

Oral Health-Related Quality of Life, A Proxy of Poor Outcomes in Patients on Peritoneal Dialysis

Sirirat Purisinsith^{1,16}, Patnarin Kanjanabuch^{2,16}, Jeerath Phannajit^{3,4}, Talerngsak Kanjanabuch^{4,5,6,7}, Pongpratch Puapatanakul^{4,7}, David W. Johnson^{8,9,10}, Krit Pongpirul^{7,11,12}, Jeffrey Perl¹³, Bruce Robinson¹⁴, Kriang Tungsanga⁴ and on behalf of Thailand PDOPPS Steering Committee¹⁵

¹Health Department, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, Bangkok, Thailand; ²Department of Oral Medicine, Faculty of Dentistry, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ³Division of Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁴Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁵Center of Excellence in Kidney Metabolic Disorders, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁵Center of Excellence in Kidney Metabolic Disorders, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁶Dialysis Policy & Practice Program, School of Global Health, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁷Peritoneal Dialysis Excellent Center, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; ⁸Department of Nephrology, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Woolloongabba, Queensland, Australia; ⁹Australasian Kidney Trials Network, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; ¹⁰Translational Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia; ¹¹Department of International Health and Department of Health, Behavior and Society, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; ¹²Arbor Research Collaborative for Health, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA; ¹³St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; and ¹⁴Arbor Research Collaborative for Health, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Introduction: We sought to evaluate the associations of poor oral health hygiene with clinical outcomes in patients receiving peritoneal dialysis (PD).

Methods: As part of the multinational Peritoneal Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study (PDOPPS), PD patients from 22 participating PD centers throughout Thailand were enrolled from May 2016 to December 2019. The data were obtained from questionnaires that formed part of the PDOPPS. Oral health-related quality of life (HRQoL) used in this study was the short form of the oral health impact profile (oral health impact profile [OHIP]-14, including 7 facets and 14 items). Patient outcomes were assessed by Kaplan-Meier analysis. Cox proportional hazards model regression was used to estimate associations between oral HRQoL and clinical outcomes.

Results: Of 5090 PD participants, 675 were randomly selected, provided informed consent, and completely responded to the OHIP-14 questionnaire. The median follow-up time of the study was 3.5 (interquartile range = 2.7-5.1 months) years. Poor oral health was associated with lower educational levels, diabetes, older age, marriage, and worse nutritional indicators (including lower time-averaged serum albumin and phosphate concentrations). After adjusting for age, sex, comorbidities, serum albumin, shared frailty by study sites, and PD vintage, poor oral health was associated with increased risks of peritonitis (adjusted hazard ratio [HR] = 1.45, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.06-2.00) and all-cause mortality (adjusted HR = 1.55, 95% CI: 1.04-2.32) but not hemodialysis (HD) transfer (adjusted HR = 1.89, 95% CI: 0.87-4.10) compared to participants with good oral health.

Conclusion: Poor oral health status was present in one-fourth of PD patients and was independently associated with a higher risk of peritonitis and death.

Kidney Int Rep (2022) **7**, 2207–2218; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ekir.2022.07.008 KEYWORDS: oral health hygiene; patient survival; PDOPPS; peritonitis © 2022 International Society of Nephrology. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Correspondence: Talerngsak Kanjanabuch, Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand. E-mail: Talerngsak.K@chula.ac.th

¹⁵Members of the Thailand PDOPPS Steering Committee are listed in the Appendix.

¹⁶These authors equally contributed to this work.

Received 28 January 2022; revised 9 July 2022; accepted 11 July 2022; published online 6 August 2022

O ral health directly affects one's physical and mental health. Kidney failure (KF) patients with poor oral health are more at risk of overall and cardiovascular-related deaths due to the systemic effects of this condition, such as inflammation, infections, protein-energy wasting, and atherosclerosis.¹ In addition, oral health could have a psychological effect on individuals' and patients' lives by affecting speech, chewing, taste, swallowing, and self-confidence. Several studies show that KF patients have higher rates of decayed, missing, and filled teeth, dental plaque, loss of attachment, xerostomia, gingivitis, periodontitis, as well as mouth and jaw-bone lesions than the general population.²⁻⁷ Moreover, the consequences of poor oral health are worse for KF patients due to advanced age, diabetes, polypharmacy, and impaired immune function.¹

Nevertheless, oral health evaluation is often not a high priority in the PD care setting. Similarly, there is a high discordance between symptoms reported by patients and those identified by their medical team. Currently, the International Society for Peritoneal Dialysis (ISPD) endorses the practice of reporting patient-reported outcomes as one of the essential indices that should be assessed routinely to help ensure the delivery of high-quality PD care.⁸ Patientreported oral health has been widely explored in patients receiving HD,⁹⁻²⁰ but less so in patients receiving PD.²¹⁻²⁷ Almost all studies were done in less than 120 PD participants and assessed only the physical dimension. A few studies have specifically explored the association between oral health and clinical outcomes. A single study conducted in Finland found no relationship between oral health and subsequent PDrelated peritonitis,²⁴ and no other hard clinical outcomes were explored. Nevertheless, these results might be imprecise because the analyses were based on only 77 peritonitis episodes in 46 PD patients (a median follow-up time of 23 months).

The PDOPPS is a prospective international cohort study in PD, in collaboration with the ISPD, which has recruited participants from many countries, including Thailand.²⁸ To overcome the limitations of past studies, we leveraged this rich database with information from 22 facilities in Thailand to conduct adequately powered and multivariable-adjusted comparisons of self-reported oral health hygiene among patients on PD in order to better elucidate the relationship between oral health and patient outcomes.

METHODS

Study Design and Population

This prospective cohort study was conducted among patients 18 years and older who were receiving maintenance PD in Thailand according to the global PDOPPS protocol with minor modifications to meet Thailand's specific situation. Both incident (n = 10-15) and prevalent (n = 20-30) participants were randomly selected from 22 PD centers providing treatment to at least 20 PD patients at the time of selection. The study centers were selected from a complete list of 140 eligible PD facilities in Thailand. The study rationale

and methods have been published previously.^{28,29} All reporting adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guidelines (Supplementary Item S1).³⁰ The study was approved by the Chulalongkorn University institutional review board and local ethics committees. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to study enrolment.

Data Collection

The PDOPPS collected patient-level and facility-level data using a standard protocol and data collection instruments in all participating facilities between 2 May 2016 and 1 December 2019. Participant demographics and comorbidities were captured at study enrolment. Blood chemistries were tested bimonthly, whereas allcause mortality, cause-specific PD technique failure, hospitalizations, and PD-related complications were collected continuously during study follow-up. Patient-reported data, including HRQoL were collected at study enrolment and annually thereafter via selfadministered surveys. The returned surveys were coded and entered into an electronic data file with a double-entry cross-checking process.

Self-reported Oral Health Status and HRQoL

Oral HRQoL was evaluated in this study by using the short form (14 items, 7 facets) of the 49-item OHIP developed by Slade et al.^{31,32} The short form OHIP-14 has been widely used across the globe for various research purposes and verified among HD⁹ and PD patients.²³ The OHIP-14 measures limitation, discomfort, and disability attributed to oral conditions and is a self-filled questionnaire that focuses on 7 domains of impact (functional limitation, pain, psychological discomfort, physical disability, psychological disability, social disability, and handicap), with participants being asked to respond according to the frequency of impact on a 5-point Likert scale coded as follows: never (score 0), hardly ever (score 1), occasionally (score 2), fairly often (score 3) and very often (score 4) using a few-months recall period. All 2 items of each facet of the questionnaire were aggregated and averaged to generate facet scores. Complete response was defined by the response to all 14 items of the questionnaire. The total OHIP-14 score was summed up from all 14 items. The higher the average value of the 7 dimensions and total OHIP score, the more negative the impact of oral health on the quality of life of an individual. The fourth quartile of OHIP-14 defined poor oral hygiene, whereas the first quartile of the OHIP-14 score was designated as good oral health. The second and third quartiles were collapsed and assigned to the

category of fair oral health. In Thailand, PDOPPS additionally collected OHIP-14 biennially.

HRQoL was assessed using the 12-item Short-Form (SF-12) of the original 36-item Kidney Disease Quality of Life survey. The SF-12 captured the 8 health domains and summarized them into a physical component summary score (PCS) and a mental component summary score (MCS). Higher PCS and MCS represented better physical and mental aspects of HRQoL, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to present the baseline characteristics of enrolled participants. Mean \pm SD or median (interquartile range were used for continuous variables as appropriate, whereas categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages. Oneway analysis of variance was used for comparison of continuous variables among the 3 groups of participants, whereas the χ^2 test was used for comparison of categorical variables.

