Article Type

Clinical observational study

Title

Non-invasive technology to assess hydration status in advanced cancer to explore relationships between fluid status and symptoms: an observational study using bioelectrical impedance analysis

Authors

*Amara Callistus Nwosu [1,2,3], Sarah Stanley [3], Catriona R Mayland [4,5,6], Stephen Mason [5], Alexandra McDougall [7], John E Ellershaw [2,5]

[1] *Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK*

[2] *Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK*

[3] *Marie Curie Hospice Liverpool, Liverpool, UK*

[4] *University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.*

[5] *Palliative Care Unit, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.*

[6] *Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK.*

[7] *Clatterbridge Cancer Centre, Liverpool, UK.*

*Corresponding author

Email: Dr Amara Callistus Nwosu a.nwosu@lancaster.ac.uk (ACN)

Word Count: 4314

Funding

This research was supported by the following funding streams: The Academy of Medical Sciences (£24,250), UKH Foundation (£5,000), Anne Duchess of Westminster Charity (£5,000), Liverpool Clinical Commissioning Group (£22029), National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) North West Coast Clinical Research Network (£19,086.57).

Abstract

Background

Oral fluid intake decreases in people with advanced cancer, especially when they approach the dying phase of their illness. There is inadequate evidence to support hydration assessment and decision making in the dying phase of illness. Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) and vector analysis (BIVA) are validated methods of hydration assessment, with research demonstrating that hydration status is associated with specific symptoms, and survival in advanced cancer. However, further research is needed to better understand the relationships between hydration status and clinical outcomes in advanced cancer, particularly at the end-of-life.

Aim

To evaluate hydration status and its associations with clinical outcomes in advanced cancer patients, and those in the last week of life.

Materials and methods

An observational study of people with advanced cancer in three centres. Advance consent methodology was used to conduct hydration assessments in the dying. Total body water was estimated using the BIA Impedance index (Height – H $(m)^2$ /Resistance – R (Ohms)). We used backward regression to identify factors (signs, symptoms, quality of life) that predict H^2/R. Participants in the last 7 days of life were further assessed with BIA to assess hydration changes, and its relationship with clinical outcomes.

Results

125 people participated (males n=74 (59.2%), females, n=51 (40.8%). BIVA demonstrated that baseline hydration status was normal in 58 (46.4%), 'more-hydrated' in 52 (41.6%) and 'less hydrated' in 13 (10.4%). Regression analysis demonstrated that less hydration (lower H^2/R) was associated with female sex (Beta = -0.371, p<0.001), increased anxiety (Beta = -0.135, <0.001), increased severity of physical signs (dry mouth, dry axilla, sunken eyes - Beta = -0.204, p<0.001), and increased breathlessness (Beta = -0.180, p<0.014). 'More hydration'

(higher H^2/R) was associated with oedema (Beta= 0.514, $p<0.001$) and increased pain (Beta = 0.156, $p=0.039$). Eighteen participants (14.4%) were in the last week of life. For dying participants, hydration status (H^2/R) was not significantly different compared to baseline (n= 18, M= 49.55, SD= 16.00 vs. M= 50.96, SD= 12.13; $t(17)= 0.636$, $p = 0.53$) and was not significantly associated with agitation ($r_s = -0.847$, $p = 0.740$), pain ($r_s = 0.306$, $p = 0.232$) or respiratory tract secretions ($r_s = -0.338$, $p = 0.185$).

Conclusions

In advanced cancer, hydration status was associated with specific physical signs and symptoms. No significant associations between survival and hydration status were recorded. In the dying phase, hydration status did not significantly change compared to baseline, and was not associated with symptoms. Further work can use BIA/BIVA to standardise the process to identify clinically relevant outcomes for hydration studies, to establish aa core outcome set to evaluate how hydration affects symptoms and quality of life in cancer.

Keywords

Palliative care; cancer; hydration; dehydration; bioelectrical impedance analysis; clinically assisted hydration; renal failure; technology; end of life.

Key message

We used bioelectrical impedance analysis (a non-invasive body composition assessment tool) to evaluate associations between hydration status and clinical outcomes in people with cancer. Hydration status was significantly associated with biological sex, physical signs, symptoms and psychological outcomes. In the dying phase, hydration status did not significantly change compared to baseline, and hydration status was not significantly associated with survival. The development of a standardised set core outcome set for cancer hydration studies, to evaluate how hydration affects symptoms, quality of life and outcomes in cancer patients, will help to establish a meaningful evidence base for the development of clinical practice.

Introduction

Oral fluid intake commonly reduces in people with advanced cancer as they enter the dying phase of illness.[1] There is limited data describing how hydration status of advanced cancer is related to clinical outcomes[2] and inadequate evidence on the role of artificial hydration in clinical management.[3]

Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is a non-invasive body composition tool, which has usefulness in the assessment of hydration status, and its effects, in advanced cancer. [4, 5, 6, 7] BIA measures resistance to the flow of electrical current passed through the human body,[8] measuring resistance (R - the restriction to the flow of electrical current through the body, primarily related to the amount of water present in tissue) and reactance (Xc - resistive effect produced by the tissue interfaces and cell membranes). The impedance index (calculated from the equation = Height - H $(m)^2$/R (Ohms)) is the best single predictor of total body water (TBW).[9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]

The BIA vector analysis (BIVA) RXc graph method involves standardization of BIA measurements by height, which are plotted as bivariate vectors with their confidence intervals, represented as ellipses on the R-Xc plane (Figure 1 - *The RXc graph with 95%, 75% and 50% tolerance ellipses).*The advantage of this method is that it allows for information to be obtained simultaneously about changes in tissue hydration or soft-tissue mass, independent of regression equations, or body weight. BIVA has been used to study hydration in a variety of different diseases[21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29] and to undertake general body composition assessments in people with lung cancer[28, 30] and cancers of the head and neck.[31]

Our previous study used BIA/BIVA to report statistically significant associations between hydration status and clinical outcomes in advanced cancer.[5] Our previous study reported that lower hydration was associated with increased symptom intensity (dry mouth, thirst, taste and fatigue), increased physical signs (mouth moisture, sunken eyes and axilla dryness) and shorter survival (for people expected to live for ≥30 days), whereas higher hydration was associated with oedema.[5] However, our previous study did not evaluate potential associations between hydration and factors such as, myoclonus, quality of life or those

lacking capacity. Consequently, our previous study was unable to describe how hydration status effected clinical outcomes in the dying (i.e., ≤7 days of life) as these individuals are commonly unable to provide consent, and hence, participate. Improving the evidence base to explain how hydration status affects several clinical outcomes in advanced cancer can potentially support healthcare professionals' decision-making, and evaluate hydration interventions, particularly in the dying phase.[32] [33]

Figure 1 - *The RXc graph with 95%, 75% and 50% tolerance ellipses. Reproduced with permission*).[34]



Aim

The primary aim of this study is to evaluate hydration status, and its associations with clinical outcomes in advanced cancer. The secondary aim to assess hydration the effect of hydration on clinical outcomes in the dying phase (i.e., ≤7 days of life).

