

- 1 Combined pre-dialysis systolic blood pressure and pulse rate assessment for all-cause
2 and cardiovascular mortalities: A nationwide cohort study on patients undergoing
☒ haemodialysis
☒
- ☒ Nobuhiko Joki, MD, PhD^{1, 2,#}, Tatsunori Toida, MD, PhD^{3, 4,#}, Kakuya Niihata, MD,
☒ PhD^{4,#}, Ryohei Inanaga, MD^{4, 5}, Kenji Nakata, MD¹, Masanori Abe, MD, PhD^{2, 6}, Norio
☒ Hanafusa, MD, PhD^{2, 7}, Noriaki Kurita, MD, PhD, FACP^{4, 8, 9, *}
☒
- ☒ ¹Division of Nephrology, Toho University Ohashi Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan
- 1☒ ²The Committee of Renal Data Registry, the Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy,
11 Tokyo, Japan
- 12 ³School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kyushu University of Health and Welfare,
1☒ Miyazaki, Japan
- 1☒ ⁴Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine, Fukushima
1☒ Medical University, Fukushima, Japan
- 1☒ ⁵Department of Nephrology, Shin-Yurigaoka General Hospital, Kanagawa, Japan
- 1☒ ⁶Divisions of Nephrology, Hypertension, and Endocrinology, Department of Internal
1☒ Medicine, Nihon University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan
- 1☒ ⁷Department of Blood Purification, Tokyo Women's Medical University, Tokyo, Japan
- 2☒ ⁸Department of Innovative Research and Education for Clinicians and Trainees
21 (DiRECT), Fukushima Medical University Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

1 ⁹The Subcommittee of Statistical Analysis, The Committee of Renal Data Registry, The

2 Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy, Tokyo, Japan

#N.J., T.T., and K.N. share the first authorship.

***Corresponding author:** Professor Noriaki Kurita, MD, PhD, FACP

Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine, Fukushima

Medical University

1 Hikarigaoka, Fukushima City, Fukushima 960-1295, Japan

Tel: +81-24-547-1470

1 Fax: +81-24-547-1468

11 E-mail: kuritanoriaki@gmail.com

12 ORCID: 0000-0003-4127-7500

1

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background and Aims**

☒ The prognostic utility of the combined assessment of pre-haemodialysis systolic blood
☒ pressure (SBP) and pulse rate (PR) compared with their individual assessment is
☒ unclear. This study aimed to determine whether the combined assessment could enhance
☒ the prognostic utility in patients on haemodialysis.

☒ **Methods**

☒ This nationwide cohort study involved patients undergoing maintenance haemodialysis
☒ using the Japanese Renal Data Registry database. Exposure was defined as a
1☒ combination of SBP and PR. Forty-eight levels of exposure groups were created: SBP
11 (six levels; <100, 100-<120, 120-<140, 140-<160 [reference], 160-<180, and ≥180
12 mmHg) and PR (eight levels; <50, 50-<60, 60-<70 [reference], 70-<80, 80-<90, 90-
1☒ <100, 100-<110, and ≥110 per minute). The primary and secondary outcomes were one-
1☒ year all-cause and cardiovascular mortalities, respectively. Multivariate Cox
1☒ proportional hazards models were used, and multiplicative interactions were assessed to
1☒ determine the superiority of the combined model over the individual models. Additive
1☒ interactions were assessed using relative excess risk due to interactions (RERI).

1☒ **Results**

1☒ The combined model explained mortality and cardiac mortality better than the
2☒ individual SBP and PR models ($P<0.001$ and $P<0.002$, respectively). A lower SBP was
21 associated with a higher risk of all-cause mortality regardless of the PR. Most categories
22 of lower SBP or higher PR vs. the 120-<140 mmHg and 70-<80/min category had
2☒ positive RERIs. Similar findings were also observed for cardiac mortality.

1

2 **Conclusions**

The combined assessment of pre-dialysis SBP and PR may help in the simple
 stratification of patients with excess risks that cannot be identified by individual SBP or
 PR assessment.

Keywords: combined assessment, haemodialysis, pre-dialysis, pulse rate, systolic blood
 pressure

1 Introduction

2 Pre-haemodialysis (HD) blood pressure (BP) and pulse rate (PR) are two basic
3 physiological parameters routinely measured not only for safe and effective treatment,
4 but also for the prediction of potential underlying cardiovascular complications and
5 poor prognosis. A pre-HD systolic BP (SBP) of 130-160 mmHg is associated with a
6 decrease in all-cause and cardiovascular mortalities,¹⁻⁴ and deviation of SBP from this
7 range exhibits a U-shaped increase in the risks characteristic of HD. Few studies
8 examining the predictive utility of pre-HD PR for mortality suggested a dose-response
9 increase in one-year mortality risk associated with a higher PR (>60-70 / min).⁵⁻⁶ Given
10 that simultaneous changes in SBP and PR occur along with changes in myocardial
11 oxygen demand and regulation of the autonomic nervous system, a combined
12 assessment of SBP and PR could yield more accurate prognostic information.
13 Nevertheless, very few such studies have been conducted in populations with chronic
14 kidney disease (CKD).

15 A study on patients with non-dialysis CKD and hypertension demonstrated that
16 a higher rate of pressure product (RPP), defined as the product of SBP and PR, was
17 associated with an increased risk of major cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events
18 and mortality, even after simultaneous adjustments for SBP and PR.⁷ The associations
19 between high RPP and increased long-term cardiovascular and all-cause mortalities
20 have also been reported in the general population and in patients with coronary artery
21 disease.^{8,9} Given that RPP indicates myocardial workload and thus myocardial oxygen
22 demand,⁷ a rationale for examining the impact of high RPP on cardiovascular clinical
23 outcomes can be readily concurred.¹⁰ However, as the authors point out,⁷ if SBP and PR
24 change in opposite directions under physiological conditions, the RPP will remain

1 parallel,¹¹ and thus this may mask the possible adverse effects associated with
2 alterations in the respective indices. Indeed, the predictability of short-term
☒ cardiovascular disease or mortality risk due to a high shock index (SI), calculated by
☒ dividing PR by SBP, has been shown in patients with coronary artery disease and
☒ myocardial infarction, independent of SBP and PR.^{12,13} Thus, although different
☒ methods for evaluating the combination of SBP and PR are used in cases of high SBP
☒ and high PR (i.e. high RPP) and low SBP and high PR (i.e. high SI), few studies have
☒ considered both cases simultaneously. Patients undergoing maintenance dialysis who
☒ often have left ventricular dysfunction or coronary artery disease are likely to have poor
1☒ clinical outcomes.

