrations revealed an imprecision (VC) of 7.5%. No matrix effects were detected for the included spike agents.

Calcium ion

Calcium ion was measured using the CHEM8 cassette. Twenty-seven samples of standard fluids having a known calcium ion concentration of 1.25 mmol/L with known amounts of bicarbonate, lactate and glucose concentrations were analyzed. Bland-Altman analysis showed an imprecision (VC) of 4.1%. A significant matrix effect was identified only for glucose, **actual Ca** = $f \times$ **apparent Ca**:

$$f^{-1} = a + b \cdot \text{glu}$$

Here, $a = 0.74$ and $b = 2.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$.

Segmented linear regression

The square-cube model and break-point models may be linearized:

$$\log y = \log \left(p_0 \left(\frac{v}{v_t} \right)^a \right) = a \log \frac{v}{v_t} + \log p_0$$

Here, y are the data points (i.e., OCG or MTAC values), v is the intra-peritoneal volume, and p_0 is the value of the variable at the intra-peritoneal volume v_t set to 2,286 mL for the square cube model. For the square-cube model, $a=2/3$, and for the break-point model, $a=2/3$ for the first segment (up to the break-point) and then $a=1/3$. The calculation of p_0 for the square-cube model is straightforward

$$p_0 = e^{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t}}$$

The root-mean-square error for the square-cube model is then calculated as

$$RMSE_0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2$$

Since the data points are distributed over 6 different intra-peritoneal volumes (688 mL, 1200 mL, 1694 mL, 2286 mL, 2817 mL and 3329 mL), there are four possible break-point models (one for each interior volume). The calculations of the 4 parameters p_0 is similar, but performed only over the segments $A=\{688 \text{ mL}, 1200 \text{ mL}\}$, $B=\{688 \text{ mL}, 1200 \text{ mL}, 1694 \text{ mL}\}$, $C=\{688 \text{ mL}, 1200 \text{ mL}, 1694 \text{ mL}, 2286 \text{ mL}\}$, $D=\{688 \text{ mL}, 1200 \text{ mL}, 1694 \text{ mL}, 2286 \text{ mL}, 2817 \text{ mL}\}$, as follows

$$p_{0,A} = e^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in A} \log y_i - a \log \frac{v_i}{v_t}}$$

$$p_{0,B} = e^{\frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in B} \log y_i - a \log \frac{v_i}{v_t}}$$

$$p_{0,C} = e^{\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i \in C} \log y_i - a \log \frac{v_i}{v_t}}$$

$$p_{0,D} = e^{\frac{1}{5} \sum_{i \in D} \log y_i - a \log \frac{v_i}{v_t}}$$

The root-mean-square errors are then calculated as follows

$$RMSE_A = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i \in A} \left(\log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 + \sum_{i \notin A} \left(\log y_i - \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 \right)$$

$$RMSE_B = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i \in B} \left(\log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 + \sum_{i \notin B} \left(\log y_i - \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 \right)$$

$$RMSE_C = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i \in C} \left(\log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 + \sum_{i \notin C} \left(\log y_i - \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 \right)$$

$$RMSE_D = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i \in D} \left(\log y_i - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 + \sum_{i \notin D} \left(\log y_i - \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{v_i}{v_t} - \log p_0 \right)^2 \right)$$

Lastly, root-mean-squared errors had an apparent right-tailed distribution much like the log-normal distribution of which the first moment is the geometric mean. T-tests were therefore carried out on log-transformed RMSE.

Mathematical derivation of dwell-time and UF factor

Theorem 1: Assume that the intra-peritoneal volume is changed from V to V_{new} , and that the dialysate concentration D of a solute species follows an exponential model $D(t)=D_0\exp(Vt/MTAC)$. Then, the time it takes to reach a dialysate concentration ratio (D/D_0) using the new fill volume V_{new} is reduced/increased by the factor $(V_{new}/V)^{1/3}$.

Proof: The time T it takes to reach a dialysate concentration D from an initial concentration D_0 is

$$T = \frac{V}{MTAC} \log \frac{D}{D_0}$$

Changing the volume from V to V_{new} , we get

$$T_{new} = \frac{V \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V}\right)}{MTAC \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V}\right)^{2/3}} \log \frac{D}{D_0} = \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V}\right)^{1/3} \frac{V}{MTAC} \log \frac{D}{D_0}$$

Thus, the time to reach D/D_0 is reduced/increased by the factor $(V_{new}/V)^{1/3}$, meaning that when the fill volume is decreased the patient will appear “faster” and *vice versa*.

Theorem 2: In addition to the assumptions in Theorem 1, assume that the osmotic gradient is maintained by adjusting the dwell time by the factor $(V_{new}/V)^{1/3}$. Then, the UF-rate is reduced/increased by the factor (V_{new}/V) .

Using Ohm's law ², the UF rate is given by

$$UFR = OCG \cdot 19.3T(D_0 - D)/\log(D_0/D)$$

Again, changing the volume from V to V_{new} and also changing the time to achieve the same osmotic gradient (D/D_0) , we get

$$UFR = OCG \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V} \right)^{2/3} \cdot 19.3T \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V} \right)^{1/3} (D_0 - D) / \log(D_0/D) \leftrightarrow$$

$$UFR = \left(\frac{V_{new}}{V} \right) OCG \cdot 19.3T (D_0 - D) / \log(D_0/D)$$

Thus, changing the volume from V to V_{new} , the UF-rate is decreased by the factor (V_{new}/V) if the dwell time is also adjusted by the factor $(V_{new}/V)^{1/3}$ to achieve a similar osmotic gradient.

REFERENCES

1. Inc. APoC. *i-STAT 1 System Manual* Emergo Europe: The Hague, Netherlands, 2015.
2. Martus G, Bergling K, Simonsen O, *et al.* Novel Method for Osmotic Conductance to Glucose in Peritoneal Dialysis. *Kidney Int Rep* 2020; **5**: 1974-1981.
1. Inc. APoC. *i-STAT 1 System Manual* Emergo Europe: The Hague, Netherlands, 2015.
1. Hamer WJ, Wu YC. Osmotic coefficients and mean activity coefficients of uni-univalent electrolytes in water at 25° C. *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data* 1972; **1**: 1047-1100.
2. Sarbar M, Covington A, Nuttall R, *et al.* The activity and osmotic coefficients of aqueous sodium bicarbonate solutions. *The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics* 1982; **14**: 967-976.
3. Staples BR, Nuttall RL. The activity and osmotic coefficients of aqueous calcium chloride at 298.15 K. *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data* 1977; **6**: 385-408.
4. Rard JA, Miller DG. Isopiestic determination of the osmotic and activity coefficients of aqueous magnesium chloride solutions at 25. degree. C. *Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data* 1981; **26**: 38-43.
5. Robinson RA, Stokes RH. Tables of osmotic and activity coefficients of electrolytes in aqueous solution at 25 C. *T Faraday Soc* 1949; **45**: 612-624.
6. Inc. APoC. *i-STAT 1 System Manual* Emergo Europe: The Hague, Netherlands, 2015.