Materials and Methods

We recruited participants from three UK specialist palliative care units (Academic Palliative Care Unit, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool; Marie Curie Hospice West

Midlands, Solihull, and Marie Curie Hospice Liverpool, Liverpool) between July 2017 and December 2020.

Participants and eligibility

Eligibility criteria were: admission to specialist palliative care inpatient unit; age ≥18 years; cancer (proven by histology or radiology); palliative (i.e., no further curative treatment possible); and able to understand and communicate in English. Exclusion criteria were: implantable defibrillator devices; unable to provide fully informed consent; active transmissible infections; amputations; local wound infection or poor wound skin healing; and current antineoplastic treatment.

Baseline assessments

We conducted assessments between 9am – 12pm. The following information was collected: age (years), biological sex, ethnicity (National Health Service England Ethnicity data categories[35]); primary site of cancer (according to the International Classification of Diseases[36]); and presence of metastatic disease. Participants received the following assessments:

Bioelectrical impedance

BIA was conducted at the bedside using the AKERN BIA 101 Bio-impedance analyser. The BIA method involved a tetra-polar technique to deliver a single frequency electrical current of 50kHz (±5%). We conducted the testing procedure with methods described by Lukaski[37] and others.[38, 39] During testing, participants were lightly clothed, lying supine, without shoes or socks. We positioned their arms at a 30 degree angle from their body with their legs positioned 45 degrees away from each other. Two disposable pre-gelled aluminium electrodes were attached to the dorsum of their right hand (one placed on the edge of an imaginary line bisecting the ulnar head and the other on the middle finger proximal to the metacarpal-phalangeal) and two electrodes were placed to the dorsum of the right foot (one placed medially, to an imaginary line bisecting the medical malleolus at the ankle and

the other proximal to the metatarsal-phalangeal joints). We calibrated the analyser daily using an impedance calibration circuit (R = 470 Ω, Xc = 90 Ω). BIA measurements of R, Xc, Phase Angle (PA) and the impedance index (calculated from the equation = Height - H $(m)^2$/R (Ohms) were recorded.

Dehydration Symptom Questionnaire (Appendix: Dehydration Symptom Questionnaire)

Participants reported dehydration-related symptom severity using a questionnaire developed by Burge,[40, 41] consisting of a numerical rating scale (0 least severe – 10 most severe) of four questions (thirst, dry mouth, unpleasant taste and fatigue) to measure symptom severity over the previous 24-hours.

The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (Appendix: The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System)

Participants rated the intensity of nine physical symptoms (pain, tiredness, drowsiness, nausea, lack of appetite, breathlessness, depression, anxiety, wellbeing) using a numerical rating (0 least severe – 10 most severe).[42]

Morita Dehydration Assessment Score (Appendix: Morita Dehydration Assessment Score)

Dehydration severity was assessed by clinical examination (conducted by the researcher) using the approach described by Morita et al,[43] to assess moisture of mucous membranes (0: moist, 1: somewhat dry, 2: dry), axillary moisture (0: moist, 1: dry), and sunken eyes (0: normal, 1: slightly sunken, 2: sunken).[43] These signs have significant correlations with biological dehydration,[41, 44, 45, 46] with higher scores (range 0-5) indicating an increased risk of dehydration (previous studies have used a Morita cut-off of 2 to define an increased risk of dehydration[47, 48]).

Peripheral oedema assessment (Appendix: Peripheral oedema assessment)

Oedema was assessed by observation (conducted by the researcher), recording oedema presence in the upper limb, lower limb, torso and/or abdomen (0 = none; 1 = present).

Height

Height was measured, without shoes, to the nearest 0.1cm using a portable stadiometer (SECA 213 Height Measure / Stadiometer); we measured length in those unable to stand.

Quality of Life assessment (Appendix: Quality of Life assessment)

Participants completed five areas of the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy–Fatigue (FACIT - appendix). The areas evaluated were: 'Lack of energy'; 'I am worried my condition will worsen'; I am sleeping well'; 'I am able to enjoy life'; and 'I am content with the quality of my life right now'. Participants rated the intensity of fatigue and its related symptoms on a scale of 0 to 4 (0 = "not at all," 4 = "very much").[49]

Performance status (Appendix: Performance status)

We used the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG - appendix) scale to describe the physical function of participants (0= fully active, 5 = dead).[50]

Myoclonus assessment (Appendix: Myoclonus assessment)

We used section 2 of the Unified Myoclonus Rating Scale (UMRS – appendix) to determine the presence or absence of myoclonus at rest during a 10-second observation period.[51]

Dying phase assessments

We defined 'dying' as an expected prognosis of ≤7 days. We used an advance consent process to enable participates to provide prior consent for research assessments in the dying phase. During the consent process, the participant chose a consultee (e.g., family caregiver, healthcare professional) who would provide assent to facilitate ongoing study participation if the participant was deemed (by their responsible clinical team) to be dying (e.g., identified by use of care plan to support management for the dying phase [52, 53]),

and the participant was no longer able to provide consent for ongoing research participation. The following assessments were conducted in participants receiving 'dying phase' assessments: (1) a further BIA assessment and (2) a proxy measure of their comfort recorded by a healthcare professional or caregiver (Appendix: Proxy measurement of comfort recorded by a healthcare professional or caregiver).

Statistical analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28.0 was used for standard calculations. Distributions of all variables were assessed for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test (Appendix: Normality test). Parametric and non-parametric tests were used as appropriate to the data. Frequency analysis was conducted to compare differences between groups and variables using the chi-squared test, Student t-test and the Mann-Whitney U test. We conducted an exploratory univariate analysis of all data to explore associations with hydration (H^2/R) with these variables (Appendix: Univariate test). A regression analysis was subsequently conducted to explore the influence of potential predictors on the H^2/R.

BIVA point graph analysis

For BIVA, the impedance vector (Z) was plotted as a bivariate vector from its components, R (X-axis) and Xc (Y-axis), after being standardized by height (H); this forms two correlated normal random variables (i.e. a bivariate Gaussian vector).[5, 54, 55] Elliptical probability regions of the mean vector are plotted on the RXc plane forming elliptical probability regions on the RXc plane, which are tolerance ellipses for individual vectors and confidence ellipses for mean vectors.[5, 8, 55, 56, 57, 58] Tolerance ellipses are the bivariate reference intervals of a normal population for an observation. The RXc graph features three tolerance ellipses: the median, the third quartile, and the 95th percentile (i.e., 50%, 75% and 95% of individual points). Participant data were plotted on the RXc point graph using the 50%, 75% and 95% tolerance ellipses from a non-cancer reference population.[8]). Hydration status can be described by dividing the BIA RXc normogram into three parallel sections, which correspond with the boundaries of each tolerance ellipse (*Figure 2- Classification of hydration status using the RXc graph and the 50th and 75th percentile tolerance ellipses*).[59] Individuals with vectors above the 50% tolerance ellipse were 'less-hydrated',

participants with vectors in the central 50th percentile ellipse were 'normally-hydrated', participants with vectors below the 50% tolerance ellipse were 'more hydrated'.