11 Thus, to resolve this dilemma, we examined the combined effect of SBP and PR
12 on all-cause and cardiovascular mortalities in patients on HD using data from the
1☒ Japanese Renal Data Registry (JRDR), which encompasses nationwide dialysis centres
1☒ in Japan. This epidemiologic approach allows quantification of the excess risk of the
1☒ combined category of SBP and PR over the individual SBP and PR indices.^{14,15}

1☒

1☒ Methods

1☒ *Study design and setting*

1☒ This nationwide cohort study used data from the JRDR database established by
2☒ the Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy (JSDT). The JRDR has accumulated data of
21 patients on dialysis retrieved through annual surveys of all dialysis units in Japan
22 conducted at the end of each year. The details of the JRDR have been published
2☒ previously.¹⁶ We used the JRDR data for 2019 as the baseline data and those for 2020 as

1 the follow-up data. The response rates in 2019 and 2020 were 98.3% and 98.8% on a
2 facility basis, and 94.5% and 95.1% on a patient basis, respectively.^{17,18}

Participants

Patients on haemodialysis (including haemodiafiltration [HDF] and
 haemofiltration) as of the end of 2019, aged ≥ 20 years were included in the study. The
 exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) missing SBP and PR data, (2) implausible data
 considered to be outliers or apparent errors (e.g. SBP < 70 or > 260 mmHg, diastolic
 blood pressure < 30 or > 150 mmHg, pulse pressure < 15 or ≥ 150 mmHg, PR < 30 or
 > 180 per minute, height < 120 or ≥ 200 cm, body weight < 20 or ≥ 200 kg, body weight
1 < 25 kg, body mass index [BMI] < 10 or > 50 kg/m², ultrafiltration [possibility of infusion
11 during dialysis] < -1.0 kg, haemoglobin < 6.0 g/dL, and C-reactive protein level > 50
12 mg/dL), and (3) withdrawal from dialysis during follow-up.

1 *Exposures*

1 Exposure was defined as a combination of pre-HD SBP and PR, both of which
1 are components of the RPP or SI. In this study, we decided to examine the effects of
1 combinations of SBP and PR categories, because we expected the effects of high SBP
1 and low PR to differ from those of low SBP and high PR, even if they had the same
1 RPP. SBP was categorized into the following six levels: < 100 , $100- < 120$, $120- < 140$,
1 $140- < 160$, $160- < 180$, and ≥ 180 mmHg. PR was categorized into the following eight
2 levels: < 50 , $50- < 60$, $60- < 70$, $70- < 80$, $80- < 90$, $90- < 100$, $100- < 110$, and ≥ 110 per minute.
21 A total of 48 levels were created based on the 6×8 categories. For this study, $140- < 160$
22 mmHg and $60- < 70$ /min was used as the reference category.

1 *Outcomes*

2 The primary outcome was all-cause mortality during the one-year follow-up
3 ☒ period, and the secondary outcome was mortality due to heart disease during the same
4 ☒ period. Heart diseases included heart failure, pulmonary oedema, ischaemic heart
5 ☒ disease (IHD), arrhythmia, valvular heart disease, other heart diseases, hyperkalaemia,
6 ☒ and sudden death. The causes of death were diagnosed and reported by the on-site
7 ☒ physicians based on the patients' medical records. The follow-up period started on 31
8 ☒ December 2019 and ended on events involving death or kidney transplantation, or on 31
9 ☒ December 2020 whichever occurred first. We collected data on the month of death and
10 ☒ causes of death from the JRDR database in 2020. Because the JRDR only records the
11 month of death, withdrawal of dialysis, and kidney transplantation without specific days,
12 we assumed that each event occurred on the 15th day of the month for our
13 ☒ estimations.^{19,20}

14 ☒ *Covariates*

15 ☒ Covariates were defined as variables considered to be determinants of SBP, PR,
16 ☒ and mortality, and were identified based on evidence from the literature and clinical
17 ☒ expertise through discussion among the investigators (NJ, KN, TT, KN, and NK). We
18 ☒ selected minimally sufficient covariates to estimate the total effects of exposure using
19 ☒ the established analysis rule with the DAGitty web application (www.dagitty.net),^{21,22}
20 ☒ based on the directed acyclic graph model (Supplementary Figure 1). The following
21 variables were selected as covariates: age; sex; diastolic blood pressure; interdialytic
22 weight gain (IDWG) calculated as pre-dialysis body weight minus post-dialysis body
23 ☒ weight; BMI; serum C-reactive protein levels; haemoglobin levels; atrial fibrillation

1 (AF); use of antihypertensive drugs; smoking; diabetes; and history of IHD, cerebral
2 haemorrhage, and cerebral infarction.

Statistical analysis

For descriptive statistics, continuous variables are summarised as medians
 (interquartile ranges), and categorical variables are summarised as frequencies and
 percentages. To examine the impact of exposure on the outcomes, we used Cox
 proportional hazards models that included the aforementioned covariates. Our interest
 was whether the combination of SBP and PR could explain the impact on outcomes
 better than the individual SBP and PR categories. This is mathematically equivalent to
1 examining whether the addition of 35 interaction terms from the (6-1)×(8-1) categories
11 to the respective categories of SBP and PR is statistically significant (i.e. evaluating
12 multiplicative interactions). Therefore, we created two separate models, one including
1 SBP and PR categories and interaction terms and the other including SBP and PR
1 categories, and compared the models with and without interaction terms using the Wald
1 test.²³ This analysis was performed for both primary and secondary outcomes.
1 Furthermore, to evaluate the potential additive interaction between SBP and PR, we
1 calculated the relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI) in the models, including
1 exposures and covariates.^{14,15,24} For semiquantitative visualisation of the relationships
1 between the three factors of pre-HD SBP and PR and the outcomes, heatmaps were
2 overlaid on tables for the hazard ratios (HRs) and RERIs by the SBP and PR
21 combinations.²⁵ The sequential scheme “YlOrRed” colour palette was used for the HRs
22 heatmaps, and the divergent scheme “RdBu” colour palette was used for the RERIs
2 heatmaps.²⁶ Missing values were imputed using a multiple imputation method, creating
2 20 datasets using conditional chained equations, and combining them according to

- 1 Rubin's rule.²⁷ All analyses were performed using Stata/SE version 18 software (Stata
- 2 LP, College Station, TX, USA).

Ethics statement

The data used in this study do not contain any personally identifiable
 information. The present study was conducted following Japan's privacy protection
 laws and ethical guidelines for epidemiological studies published by the Ministry of
 Education, Science, and Culture, Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, and the
 STROBE guidelines. The study protocol was approved by the Medicine Ethics
 Committee of the JSDT (No.60) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of
1 Helsinki. The requirement for written informed consent was waived due to the
11 retrospective nature of this study.

12 **Results**

1 *Patient characteristics*

1 A total of 321,077 patients, aged ≥ 20 years undergoing HD or HDF were
1 identified. Of these, 45,418 patients with missing or implausible BP or PR values were
1 excluded and 275,659 patients were enrolled at the end of 2019. Furthermore, 444
1 patients were excluded owing to missing follow-up data at the end of 2020. Finally,
1 275,215 patients were included in the analysis.

1 The patient characteristics are presented in Tables 1 and 2. In particular, patients
2 in the SBP <100 mmHg category had a higher median age and CRP level, longer
21 dialysis duration, lower median BMI, and an increased incidence of AF and IHD (Table

1 1). However, the PR ≥ 100 / min category had lower median age, higher median CRP,
2 and an increased incidence of diabetes, AF, and IHD (Table 2).

☒ *Association of combined pre-HD SBP and PR with all-cause mortality*

☒ During 263,016 person-years of follow-up, 24,623 deaths were observed, with
☒ an incidence rate of 9.4 per 100 person-years. Descriptive statistics for all-cause
☒ mortality by the combined category of pre-HD SBP and PR are presented
☒ (Supplementary Table 1). The model for the combined SBP and PR category explained
☒ mortality better than the model that included the SBP and PR categories separately (P
☒ for interaction by the Wald test <0.001). The combined effects of SBP and PR on
1☒ mortality in terms of HRs and RERI are shown in Figure 1. In subgroups with a PR of
11 60- <70 / min or lower, the increased HR of risk by SBP category was U-shaped (Figure
12 1A). Regardless of the PR subgroup, the association between low SBP and high all-
1☒ cause mortality risk was consistent. A monotonic increase in HR with increasing PR
1☒ was observed mainly in the subgroups with an SBP of 140- <160 mmHg or lower. In the
1☒ subgroup with SBP >180 mmHg, the increased HR of risk by the PR category was U-
1☒ shaped.