For time-to-event analyses, follow-up started at the participant's enrolment date. Follow-up ended at death, kidney transplantation, 7 days after a permanent shift to HD, loss to follow-up, or study end, whichever came first. Peritonitis was diagnosed according to the 2016 ISPD guidelines by employing at least 2 of the following criteria: (i) clinical features consistent with peritonitis, including abdominal pain and/or cloudy effluent; (ii) PD effluent leukocyte count more than $100/\mu$ l with polymorphonuclear cell predominance (after dwell time at least 2 hours); (iii) positive microbial culture from PD effluent.³³ HD transfer (defined as transfer to HD for greater than 84 days [12 weeks], or planned modality switch [clinically reported] and was censored for kidney transplantation and death). Death within 7 days of transfer to HD was counted as death on PD (outcome event), not HD transfer. Relapsing peritonitis (defined as a peritonitis episode that occurred within 4 weeks of completion of therapy of a prior episode with the same organism or no growth) was only counted once.³³

Patient, peritonitis-free, and PD technique survivals were analyzed as time-to-event outcomes using the Kaplan-Meier method and multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression models, whereas peritonitisfree survival and HD transfer were analyzed as time-to-event outcomes adjusted for participant age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities including (diabetes, coronary artery disease, congestive heart failure, and cerebrovascular disease), shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin using cause-specific hazards models in the presence of competing events. The proportional hazards assumption of the Cox regression model was checked using Schoenfeld residuals and a log-log plot.



Figure 1. Patient flow diagram. OHIP, oral health impact profile; PDOPPS, peritoneal sialysis outcomes and practice patterns study.

Covariates were treated as time-varying if the assumption was not met. Sensitivity analyses were also conducted to calculate subdistribution (hazard ratios) HRs using Fine and Grey subdistribution hazard models,³⁴ and generate cumulative incidence curves for peritonitis considering HD transfer and death as competing events, and for HD transfer considering death as a competing event. Peritonitis was calculated as incidence (episodes per participant-year) and compared among groups using multivariable Poisson regression with adjustment for relevant variables mentioned earlier. All models accounted for PD facility clustering using robust sandwich covariance estimators. Multiple imputations were used to manage covariate variables with missing values. Assuming the missingness occurred randomly, we used sequential imputation by chained equations with 20 imputations added. All statistical analyses were performed using STATA/IC version 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

Study Population

Of 5090 PD patients from 22 facilities in the Thailand PDOPPS database census, 975 patients were randomly selected. Of these, 848 patients provided written informed consent to participate in the study, while 53 (6%), 117 (14%), and 675 (80%) participants provided none, incomplete, and complete responses, respectively, to the OHIP-14 questionnaires. Only participants who completed all 14 items of the questionnaires