Figure 2. Classification of hydration status using the RXc graph and the 50th and 75th percentile tolerance ellipses.



The 50% and 75% percentiles were used to project a 3-point hydration scale on the BIA normogram.

Backward regression analysis

A backward stepwise linear regression was used to explore the influence of potential predictors on the impedance index (used as a proxy for hydration). At each step variables were chosen based on p-values, and a p-value threshold of 0.1 was used to set a limit on the total number of variables included in the final model. We preselected nine variables, with evidence of association with hydration status in advanced cancer, for inclusion in the regression model. The selected variables were: age,[60, 61] sex,[62] anxiety,[63] Morita Dehydration score,[43] oedema,[5, 48, 64] thirst,[5] nausea,[1] pain[41] and breathlessness.[65] We included highly correlated variables from the univariate analysis to the pre-selected variables (to a maximum of one variable to 10 participants for the

regression equation). The significance level was <0.05. BIVA statistical software for the analysis, developed by Professor Antonio Piccoli, University of Padova,[66] was used for the analysis.

Analysis of dying participants receiving repeat assessments

Paired t-test analysis was used to compare change in hydration status from baseline to the dying phase assessments, by comparing the mean difference between the impedance index (H^2/R). One sample Hotelling's T^2 test was used to determine statistical difference between baseline and dying phase assessments on the RXc graph. Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to explore associations between hydration status and proxy symptom scores in the dying phase.

Survival analysis

Survival was evaluated from baseline assessment date to death. All patients were followed up for 18 months following completion of the study. Kaplan-Meier analysis was used to analyse survival, according to the hydration status. The Cox proportional hazards model was used to assess the effect of hydration (H^2/R) on survival, with adjustment for sex, age, baseline ECOG performance status, the presence of metastatic disease and cancer type.

Sample size

An exploratory sample of 150 participants was selected to achieve a minimum of 10 participants for each item in the regression model (based on recommendations for observational studies).[67, 68] We aimed to recruit 20% of participants in the dying phase (i.e. last week of life) of their illness; therefore, 30 assessments were anticipated from a sample of 150.

Results

Demographics and baseline data

One hundred and twenty-five people participated (males n=74 (59.2%), females, n=51 (40.8%) (Figure 3 – recruitment flowchart). Primary cancer type was most commonly gastrointestinal (n=51/125, 50.8%), genitourinary (n=26, 20.8%) or lung (n=24, 19.2%). Most participants were white (n=119, 95.2%), with metastatic disease (n=78, 62.4%) and an ECOG performance status of 3 (n=68, 54.4%). Oedema was present in less than half of the participants (n=54, 43.2%) and a third had myoclonus (n=42, 33.6%) (*Table 1 - Demographic details of study participants*). Baseline assessment data are presented in Table 2. Dying phase assessments were conducted in 18 (14.4%) of participants (*Table 2 - Table 2. Baseline clinical assessment data*).

Figure 3. Recruitment flowchart



Flowchart representation of the number of individuals recruited to the study.

Table 1. Demographic details of study participants

Characteristic	N (Data presented as mean or %)
Mean age (± SD), years	68.15 (10.79)
Male	74 (59.2)
Female	51 (40.8)
Mean height (± SD), cm	167.04 (9.47)
Race/ethnicity	
White British	117 (93.6)
White Irish	2 (1.6)
Mixed white and black African	2 (1.6)
White other background	1 (0.8)
Mixed white and Asian	1 (0.8)
Mixed other background	1 (0.8)
Missing	1 (0.8)
ECOG	
0: Asymptomatic	1 (0.8)
1: Symptomatic but completely ambulatory	15 (12.0)
2: Symptomatic, <50% in bed during the day	26 (20.8)
3: Symptomatic, >50% in bed, but not bedbound	68 (54.4)
4: Bedbound	13 (10.4)
Cancer diagnosis	
Gastrointestinal	51 (40.8)
Genitourinary	26 (20.8)
Lung	24 (19.2)

	Breast	14 (11.2)
	Gynaecological	7 (5.6)
	Miscellaneous	2 (1.6)
Metastases		
	Yes	78 (62.4)
	No	47 (37.6)
Oedema		
	Yes	54 (43.2)
	No	71 (56.8)
Myoclonus		
	Yes	42 (33.6)
	No	83 (66.4)

Table 2. Baseline clinical assessment data

Variable	N (%)	Mean (M)	SD	Range (min – max)
Bioelectrical impedance				
R/H (Ohm/m)	124	344.61	92.25	
Xc/H (Ohm/m)	124	24.69	11.52	
Phase Angle (degrees)	123	3.98	1.50	
H^2/R (m^2/Ohm)	124	52.84	18.04	
Morita Dehydration Score				
<2 (%)	55 (44.0)			
≥2 (%)	70 (56.0)			
Burge oral symptom assessment				
Thirst	125	5.58	2.85	0 - 10
Dry mouth	125	6.10	3.12	0 - 10
Unpleasant taste	124	4.14	3.67	0 - 10

Edmonton Symptom Assessment Score				
Pain	125	3.59	3.08	0 - 10
Tiredness	125	6.46	2.72	0 - 10
Drowsy	125	5.58	2.95	0 - 10
Nausea	125	1.94	2.72	0 - 10
Appetite	125	4.93	3.48	0 - 10
Breathlessness	125	3.83	3.44	0 - 10
Depression	124	3.28	3.39	0 - 10
Anxiety	125	3.46	3.24	0 - 10
Wellbeing	125	4.86	2.85	0 - 10
FACIT				
Lack of energy	125	2.77	1.10	0 – 4
I am worried that my condition will worsen	125	2.26	1.54	0 – 4
I am sleeping well	125	2.59	1.19	0 – 4
I am able to enjoy life	125	1.66	1.26	0 – 4
I am content with the quality of my life right now	125	1.58	1.36	0 – 4

End of life assessments	
Yes	18 (14.4)
No	107 (85.6)

Hydration assessment and BIVA

Hydration status was normal in 58 (46.4%), 'more-hydrated' in 52 (41.6%) and 'less hydrated' in 13 (10.4%) *(Table 3 - Classification of hydration as a three-item scale according to the RXc graph scale; Figure 3- Bioimpedance vector positions for females on the RXc point graph (N = 51); Figure 4. Bioimpedance vector positions for males on the RXc point graph (N = 74)).* Bioimpedance data for participants (and the reference population used for the comparative analysis) are presented in Table 4 (*Table 4 - Bioelectrical impedance data*).

Table 3. Classification of hydration as a three-item scale according to the RXc graph scale

Hydration status	Male	Female	Total (%)
Less hydrated	7	6	13 (10.4)
Normally hydrated	38	20	58 (46.4)
More hydrated	27	25	52 (41.6)
Missing	2	0	2 (1.6)
Total	72	51	125

Figure 3. Bioimpedance vector positions for females on the RXc point graph (N = 51).



Values for female participants are illustrated by triangles on the 50%, 75%, and 95% bioimpedance tolerance ellipses of the reference population.

Figure 4. Bioimpedance vector positions for males on the RXc point graph (N = 74).