1☒ In addition, evidence of effect modification by additive scales was observed
1☒ (Figure 1B). In particular, most categories with a lower pre-HD SBP or higher PR than
1☒ the 120- <140 mmHg and 70- <80 /min categories, respectively showed positive RERIs.
2☒ For example, the strongest positive RERI was found in the SBP <100 mmHg and PR
21 ≥ 110 / min category (RERI=2.00, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.43-3.57). Conversely,
22 many categories with a higher pre-HD SBP or PR than the 160- <180 mmHg and 70-
2☒ <80 /min categories showed negative RERIs.

2☒

1 *Association of combined pre-HD SBP and PR with cardiac mortality*

2 During the same follow-up, 7,056 cardiac mortalities were observed with an
3 incidence rate of 2.7 per 100 person-years. Descriptive statistics for cardiac mortality by
4 the combined category of pre-HD SBP and PR are presented (Supplementary Table 2).
5 The model for the combined SBP and PR categories explained cardiac mortality better
6 than the model that included the SBP and PR categories separately (*P* for interaction by
7 the Wald test: 0.002). The combined effects of SBP and PR on cardiac mortality in
8 terms of HRs and RERI are shown in Figure 2. Similar to all-cause mortality, the
9 increased HR by SBP category was U-shaped in subgroups with PRs of 60-<70/min or
10 lower (Figure 2A). Regardless of the PR subgroup, the association between low SBP
11 and high cardiac mortality risk was consistent. A monotonic increase in HR with
12 increasing PR was mainly observed in subgroups with an SBP of 140-<160 mmHg or
13 lower. In the subgroup with an SBP of 160-<180 mmHg or higher, the increased HR of
14 risk by the PR category was U-shaped.

15 In addition, evidence of effect modification by additive scales was observed
16 (Figure 2B). In particular, most categories with a lower pre-HD SBP or higher PR than
17 the 120-<140 mmHg and 80-<90/min categories had positive RERIs. Conversely, many
18 categories with a higher pre-HD SBP or PR than the 160-<180 mmHg and 70-<80/min
19 categories showed negative RERIs, although they were not statistically significant.

20 **Discussion**

21 Using data from a nationwide registry of Japanese patients undergoing
22 maintenance HD, we found that the combined category of SBP and PR explained the
23 one-year risk of all-cause and cardiovascular mortalities better than the separate

1 categories of pre-dialysis SBP and PR. For the HR for all-cause mortality, compared
2 with the reference range of pre-dialysis SBP and PR (140-160 mmHg and 60-70 bpm,
☒ respectively), either an increase or decrease in SBP alone (i.e. a U-shaped relationship)
☒ and an increase in PR alone were associated with an increased risk; however, the
☒ combination of lower SBP and higher PR demonstrated a greater risk than lower SBP or
☒ higher PR alone. This was also supported by the presence of many low SBP and high
☒ PR categories showing positive RERI. Similarly, for the HR for cardiovascular
☒ mortality, compared with the pre-dialysis reference range for SBP and PR, an increase
☒ or decrease in SBP alone (i.e. a U-shaped relationship) and an increase in PR alone were
1☒ associated with an increased risk; however, the combination of low SBP and high PR
11 showed a greater risk compared with low SBP or high PR alone. This was supported by
12 the presence of several low SBP and high PR categories showing positive RERI.

1☒ The findings from our study partially concur with those of previous studies on
1☒ the relationship between pre-dialysis SBP or PR and prognosis among patients
1☒ undergoing HD and provide a new interpretation by combining the two indices. For all-
1☒ cause and cardiovascular mortalities, a U-shaped increase in HR by SBP category was
1☒ observed mainly in the subgroup with a PR of 60-<70/min or less. The SBP categories
1☒ with particularly low risk in these subgroups ranged from 120 to 160 mmHg, consistent
1☒ with the observed pre-dialysis SBP range of 130-160 mmHg associated with the lowest
2☒ risk among the total participants in the previous cohort studies.^{1,2,4,28} The elevated pre-
21 HD SBP may reflect both arterial stiffness and IDWG.²⁹ Increased cardiac preload and
22 afterload, through the combination of arterial stiffness and the Frank-Starling
2☒ mechanism associated with elevated ventricular volume,³⁰ increases myocardial oxygen
2☒ demand, thereby precipitating the development of cardiovascular events.²⁹ However,

1 because we adjusted for weight gain and history of cardiovascular diseases, the
2 increased risks associated with higher pre-HD SBP may reflect structural changes, such
☒ as endothelial dysfunction and hypertensive cardiomyopathy, which were not captured
☒ by the adjusted variables.

☒ The observed relationships between low pre-HD SBP and high risks of all-cause
☒ and cardiovascular mortalities, regardless of the PR category, are supported by previous
☒ studies.^{4,31} The underlying pathophysiology of chronic hypotension among patients on
☒ dialysis may be well defined in some cases,³² but remains poorly understood.³³

☒ Cardiac disease with severely reduced left ventricular ejection fraction and
1☒ valvular heart disease may also occur.³² Pathophysiological mechanisms such as
11 autonomic dysregulation and excess activity of vasodilatory mediators have also been
12 noted.^{32,33} For example, nitric oxide, a strong vasodilator, is increased in uraemia, and
1☒ plasma levels of nitrites are positively correlated with years of dialysis.³² Long-term
1☒ (usually 5 years) haemodialysis is common in chronic hypotension.³² While our study
1☒ did not capture the abovementioned structural heart diseases, the excess activity of
1☒ vasodilatory mediators may be involved in this population, as the group with an SBP
1☒ <100 mmHg had a particularly long history of dialysis (median 7.0 years).

1☒ The monotonic increase in HR by an increasing PR category was observed
1☒ mainly in the subgroup with an SBP of 140-<160 mmHg or less. The cause of
2☒ tachycardia in patients undergoing HD may be multifactorial, including prodromal
21 congestive heart failure and sympathetic nervous system activation.⁶ Indeed, the
22 category with the highest PR of ≥ 110 /min was characterised by baseline characteristics
2☒ consistent with congestive heart failure: high prevalence of diabetes mellitus, AF, and
2☒ IHD. However, this may reflect unmeasured tachyarrhythmic diseases or heart failure

1 with low cardiac output because we adjusted for the characteristics mentioned above. In
2 contrast, especially for cardiovascular mortality, a U-shaped increase in HR by PR
☒ category was observed mainly in the subgroup with an SBP of 160-<180 mmHg or
☒ higher. Bradycardia may reflect medications with negative chronotropic effects, cardiac
☒ disease with damage to the conduction system (e.g. narrowing of the right coronary
☒ artery), or electrolyte imbalance. However, because prescribing β -blockers to patients
☒ on HD may be associated with a favourable prognosis,³⁴ underlying pathologies
☒ requiring its prescription may be the culprit for the poor prognosis associated with
☒ bradycardia.

