1 Title

2 Adaptive design methods in dialysis clinical trials – a systematic review

3

4 Authors (first name, middle initial and last names)

5 Conor Judge, M.B., BEng. (1) (2) (3)

6 Robert Murphy, M.B. (1)

7 Catriona Reddin, M.B. (1)

8 Sarah Cormican, M.B. (1) (3)

9 Andrew Smyth, M.B., Ph.D. (1)

10 Martin O’Halloran, BEng., Ph.D. (2)

11 Martin J O’Donnell, M.B., Ph.D. (1)

12

13 Running Title (35 characters including spaces)

14 Adaptive design methods in dialysis

15

16 Author affiliations (including division and/or department)

17 (1) HRB-Clinical Research Facility Galway, NUI Galway, Galway, Ireland

18 (2) Translational Medical Device Lab, NUI Galway, Galway, Ireland

19 (3) Wellcome Trust – HRB, Irish Clinical Academic Training

20

21   **Word Count - Abstract**

22   270

23   **Word Count - Text**

24   3060

25   **Corresponding Author**

26   Dr Conor Judge, HRB-Clinical Research Facility Galway, National University of Ireland Galway,

27   Newcastle Road, Galway, Ireland, H91YR71 Email: conorjudge@gmail.com

28   **Key Words**

29   Dialysis, Adaptive design, Haemodialysis, Peritoneal Dialysis, End Stage Kidney Disease

30 Significance statement

31 What was previously known about the specific topic of the manuscript?

32 The use of adaptive designs methods in dialysis trials is unquantified.

33 What were the most important findings? If studies are animals, this should be specified.

34 Although absolute numbers of adaptive design trials have increased over time, the proportion of
 35 dialysis trials using an adaptive design has reduced. Among trials that employed an adaptive design,
 36 52% of dialysis trials were revised due to the adaptive criteria. Group sequential designs were the
 37 most common type of adaptive design method used in dialysis randomized clinical trials. Acute
 38 Kidney Injury (AKI) was studied in 54% of trials and End Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) was studied in
 39 44% of trials, which used an adaptive design.

40 How does the new information advance a new understanding of the kidney and its diseases?

41 Adaptive design methods are effective in dialysis trials, but their relative use has declined over time.

42 Word Count (120)

43 152 (including headings)

44

45 Abstract

46 Background

47 Adaptive design methods are intended to improve efficiency of clinical trials and are relevant to
48 evaluating interventions in dialysis populations. We sought to quantify the use of adaptive designs in
49 dialysis clinical trials.

50 Methods

51 We completed a full text systematic review and adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for
52 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines. Our review utilised a machine learning
53 classifier and a novel full text systematic review method. We searched MEDLINE (Pubmed) and
54 performed a detailed data extraction of trial characteristics and a completed a narrative synthesis of
55 the data.

56 Results

57 50 studies, available as 66 articles, were included after full text review. 31 studies were conducted in
58 a dialysis population and 19 studies had renal replacement therapy as a primary or secondary
59 outcome. While the absolute number of adaptive design methods is increasing over time, the
60 relative use of adaptive design methods in dialysis trials is decreasing over time (6.1% in 2009 to
61 0.3% in 2019). Adaptive design methods impacted 52% of dialysis trials they were used in. Group
62 sequential designs were the most common type of adaptive design method used. Acute Kidney
63 Injury (AKI) was studied in 27 trails (54%), End Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) was studied in 22 trials
64 (44%) and Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) was studied in 1 trial (2%). 26 studies (52%) were supported
65 by public funding. 41 studies (82%) did not report their adaptive design method in the title or
66 abstract and would not be detected by a standard systematic.

67 Conclusions

68 Adaptive design methods are employed in dialysis trials, but there has been a decline in their relative
69 use over time.

70

71 Registration Number

72 PROSPERO: CRD42020163946

73

74 Word Count (300)

75 270

76 Introduction

77 Background

78 Randomized clinical trials are the gold standard for evaluating efficacy, futility or harm of new
79 therapies (1). Compared to similar specialties, nephrology has traditionally had a low number of
80 randomized clinical trials, particularly evident for patients with End Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) (2).
81 The comparatively low number of trials are postulated to be due to difficult recruitment, previous
82 history of underpowered trials and lack of funding (3,4). Although the number of trials are
83 increasing, nephrology continues to lag behind other specialities such as cardiology,
84 haematology/oncology and gastroenterology (5,6).