Values for male participants are illustrated by circles on the 50%, 75%, and 95% bioimpedance tolerance ellipses of the reference population.

Table 4. Bioelectrical impedance data

Sample data	R -Ohm (SD)	Xc – Ohm (SD)	Phase angle – degrees (SD)	R/H - Ohm/m (SD)	Xc/H - Ohm/m (SD)	Impedance index	Reference population data[a]		
							N	R/H - Ohm/m (SD)	Xc/H - Ohm/m (SD)
Baseline data									
All patients (n = 125)	572.02 (142.6)	40.99 (18.76)	3.98 (1.50)	344.61 (92.25)	24.70 (11.52)	52.84 (18.04)	-	-	-
Males (n = 74)	542.55 (131.44)	40.68 (19.53)	4.14 (1.62)	317.55 (76.90)	23.89 (11.66)	58.02 (18.70)	354	371.9 (43.2)	30.8 (7.2)
Female (n = 51)	614.20 (148.55)	41.43 (17.79)	3.75 (1.30)	383.33 (99.10)	25.85 (11.34)	45.43 (14.20)	372	298.6 (49.0)	34.4 (7.7)
Repeat data									
All patients (n =18)						49.55 (16.00)	-	-	-
Males (n = 9)						56.15 (18.58)	354	371.9 (43.2)	30.8 (7.2)
Female (n = 9)						42.96 (10.05)	372	298.6 (49.0)	34.4 (7.7)

[a] The Piccoli et al., 1995[8] reference population data was used for comparison with the outcomes from this study.

Univariate analysis (Appendix - Univariate analysis)

The univariate analysis identified that lower H^2/R (lower total body water) was associated with female sex (r_s -0.378, p<0.001); reduced appetite (r_s -0.273 p<0.002); increased anxiety (r_s -0.192, p<0.032); increased mouth dryness (r_s -0.242, p<0.007); higher Morita dehydration score (r_s -0.320, p<0.01); increased concern of participants that their condition will worsen over the next 7 days (r_s -0.19, p=0.034). Higher H^2/R (suggesting higher total body water) was significantly associated with oedema (r_s 0.509, p<0.001) and improved sleep (r_s -0.235, p=0.009).

Backward regression analysis

Three variables from the univariate analysis (reduced appetite, improved sleep and 'worry my condition will worsen') were added to the nine variables, preselected, for the backward regression analysis. Backward stepwise linear regression reduced 12 variables to 5, to identify a regression equation to predict H^2/R (F2(6, 117) = 22.168, p <0.001), with an R^2 of 0.532). This equation demonstrated that lower H^2/R (less hydration) was associated with female sex (Beta = -0.371, p<0.001), more anxiety (Beta = -0.135, <0.001), more physical signs (dry mouth, dry axilla, sunken eyes - Beta = -0.204, p<0.001), and increased breathlessness (Beta = -0.180, p<0.014). Higher H^2/R (more hydration) was associated with oedema (Beta= 0.514, p<0.001) and increased pain (Beta = 0.156, p=0.039) (Table 5 - Backward regression analysis of the impedance index (H^2/R)).

Table 5: Backward regression analysis of the impedance index (H^2/R)

Variable	Beta	t	P
Female sex	-3.71	-5.719	<0.001
Physical signs of dehydration (Morita score)	-0.204	-3.123	0.002
Oedema presence	0.514	7.827	<0.001
Pain	0.156	2.086	.039
Breathlessness	-0.180	-2.501	0.014

R	0.729
R squared	0.532
Adjusted R squared	0.508
Standard error of estimate	0.9454
Durbin-Watson	1.811
No of observations	125

Table 5 shows the multiple linear regression analysis to model the relationship between the impedance index (H^2/R) and predictor variables (age, sex, Morita Dehydration score), oedema presence, pain and breathlessness.

Assessments in the dying phase

Eighteen (14.4%) dying participants received further assessment (Table 6 - Bioimpedance assessment data at the end of life). Paired t-test demonstrated that hydration status (H^2/R) of dying participants illness was not significantly different to the baseline assessments of the participants (n= 18, M= 49.55, SD= 16.00 vs. M= 50.96, SD= 12.13; t(17)= 0.636, p = 0.53). Furthermore, the Hotelling's test of paired BIVA vector data (comparing baseline and repeat hydration assessment) demonstrated no significant difference of hydration status, as the 95% confidence ellipse crossed the origin (i.e., 0,0 on the RXc graph) (Appendix: The Hotelling's test of paired BIVA vector data to compare baseline and end of life care assessments).[69] The H^2/R was not significantly associated with agitation (r_s = -0.847, p = 0.740), pain (r_s = 0.306, p = 0.232) and respiratory tract secretions (r_s = -0.338, p = 0.185) in dying participants, which suggests that that hydration status was not associated with these symptoms in the dying phase. (Table 7 - Spearman rank correlation coefficients to describe association between impedance index and symptoms in dying participants).

Table 6: Bioimpedance assessment data at the end of life

Variable	N	Mean (M)	SD	Standard error	Paired t-test		
					t	df	Sig (two-tailed)
Impedance index	18	50.9631	12.13720	2.86077	0.636	17	0.533
Follow-up impedance index	18	49.5539	16.00192	3.77169			

Table 7: Spearman rank correlation coefficients to describe association between impedance index (H^2/R) and symptoms in dying participants

Variable	N	Correlation coefficient (r_s)	Sig (two-tailed)
Agitation	18	-0.847	0.740
Pain	17	0.306	0.232
Respiratory tract secretions	17	-0.338	0.185

Survival analysis

123 (98.4%) participants died by the end of the follow-up period. Median survival for the sample was 35 days (IQR 17 - 106) (Table 8 - Survival data for participants according to hydration status). Median survival was shortest in 'more hydrated' participants (32 days, IQR 15 - 72) and longest in those 'less hydrated' (45 days, IQR 21 - 117). No significant associations between survival and hydration status were recorded (*Figure 5. Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival time in days according to BIVA determined hydration status*). Multivariate Cox regression survival analysis did not demonstrate significant associations with survival with age, sex performance status, cancer type, metastatic disease, and impedance index (*Table 9 - Multivariate cox regression analysis for death according to age, sex performance status, cancer type, metastatic disease and impedance index).*

Figure 5. Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival time in days according to BIVA determined hydration status (χ^2= 0.17, P= 0.93)



Table 8. Univariate survival analysis of participants according to BIVA determined hydration status

Subgroup	N	Median survival in days (IQR)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p
Overall	123	35.0 (17.0 – 106)		
Hydration classification according to three BIVA classifications				
Less hydrated	13	45.0 (21 – 117)	1.00 (ref)	0.94
Normal	58	41.0 (17 – 144)	0.94 (0.51, 1.72)	0.87
More hydrated	52	32.0 (15 – 72)	1.01 (0.55, 1.87)	0.98

Table 9: Multivariate cox regression analysis for death according to age, sex performance status, cancer type, metastatic disease and impedance index.