1☒ A novel finding of this study was that the combined pre-HD SBP and PR
11 category explained the risks of all-cause and cardiovascular mortalities better than the
12 pre-HD SBP or PR categories alone. In particular, most categories with lower pre-HD
1☒ SBP or higher PR than the 120-<140 mmHg and 70-<80/min categories showed
1☒ positive RERIs, indicating that the combined pre-HD SBP and PR category accounted
1☒ for more patients with excess risks than the single categories. In addition, this subset
1☒ includes combined categories corresponding to an SI >0.7, which showed poor
1☒ prognosis among patients with myocardial infarction,¹² that is, those with an SBP <100
1☒ mmHg and 70-<80/min or higher PR, or those with an SBP of 100-<120 mmHg and 90-
1☒ <100/min or higher PR. The underlying pathologies explaining these categories may
2☒ include the aforementioned cardiac diseases with low cardiac output, excess activity of
21 vasodilatory mediators, decreased extracellular fluid volume, and malnutrition.^{6,32}
22 Indeed, the population with an SBP <100 mmHg was characterised by a relatively low
2☒ BMI, high CRP level, and increased IHD, which is seen in the complex of protein-

1 energy wasting, inflammation, and cardiovascular disease associated with unfavourable
2 prognosis.³⁵

☒ In contrast, many categories with a higher pre-HD SBP or PR than the 160-<180
☒ mmHg and 70-<80/min categories showed negative RERIs. These categories
☒ corresponded to high RPP categories; however, we were unable to verify the increased
☒ mortality risk associated with high RPP observed in non-dialysis CKD.⁷ However, the
☒ exact reason for this remains unclear. Although speculative, this may indicate the
☒ robustness of the cardiac system with functioning compensatory mechanisms; for
☒ example, a concomitant increase in SBP and a parallel increase in PR with increasing
1☒ fluid volume.

11 Finally, positive, although not statistically significant, RERI in the ≥ 180 mmHg
12 and < 50 / min category indicates the presence of a high-risk subgroup that cannot be
1☒ characterised by a high SI or RPP.

1☒ This study has several implications for dialysis providers and policymakers.
1☒ First, the identification of subsets with high RERIs through the simultaneous assessment
1☒ of pre-HD SBP and PR will help the limited healthcare staff within dialysis facilities to
1☒ focus care and interventions on patients with an excess risk of cardiac or all-cause
1☒ mortality.³⁶ For example, targeted care can be designed, such as screening for cardiac
1☒ diseases, investigating the causes of malnutrition and interventions, and adjusting
2☒ dialysis regimens for haemodynamic stability. Second, the assessment using the
21 combined categories of pre-HD SBP and PR offers the potential for stratification of
22 high-risk patients that cannot be identified not only by the SBP or PR categories alone,
2☒ but also by indices defined by RPP or SI alone. Specifically, patients with high SBP and
2☒ high PR, low SBP and high PR, and high SBP and low PR were at higher risk than the

1 reference category. In contrast, a high RPP (i.e. $SBP \times PR$) can only risk stratify those
2 with high SBP and PR, whereas a high SI (i.e. PR/SBP) can only risk stratify those with
☒ low SBP and high PR. In addition, the combination of SBP and PR is more convenient
☒ in clinical practice than calculating the RPP and SI. Indeed, the heatmaps successfully
☒ visualised the degree of risk in a semiquantitative manner.²⁵ Therefore, our findings will
☒ serve as a useful reference for the preparation of blood pressure guidelines for patients
☒ on maintenance HD and will be a user-friendly resource for general dialysis
☒ practitioners.

☒ This study had several limitations. First, as in international cohort studies, such
1☒ as the Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study (DOPPS), the SBP and PR
11 measurements captured in the JSMT are not standardised. However, in the JSMT, SBP
12 and PR are usually measured in the supine position while lying in bed during
1☒ preparation for HD sessions.⁶ Second, several unmeasured factors, such as underlying
1☒ structural heart disease, serum potassium level, and drugs with negative inotropic or
1☒ chronotropic effects, may have influenced the relationship between pre-HD SBP, PR,
1☒ and outcomes. Third, the follow-up period of 1 year in this study may not have been
1☒ long enough to examine the impact of SBP and PR on mortality from atherosclerotic
1☒ heart disease.

1☒ In conclusion, among patients on maintenance dialysis, the combined pre-HD
2☒ SBP and PR categories were shown to identify excess risk groups for one-year all-cause
21 and cardiac mortalities more effectively than either category alone. Longitudinal studies
22 with longer follow-up periods are needed to examine the long-term effects of the
2☒ combination of SBP and PR.

2☒

1 **Funding**

2 None

Acknowledgements:

We acknowledge the efforts of the members of the Subcommittee for JRDR Regional

Cooperation and staff members of the dialysis facilities who participated in the survey

and responded to the questionnaires.

Disclosure of interest

1 TT received consulting fees from Astellas Pharma Inc., and payments and educational

11 events from Torii Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Kyowa Kirin

12 Co., Ltd., AstraZeneca K.K., and Nobelpharma Co., Ltd. RI received payments for

1 speaking from Astellas Pharma, Inc., Novartis Pharma K.K., and Otsuka

1 Pharmaceuticals. MA has received payment for speaking from Novartis Pharma K.K.,

1 Otsuka Pharmaceutical. NK received consulting fees from GlaxoSmithKline K.K. and

1 payments for speaking and educational events from Eisai Co., Ltd., Taisho

1 Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Kyowa Kirin Co., Ltd., GlaxoSmithKline K.K., Takeda

1 Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Kissei Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., and Baxter Corporation.

1

2 **Data availability statement**

21 Data will be available immediately after publication with no end dates. Data will be

22 shared upon reasonable request to the corresponding author with permission from the

2 JRDR investigators. Restrictions apply to the availability of the data analysed in this

2 study to preserve patient confidentiality.

1 **Prior presentation**

2 Presented in part at the 69th Annual Meeting of the Japanese Society for Dialysis

☒ Therapy; 8 June 2024; Yokohama.

☒

☒ **Reference**

☒ 1. Kurita N, Akizawa T, Fukuhara S. Vitality Measured as Self-reported Energy

☒ Level and Clinical Outcomes in Hemodialysis Patients: The Japanese Dialysis

☒ Outcomes and Practice Pattern Study (J-DOPPS). *Am J Kidney Dis* 2019;73:486–495.

☒ doi: <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2018.10.001>

1☒ 2. Hannedouche T, Roth H, Krummel T, London GM, Jean G, Bouchet JL, et al.

11 Multiphasic Effects of Blood Pressure on Survival in Hemodialysis Patients. *Kidney Int*

12 2016;90:674–684. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kint.2016.05.025>

1☒ 3. Zager PG, Nikolic J, Brown RH, Campbell MA, Hunt WC, Peterson D, et al. “U”

1☒ Curve Association of Blood Pressure and Mortality in Hemodialysis Patients. Medical

1☒ Directors of Dialysis Clinic, Inc. *Kidney Int* 1998;54:561–569. doi:

1☒ <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1755.1998.00005.x>

1☒ 4. Robinson BM, Tong L, Zhang J, Wolfe RA, Goodkin DA, Greenwood RN, et al.