Table 1. Baseline characteristics

				Oral hygiene		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Clinical parameters	Total (675)	Good (171)	Fair (338)	Poor (166)	<i>P</i> -value ^a
Age, yrs 55.4 ± 13.4 52.1 ± 15.1 56.3 ± 13.2 57.0 ± 11.2 $< c001$ Maie gender337 (50%)333 (49%)173 (61%)81 (49%)0.81Moringe stulus485 (72%)106 (62%)247 (73%)132 (60%)0.001Education51 (8%)22 (13%)21 (6%)8 (5%)104Bachelor's degree of higher108 (16%)31 (18%)57 (17%)20 (12%)Bochelor's degree of higher108 (16%)14 (8%)32 (9%)7 (4%)Employed stulus271 (40%)11 (48%)32 (9%)7 (4%)Caragiver dependency294 (44%)61 (36%)157 (46%)93 (56%)0.02Dobels332 (49%)70 (41%)169 (60%)93 (56%)0.02Coronary head falsesea54 (48%)14 (48%)27 (48%)13 (48%)0.99Congeslive headt falure77 (13%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Gederoxoscular diseose26 (4%)31 (25%)72 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)70 (29%)44 (33%)Naking falure7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)00Former smoker10.8 ± 1.60.8 ± 1.50.8 ± 1.61.0 ± 1.70.3Adive smoker7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)00Former smoker10.8 ± 1.60.7 ± 0.60.6 ± 0.70.5 ± 0.50.6CAPD modulity0.8 ± 1.60.8 ± 1.60.4 ± 1.41.0 ± 1.30.2PU Hidure vindure, 1	Total OHIP-14 score	13.4 ± 11.8	0.6 ± 0.9	11.6 ± 5.8	30.3 ± 6.3	< 0.001
	Age, yrs	55.4 ± 13.4	52.1 ± 15.1	56.3 ± 13.2	57.0 ± 11.2	<0.001
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \mbox{Morriage status} & 465 (72\%) & 106 (62\%) & 247 (73\%) & 132 (80\%) & 0.001 \\ 0.001 \\ \hline Education & 0.004 \\ \hline Elumentary school or lower & 51 (8\%) & 22 (13\%) & 21 (6\%) & 8 (5\%) \\ \hline High school graduate & 463 (69\%) & 104 (61\%) & 228 (67\%) & 131 (79\%) \\ \hline Bochelor's degree of higher & 108 (16\%) & 31 (18\%) & 57 (17\%) & 20 (12\%) \\ \hline Unknown & 53 (6\%) & 14 (4\%) & 32 (9\%) & 77 (4\%) \\ \hline Employed status & 271 (40\%) & 71 (42\%) & 140 (41\%) & 60 (36\%) & 0.5 \\ \hline Garegiver dependency & 249 (44\%) & 61 (36\%) & 159 (56\%) & 76 (46\%) & 006 \\ \hline Dachels & 322 (49\%) & 70 (41\%) & 169 (56\%) & 93 (56\%) & 0.02 \\ \hline Coronary heart fulure & 77 (13\%) & 16 (11\%) & 38 (13\%) & 23 (15\%) & 0.5 \\ \hline Caregiver dependency & 25 (4\%) & 3 (2\%) & 15 (5\%) & 7 (5\%) & 0.3 \\ \hline Caregiver scalar disease & 25 (4\%) & 31 (25\%) & 73 (29\%) & 44 (33\%) \\ \hline Former smoker & 7 (1\%) & 2 (2\%) & 5 (2\%) & 0 \\ \hline Former smoker & 7 (1\%) & 91 (73\%) & 177 (6\%) & 91 (6\%) \\ \hline Former smoker & 7 (1\%) & 91 (73\%) & 177 (6\%) & 91 (67\%) \\ \hline Valure winloge, yrs & 0.0 \pm 1.7 & 1.0 \pm 1.8 & 0.9 \pm 1.6 & 1.2 \pm 1.8 & 0.2 \\ P0 windge, yrs & 0.8 \pm 1.6 & 0.8 \pm 1.5 & 0.8 \pm 1.6 & 1.0 \pm 1.7 & 0.3 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ \hline CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 $	Male gender	337 (50%)	83 (49%)	173 (51%)	81 (49%)	0.81
Education 0.004 Elementary school protower 51 (8%) 22 (13%) 21 (6%) 8 (5%) Bachelor's degree of higher 108 (16%) 31 (18%) 57 (17%) 20 (12%) Bachelor's degree of higher 108 (16%) 31 (18%) 57 (17%) 20 (12%) Unknown 53 (8%) 14 (8%) 32 (9%) 7 (4%) 00 Corregiver dependency 294 (44%) 61 (36%) 157 (46%) 76 (46%) 0.06 Diobetes 332 (49%) 70 (41%) 169 (50%) 93 (56%) 0.02 Cornary heart disease 54 (8%) 14 (8%) 27 (8%) 13 (8%) 0.92 Conserve heart fulure 77 (13%) 16 (11%) 38 (13%) 23 (15%) 0.5 Cerebrowscular disease 25 (4%) 3 (2%) 15 (5%) 7 (5%) 0 Former smoker 148 (9%) 31 (25%) 73 (29%) 44 (33%) 24 Newer 359 (70%) 91 (67%) 91 (67%) 0 0 P0 wintdgg, rys 0.6 ± 0.6 <t< td=""><td>Marriage status</td><td>485 (72%)</td><td>106 (62%)</td><td>247 (73%)</td><td>132 (80%)</td><td>0.001</td></t<>	Marriage status	485 (72%)	106 (62%)	247 (73%)	132 (80%)	0.001
Elementary school or lower 51 (8%) 22 (13%) 21 (6%) 8 (5%) High school graduate 463 (69%) 104 (61%) 228 (67%) 131 (79%) Bachelor's degree of higher 108 (16%) 31 (18%) 57 (17%) 20 (12%) Unknown 53 (8%) 14 (8%) 32 (9%) 7 (4%) 0 Corregiver dependency 294 (44%) 61 (36%) 157 (46%) 93 (66%) 0.02 Corregiver dependency 294 (44%) 16 (36%) 16 (95%) 93 (66%) 0.02 Corronary heart disease 54 (8%) 14 (8%) 27 (8%) 13 (8%) 0.99 Corgeiver vascular disease 25 (4%) 3 (2%) 15 (5%) 7 (5%) 0.3 Smoking sldus 7 (1%) 2 (2%) 5 (2%) 0 6 Former smoker 148 (9%) 31 (25%) 73 (2%) 44 (33%) 0.2 Never 359 (70%) 91 (73%) 177 (6%) 91 (67%) 0.6 PO intogy, rys 0.8 ± 1.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 <td>Education</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.004</td>	Education					0.004
High school groduate463 (69%)104 (61%)228 (67%)131 (79%)Bachelor's degree drigher108 (16%)31 (18%)57 (17%)20 (12%)Unknown53 (6%)14 (4%)32 (9%)7 (4%)Employed status271 (40%)71 (42%)140 (41%)60 (36%)0.5Caregiver dependency294 (44%)61 (36%)157 (46%)76 (46%)0.02Diabeles332 (49%)70 (41%)169 (50%)93 (56%)0.02Coronary hear disease54 (8%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Coregiver heart failure77 (13%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Coronary heart disease25 (4%)3 (2%)15 (5%)7 (5%)0.3Smoking status7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)73 (29%)44 (33%)Never359 (70%)91 (73%)177 (6%)91 (67%)0.6Adhve smoker0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.6 0.6APD modality654 (97%)161 (94%)330 (96%)163 (96%)0.06Coronary hear (and mice with mg/d)9.4 ± 3.8 9.8 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2Serum ordinine, mg/d19.4 ± 3.8 9.8 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2Serum ordinine, mg/d19.4 ± 3.8 9.8 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.6 0.2 </td <td>Elementary school or lower</td> <td>51 (8%)</td> <td>22 (13%)</td> <td>21 (6%)</td> <td>8 (5%)</td> <td></td>	Elementary school or lower	51 (8%)	22 (13%)	21 (6%)	8 (5%)	
Bachelor's degree of higher108 (16%)31 (18%)57 (17%)20 (12%)Unknown53 (8%)14 (8%)32 (9%)7 (4%)Employed status271 (40%)71 (42%)140 (41%)60 (36%)0.5Coregiver dependency294 (44%)61 (36%)157 (46%)76 (46%)0.02Diobetes332 (49%)70 (41%)169 (50%)93 (56%)0.02Corony heart disease54 (8%)14 (8%)27 (8%)13 (8%)0.99Congestive heart failure77 (13%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Ceretrovsculur disease25 (4%)3 (2%)15 (5%)7 (5%)0.3Smoking status	High school graduate	463 (69%)	104 (61%)	228 (67%)	131 (79%)	
	Bachelor's degree of higher	108 (16%)	31 (18%)	57 (17%)	20 (12%)	
Employed status271 (40%)71 (42%)140 (41%)60 (36%)0.5Coregive dependency294 (44%)61 (36%)157 (46%)76 (46%)0.06Diobetes332 (49%)70 (41%)169 (50%)93 (56%)0.02Cornary heart disease54 (8%)14 (3%)27 (8%)13 (8%)0.99Congestive heart failure77 (13%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Correly towascular disease25 (4%)3 (2%)15 (5%)7 (5%)0.3Smoking status0.4Active smoker7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)73 (29%)44 (33%)Never359 (70%)91 (73%)177 (6%)91 (67%)P0 vintage, yrs1.0 ± 1.71.0 ± 1.80.9 ± 1.61.2 ± 1.80.2P0 vintage, yrs0.8 ± 1.60.8 ± 1.50.8 ± 1.61.0 ± 1.70.324-h urine volume, 10.6 ± 0.60.7 ± 0.60.6 ± 0.70.5 ± 0.50.6CAPD modality654 (97%)161 (94%)330 (98%)163 (98%)0.06LaboratoriesSerum readmine, mg/d19.4 ± 3.89.9 ± 4.29.2 ± 3.59.4 ± 3.80.2Serum polosium, mEq/l3.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.53.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.50.2Serum polosium, mEq/l3.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.53.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.50.03Serum polosium, mg/d18.8 ± 0.88.7 ± 0.	Unknown	53 (8%)	14 (8%)	32 (9%)	7 (4%)	
	Employed status	271 (40%)	71 (42%)	140 (41%)	60 (36%)	0.5
Diobeles332 (49%)70 (41%)169 (50%)93 (56%)0.02Coronary heart disease54 (8%)14 (8%)27 (8%)13 (8%)0.99Congestive heart failure77 (13%)16 (11%)38 (13%)23 (15%)0.5Cerebrovscular disease25 (4%)3 (2%)15 (5%)7 (5%)0.3Smoking status0.4Active smoker7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)73 (29%)44 (33%)Never359 (70%)91 (73%)177 (6%)91 (67%)Kidney failure vintage, yrs0.8 ± 1.60.8 ± 1.50.8 ± 1.61.0 ± 1.70.324-h urine volume, 10.6 ± 0.60.7 ± 0.60.6 ± 0.70.5 ± 0.50.6CAPD modality60 407%)161 (94%)330 (98%)163 (3.8 ± 3.10.5Serum readinine, mg/d19.4 ± 3.89.9 ± 4.29.2 ± 3.59.4 ± 3.80.2Serum potasium, mEq/113.6.5 ± 3.3136.7 ± 3.4136.4 ± 3.3136.3 ± 3.10.5Serum potasium, mEq/13.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.53.7 ± 0.63.8 ± 0.50.2Serum potasium, mEq/13.4 ± 0.88.7 ± 0.98.7 ± 0.98.7 ± 0.98.7 ± 0.93.2 ± 0.63.3 ± 0.50.03Serum potasium, mg/d13.3 ± 0.63.4 ± 0.73.2 ± 0.63.3 ± 0.50.031.03 ± 1.50.03Hemglobin, g/d110.3 ± 1.510.4 ± 1.610.2 ± 1.410.5 ± 1.30.20.03Hemglobin	Caregiver dependency	294 (44%)	61 (36%)	157 (46%)	76 (46%)	0.06
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Diabetes	332 (49%)	70 (41%)	169 (50%)	93 (56%)	0.02
$\begin{array}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Coronary heart disease	54 (8%)	14 (8%)	27 (8%)	13 (8%)	0.99
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Congestive heart failure	77 (13%)	16 (11%)	38 (13%)	23 (15%)	0.5