Variable	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	p
Age (years)	1.005 (0.99, 1.02)	0.57
Female	1.03 (0.67, 1.58)	0.90
ECOG 1	-	0.11
ECOG (2 vs. 1)	0.96 (0.12, 7.73)	0.97
ECOG (3 vs. 1)	1.95 (0.26, 14.78)	0.88
ECOG (4 vs. 1)	1.54 (0.18, 13.30	0.52
Cancer type (GI)	-	0.83
Cancer type (Gynae vs. GI)	0.99 (0.99, 0.34)	2.92
Cancer type (Lung vs. GI)	0.70 (1.11, 0.65)	1.91
Cancer type (GU vs. GI)	0.64 (0.89, 0.54)	1.46
Cancer type (Breast vs GI)	0.41 (0.75, 0.38)	1.49
Cancer type (Misc vs. GI)	0.36 (0.45, 8.97)	0.36
Metastases present	1.45 (0.97, 2.18)	0.07
H^2/R (m^2/Ohm)	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	0.72

Discussion

Summary of findings from the entire cohort

Our findings highlight that baseline hydration status was normal in 58 (46.4%), 'more-hydrated' in 52 (41.6%) and 'less hydrated' in 13 (10.4%). Hydration status was associated with several clinical outcomes, with lower hydration status (lower H^2/R) associated with female sex (Beta = -0.371, p<0.001), increased anxiety (Beta = -0.135, <0.001), increased severity of physical signs (dry mouth, dry axilla, sunken eyes - Beta = -0.204, p<0.001), and increased breathlessness (Beta = -0.180, p<0.014). 'More hydration' (higher H^2/R) was

associated with oedema (Beta= 0.514, p<0.001) and increased pain (Beta = 0.156, p=0.039). in. No significant associations between hydration status and survival were recorded.

Summary of findings from the dying participants

Eighteen participants of our sample were classified as dying and received further assessment (n=18, 14.4%). Hydration status (H^2/R) of dying participants was not significantly different compared to their baseline assessment (n= 18, M= 49.55, SD= 16.00 vs. M= 50.96, SD= 12.13; t(17)= 0.636, p = 0.53). The H^2/R was not significantly associated with agitation (r_s = -0.847, p = 0.740), pain (r_s = 0.306, p = 0.232) and respiratory tract secretions (r_s = -0.338, p = 0.185) in dying participants.

New knowledge

This paper builds on our previous BIA/BIVA work which described significant associations between status and clinical outcomes in advanced cancer.[5] We provide bioimpedance data an adults with advanced cancer, for use as reference population data in future BIA/BIVA reference. Further, we demonstrate opportunities to improve palliative care research, by demonstrating the feasibility of using the BIA/BIVA method to conduct body composition assessments in advanced cancer, and the advance consent method to research assessments the dying.

Comparison with previous work

Consistent with previous work, hydration status was associated with physiological outcomes.[5] Females had comparatively less body water (lower H^2/R) than men, which (Beta = -0.371, p<0.001) has physiological explanation, as women generally have less lean-muscle mass compared to men. Intracellular water is most present in lean muscle; therefore, women comparatively have less body water than men as they generally have less muscle mass.[8, 57, 70]

Lower H^2/R (less hydration) was associated with more anxiety, a finding consistent with previous non-cancer research that describes how water consumption is associated with

improved mental health in adults.[71] Theories to explain the mental health benefits of water consumption are uncertain, but may be due body fluid homeostasis affecting hypothalamic regulation of stress.[72] Psychological factors associated with disease and nutrition may also contribute to mental health; for example, people with cancer may experience increased anxiety as their oral intake reduces and their physical health worsens.[73, 74] A less hydrated state may contribute to delirium through several processes, such as cerebral and renal hypoperfusion, increased concentration of medications and renal impairment.[75, 76]

It is difficult to compare our findings with previous studies reporting the associations between anxiety and hydration status, due to the use of different definitions of anxiety, and the tendency of investigators to 'cluster' this symptom with other factors (e.g. as restlessness and agitation.[47]). Some authors have reported associations between hydration and agitation/anxiety with mixed results; for example, Morita et al[43] found no association between clinician-rated scores of agitation for dying people with abdominal cancer, who were receiving artificial hydration compared to placebo. Similarly, Bruera et al[47] comparing outcomes for hydration vs placebo, found anxiety scores improved in the placebo group following 4 days of artificial hydration, but no difference existed at 7 days.[47] However, a study by Lokker et al[77] reported a higher frequency of agitation in dying people (cancer and non-cancer) who received higher amounts of fluid daily.

In our current study, less hydration was associated with the increased severity of dehydration (as measured by the Morita Dehydration Score), which is consistent with studies using this tool to assess physical signs of hydration.[5, 43] Oedematous participants had higher H^2/R compared to non-oedematous participants, which suggests higher total body water. This finding is consistent with previous research;[5] however, it is not possible to determine intracellular or extracellular volumes without regression equations, which are methodologically limited in advanced cancer.[25, 26, 78, 79, 80]

Breathlessness was associated with lower H^2/R (less hydration). However, possible explanations may relate to underlying mechanisms of breathlessness, such as the influence of peripheral and central chemoreceptors.[81, 82] However, associations between artificial

hydration and breathlessness has been reported in previous studies of dying people with cancer; for example, Fritzson et al [65] reported a higher level of breathlessness for individuals receiving artificial hydration. Higher H^2/R (suggesting more hydration) was associated with increased pain; although pain is a common in cancer, [41, 47, 83] the nature of its relationship with hydration status is unknown. Potential explanations could be due to factors related to direct effects of cancer (location and severity of the cancer affecting fluid volume homeostasis) and indirect effects, such as renal impairment and accumulation of biochemical abnormalities.

Survival was not statistically associated with H^2/R which suggests no significant association between hydration status and prognosis. This finding differs from our previous study,[5] which demonstrated that survival was shorter in people with lower H^2/R (i.e. less hydration). Furthermore, survival for the current cohort was shorter than the 2016 sample (median 35 days vs 62 days). Methodological differences between the studies can potentially explain differences in survival. For example, to be eligible for the 2016 study, participants were required to receive serum biochemistry tests within seven days of the first bioimpedance assessment. Therefore, participants without blood tests (for example, due to perceived lack of clinical usefulness for people with a short prognosis), were not eligible for recruitment. Participants were not required to have blood tests to participate in the current study, thus increasing the potential to recruit those who were in the ≤7 days of life.

Hydration status of dying participants did not significantly change compared to baseline assessment. This finding, together with the finding that 10.4% of all participants were 'less hydrated', may suggest that dehydration in the dying is not as highly prevalent as previous estimates.[84] No studies are available to directly compare our finding of a lack of association between hydration status and clinical outcomes (agitation, pain and respiratory tract secretions) in people dying with cancer. However, consistent with our finding, there is evidence that artificial hydration is not significant in causing respiratory tract secretions in the dying.[77]

Limitations

This study describes a predominantly white UK population, in specialist palliative care units, in the last month of life. The numbers included in this analysis are small and we are not able to determine causation (of the studied variables) because the study is observational. The global COVID19 pandemic affected participant and consultee recruitment, due to restrictions on face-to-face contact, which contributed to our inability to achieve the target sample size. Furthermore, we did not achieve the target for the sub-analysis of participants in the dying phase (n=18 recruited with a target of n=30), which affects the validity of these findings. Some of the recruitment challenges were due to practical differences between research sites. For example, recruitment did not occur every day across sites, meaning some people died or were discharged prior to research assessment. Similarly, although having a process to ensure ongoing study participation following discharge, we were unable to conduct the 'dying phase assessments' on some participants who were discharged and then later readmitted when they were dying.