1☒ Blood Pressure Levels and Mortality Risk Among Hemodialysis Patients in the Dialysis

1☒ Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study. *Kidney Int* 2012;82: 570–580. doi:

2☒ <https://doi.org/10.1038/ki.2012.136>

21 5. Inoue T, Tokuyama K, Yoshi S, Nagayoshi N, Iseki C, Iseki K. Elevated Resting

- 1 Heart Rate is an Independent Predictor of All-cause Death and Cardiovascular Events in
2 Japanese Ambulatory Hemodialysis Patients. *Clin Exp Nephrol* 2012;16:938–944. doi:
☒ <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10157-012-0641-3>
- ☒ 6. Iseki K, Nakai S, Yamagata K, Tsubakihara Y; Committee of Renal Data
☒ Registry of the Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. Tachycardia as a Predictor of
☒ Poor Survival in Chronic Haemodialysis Patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2011;26:
☒ 963–969. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfq507>
- ☒ 7. Jiang X, Li X, Peng H, Li M, Wang C. Prognostic Value of Nighttime Double
☒ Product in Nondialysis Chronic Kidney Disease With Hypertension. *J Am Heart Assoc*
1☒ 2023;12: e031627. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1161/jaha.123.031627>
- 11 8. Inoue R, Ohkubo T, Kikuya M, Metoki H, Asayama K, Kanno A, et al.
12 Predictive Value for Mortality of the Double Product at Rest Obtained by Home Blood
1☒ Pressure Measurement: The Ohasama Study. *Am J Hypertens* 2012;25:568–575. doi:
1☒ <https://doi.org/10.1038/ajh.2012.3>
- 1☒ 9. Jiang ZH, Aierken A, Wu TT, Zheng YY, Ma YT, Xie X. Rate Pressure Product
1☒ as a Novel Predictor of Long-term Adverse Outcomes in Patients After Percutaneous
1☒ Coronary Intervention: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *BMJ Open* 2023;13:e067951.
1☒ doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067951>
- 1☒ 10. Stoschitzky K. Blood Pressure, Heart Rate, or the Rate Pressure Product: What
2☒ is the Best Predictor of Clinical Outcome? *Eur Heart J Open* 2022;2:oeac063. doi:
21 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehjopen/oeac063>
- 22 11. van Vliet BN, Montani JP. Baroreflex Stabilization of the Double Product. *Am J*

- 1 *Physiol* 1999;277:H1679–1689. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpheart.1999.277.5.h1679>
- 2 12. Huang B, Yang Y, Zhu J, Liang Y, Tan H, Yu L, et al. Usefulness of the
 Admission Shock Index for Predicting Short-term Outcomes in Patients With ST-
 segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 2014;114:1315–1321. doi:
 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2014.07.062>
13. El-Menyar A, Al Habib KF, Zubaid M, Alsheikh-Ali AA, Sulaiman K,
 Almahmeed W, et al. Utility of Shock Index in 24,636 Patients Presenting With Acute
 Coronary Syndrome. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care* 2020;9:546–556. doi:
 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2048872619886307>
- 1 14. de Mutsert R, de Jager DJ, Jager KJ, Zoccali C, Dekker FW. Interaction on an
11 Additive Scale. *Nephron Clin Pract* 2011;119:c154–157. doi:
12 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000327596>
- 1 15. de Jager DJ, de Mutsert R, Jager KJ, Zoccali C, Dekker FW. Reporting of
1 Interaction. *Nephron Clin Pract* 2011;119:c158–161. doi:
1 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000327598>
- 1 16. Nitta K, Goto S, Masakane I, Hanafusa N, Taniguchi M, Hasegawa T, et al.
1 Annual Dialysis Data Report for 2018, JSDT Renal Data Registry: Survey Methods,
1 Facility Data, Incidence, Prevalence, and Mortality. *Ren Replace Ther* 2020;6:1–18.
1 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41100-020-00286-9>
- 2 17. Nitta K, Masakane I, Hanafusa N, Hoshino J, Taniguchi M, Joki N, et al. 2019
21 Annual Dialysis Data Report, JSDT Renal Data Registry. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2020;53:
22 579–632 (In Japanese except for abstract). doi: <https://doi.org/10.4009/jsdt.53.579>

- 1 18. Hanafusa N, Abe M, Joki N, Hoshino J, Kikuchi K, Goto S, et al. 2020 Annual
2 Dialysis Data Report, JSDT Renal Data Registry. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2021;54:611–657
☒ 579–632 (In Japanese except for abstract). doi: <https://doi.org/10.4009/jsdt.54.611>
- ☒ 19. Murakami M, Fujii N, Kanda E, Kikuchi K, Wada A, Hamano T, et al.
☒ Association of Four Types of Vascular Access Including Arterial Superficialization
☒ with Mortality in Maintenance Hemodialysis Patients: A Nationwide Cohort Study in
☒ Japan. *Am J Nephrol* 2023;54:83–94. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000529991>
- ☒ 20. Wakasugi M, Kazama JJ, Wada A, Hamano T, Masakane I, Narita I. Functional
☒ Impairment Attenuates the Association Between High Serum Phosphate and Mortality
1☒ in Dialysis Patients: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*
11 2019;34:1207–1216. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfy253>
- 12 21. Textor J, Hardt J, Knüppel S. DAGitty: A Graphical Tool for Analyzing Causal
1☒ Diagrams. *Epidemiology* 2011;22:745. doi:
1☒ <https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0b013e318225c2be>
- 1☒ 22. Etminan M, Collins GS, Mansournia MA. Using Causal Diagrams to Improve
1☒ the Design and Interpretation of Medical Research. *Chest* 2020;158:S21–S28. doi:
1☒ <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.011>
- 1☒ 23. Greenland S. Tests for Interaction in Epidemiologic Studies: A Review and a
1☒ Study of Power. *Stat Med* 1983;2:243–251. doi:
2☒ <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780020219>
- 21 24. Andersson T, Alfredsson L, Källberg H, Zdravkovic S, Ahlbom A. Calculating
22 Measures of Biological Interaction. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2005;20:575–579. doi:

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-005-7835-x>
- 2 25. Ohannessian R, Bénet T, Argaud L, Guérin C, Guichon C, Piriou V, et al.
☒ Heatmap for Data Visualization in Infection Control Epidemiology: An Application
☒ Describing the Relationship Between Hospital-acquired Infections, Simplified Acute
☒ Physiological Score II, and Length of Stay in Adult Intensive Care Units. *Am J Infect*
☒ *Control* 2017;45:746–749. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2017.02.012>
- ☒ 26. Jann B. Color Palettes for Stata Graphics. *Stata J* 2018;18:765–785. doi:
☒ <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X1801800402>
- ☒ 27. Rubin DB, Schenker N. Multiple Imputation in Health-care Databases: An
1☒ Overview and Some Applications. *Stat Med* 1991;10:585–598. doi:
11 <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780100410>
- 12 28. Turner JM, Peixoto AJ. Blood Pressure Targets for Hemodialysis Patients.
1☒ *Kidney Int* 2017;92:816–823. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kint.2017.01.038>
- 1☒ 29. Loutradis C, Sarafidis PA, Ferro CJ, Zoccali C. Volume Overload in
1☒ Hemodialysis: Diagnosis, Cardiovascular Consequences, and Management. *Nephrol*
1☒ *Dial Transplant* 2021;36:2182–2193. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfaa182>
- 1☒ 30. Nixon JV, Mitchell JH, McPhaul JJ Jr, Henrich WL. Effect of Hemodialysis on
1☒ Left Ventricular Function. Dissociation of Changes in Filling Volume and in Contractile
1☒ State. *J Clin Invest* 1983;71:377–384. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1172/jci110779>
- 2☒ 31. Port FK, Hulbert-Shearon TE, Wolfe RA, Bloembergen WE, Golper TA,
21 Agodoa LY, et al. Predialysis Blood Pressure and Mortality Risk in a National Sample