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } Strain Status & 0.4 \\ \hline Active smoker & 7 (1%) & 2 (2%) & 5 (2%) & 0 \\ \hline Active smoker & 148 (9%) & 31 (25%) & 73 (29%) & 44 (33%) \\ \hline Never & 359 (70\%) & 91 (73\%) & 177 (6\%) & 91 (67\%) \\ \hline Kidney foilure vintage, yrs & 1.0 \pm 1.7 & 1.0 \pm 1.8 & 0.9 \pm 1.6 & 1.2 \pm 1.8 & 0.2 \\ PD vintage, yrs & 0.8 \pm 1.6 & 0.8 \pm 1.5 & 0.8 \pm 1.6 & 1.0 \pm 1.7 & 0.3 \\ 24 h urine volume, 1 & 0.6 \pm 0.6 & 0.7 \pm 0.6 & 0.6 \pm 0.7 & 0.5 \pm 0.5 & 0.6 \\ CAPD modality & 654 (97\%) & 161 (94\%) & 330 (98\%) & 163 (98\%) & 0.06 \\ Laboratories' & & & & & & \\ Serum credinine, mg/dl & 9.4 \pm 3.8 & 9.9 \pm 4.2 & 9.2 \pm 3.5 & 9.4 \pm 3.8 & 0.2 \\ Serum sodium, mEq/1 & 136.5 \pm 3.3 & 136.7 \pm 3.4 & 136.4 \pm 3.3 & 136.3 \pm 3.1 & 0.5 \\ Serum potossium, mEq/1 & 37 \pm 0.6 & 3.8 \pm 0.5 & 3.7 \pm 0.6 & 3.8 \pm 0.5 & 0.2 \\ Serum potossium, mEq/1 & 27.4 \pm 2.8 & 27.1 \pm 2.9 & 27.6 \pm 2.9 & 27.4 \pm 2.7 & 0.3 \\ Serum potossium, mg/dl & 8.8 \pm 0.8 & 8.7 \pm 0.9 & 8.7 \pm 0.8 & 8.8 \pm 0.8 & 0.4 \\ Serum potosphete, mg/dl & 4.2 \pm 1.4 & 4.5 \pm 1.4 & 4.0 \pm 1.4 & 4.1 \pm 1.4 & 0.009 \\ Serum nogloum, ng/dl & 3.3 \pm 0.6 & 3.4 \pm 0.7 & 3.2 \pm 0.6 & 3.3 \pm 0.5 & 0.2 \\ Henglobin, g/dl & 1.0 \pm 1.5 & 1.0.4 \pm 1.6 & 1.0.2 \pm 1.4 & 1.0 \pm 1.3 & 0.2 \\ Henglobin, g/dl & 1.0 \pm 1.1 & 23 \pm 0.9 & 2.3 \pm 0.9 & 2.6 \pm 1.6 & 0.4 \\ Physical component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 40.3 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component status & 41.1 (36.6-47.6) & 43.0 (38.1-51.6) & 41.2 (36.1-47.6) & 40.2 (36.3-45.6) & 0.03 \\ \hline Mental component st$	Cerebrovascular disease	25 (4%)	3 (2%)	15 (5%)	7 (5%)	0.3
Active smoker7 (1%)2 (2%)5 (2%)0Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)73 (29%)44 (33%)Never359 (70%)91 (73%)177 (6%)91 (67%)Kidney failure vintage, yrs 1.0 ± 1.7 1.0 ± 1.8 0.9 ± 1.6 1.2 ± 1.8 0.2 PD vintage, yrs 0.8 ± 1.6 0.8 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 1.6 1.0 ± 1.7 0.3 24-h urine volume, 1 0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 0.6 CAPD modality654 (97%)161 (94%)330 (98%)163 (98%) 0.6 Laboratories ¹⁶ Serum creatinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum readinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum potassium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum calcium, mg/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.33 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 <tr< td=""><td>Smoking status</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.4</td></tr<>	Smoking status					0.4
Former smoker148 (9%)31 (25%)73 (29%)44 (33%)Never359 (70%)91 (73%)177 (6%)91 (67%)Kidney failure vintage, yrs 1.0 ± 1.7 1.0 ± 1.8 0.9 ± 1.6 1.2 ± 1.8 0.2 PD vintage, yrs 0.8 ± 1.6 0.8 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 1.6 1.0 ± 1.7 0.3 24-h urine volume, I 0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 0.6 CAPD modality 654 (97%) 161 (94%) 330 (98%) 163 (98%) 0.06 Laboratories ^b 8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum creatinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum sodium, mEq/1 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum plassium, mEq/1 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum plassium, mEq/1 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum plassinder, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum alburnin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KIV/ urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$)	Active smoker	7 (1%)	2 (2%)	5 (2%)	0	
Never $359 (70\%)$ $91 (73\%)$ $177 (6\%)$ $91 (67\%)$ Kidney failure vintage, yrs 1.0 ± 1.7 1.0 ± 1.8 0.9 ± 1.6 1.2 ± 1.8 0.2 PD vintage, yrs 0.8 ± 1.6 0.8 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 1.6 1.0 ± 1.7 0.3 24-h urine volume, I 0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 0.6 CAPD modality $654 (97\%)$ $161 (94\%)$ $330 (98\%)$ $163 (98\%)$ 0.06 Laboratories ³ $$	Former smoker	148 (9%)	31 (25%)	73 (29%)	44 (33%)	
Kidney failure vintage, yrs 1.0 ± 1.7 1.0 ± 1.8 0.9 ± 1.6 1.2 ± 1.8 0.2 PD vintage, yrs 0.8 ± 1.6 0.8 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 1.6 1.0 ± 1.7 0.3 24-h urine volume, I 0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 0.6 CAPD modality 654 (97%) 161 (94%) 330 (98%) 163 (98%) 0.06 Laboratories ^b 54 9.7% 161 (94%) 330 (98%) 163 (98%) 0.6 Serum creatinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum sodium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum potassium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl) 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KI/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($36.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.3 <	Never	359 (70%)	91 (73%)	177 (6%)	91 (67%)	
PD vintage, yrs 0.8 ± 1.6 0.8 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 1.6 1.0 ± 1.7 0.3 24-h urine volume, I 0.6 ± 0.6 0.7 ± 0.6 0.6 ± 0.7 0.5 ± 0.5 0.6 CAPD modality 654 (97%) 161 (94%) 330 (98%) 163 (98%) 0.06 Laboratories ^b Serum creatinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum sodium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl) 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KtV urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Kidney failure vintage, yrs	1.0 ± 1.7	1.0 ± 1.8	0.9 ± 1.6	1.2 ± 1.8	0.2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	PD vintage, yrs	0.8 ± 1.6	0.8 ± 1.5	0.8 ± 1.6	1.0 ± 1.7	0.3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	24-h urine volume, I	0.6 ± 0.6	0.7 ± 0.6	0.6 ± 0.7	0.5 ± 0.5	0.6
Laboratories ^b Serum credinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum sodium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status $39.1 (33.5 - 44.9)$ $40.8 (35.4 - 47.2)$ $38.5 (32.8 - 45.4)$ $37.8 (33.1 - 42.1)$ 0.03 Mental component status $41.1 (36.6 - 47.6)$ $43.0 (38.1 - 51.6)$ $41.2 (36.1 - 47.6)$ $40.2 (36.3 - 45.6)$ 0.03	CAPD modality	654 (97%)	161 (94%)	330 (98%)	163 (98%)	0.06
Serum credinine, mg/dl 9.4 ± 3.8 9.9 ± 4.2 9.2 ± 3.5 9.4 ± 3.8 0.2 Serum sodium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Laboratories ^b					
Serum sodium, mEq/l 136.5 ± 3.3 136.7 ± 3.4 136.4 ± 3.3 136.3 ± 3.1 0.5 Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Serum creatinine, mg/dl	9.4 ± 3.8	9.9 ± 4.2	9.2 ± 3.5	9.4 ± 3.8	0.2
Serum potassium, mEq/l 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 3.7 ± 0.6 3.8 ± 0.5 0.2 Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Serum sodium, mEq/I	136.5 ± 3.3	136.7 ± 3.4	136.4 ± 3.3	136.3 ± 3.1	0.5
Serum bicarbonate, mEq/l 27.4 ± 2.8 27.1 ± 2.9 27.6 ± 2.9 27.4 ± 2.7 0.3 Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KtV urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status $39.1 (33.5-44.9)$ $40.8 (35.4-47.2)$ $38.5 (32.8-45.4)$ $37.8 (33.1-42.1)$ 0.03 Mental component status $41.1 (36.6-47.6)$ $43.0 (38.1-51.6)$ $41.2 (36.1-47.6)$ $40.2 (36.3-45.6)$ 0.03	Serum potassium, mEq/I	3.7 ± 0.6	3.8 ± 0.5	3.7 ± 0.6	3.8 ± 0.5	0.2
Serum calcium, mg/dl 8.8 ± 0.8 8.7 ± 0.9 8.7 ± 0.8 8.8 ± 0.8 0.4 Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.3 Hemoglobin, g/dl 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KtV urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Serum bicarbonate, mEq/I	27.4 ± 2.8	27.1 ± 2.9	27.6 ± 2.9	27.4 ± 2.7	0.3
Serum phosphate, mg/dl 4.2 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.4 4.0 ± 1.4 4.1 ± 1.4 0.009 Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 Hemoglobin, g/dl) 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total KtV urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status $39.1 (33.5-44.9)$ $40.8 (35.4-47.2)$ $38.5 (32.8-45.4)$ $37.8 (33.1-42.1)$ 0.03 Mental component status $41.1 (36.6-47.6)$ $43.0 (38.1-51.6)$ $41.2 (36.1-47.6)$ $40.2 (36.3-45.6)$ 0.03	Serum calcium, mg/dl	8.8 ± 0.8	8.7 ± 0.9	8.7 ± 0.8	8.8 ± 0.8	0.4
Serum albumin, g/dl 3.3 ± 0.6 3.4 ± 0.7 3.2 ± 0.6 3.3 ± 0.5 0.03 Hemoglobin, g/dl) 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Serum phosphate, mg/dl	4.2 ± 1.4	4.5 ± 1.4	4.0 ± 1.4	4.1 ± 1.4	0.009
Hemoglobin, g/dl) 10.3 ± 1.5 10.4 ± 1.6 10.2 ± 1.4 10.5 ± 1.3 0.2 Total Kt/V urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 ($33.5-44.9$) 40.8 ($35.4-47.2$) 38.5 ($32.8-45.4$) 37.8 ($33.1-42.1$) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 ($36.6-47.6$) 43.0 ($38.1-51.6$) 41.2 ($36.1-47.6$) 40.2 ($36.3-45.6$) 0.03	Serum albumin, g/dl	3.3 ± 0.6	3.4 ± 0.7	3.2 ± 0.6	3.3 ± 0.5	0.03
Total KtV urea 2.4 ± 1.1 2.3 ± 0.9 2.3 ± 0.9 2.6 ± 1.6 0.4 Physical component status 39.1 (33.5–44.9) 40.8 (35.4–47.2) 38.5 (32.8–45.4) 37.8 (33.1–42.1) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 (36.6–47.6) 43.0 (38.1–51.6) 41.2 (36.1–47.6) 40.2 (36.3–45.6) 0.03	Hemoglobin, g/dl)	10.3 ± 1.5	10.4 ± 1.6	10.2 ± 1.4	10.5 ± 1.3	0.2
Physical component status 39.1 (33.5-44.9) 40.8 (35.4-47.2) 38.5 (32.8-45.4) 37.8 (33.1-42.1) 0.03 Mental component status 41.1 (36.6-47.6) 43.0 (38.1-51.6) 41.2 (36.1-47.6) 40.2 (36.3-45.6) 0.03	Total Kt/V urea	2.4 ± 1.1	2.3 ± 0.9	2.3 ± 0.9	2.6 ± 1.6	0.4
Mental component status 41.1 (36.6–47.6) 43.0 (38.1–51.6) 41.2 (36.1–47.6) 40.2 (36.3–45.6) 0.03	Physical component status	39.1 (33.5-44.9)	40.8 (35.4-47.2)	38.5 (32.8–45.4)	37.8 (33.1–42.1)	0.03
	Mental component status	41.1 (36.6–47.6)	43.0 (38.1–51.6)	41.2 (36.1–47.6)	40.2 (36.3-45.6)	0.03