Implications to current policy, practice and research

These findings may potentially support healthcare professionals' decision-making regarding assessment of hydration status in people with advanced cancer, by providing evidence of the clinical outcomes related to hydration status. We do not provide guidance on the appropriate use (or non-use) of artificial hydration in advanced cancer; however, our data provides evidence about hydration assessment, to support future intervention studies evaluating the use of artificial hydration in clinical practice.

Our data demonstrates the feasibility of usings advance consent methods for palliative care research. Investigators can use the advance consent process in studies where participants are expected to lose capacity (e.g., delirium, agitation and the dying). Consequently, this method can potentially improve the evidence base (and hence, quality of care) for the dying. Future BIA/BIVA research can involve hydration assessment of specific cancers and associated variables (e.g., stage of illness, ethnicity and gender).

Furthermore, in the absence of an established core-outcome set to assess hydration in advanced disease, or data suggests that BIA/BIVA would be a potential tool to identify clinical factors related to hydration. BIA/BIVA can potentially support further research about personalised hydration.[85] Researchers can use several bioimpedance methods to conduct detailed analysis of fluid volume compartments (e.g. multifrequency bioimpedance analysis, bioimpedance spectroscopy and multi-segment bioimpedance), to examine how fluid distribution (e.g., third spacing, oedema, lymphoedema) affects clinical outcomes in cancer.[86, 87, 88, 89]

Conclusion

In advanced cancer, hydration status was associated with specific physical signs and symptoms. No significant associations between survival and hydration status were recorded. In the dying phase, hydration status did not significantly change compared to baseline, and was not associated with symptoms. Further work can use BIA/BIVA to standardise the process to identify clinically relevant outcomes for hydration studies, to establish a core outcome set to evaluate how hydration affects symptoms and quality of life in cancer.

Ethics

Written consent was obtained from all study participants; this included consent to report individual patient data in publication. Participant consent was recorded in a research recruitment log. All participants were provided with a copy of their consent forms.
Ethics committee, North West - Haydock Ethics Research Ethics Committee, gave ethical approval for this work (REC: 17/NW/0050; IRAS ID: 196540). The study is supported by the Cancer Research UK Liverpool Cancer Trials Unit (LCTU). The LCTU is part of the Cancer Trials Research Centre which has UKCRC Clinical Trials Unit full registration, ensuring high standards of regulatory and quality control. The study was sponsored by the University of Liverpool. The researchers were independent from funders and sponsors. The sponsors and funder did not have access to the data or a role in the data analysis, results interpretation or writing the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by, the Academy of Medical Sciences (£24,250), UKH Foundation (£5,000), Anne Duchess of Westminster Charity (£5,000) and the Liverpool Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Research Capability Funding (RCF) streams (£22029), Non recurrent contingency funding, National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) North West Coast Clinical Research Network, (£19,086.57). The posts of ACN and SS were funded by Marie Curie.[90] We thank Fran Westwell, Rachel Perry and Joanne Bell for assisting with the data collection.

Supporting Information

- Dehydration Symptom Questionnaire (Appendix)
- The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (appendix)
- Morita Dehydration Assessment Score (appendix)
- Peripheral oedema assessment (appendix)
- Quality of Life assessment (appendix)
- Performance status (appendix)
- Myoclonus assessment (appendix)
- Normality test
- Univariate analysis (appendix)
- Proxy measurement of comfort recorded by a healthcare professional or caregiver
- The Hotelling's test of paired BIVA vector data to compare baseline and end of life care assessments

References

1. Cerchietti L, Navigante A, Sauri A, Palazzo F. Hypodermoclysis for control of dehydration in terminal-stage cancer. IntJPalliatNurs. 2000;6(8):370-4.

2. Nwosu AC, Mayland CR, Mason SR, Khodabukus AF, Varro A, Ellershaw JE. Hydration in advanced cancer: can bioelectrical impedance analysis improve the evidence base? A systematic review of the literature. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2013;46(3):433-46.e6.

3. Good P, Richard R, Syrmis W, Jenkins-Marsh S, Stephens J. Medically assisted hydration for adult palliative care patients. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2014;4:CD006273.

4. Nwosu AC, Mayland CR, Mason SR, Khodabukus AF, Varro A, Ellershaw JE. Hydration in advanced cancer: can bioelectrical impedance analysis improve the evidence base? A systematic review of the literature. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2013;46(3):433-46 e6.

5. Nwosu AC, Mayland CR, Mason S, Cox TF, Varro A, Ellershaw J. The association of hydration status with physical signs, symptoms and survival in advanced cancer—The use of bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) technology to evaluate fluid volume in palliative care: An observational study. PloS one. 2016;11(9):e0163114.

6. Davis MP, Yavuzsen T, Khoshknabi D, Kirkova J, Walsh D, Lasheen W, et al. Bioelectrical impedance phase angle changes during hydration and prognosis in advanced cancer. AmJHospPalliatCare. 2009;26(3):180-7.

7. Bennet D, Khorsandian Y, Pelusi J, Mirabella A, Pirrotte P, Zenhausern F. Molecular and physical technologies for monitoring fluid and electrolyte imbalance: A focus on cancer population. Clinical and Translational Medicine. 2021;11(6):e461.

8. Piccoli A, Nigrelli S, Caberlotto A, Bottazzo S, Rossi B, Pillon L, et al. Bivariate normal values of the bioelectrical impedance vector in adult and elderly populations. AmJClinNutr. 1995;61(2):269-70.

9. Thomasset A. Bioelectrical properties of tissue impedance measurements. Lyon Medical. 1962;207:12.

10. Hoffer EC, Meador CK, Simpson DC. Correlation of whole-body impedance with total body water volume. J Appl Physiol. 1969;27(4):531-4.

11. Kushner RF. Bioelectrical impedance analysis: a review of principles and applications. Journal of the American College of Nutrition. 1992;11(2):199-209.

12. Kushner RF, Schoeller DA, Fjeld CR, Danford L. Is the impedance index (ht2/R) significant in predicting total body water? Am J Clin Nutr. 1992;56(5):835-9.

13. Deurenberg P, van der Kooy K, Leenen R, Weststrate JA, Seidell JC. Sex and age specific prediction formulas for estimating body composition from bioelectrical impedance: a cross-validation study. International journal of obesity. 1991;15(1):17-25.

14. Kushner RF, Schoeller DA. Estimation of total body water by bioelectrical impedance analysis. Am J Clin Nutr. 1986;44(3):417-24.