- 1 of Maintenance Hemodialysis Patients. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1999;33:507–517. doi:
2 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-6386\(99\)70188-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-6386(99)70188-5)
32. Palmer BF. Why are Some Dialysis Patients Chronically Hypotensive in the
 Absence of Heart Disease and Volume Depletion? *Semin Dial* 2011;24:404–405. doi:
 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-139x.2011.00915.x>
33. Bajpai D, Puttarajappa CM. Chronic Hypotension and Transplant Outcomes—the
 Known Unknowns. *Kidney Int Rep* 2024;9:1571–1573. doi:
 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ekir.2024.04.065>
34. Agarwal R, Sinha AD, Pappas MK, Abraham TN, Tegegne GG. Hypertension in
1 Hemodialysis Patients Treated With Atenolol or Lisinopril: A Randomized Controlled
11 Trial. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2014;29:672–681. doi:
12 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gft515>
- 1 35. de Mutsert R, Grootendorst DC, Axelsson J, Boeschoten EW, Krediet RT,
1 Dekker FW, et al. Excess Mortality due to Interaction Between Protein-Energy Wasting,
1 Inflammation and Cardiovascular Disease in Chronic Dialysis Patients. *Nephrol Dial
1 Transplant* 2008;23:2957–2964. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfn167>
- 1 36. VanderWeele TJ. The Interaction Continuum. *Epidemiology* 2019;30:648–658.
1 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0000000000001054>
- 1
2

1 **Figure legends**

2 **Figure 1. Heatmap showing the association between the combination of pre-**

3 **haemodialysis systolic blood pressure and pulse rate and all-cause mortality**

4 A. Hazard ratios; B. Relative excess risks due to interaction

5 Hazard ratios and relative excess risks owing to interactions are estimated using the

6 same Cox proportional hazards model. Pre-haemodialysis systolic blood pressure of

7 140-<160 mmHg and a pulse rate of 60-<70 / min is the reference category. The data

8 are adjusted for age; sex; body mass index; serum C-reactive protein level; haemoglobin

9 level; smoking status; use of antihypertensive drugs; history of atrial fibrillation,

10 diabetes, ischaemic heart disease, cerebral infarction, and cerebral haemorrhage;

11 interdialytic weight gain; and diastolic blood pressure.

12 Each cell is coloured according to the numerical value of the point estimates. Numbers

13 in parenthesis indicate 95% confidence intervals.

14 HD, haemodialysis; N/A, not applicable

15 **Figure 2. Heatmap showing the association between the combination of pre-**

16 **haemodialysis systolic blood pressure and pulse rate and cardiac mortality**

17 A. Hazard ratios; B. Relative excess risks due to interaction

18 Hazard ratios and relative excess risks owing to interactions are estimated using the

19 same Cox proportional hazards model. Pre-haemodialysis systolic blood pressure of

20 140-<160 mmHg and a pulse rate of 60-<70 / min is the reference category. The data

21 are adjusted for age; sex; body mass index; serum C-reactive protein level; haemoglobin

22 level; smoking status; use of antihypertensive drugs; history of atrial fibrillation,

23 diabetes, ischaemic heart disease, cerebral infarction, and cerebral haemorrhage;

- 1 interdialytic weight gain; and diastolic blood pressure.
 - 2 Each cell is coloured according to the numerical value of the point estimates.
- Numbers in parenthesis indicate 95% confidence intervals.
-

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the overall patients and those categorised by the systolic blood pressure

Variable	Overall N = 275,215	Systolic blood pressure, mmHg					
		<100 n = 4,304	100-<120 n = 19,773	120-<140 n = 60,046	140-<160 n = 91,112	160-<180 n = 65,955	≥180 n = 34,025
Age (years)	70.0 (61.0,78.0)	72.0 (64.0,81.0)	73.0 (64.0,81.0)	71.0 (63.0,79.0)	71.0 (62.0,78.0)	70.0 (61.0,77.0)	69.0 (58.0,76.0)
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Men	65.8	55.7	61.1	64.8	66.7	67.4	66.2
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dialysis vintage (years)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	7.0 (2.0,16.0)	5.0 (2.0,13.0)	5.0 (2.0,11.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,9.0)
missing	160	6	12	46	43	35	18
Renal disease							
Diabetic nephropathy	42.3	25.6	29.2	33.9	40.3	48.4	59.7
Chronic glomerulo- nephritis	25.4	34.5	30.7	29.1	26.5	22.8	17.3
Nephrosclerosis	13	14.9	15.6	14.7	13.3	12	9.8
Polycystic kidney disease	3.9	4.1	5.2	5	4.1	3.1	1.9
RPGN	0.8	1.1	1.1	1	0.8	0.6	0.4
Unknown	14.6	19.8	18.1	16.3	15	13.1	10.9
missing	30,418	644	2,579	7,298	10,224	6,612	3,061
Modality							
HD	55.4	57.4	56.7	55.8	55.8	54.9	53.4
HDF	44.6	42.6	43.3	44.2	44.2	45.1	46.6
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diabetes	54.2	38.4	42.1	45.8	52.2	60.1	70.8
missing	23,808	458	2,058	5,734	8,015	5,288	2,255
Current smoking	10.8	6.7	7.3	8.7	10.5	12.5	14.6
missing	53,646	827	3,924	11,465	17,611	12,950	6,869
Use of antihypertensives	66.7	28.1	44.3	60	69.3	73.4	75.8

	missing	31,612	575	2,406	6,721	10,266	7,644	4,000
Atrial fibrillation		7.7	21.4	14.7	9.7	7	5.6	4.6
	missing	46,510	799	3,416	9,960	15,201	11,233	5,901
Ischaemic heart disease		26.7	35.8	30.4	27.2	25.4	26.2	26.6
	missing	39,556	587	2,799	8,252	13,016	9,717	5,185
Cerebral haemorrhage		6.5	7.4	7.4	6.9	6.4	6.2	6
	missing	43,436	675	3,139	9,096	14,183	10,633	5,710
Cerebral infarction		18.2	19.6	19.7	18.1	17.5	18.2	19.1
	missing	40,592	635	2,898	8,495	13,300	9,971	5,293
Pre-dialysis HR		73 (65,82)	74 (65,84)	72 (64,82)	72 (64,80)	73 (65,81)	75 (66,83)	77 (68,86)
	missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pre-dialysis SBP		151 (135,167)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	missing	0						
Pre-dialysis DBP		78 (68, 87)	53 (47, 59)	63 (56, 69)	70 (64, 78)	77 (70, 85)	84 (76, 92)	93 (84, 102)
	missing	194	40	27	46	35	11	35
BMI		22.4 (20.0,25.2)	21.2 (18.6,24.0)	21.7 (19.4,24.5)	22.0 (19.8,24.7)	22.3 (20.0,25.1)	22.6 (20.3,25.6)	23.1 (20.5,26.2)
	missing	17,879	324	1,417	3,902	5,864	4,235	2,137
UF (L)		2.4 (1.8, 3.0)	2.0 (1.3, 2.6)	2.2 (1.5, 2.8)	2.3 (1.7, 2.9)	2.4 (1.8, 3.0)	2.5 (1.9, 3.1)	2.6 (2.0, 3.4)
	missing	2232	78	201	517	697	522	217
UFR(L/hr)		0.60 (0.45,0.75)	0.48 (0.32,0.63)	0.54 (0.40,0.68)	0.57 (0.43,0.73)	0.60 (0.46,0.75)	0.63 (0.47,0.77)	0.65 (0.50,0.82)
	missing	3,313	81	272	769	1,044	784	363
Dialysis time (min)		240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,244)
	missing	1,435	21	102	325	463	346	178
Hb (g/dL)		11.0 (10.2,11.7)	10.9 (9.9,11.7)	10.9 (10.1,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.3,11.7)	11.0 (10.3,11.7)
	missing	3,818	83	290	866	1,149	935	495
CRP (mg/dL)		0.15 (0.06,0.46)	0.33 (0.10,1.15)	0.21 (0.08,0.70)	0.16 (0.06,0.50)	0.14 (0.06,0.43)	0.14 (0.06,0.41)	0.15 (0.06,0.42)

missing 36,306 515 2,530 7,726 11,946 8,992 4,597

1 Data are presented as medians (interquartile range) for continuous measures and as percentages for categorical measures. RPGN, rapidly progressive
2 glomerulonephritis; HD, haemodialysis; HDF, haemodiafiltration; PR, pulse rate; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass
index; UFR, ultrafiltration rate; Hb, haemoglobin; CRP, C-reactive protein; N/A, not applicable; HR, hazard ratio