CAPD, continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis; OHIP, oral health impact profile; PD, peritoneal dialysis.

^aTest of difference using ANOVA and χ^2 test for continuous and categorical measures, respectively.

^bTime averaged values over the first 4 months.

Parameter missingness varied from 13% (PD vintage) to 24% (smoking status).

All data are presented as mean \pm SD or median (IQR) for continuous measures, and n (%) for categorical measures.

were included in the analysis (Figure 1). One-fourth (25%) of the participants reported poor oral health at baseline. The OHIP-14 questionnaire was repeated in the following 2 years among 222 participants (33%).

Participants' Demographics and Clinical Characteristics

Participant characteristics across different groups of oral health status are demonstrated in Table 1. Poor oral health at enrolment was associated with lower educational level, older age, marriage, diabetes, and worse nutritional indicators (including lower time-averaged serum albumin and phosphate concentrations). Other parameters were not significantly different among 3 groups. Parameter missingness varied from 13% (PD vintage) to 24% (smoking status), as demonstrated in Supplementary Table S1.

Subscales of OHIP-14 and HRQoL

Different subscales of OHIP-14 measurements at the first and subsequent surveys are demonstrated in Supplementary Table S2 and S3. The most common concerning facet was physical pain while eating or at rest. Although comparability was limited, functional or psychological impairments and pain were the predominantly affected subscales. Of note, functional and social handicaps were also present but were comparably lower than the other facets. More than half (65%) of the participants did not consider their oral hygiene as a significant handicap. All subscales and total OHIP-14 scores were consistently and significantly worse in

Table 2. Adjusted hazard ratio for the estimated effect of self-reported oral health status on crucial patient outcomes

	Oral hygiene			
Outcomes	Good $(n = 171)$	Fair $(n = 338)$	Poor (<i>n</i> = 166)	
Peritonitis ^c				
Incidence proportion (n/N)	42% (71/171)	43% (147/338)	57% (94/166)	
Incidence rate (episodes per pt-years)	0.17	0.24	0.27	
Unadjusted HR ^a	reference	1.14 (0.86–1.52)	1.51 (1.11–2.05)	
Adjusted HR ^{a,b}	reference	1.08 (0.82–1.44)	1.45 (1.06–2.00)	
Hemodialysis transfer				
Incidence proportion (n/N)	6% (11/171)	9% (31/338)	11% (18/166)	
Incidence rate (episodes per pt-yrs)	0.019	0.029	0.033	
Unadjusted HR ^a	reference	1.54 (0.78–3.07)	1.73 (0.82–3.66)	
Adjusted HR ^{a,b}	reference	1.61 (0.88–2.94)	1.89 (0.87–4.10)	
Death				
Incidence proportion (n/N)	21% (36/171)	30% (100/338)	36% (60/166)	
Incidence rate (episodes per pt-yrs)	0.06	0.09	0.11	
Unadjusted HR ^a	reference	1.53 (1.04–2.24)	1.75 (1.16–2.65)	
Adjusted HR ^{a,b}	reference	1.20 (0.73–1.98)	1.55 (1.04–2.32)	

HR, hazard ratio; pt, patient.

^aCox proportional hazard regression.

^bAdjusted for age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities (diabetes, congestive heart failure, coronary artery disease, and cerebrovascular disease), shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin, and after multiple imputations and accounting for facility clustering.

^cRelapsing episode was counted at once.

the subsequent evaluation (P < 0.001) (Supplementary Table S4 and S5). MCS and PCS were significantly different among the OHIP groups. Patients with better oral health had higher MCS and PCS. By spearman correlation analysis, both MCS and PCS showed significant negative correlations with OHIP score (rho = -0.18, P = 0.0006, and rho = -1.69, P =0.0014, respectively) (Supplementary Table S6).

Oral Health and Subsequent Peritonitis, HD Transfer, and Death

Of 675 enrolled participants, 312 (46%) developed at least 1 episode of peritonitis, 60 (9%) experienced permanent HD transfer, and 196 (29%) died during a median follow-up time of 3.5 years (interquartile range 2.5-5.1). Peritonitis rates were 0.24 episodes per patient-year (overall), 0.17 episodes per patient-year in the good oral health group, 0.24 episodes per patient-year in the fair oral health group, and 0.27 episodes per patient-year in the poor oral health group. Many oral and nonoral pathogens, including Bacillus/Corynebacterium, Streptococcus, Pseudomonas, fungi and mycobacterium, demonstrated trends toward graded increases in peritonitis rates due to these organisms across OHIP levels; however, none individually reached the level of statistical significance (Supplementary Table S7).

Using a time-to-event analysis with a multivariable Cox proportional hazards model adjusted for age, gender, comorbidities, shared frailty by study sites, serum albumin, and PD vintage, patients who reported poor oral health at study entry were associated with higher risks of peritonitis (adjusted HR 1.46, 95% CI 1.06–2.01) and all-cause mortality (adjusted HR 1.55, 95% CI 1.04–2.32), but not HD transfer (adjusted HR 2.00, 95% CI 0.88-4.52) compared to those who reported good oral health. Patients with fair oral health showed an increased risk; however, it was not statistically significant (Table 2). Kaplan-Meier curves for peritonitis-free survival, PD technique survival, and patient survival are demonstrated in Figure 2, 3, and 4. The findings were consistent in sensitivity analyses using Fine and Grey subdistribution hazard models for peritonitis and HD transfer. The results of the competing risk regression and cumulative incidence curves are shown in Supplementary Table S8 and Supplementary Figure S1, respectively. In addition, the proportion of peritonitis-free participants was significantly lower in the poor oral health group (43% [72/ 166] vs. 59% [100/171], P = 0.006).

DISCUSSION

In this large and multicenter study evaluating selfreported oral health among PD patients, poor oral health was common in the PD population, particularly among patients of older age, marriage, diabetes, lower educational level, and worse nutritional status (including lower time-averaged serum albumin and phosphate concentrations). Interestingly, self-reported poor oral health at baseline was significantly associated with shorter time to first peritonitis and death as well as higher rates of peritonitis and death but not HD transfer after adjusting for age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities, shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin. Oral health (in all dimensions) became worse with prolonged PD vintage.



Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier survival curves demonstrating peritonitis-free survival among PD patients with good, fair, and poor self-reported oral health hygiene at the study entry. OHIP, oral health impact profile. After adjustment for participant age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities, shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin using cause-specific hazards models in the presence of competing events, peritonitis-free survival was significantly lower for poor oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.45, 95% confidence interval 1.06–2.00, P = 0.03) but not fair oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.08, 95% confidence interval 0.82–1.44, P = 0.59) compared with good oral health (reference).



Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier survival curves demonstrating patient survival among PD patients with good, fair, and poor self-reported oral health hygiene at the study entry. OHIP, oral health impact profile. After adjustment for participant age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities, shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin using cause-specific hazards models in the presence of competing events, peritonitis-free survival was significantly lower for poor oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.55, 95% confidence interval 1.04–2.32, P = 0.03) but not fair oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.20, 95% confidence interval 0.73–1.98, P = 0.46) compared with good oral health (reference).



Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier survival curves demonstrating technique survival among PD patients with good, fair, and poor self-reported oral health hygiene at the study entry. OHIP, oral health impact profile. After adjustment for participant age, gender, PD vintage, comorbidities, shared frailty by study sites, and serum albumin using cause-specific hazards models in the presence of competing events, peritonitis-free survival was significantly lower for poor oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.61, 95% confidence interval 0.88–2.94, P = 0.14) but not fair oral health (adjusted hazard ratio 1.89, 95% confidence interval 0.87–4.10, P = 0.14) compared with good oral health (reference).

Poor oral health has previously been reported as common in pre-KF and HD patients, with 30% to 70% prevalence.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Nevertheless, only a few studies have examined oral health as a primary focus among PD patients. They reported poor oral health and gingivitis in 43% and 67% of patients, 21,25 respectively, but small sample sizes and single-center designs limited the reliability of their estimates. In contrast, the present study involving 675 patients from 22 PD facilities is by far the largest cohort to address this issue and observe a 24% prevalence of poor oral health. Nevertheless, the prevalence was seemingly lower than the previous reports in pre-KF and dialysis patients.^{18-21,25} The explanation might be related to different tools or cutpoints for poor oral health used in different studies. If we applied the OHIP-14 cut-point of 11 as recommended by Roumani et al.,³⁵ the prevalence of poor oral health was much higher, 333 of 675 (49%). The other possibility of this discrepancy is that oral health might be of less concern in our population. In fact, more than half (65%) of the participants did not consider their oral hygiene a significant handicap. Previously published data from our group demonstrated that most (54%) PD patients brushed their teeth less than twice a day. Most of the patients brushed their teeth for only 1 to 2 minutes, and none of them dental floss or mouthwash for additional used

cleansing. Most participants sought the dentist's advice only when problems existed. One-third of the PD patients never had an oral examination or dental treatment.²⁶

Poor oral health also appeared to associate with older age and some specific comorbid conditions, such as diabetes and malnutrition. The association between underlying diabetes and poor oral health in the present study is consistent with previous findings from a Turkish study.²² Diabetes is closely related to oral health in dialysis patients.²⁵ The level of glycemic control is an essential determinant in that relationship.³⁶ Oral health status showed a significant negative correlation with serum albumin²¹ and other nutritional indices.⁵ Several proposed mechanisms underlying the association of malnutrition with poor oral health include the following: (i) dryness, pain, or abnormal taste in the mouth leading to anorexia and poor intake; (ii) tooth loss contributing to mastication dysfunction; and (iii) gingivitis and periodontitis associated with systemic inflammation and increased anorectic cytokines.¹ It is also possible that poor oral health may be a marker of poor general health or poor lifestyle and health-related behaviors.

Although the association between poor oral health and peritonitis has long been mentioned in the literature, the evidence supporting this assumption is weak, usually limited to case reports or series observing that a concomitant oral infection (gingivitis, periodontitis, or dental root abscess) is established during peritonitis after carefully excluding other potential sources of peritonitis. The 2016 ISPD Peritonitis Guidelines mention that Streptococci frequently originate from the mouth and that transient bacteremia is common after dental procedures and may lead to peritonitis. Prophylactic antibiotics before extensive dental procedures may be reasonable (without grading).³³ These statements are based on 2 retrospective studies that demonstrated streptococcal peritonitis after dental treatment in 1 and 3 cases.^{37,38} Arenius *et al.*²⁴ recently observed no relationship between oral health evaluation by complete oral and radiographic examinations and subsequent peritonitis. Our study is the first to demonstrate a relationship between poor oral health and peritonitis. Our finding is supported by a Japanese observational study²³ that reported that improving oral hygiene habits (increased duration of daily oral care and more frequent toothbrush replacement) was significantly associated with less frequent peritonitis among 75 PD patients, mainly caused by Streptococci.

The proposed mechanisms of the association between poor oral hygiene and peritonitis may be related to the presence of an increased reservoir of pathogens in the oral cavity, particularly gingiva and surrounding tissues (periodontal pockets), or indirect effects caused by poor nutritional status resulting in impaired host immunity. Most dental manipulations, including tooth brushing, dental flossing, and oral irrigation, can engender transient and inconsequential bacteremia for healthy individuals but may contribute to persistent and clinically significant bacteremia in immunocompromised patients in the presence of accumulated plaque and gingivitis.¹ The overall area of periodontal lesions can be as large as 1500 to 2000 mm²,³⁹ and the number of bacteria can exceed 100 million in a single cubic millimeter of dental plaque.¹ Greater severity of gingival inflammation correlates with a higher likelihood of detectable bacteremia.⁴⁰ Odontogenic pathogens might enter the blood circulation and invade the PD system, thereby causing peritonitis.

On the OHIP-14 scale, the most common concerning facet raised by the participants in this study was physical pain while eating or at rest. This problem potentially disturbed their quality of life, created emotional stress, and contributed to insufficient food intake. Any difficulty in eating solid foods may reduce protein intake and contribute to overhydration due to consuming a softer or higher fluid-containing diet as compensation. Chewing affects both quality and quantity of food intake, contributing to malnutrition and potentially a higher peritonitis rate and worse survival.

The association between poor oral health and mortality remained significant even after adjustment for various clinical parameters; the adjusted HR was 1.55 [95% CI 1.04–2.32]. This result is consistent with what has been reported among HD patients. In the Oral-D study,^{6,7} dental health status and habits were associated with increased risks of all-cause and cardiovascular death among patients receiving HD. The oral disease was associated with inflammation and malnutrition, which might have accelerated cardiovascular disease and therefore represents a testable risk factor for cardiovascular events in the context of KF.¹ Not only does oral infection drive local inflammation within the gingival epithelium, but it also stimulates systemic inflammation through bacteremia, circulating oral microbial toxins, and immunologic responses to the microorganism.^{1,40} It is also worth emphasizing the role of oral hygiene in systemic inflammation, which plays a crucial role in the progression of cardiovascular system disease, one of the leading causes of death in dialyzed patients.

The oral-health dimension of life participation assessment allows a shift from the traditional physical dental evaluation to the individual social, emotional, and physical functioning of a patient in caring for oral health. It may also be a proxy of overall personal hygiene habits, such as washing, grooming, trimming fingernails, regularly changing clothing, removing visible nail dirt, hand washing, etc. In our view, such overall personal cleanliness, rather than just simply considering hand hygiene, is vital for preventing peritonitis in PD patients. Furthermore, we postulate that oral hygiene might be a good indicator of longterm personal hygiene status with the ability to reflect the cumulative poor personal hygiene of the preceding several months to years. The 2016 ISPD guidelines only state that meticulous hand hygiene during the dialysis exchange is essential and should be emphasized during patient training but do not generalize to personal hygiene.33 Therefore, the role of overall personal hygiene in preventing PD-related infections is worthy of further exploration.

The strengths of our study include the length of follow-up (median 40.3 months, interquartile range 29.5–59.8), multicenter design, large sample size (678 patients), and high cumulative number of peritonitis, HD transfer, and death events, which helped to augment statistical power. Nevertheless, some limitations also need to be highlighted. First, the OHIP-14 used a subjective measure to assess oral health among PD patients. Future research might benefit from more objective measures of oral health, a dental examination, and radiographic studies. Second, the questionnaire was collected voluntarily and selfadministered such that the patients with inferior functional status may have been less likely to respond to the questionnaire and be under-represented in the cohort. Despite adjusting for several demographic and clinical factors, the possibility of residual confounding cannot be excluded. Finally, the observational design of this study meant that causal inferences could not be drawn.

In conclusion, poor oral health status was common among PD patients and was independently associated with a higher risk of peritonitis and death but not HD transfer and may be a proxy of poor overall personal hygiene. These associations may have important clinical implications for clinicians by using a simple oral health assessment to predict PD patients at risk of peritonitis and death and prioritizing them for full dental assessment and intervention. Further exploration of whether poor oral health is a proxy of overall personal hygiene and provides valuable guidance for prioritizing home visits and more intensive PD training is warranted.