15. Davies PS, Preece MA, Hicks CJ, Halliday D. The prediction of total body water using bioelectrical impedance in children and adolescents. Annals of human biology. 1988;15(3):237-40.

16. Deurenberg P, van der Kooij K, Evers P, Hulshof T. Assessment of body composition by bioelectrical impedance in a population aged greater than 60 y. Am J Clin Nutr. 1990;51(1):3-6.

17. Van Loan M, Mayclin P. Bioelectrical impedance analysis: is it a reliable estimator of lean body mass and total body water. Human biology. 1987;59(2):299-309.

18. Jackson AS, Pollock ML, Graves JE, Mahar MT. Reliability and validity of bioelectrical impedance in determining body composition. Journal of applied physiology (Bethesda, Md : 1985). 1988;64(2):529-34.

19. Nyboer J. Electrical impedance plethysmography.: Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications Ltd. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C.Thomas.; 1959.

20. Simons JP, Schols AM, Westerterp KR, Ten Velde GP, Wouters EF. Bioelectrical impedance analysis to assess changes in total body water in patients with cancer. Clin Nutr. 1999;18(1):35-9.

21. Piccoli A. Bioelectric impedance measurement for fluid status assessment. ContribNephrol. 2010;164:143-52.

22. McDonald JJ, Chanduvi B, Velarde G, Cama R, Diaz F, Carrillo L, et al. Bioimpedance monitoring of rehydration in cholera. Lancet. 1993;341(8852):1049-51.

23. Bozzetto S, Piccoli A, Montini G. Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis to evaluate relative hydration status. PediatrNephrol. 2009.

24. Codognotto M, Piazza M, Frigatti P, Piccoli A. Influence of localized edema on whole-body and segmental bioelectrical impedance. Nutrition. 2008;24(6):569-74.

25. Nescolarde L, Piccoli A, Roman A, Nunez A, Morales R, Tamayo J, et al. Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis in haemodialysis patients: relation between oedema and mortality. Physiol Meas. 2004;25(5):1271-80.

26. Piccoli A. Bioelectric impedance vector distribution in peritoneal dialysis patients with different hydration status. Kidney Int. 2004;65(3):1050-63.

27. Pillon L, Piccoli A, Lowrie EG, Lazarus JM, Chertow GM. Vector length as a proxy for the adequacy of ultrafiltration in hemodialysis. Kidney Int. 2004;66(3):1266-71.

28. Toso S, Piccoli A, Gusella M, Menon D, Crepaldi G, Bononi A, et al. Bioimpedance vector pattern in cancer patients without disease versus locally advanced or disseminated disease. Nutrition. 2003;19(6):510-4.

29. Nwosu AC, Morris L, Mayland C, Mason S, Pettitt A, Ellershaw J. Longitudinal bioimpedance assessments to evaluate hydration in POEMS syndrome. BMJ Support Palliat Care. 2016.

30. Toso S, Piccoli A, Gusella M, Menon D, Bononi A, Crepaldi G, et al. Altered tissue electric properties in lung cancer patients as detected by bioelectric impedance vector analysis. Nutrition. 2000;16(2):120-4.

31. Malecka-Massalska T, Smolen A, Zubrzycki J, Lupa-Zatwarnicka K, Morshed K. Bioimpedance vector pattern in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. JPhysiol Pharmacol. 2012;63(1):101-4.

32. Parkash R, Burge F. The family's perspective on issues of hydration in terminal care. JPalliatCare. 1997;13(4):23-7.

33. Palliative and end of life care Priority Setting Partnership (PeolcPSP). James Lind Alliance; 2015 January.

34. Nwosu AC, Mayland CR, Mason S, Cox TF, Varro A, Stanley S, et al. Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) as a method to compare body composition differences according to cancer stage and type. Clinical nutrition ESPEN. 2019;30:59-66.

35. NHS Digital. Ethnicity. 2023.

36. Marie Curie Hospice Liverpool. Hospice minimum dataset for 2012. 2013.

37. Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW, Hall CB, Siders WA. Validation of tetrapolar bioelectrical impedance method to assess human body composition. J Appl Physiol. 1986;60(4):1327-32.

38. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Gomez JM, et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis--part I: review of principles and methods. Clin Nutr. 2004;23(5):1226-43.

39. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Manuel GJ, et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis-part II: utilization in clinical practice. ClinNutr. 2004;23(6):1430-53.

40. Burge F. Dehydration symptoms of palliative care cancer patients: McGill University, Montreal; 1991.

41. Burge FI. Dehydration symptoms of palliative care cancer patients. JPain SymptomManage. 1993;8(7):454-64.

42. Bruera E, Kuehn N, Miller MJ, Selmser P, Macmillan K. The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (ESAS): a simple method for the assessment of palliative care patients. Journal of palliative care. 1991;7(2):6-9.

43. Morita T, Hyodo I, Yoshimi T, Ikenaga M, Tamura Y, Yoshizawa A, et al. Association between hydration volume and symptoms in terminally ill cancer patients with abdominal malignancies. AnnOncol. 2005;16(4):640-7.

44. Gross CR, Lindquist RD, Woolley AC, Granieri R, Allard K, Webster B. Clinical indicators of dehydration severity in elderly patients. JEmergMed. 1992;10(3):267-74.

45. Eaton D, Bannister P, Mulley GP, Connolly MJ. Axillary sweating in clinical assessment of dehydration in ill elderly patients. BMJ. 1994;308(6939):1271.

46. McGee S, Abernethy WB, III, Simel DL. The rational clinical examination. Is this patient hypovolemic? JAMA. 1999;281(11):1022-9.

47. Bruera E, Hui D, Dalal S, Torres-Vigil I, Trumble J, Roosth J, et al. Parenteral hydration in patients with advanced cancer: a multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled randomized trial. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(1):111-8.

48. Nakajima N, Hata Y, Kusumuto K. A clinical study on the influence of hydration volume on the signs of terminally ill cancer patients with abdominal malignancies. J Palliat Med. 2013;16(2):185-9.

49. Cella DF, Tulsky DS, Gray G, Sarafian B, Linn E, Bonomi A, et al. The Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy scale: development and validation of the general measure. J Clin Oncol. 1993;11(3):570-9.

50. Oken MM, Creech RH, Tormey DC, Horton J, Davis TE, McFadden ET, et al. Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. Am J Clin Oncol. 1982;5(6):649-55.

51. Frucht SJ, Leurgans SE, Hallett M, Fahn S. The Unified Myoclonus Rating Scale. Advances in neurology. 2002;89:361-76.

52. Leadership Alliance for the Care of Dying People. One chance to get it right. 2014.

53. Health NIf, Excellence C. End of life care for adults: service delivery: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2019.

54. Gatignon H. Multivariate Normal Distribution. Statistical analysis of management data: Springer; 2011. p. 9-28.

55. Piccoli A, Rossi B, Pillon L, Bucciante G. A new method for monitoring body fluid variation by bioimpedance analysis: the RXc graph. Kidney Int. 1994;46(2):534-9.