Table 2. Baseline characteristics of the overall patients and those categorised by the pulse rate

Variable	Overall N = 275,215	Pulse rate, per minute							
		<50 n = 3,419	50-<60 n = 25,396	60-<70 n = 73,511	70-<80 n = 84,845	80-<90 n = 55,096	90-<100 n = 23,613	100-<110 n = 7,059	≥110 n = 2,276
Age (years)	70.0 (61.0,78.0)	77.0 (71.0,83.0)	75.0 (68.0,81.0)	72.0 (66.0,80.0)	70.0 (61.0,78.0)	68.0 (57.0,76.0)	65.0 (54.0,74.0)	64.0 (52.0,73.0)	67.0 (55.0,75.0)
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Men	65.8	75.1	71.5	66	63.6	64.8	67	68.5	68.1
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dialysis vintage (years)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	4.0 (1.0,9.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,11.0)	5.0 (2.0,11.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,10.0)	5.0 (2.0,11.0)
missing	160	5	18	44	40	26	18	7	2
Renal disease									
Diabetic nephropathy	42.3	40	35.3	37.8	42.3	47.4	50.2	49.6	44.3
Chronic glomerulo- nephritis	25.4	24.2	28.2	27.6	25.7	23.1	21.6	21.6	24.1
Nephrosclerosis	13	18.8	17.9	15	12.3	10.8	9.7	10.3	11.5
Polycystic kidney disease	3.9	3.5	4.2	4.3	4	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.2
RPGN	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.9
Unknown	14.6	13.1	13.7	14.6	14.9	14.5	14.5	14.9	16
missing	30,418	446	3,022	8,449	9,314	5,706	2,487	737	257
Modality									
HD	55.4	60.7	58.8	57.1	55	53.3	52.8	52	55.3
HDF	44.6	39.3	41.2	42.9	45	46.7	47.2	48	44.7
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diabetes	54.2	52.8	48	50.1	53.9	58.8	61.2	61	55.8
missing	23,808	357	2,334	6,859	7,298	4,374	1,864	546	176
Current smoking	10.8	7.2	7.4	8.9	10.7	13	15	15.1	13
missing	53,646	724	4,978	14,341	16,553	10,607	4,598	1,359	486
Use of antihypertensives	66.7	65.8	69.6	68.3	66.9	65.6	63.2	60.1	54.4
missing	31,612	421	2,804	8,417	9,735	6,374	2,690	853	318

⊠

Atrial fibrillation	7.7	15.1	8.5	7.1	6.7	7.4	9.2	13	24
missing	46,510	618	4,257	12,408	14,319	9,345	3,975	1,188	400
Ischaemic heart disease	26.7	32.9	29.8	27.4	25.9	25.6	25.4	26	29.3
missing	39,556	522	3,542	10,728	12,135	7,885	3,413	990	341
Cerebral haemorrhage	6.5	7.5	7.3	7	6.4	6.2	5.6	5.6	5.8
missing	43,436	601	3,940	11,778	13,323	8,608	3,704	1,096	386
Cerebral infarction	18.2	21	20.5	19	17.7	17.4	16.8	16.5	19.1
missing	40,592	549	3,620	10,998	12,490	8,055	3,501	1,032	347
Pre-dialysis HR	73 (65,82)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
missing	0								
Pre-dialysis SBP	151 (135,167)	144 (128,160)	147 (132,162)	149 (134,164)	151 (136,167)	154 (138,170)	156 (138,173)	155 (137,173)	149 (128,168)
missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pre-dialysis DBP	78 (68, 87)	64 (57, 73)	70 (62, 78)	74 (66, 83)	78 (70, 87)	82 (73, 91)	85 (75, 95)	86 (75, 97)	86 (74, 97)
missing	194	7	24	36	53	37	18	11	8
BMI	22.4 (20.0,25.2)	21.4 (19.3,23.6)	21.5 (19.4,23.9)	21.9 (19.7,24.4)	22.4 (20.0,25.2)	23.0 (20.4,26.0)	23.5 (20.8,26.9)	23.8 (21.0,27.4)	23.2 (20.4,26.6)
missing	17,879	255	1,665	4,665	5,394	3,657	1,613	470	160
UF (L)	2.4 (1.8, 3.0)	2.3 (1.8, 2.9)	2.3 (1.8, 2.9)	2.4 (1.8, 2.9)	2.4 (1.8, 3.0)	2.5 (1.8, 3.2)	2.6 (1.9, 3.3)	2.6 (1.8, 3.4)	2.4 (1.7, 3.2)
missing	2232	27	207	564	671	453	200	68	42
UFR (L/hr)	0.60 (0.45,0.75)	0.60 (0.46,0.73)	0.60 (0.45,0.73)	0.60 (0.45,0.73)	0.60 (0.45,0.75)	0.62 (0.46,0.77)	0.63 (0.47,0.80)	0.63 (0.46,0.82)	0.60 (0.43,0.77)
missing	3,313	35	296	880	1,002	662	299	93	46
Dialysis time (min)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,240)	240 (240,243)	240 (240,244)	240 (240,245)	240 (240,245)
missing	1,435	14	127	374	450	289	135	38	8
Hb (g/dL)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.3,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	11.0 (10.2,11.7)	10.9 (10.1,11.8)	10.9 (10.0,11.8)
missing	3,818	44	315	979	1,145	794	368	130	43
CRP (mg/dL)	0.15 (0.06,0.46)	0.15 (0.06,0.43)	0.12 (0.05,0.36)	0.13 (0.05,0.39)	0.14 (0.06,0.43)	0.17 (0.07,0.52)	0.21 (0.08,0.67)	0.27 (0.10,0.85)	0.32 (0.11,1.03)
missing	36,306	414	3,310	9,769	11,383	7,080	3,180	887	283

⊠

1 Data are presented as medians (interquartile range) for continuous measures and as percentages for categorical measures. RPGN, rapidly progressive
2 glomerulonephritis; HD, haemodialysis; HDF, haemodiafiltration; PR, pulse rate; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass
3 index; UFR, ultrafiltration rate; Hb, haemoglobin; CRP, C-reactive protein; N/A, not applicable; HR, hazard ratio
4