APPENDIX

List of the Thailand PDOPPS Steering Committee

Professor Kriang Tungsanga, M.D., Professor Kearkiat Praditpornsilpa, M.D., Tanittha Chutsawan, Ph.D. and Krit Pongpirul, M.D., Ph.D., Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; Kanittha Triamamornwooth, M.Pham. and Ms. Piyaporn Towannang, R.N., King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Pichet Lorvinitnun, M.D., Department of Medicine, Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand; Suchai Sritippayawan, M.D., Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, Siriraj Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Guttiga Halue, M.D., Department of Medicine, Phayao Hospital, Phayao, Thailand; Kittisak Tangjittrong, M.D., Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, Pranangklao Hospital, Nonthaburi, Thailand; Ussanee Poonvivatchaikarn, M.D., Nephrology Clinic, Nakhon Pathom Hospital, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand; Somphon Buranaosot, M.D., Sukit Nilvarangkul, M.D., Bangkok Metropolitan Administration General Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Wanida Somboonsilp, M.D., Pimpong Wongtrakul, M.D., CAPD Clinic, Chaoprayayomraj Hospital, Suphanburi, Thailand; Chanchana Boonyakrai, M.D., Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, King Taksin Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Surapong Narenpitak, M.D., Renal Unit, Department of Internal Medicine, Udonthani Hospital, Udon Thani, Thailand; Sajja Tatiyanupanwong, M.D., Nephrology Division, Department of Internal Medicine, Chaiyaphum Hospital, Chaiyaphum, Thailand; Wadsamon Saikong, M.D.,

CAPD Clinic, Mukdahan Hospital, Mukdahan, Thailand; Sriphrae Uppamai, M.D. and Jarubut Phisutrattanaporn, M.D., Department of Internal Medicine, Sukhothai Hospital, Sukhothai, Thailand; Setthapon Panyatong, M.D., Puntapong Taruangsri, M.D., Kidney Center, Department of Internal Medicine, Nakornping Hospital, Chiang Mai, Thailand; Rutchanee Chieochanthanakij, M.D., Dialysis Unit, Sawanpracharak Hospital, Nakhon Sawan, Thailand; Niwat Lounseng, M.D., Department of Medicine, Trang Hospital, Trang, Thailand; Angsuwarin Wongpiang, M.D., CAPD, Pong Hospital, Phayao, Thailand; Worapot Treamtrakanpon, M.D., Department of Medicine, Chaophya Abhaiphubejhr Hospital, Prachin Buri, Thailand; Peerapach Rattanasoonton, M.D., Department of Medicine, Trat Hospital, Trat, Thailand; Narumon Lukrat, M.D., CAPD Unit, KhueangNai Hospital, Ubon Ratchatani, Thailand; Phichit Songviriyavithaya, M.D., Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Amnatcharoen Hospital, Amnatcharoen, Thailand; Uraiwan Parinyasiri, M.D., Kidney Diseases Clinic, Department of Internal Medicines, Songkhla Hospital, Songkhla, Thailand., Areewan Cheawchanwattana, Pharm., Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kean, Thailand.

DISCLOSURE

DJ has previously received consultancy fees, research grants, speaker's honoraria, and travel sponsorships from Baxter Healthcare and Fresenius Medical Care, consultancy fees from AstraZeneca and AWAK, and travel sponsorships from Amgen. He is also is supported by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Practitioner Fellowship. JP has received speaking honoraria from Astra Zeneca, Baxter Healthcare, DaVita Healthcare Partners, Fresenius Medical Care, Dialysis Clinics Incorporated, Satellite Healthcare, and has served as a consultant for Baxter Healthcare, DaVita Healthcare Partners, Fresenius Medical Care, and LiberDi. TK has received consultancy fees from Eledon Pharmaceuticals, Otsuka Pharmaceutical Development & Commercialization, and VISTERRA as a country investigator and current recipient of the National Research Council of Thailand and received speaking honoraria from Astra Zeneca and Baxter Healthcare. All the other authors declared no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fund Chulalongkorn University, Thailand (CU_FRB65_hea (19)_026_30_07), National Research Council of Thailand (6/2562), and Thailand Research Foundation (IRG5780017). The abstract of the study has been presented in the Asia-Pacific Congress of Nephrology 2021 and published in the Nephrology 2021. The authors would like to acknowledge contributions of the staff, nurses, and all investigators who work at participating Thailand PDOPPS centers, including Professor Kearkiat Praditpornsilpa, MD. and Professor Kriang Tungsanga, MD., Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University; Ms. Piyaporn Towannang and Kanittha Triamamornwooth, M.Pham., King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Pichet Lorvinitnun, MD. and Mrs. Nisa Thongbor, Department of Medicine, Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand; Suchai Sritippayawan, MD. and Ms. Nipa Aiyasanon, Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, Siriraj Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Guttiga Halue, MD., Mrs. Donkum Kaewboonsert, and Mrs. Pensri Uttayotha, Department of Medicine, Phayao Hospital, Phayao, Thailand; Kittisak Tangjittrong, MD., Wichai Sopassathit, MD. and Mrs. Salakjit Pitakmongkol, Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, Pranangklao Hospital, Nonthaburi, Thailand; Ussanee Poonvivatchaikarn, MD. and Mrs. Bunpring Jaroenpattrawut, Nephrology Clinic, Nakhon Pathom Hospital, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand; Somphon Buranaosot, MD., Sukit Nilvarangkul, MD., and Ms. Warakoan Satitkan, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration General Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Wanida Somboonsilp, MD., Pimpong Wongtrakul, MD., Ms. Ampai Tongpliw, and Ms. Anocha Pullboon, CAPD Clinic, Chaoprayayomraj Hospital, Suphanburi, Thailand; Chanchana Boonyakrai, MD. and Ms. Montha Jankramol, Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, King Taksin Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand; Surapong Narenpitak, MD. and Mrs. Apinya Wechpradit, Renal Unit, Department of Internal Medicine, Udonthani Hospital, Udon Thani, Thailand; Sajja Tatiyanupanwong, M.D. and Ms. Chadarat Kleebchaiyaphum, Nephrology Division, Department of Internal Medicine, Chaiyaphum Hospital, Chaiyaphum, Thailand; Wadsamon Saikong, M.D., Mrs. Worauma Panya, and Mrs. Siriwan Thaweekote, CAPD Clinic, Mukdahan Hospital, Mukdahan, Thailand; Sriphrae Uppamai, MD., Jarubut Phisutrattanaporn, MD., and Mrs. Sirirat Sirinual, Department of Internal Medicine, Sukhothai Hospital, Sukhothai, Thailand; Setthapon Panyatong, MD., Puntapong Taruangsri, MD., Mrs. Boontita Prasertkul, and Ms. Thanchanok Buanet, Kidney Center, Department of Internal Medicine, Nakornping Hospital, Chiang Mai, Thailand; Rutchanee Chieochanthanakij, M.D. and Mrs. Panthira Passorn, Dialysis Unit, Sawanpracharak Hospital, Nakhon Sawan, Thailand; Niwat Lounseng, MD. and Mrs. Rujira Luksanaprom, Department of Medicine, Trang Hospital, Trang, Thailand; Angsuwarin Wongpiang, MD. and Ms. Metinee Chaiwut, CAPD, Pong Hospital, Phayao, Thailand; Worapot Treamtrakanpon, MD. and Mrs. Ruchdaporn Phaichan, Department of Medicine, Chaophya Abhaiphubejhr Hospital, Prachin Buri, Thailand; Peerapach Rattanasoonton, MD. and Mrs. Wanlaya Thongsiw, Department of Medicine, Trat Hospital, Trat, Thailand; Narumon Lukrat, MD. and Mrs. Sayumporn Thaitrng, CAPD Unit, KhueangNai Hospital,

Ubon Ratchatani, Thailand; Phichit Songviriyavithaya, MD., Mrs. Yupha Laoong, and Mrs. Niparat Pikul, Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Amnatcharoen Hospital, Amnatcharoen, Thailand; Uraiwan Parinyasiri, MD., Mrs. Navarat Rukchart, Mrs. Korawee Sukmee, and Mrs. Wandee Chantarungsri, Kidney Diseases Clinic, Department of Internal Medicines, Songkhla Hospital, Songkhla, Thailand.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary File (PDF)

Figure S1. Cumulative incidence curves for peritonitis and HD transfer.

 Table S1. Missing values of demographics and laboratory values.

Table S2. Individual scores of OHIP-14 measures at the first survey.

Table S3. Individual scores of OHIP-14 measures in the following survey.

Table S4. Comparison of OHIP facets between the first and second surveys.

Table S5. Differences between the first and second surveys on total and individual OHIP facets (N = 222).

Table S6: PCS and MCS assessed by 12-item Short-Form(SF-12) and oral health hygiene status.

 Table S7. Causative organisms and oral health hygiene status.