56. Piccoli A, Brunani A, Savia G, Pillon L, Favaro E, Berselli ME, et al. Discriminating between body fat and fluid changes in the obese adult using bioimpedance vector analysis. IntJObesRelat Metab Disord. 1998;22(2):97-104.

57. Piccoli A, Pillon L, Dumler F. Impedance vector distribution by sex, race, body mass index, and age in the United States: standard reference intervals as bivariate Z scores. Nutrition. 2002;18(2):153-67.

58. Lentner C. Introduction to statistics. Statistical tables. Mathematical formulae. In: Geigy scientific tables. 8 ed: Basel: Ciba-Geigy Limited; 1982. 1 p.

59. Rösler A, Lehmann F, Krause T, Wirth R, von Renteln-Kruse W. Nutritional and hydration status in elderly subjects: Clinical rating versus bioimpedance analysis. Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics. 2010;50(3):e81-e5.

60. Rolls BJ, Phillips PA. Aging and disturbances of thirst and fluid balance. Nutrition reviews. 1990;48(3):137-44.

61. Kenney WL, Chiu P. Influence of age on thirst and fluid intake. Medicine and science in sports and exercise. 2001;33(9):1524-32.

62. Ritz P, Vol S, Berrut G, Tack I, Arnaud MJ, Tichet J. Influence of gender and body composition on hydration and body water spaces. Clinical Nutrition. 2008;27(5):740-6.

63. Davies AN, Waghorn M, Webber K, Johnsen S, Mendis J, Boyle J. A cluster randomised feasibility trial of clinically assisted hydration in cancer patients in the last days of life. Palliat Med. 2018;32(4):733-43.

64. Morita T, Shima Y, Miyashita M, Kimura R, Adachi I. Physician- and nurse-reported effects of intravenous hydration therapy on symptoms of terminally ill patients with cancer. JPalliatMed. 2004;7(5):683-93.

65. Fritzson A, Tavelin B, Axelsson B. Association between parenteral fluids and symptoms in hospital end-of-life care: an observational study of 280 patients. BMJ Support Palliat Care. 2013.

66. Piccoli A, Pastori, G. BIVA software2002.

67. Hutcheson GD, Sofroniou N. The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory Statistics Using Generalized Linear Models: SAGE Publications; 1999.

68. Velicer WF, Fava JL. Affects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. Psychological methods. 1998;3(2):231.

69. Armitage P, Berry G, Matthews JNS. Statistical Methods in Medical Research: Wiley; 2008.

70. Martinoli R, Mohamed EI, Maiolo C, Cianci R, Denoth F, Salvadori S, et al. Total body water estimation using bioelectrical impedance: a meta-analysis of the data available in the literature. Acta Diabetol. 2003;40 Suppl 1:S203-6.

71. Haghighatdoost F, Feizi A, Esmaillzadeh A, Rashidi-Pourfard N, Keshteli AH, Roohafza H, et al. Drinking plain water is associated with decreased risk of depression and anxiety in adults: Results from a large cross-sectional study. World journal of psychiatry. 2018;8(3):88.

72. Smith JA, Pati D, Wang L, de Kloet AD, Frazier CJ, Krause EG. Hydration and beyond: neuropeptides as mediators of hydromineral balance, anxiety and stress-responsiveness. Frontiers in systems neuroscience. 2015;9:46.

73. Del Rio M, Shand B, Bonati P, Palma A, Maldonado A, Taboada P, et al. Hydration and nutrition at the end of life: a systematic review of emotional impact, perceptions, and decision-making among patients, family, and health care staff. Psycho-Oncology. 2012;21(9):913-21.

74. Baillie J, Anagnostou D, Sivell S, Van Godwin J, Byrne A, Nelson A. Symptom management, nutrition and hydration at end-of-life: a qualitative exploration of patients', carers' and health professionals' experiences and further research questions. BMC Palliative Care. 2018;17:1-13.

75. Guo D, Lin T, Deng C, Zheng Y, Gao L, Yue J. Risk factors for delirium in the palliative care population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Psychiatry. 2021;12:772387.

76. Lawlor PG. Delirium and dehydration: some fluid for thought? SupportCare Cancer. 2002;10(6):445-54.

77. Lokker ME, Van der Heide A, Oldenmenger WH, Van der Rijt CC, Van Zuylen L. Hydration and symptoms in the last days of life. BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care. 2021;11(3):335-43.

78. Piccoli A. Identification of operational clues to dry weight prescription in hemodialysis using bioimpedance vector analysis. The Italian Hemodialysis-Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis (HD-BIA) Study Group. Kidney Int. 1998;53(4):1036-43.

79. Piccoli A, Rossi B, Pillon L, Bucciante G. Body fluid overload and bioelectrical impedance analysis in renal patients. Mineral and electrolyte metabolism. 1996;22(1-3):76-8.

80. Guglielmi FW, Mastronuzzi T, Pietrini L, Panarese A, Panella C, Francavilla A. The RXc graph in evaluating and monitoring fluid balance in patients with liver cirrhosis. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1999;873:105-11.

81. Currow DC, Higginson IJ, Johnson MJ. Breathlessness–current and emerging mechanisms, measurement and management: a discussion from an European Association of Palliative Care workshop. Palliative Medicine. 2013;27(10):932-8.

82. Fabbro ED, Dalal S, Bruera E. Symptom control in palliative care—part III: Dyspnea and delirium. Journal of palliative medicine. 2006;9(2):422-36.

83. Coelho TA, Wainstein AJ, Drummond-Lage AP. Hypodermoclysis as a strategy for patients with end-of-life cancer in home care settings. American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine®. 2020;37(9):675-82.

84. Waller A, Hershkowitz M, Adunsky A. The effect of intravenous fluid infusion on blood and urine parameters of hydration and on state of consciousness in terminal cancer patients. AmJHospPalliatCare. 1994;11(6):22-7.

85. Padhi S, Bullock I, Li L, Stroud M. Intravenous fluid therapy for adults in hospital: summary of NICE guidance. Bmj. 2013;347.

86. Yalin SF, Gulcicek S, Avci S, Erkalma Senates B, Altiparmak MR, Trabulus S, et al. Single-frequency and multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis: What is the difference? Nephrology. 2018;23(5):438-45.

87. Villa F, Magnani A, Maggioni MA, Stahn A, Rampichini S, Merati G, et al. Wearable multi-frequency and multi-segment bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy for unobtrusively tracking body fluid shifts during physical activity in real-field applications: A preliminary study. Sensors. 2016;16(5):673.

88. Bundred NJ, Stockton C, Keeley V, Riches K, Ashcroft L, Evans A, et al. Comparison of multi-frequency bioimpedance with perometry for the early detection and intervention of lymphoedema after axillary node clearance for breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment. 2015;151:121-9.

89. Czerniec SA, Ward LC, Lee M-J, Refshauge KM, Beith J, Kilbreath SL. Segmental measurement of breast cancer-related arm lymphoedema using perometry and bioimpedance spectroscopy. Supportive Care in Cancer. 2011;19:703-10.

90. Marie Curie. Website of 'Marie Curie' 2021 [Available from: https://www.mariecurie.org.uk.