A. Hazard ratio (HR)

pre-HD pulse rate, per min

pre-HD systolic blood pressure, mmHg

	< 100	100 - < 120	120 - < 140	140 - < 160	160 - < 180	≥ 180
< 50	1.89 (1.25, 2.85)	1.40 (1.09, 1.79)	1.03 (0.84, 1.26)	1.04 (0.86, 1.27)	1.24 (0.97, 1.57)	1.66 (1.22, 2.25)
50 - < 60	2.26 (1.85, 2.76)	1.18 (1.04, 1.34)	1.02 (0.93, 1.12)	1.01 (0.92, 1.10)	1.15 (1.04, 1.27)	1.16 (1.002, 1.35)
60 - < 70	1.92 (1.66, 2.22)	1.55 (1.42, 1.69)	1.06 (0.99, 1.14)	Ref.	1.09 (1.01, 1.17)	1.28 (1.17, 1.41)
70 - < 80	2.74 (2.41, 3.11)	1.65 (1.51, 1.80)	1.31 (1.22, 1.4)	1.12 (1.05, 1.19)	1.16 (1.08, 1.25)	1.24 (1.13, 1.35)
80 - < 90	2.97 (2.60, 3.41)	2.33 (2.13, 2.56)	1.65 (1.53, 1.78)	1.36 (1.26, 1.46)	1.31 (1.21, 1.41)	1.36 (1.23, 1.50)
90 - < 100	3.50 (2.92, 4.20)	2.68 (2.38, 3.01)	1.85 (1.68, 2.04)	1.65 (1.51, 1.81)	1.42 (1.27, 1.58)	1.36 (1.19, 1.56)
100 - < 110	4.10 (3.20, 5.23)	3.04 (2.55, 3.63)	2.41 (2.08, 2.79)	1.57 (1.36, 1.82)	1.76 (1.48, 2.09)	1.80 (1.46, 2.23)
≥ 110	4.93 (3.63, 6.71)	2.62 (2.07, 3.32)	2.56 (2.08, 3.15)	2.01 (1.61, 2.51)	1.55 (1.14, 2.11)	1.95 (1.36, 2.78)



B. Relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI)

pre-HD pulse rate, per min

pre-HD systolic blood pressure, mmHg

	< 100	100 - < 120	120 - < 140	140 - < 160	160 - < 180	≥ 180
< 50	-0.07 (-0.91, 0.76)	-0.19 (-0.60, 0.22)	-0.08 (-0.37, 0.22)	N/A	0.11 (-0.25, 0.47)	0.33 (-0.22, 0.88)
50 - < 60	0.33 (-0.17, 0.84)	-0.38 (-0.58, -0.18)	-0.05 (-0.18, 0.09)	N/A	0.06 (-0.09, 0.20)	-0.13 (-0.34, 0.09)
60 - < 70	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
70 - < 80	0.70 (0.29, 1.11)	-0.02 (-0.19, 0.16)	0.13 (0.02, 0.23)	N/A	-0.04 (-0.15, 0.07)	-0.16 (-0.31, -0.01)
80 - < 90	0.70 (0.25, 1.15)	0.43 (0.21, 0.65)	0.23 (0.10, 0.37)	N/A	-0.14 (-0.27, -0.002)	-0.28 (-0.45, -0.10)
90 - < 100	0.93 (0.26, 1.60)	0.48 (0.15, 0.81)	0.13 (-0.08, 0.35)	N/A	-0.32 (-0.53, -0.12)	-0.57 (-0.82, -0.33)
100 - < 110	1.6 (0.57, 2.64)	0.92 (0.36, 1.49)	0.77 (0.37, 1.18)	N/A	0.10 (-0.27, 0.47)	-0.05 (-0.49, 0.39)
≥ 110	2.00 (0.43, 3.57)	0.06 (-0.69, 0.82)	0.49 (-0.19, 1.17)	N/A	-0.55 (-1.2, 0.10)	-0.35 (-1.16, 0.47)



A. Hazard ratio (HR)

pre-HD pulse rate, per min

pre-HD systolic blood pressure, mmHg

	< 100	100 - < 120	120 - < 140	140 - < 160	160 - < 180	≥ 180
< 50	3.35 (1.83, 6.13)	1.80 (1.18, 2.75)	0.98 (0.65, 1.47)	1.24 (0.88, 1.76)	1.74 (1.17, 2.59)	2.32 (1.41, 3.83)
50 - < 60	3.22 (2.32, 4.47)	1.42 (1.13, 1.79)	1.09 (0.91, 1.30)	1.10 (0.93, 1.30)	1.06 (0.86, 1.30)	1.07 (0.79, 1.45)
60 - < 70	2.32 (1.79, 3.00)	1.89 (1.61, 2.21)	1.11 (0.97, 1.27)	Ref.	1.15 (1.001, 1.32)	1.26 (1.06, 1.51)
70 - < 80	3.34 (2.66, 4.20)	1.89 (1.61, 2.22)	1.42 (1.25, 1.61)	1.19 (1.06, 1.35)	1.20 (1.04, 1.37)	1.24 (1.04, 1.46)
80 - < 90	4.58 (3.67, 5.72)	3.07 (2.61, 3.61)	1.81 (1.57, 2.08)	1.40 (1.22, 1.60)	1.35 (1.16, 1.57)	1.50 (1.25, 1.80)
90 - < 100	4.23 (3.07, 5.85)	3.33 (2.71, 4.11)	2.24 (1.87, 2.67)	1.60 (1.34, 1.92)	1.60 (1.31, 1.95)	1.38 (1.07, 1.78)
100 - < 110	6.07 (4.07, 9.07)	3.87 (2.84, 5.27)	2.41 (1.81, 3.22)	1.79 (1.36, 2.36)	1.90 (1.38, 2.61)	2.00 (1.37, 2.92)
≥ 110	5.60 (3.21, 9.77)	3.52 (2.35, 5.29)	3.17 (2.20, 4.57)	2.90 (2.00, 4.20)	2.28 (1.38, 3.77)	1.60 (0.75, 3.40)



B. Relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI)

pre-HD pulse rate, per min

pre-HD systolic blood pressure, mmHg

	< 100	100 - < 120	120 - < 140	140 - < 160	160 - < 180	≥ 180
< 50	0.53 (-1.30, 2.36)	-0.31 (-1.15, 0.53)	-0.35 (-0.93, 0.23)	N/A	0.34 (-0.47, 1.15)	0.90 (-0.42, 2.21)
50 - < 60	0.65 (-0.37, 1.67)	-0.51 (-0.92, -0.11)	-0.11 (-0.38, 0.15)	N/A	-0.21 (-0.50, 0.09)	-0.33 (-0.77, 0.10)
60 - < 70	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
70 - < 80	0.71 (-0.09, 1.50)	-0.20 (-0.55, 0.15)	0.10 (-0.10, 0.31)	N/A	-0.14 (-0.37, 0.08)	-0.21 (-0.53, 0.10)
80 - < 90	1.73 (0.74, 2.72)	0.69 (0.23, 1.15)	0.28 (0.01, 0.55)	N/A	-0.18 (-0.45, 0.10)	-0.11 (-0.49, 0.27)
90 - < 100	1.05 (-0.25, 2.34)	0.76 (0.08, 1.44)	0.52 (0.07, 0.96)	N/A	-0.11 (-0.54, 0.31)	-0.45 (-0.96, 0.06)
100 - < 110	2.59 (0.31, 4.86)	1.14 (-0.09, 2.38)	0.45 (-0.37, 1.27)	N/A	-0.01 (-0.82, 0.79)	0.04 (-0.95, 1.02)
≥ 110	0.97 (-2.11, 4.05)	-0.41 (-2.17, 1.36)	0.04 (-1.54, 1.62)	N/A	-0.75 (-2.42, 0.92)	-1.64 (-3.41, 0.13)