Table S8. Competing risk regression for key clinical outcomes according to self-reported oral health status.

Supplementary Item S1. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

(STROBE) Statement checklist

REFERENCES

- Akar H, Akar GC, Carrero JJ, et al. Systemic consequences of poor oral health in chronic kidney disease patients. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:218–226. https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN. 05470610
- Proctor R, Kumar N, Stein A, et al. Oral and dental aspects of chronic renal failure. J Dent Res. 2005;84:199–208. https://doi. org/10.1177/154405910508400301
- De Rossi SS, Glick M. Dental considerations for the patient with renal disease receiving hemodialysis. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1996;127:211–219. https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.1996. 0171
- Buhlin K, Barany P, Heimburger O, et al. Oral Health and proinflammatory status in end-stage renal disease patients. *Oral Health Prev Dent.* 2007;5:235–244.
- Chen LP, Chiang CK, Chan CP, et al. Does periodontitis reflect inflammation and malnutrition status in hemodialysis patients? *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2006;47:815–822. https://doi.org/10. 1053/j.ajkd.2006.01.018
- 6. Strippoli GF, Palmer SC, Ruospo M, et al. Oral disease in adults treated with hemodialysis: prevalence, predictors, and

association with mortality and adverse cardiovascular events: the rationale and design of the ORAL diseases in hemodialysis (ORAL-D) study, a prospective, multinational, longitudinal, observational, cohort study. *BMC Nephrol.* 2013;14:90. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2369-14-90

- Palmer SC, Ruospo M, Wong G, et al. Dental health and mortality in people with end-stage kidney disease treated with hemodialysis: a multinational cohort study. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2015;66:666–676. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.04.051
- Brown EA, Blake PG, Boudville N, et al. International Society for peritoneal dialysis practice recommendations: prescribing high-quality goal-directed peritoneal dialysis. *Perit Dial Int.* 2020;40:244–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896860819895364
- Schmalz G, Patschan S, Patschan D, Ziebolz D. Oral Healthrelated quality of life in adult patients with end-stage kidney diseases undergoing renal replacement therapy–a systematic review. *BMC Nephrol.* 2020;21:154. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12882-020-01824-7
- Guzeldemir E, Toygar HU, Tasdelen B, Torun D. Oral Healthrelated quality of life and periodontal health status in patients undergoing hemodialysis. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2009;140:1283– 1293. https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.2009.0052
- Pakpour AH, Kumar S, Fridlund B, Zimmer S. A case-control study on oral. Health-related quality of life in kidney disease patients undergoing haemodialysis. *Clin Oral Investig.* 2015;19:1235–1243. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00784-014-1355-6
- Schmalz G, Kollmar O, Vasko R, et al. Oral Health-related quality of life in patients on chronic haemodialysis and after kidney transplantation. *Oral Dis.* 2016;22:665–672. https://doi. org/10.1111/odi.12519
- López-Pintor RM, López-Pintor L, Casañas E, et al. Risk factors associated with xerostomia in haemodialysis patients. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal.* 2017;22:e185–192. https://doi.org/10. 4317/medoral.21612
- Camacho-Alonso F, Cánovas-García C, Martínez-Ortiz C, et al. Oral status, quality of life, and anxiety and depression in hemodialysis patients and the effect of the duration of treatment by dialysis on these variables. *Odontology*. 2018;106: 194–201. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10266-017-0313-6
- Ruokonen H, Nylund K, Meurman JH, et al. Oral symptoms and oral health-related quality of life in patients with chronic kidney disease from predialysis to posttransplantation. *Clin Oral Investig.* 2019;23:2207–2213. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00784-018-2647-z
- Kahar P, Chapman C, Gupta J. Assessment of the effect of oral health on quality of life and Oral Health indicators among ESRD patients in Southwest Florida: a pilot study. *Int J Dent.* 2019;2019:1608329. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/1608329
- Oliveira LM, Sari D, Schöffer C, et al. Periodontitis is associated with oral health-related quality of life in individuals with end-stage renal disease. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2020;47:319–329. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.13233
- Chen LP, Chiang CK, Peng YS, et al. Relationship between periodontal disease and mortality in patients treated with maintenance hemodialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2011;57:276– 282. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2010.09.016
- Rodrigues VP, Libério SA, Lopes FF, et al. Periodontal status and serum biomarkers levels in haemodialysis patients.

J Clin Periodontol. 2014;41:862-868. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12283

- Iwasaki M, Borgnakke WS, Awano S, et al. Periodontitis and health-related quality of life in hemodialysis patients. *Clin Exp Dent Res.* 2016;3:13–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/cre2.50
- Cengiz MI, Bal S, Gokcay S, Cengiz K. Does periodontal disease reflect atherosclerosis in continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis patients? *J Periodontol.* 2007;78:1926–1934. https://doi.org/10.1902/jop.2007.060499
- Eltas A, Tozoğlu U, Keleş M, Canakci V. Assessment of oral health in peritoneal dialysis patients with and without diabetes mellitus. *Perit Dial Int.* 2012;32:81–85. https://doi.org/10. 3747/pdi.2010.00113
- Oka H, Yamada S, Kamimura T, et al. Better oral hygiene habits are associated with a lower incidence of peritoneal dialysis-related peritonitis. *Ther Apher Dial.* 2019;23:187–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-9987.12757
- Arenius I, Ruokonen H, Ortiz F, et al. The relationship between oral diseases and infectious complications in patients under dialysis. *Oral Dis.* 2020;26:1045–1052. https://doi.org/10.1111/ odi.13296
- Kocyigit I, Yucel HE, Cakmak O, et al. An ignored cause of inflammation in patients undergoing continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis: periodontal problems. *Int Urol Nephrol.* 2014;46:2021–2028. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11255-014-0716-z
- Kanjanabuch P, Sinpitaksakul P, Chinachatchawarat S, et al. Oral and radiographic findings in patients undergoing continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 2011;94(suppl 4):S106–112.
- Bayraktar G, Kurtulus I, Kazancioglu R, et al. Oral Health and inflammation in patients with end-stage renal failure. *Perit Dial Int.* 2009;29:472–479. https://doi.org/10.1177/08968 6080902900415
- Perl J, Davies SJ, Lambie M, et al. The Peritoneal Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study (PDOPPS): unifying efforts to inform practice and improve global outcomes in peritoneal dialysis. *Perit Dial Int.* 2016;36:297–307. https://doi. org/10.3747/pdi.2014.00288
- 29. Kanjanabuch T, Puapatanakul P, Halue G, et al. Implementation of PDOPPS in a middle-income country: early lessons from Thailand. *Perit Dial Int*. 2022;42:83–91. https://doi.org/10. 1177/0896860821993950
- von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2008;61:344–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jclinepi.2007.11.008
- **31.** Slade GD, Spencer AJ. Development and evaluation of the oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Health.* 1994;11:3–11.
- Slade GD. Derivation and validation of short-form oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*. 1997;25:284– 290. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0528.1997.tb00941.x
- Li PK, Szeto CC, Piraino B, et al. ISPD peritonitis recommendations: 2016 update on prevention and treatment. *Perit Dial Int.* 2016;36:481–508. https://doi.org/10.3747/pdi.2016.00078
- Fine JP, Gray RJ. A proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 1999;94: 496–509. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1999.10474144

- S Purisinsith et al.: Oral Health and PD-Related Outcomes
- Roumani T, Oulis CJ, Papagiannopoulou V, Yfantopoulos J. Validation of a Greek version of the oral health impact profile (OHIP-14) in adolescents. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent.* 2010;11: 247–252. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03262756
- Mealey BL, Moritz AJ. Hormonal influences: effects of diabetes mellitus and endogenous female sex steroid hormones on the periodontium. *Periodontol 2000.* 2003;32:59–81. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0906-6713.2002.03206.x
- Shukla A, Abreu Z, Bargman JM. Streptococcal PD peritonitis—a 10-year review of one centre's experience. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2006;21:3545–3549. https://doi.org/10.1093/ ndt/gfl407
- Levy M, Balfe JW, Geary D, Fryer-Keene SP. Factors predisposing and contributing to peritonitis during chronic peritoneal dialysis in children: a ten-year experience. *Perit Dial Int.* 1990;10:263–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/089686089001000 403
- Loos BG. Systemic effects of periodontitis. *Int J Dent Hyg.* 2006;4(Suppl 1):34–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-5037. 2006.00200.x
- Thoden van Velzen SK, Abraham-Inpijn L, Moorer WR. Plaque and systemic disease: a reappraisal of the focal infection concept. *J Clin Periodontol.* 1984;11:209–220. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1600-051x.1984.tb02211.x