85 Adaptive clinical trials use interim data analyses to modify the trial design or duration in a
86 predefined way (7), without undermining the integrity or validity of the trial, thereby preserving the
87 Type 1 Error (False Positive) rate. The most common type of adaptive design is the Group Sequential
88 Design (GSD), where planned interim analyses permit stopping of trials for efficacy or futility. Other
89 designs include sample size re-estimation, multi-arm multi-stage trials, adaptive randomisation,
90 biomarker adaptive and seamless phase II/III trials (8).

91 Adaptive clinical trials appear particularly suitable for the evaluation of novel interventions in ESKD,
92 by reducing resource requirements, decreasing time to study completion and increasing the
93 likelihood of study success i.e. power to answer hypothesis (9). Previous trials in ESKD have overly
94 relied on observational data to inform trial design, including assumptions of expected effect size and
95 variance (10), rather than estimates from early phase clinical trials. If incorrect, trials may be
96 underpowered with an insufficient sample size to answer the underlying research question (10).

97 Adaptive sample size re-estimation is a potential solution, as seen in cardiology trials (11), such as
98 planned blinded sample size re-estimation, which identifies inaccurate assumptions, thereby
99 triggering altered recruitment targets mid trial to ensure adequate power.

Adaptive design may also be relevant to evaluation of more established interventions. For example, the 4D trial (12) reported that atorvastatin 20mg per day did not reduce cardiovascular events in ESKD despite evidence of a 20-30% reduction in other populations (13). This trial included a single dose of statin or a single low-density lipoprotein target; it is hypothesised that alternative or multiple doses may have been more beneficial in an ESKD population given the significantly altered pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics (10,14). An adaptive multi-arm multi-stage (MAMS) trial design may have been more appropriate with one interim analysis at the end of stage I to identify an optimum dose to take forward into stage II. For example, the Telmisartan and Insulin Resistance in HIV (TAILoR) trial used a MAMS design with one interim analysis to identify the most appropriate dose among three telmisartan doses (20, 40 and 80mg daily). All three doses were tested in stage I and telmisartan 80mg was taken forward into stage II (15).

This systematic review aims to: (i) summarise the use of adaptive design methodology in randomized clinical trials in dialysis population and populations at risk of requiring dialysis; (ii) describe the characteristics of the adaptive designs including dialysis modality, funding, and geographical location; (iii) describe the adaptive trial design characteristics; (iv) estimate the percentage of adaptive clinical trials in dialysis among all dialysis RCTs; and (v) outline temporal trends in all the above.

Methods

We performed a systematic review, reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines (PRISMA) (16). The protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020163946) and published separately (17). After testing our pre-defined search strategy (17), we found a small number (n=16) of dialysis RCTs that reported an adaptive design method. We discovered that the adaptive design methods are often not reported in the title and abstract of papers and would not be detected in a traditional systematic search. To overcome this, we developed a novel “full text systematic review” protocol and to our knowledge, this is the first use of this methodology.

Search method for the identification of trials

Electronic search – Dialysis Studies

We performed an electronic search on MEDLINE (Pubmed) from database inception until 01 June 2020. Zotero was used as our reference manager. The dialysis search terms were adapted from Beaubien-Souligny et al. 2019 (18) and included dialysis, peritoneal dialysis, hemodialysis, hemodiafiltration, haemodiafiltration, hemofiltration, haemofiltration, extracorporeal blood cleansing, haemodialysis, renal dialysis, renal replacement, end stage kidney, end stage renal, stage 5 kidney and stage 5 renal (Supplementary Table 1). The output was stored in the Research Information Systems (RIS) file format.

Machine Learning Classifier – Randomized Clinical Trials

We used the high sensitivity machine learning classifier (RobotSearch) to identify RCTs from the dialysis search output (15). RobotSearch is a machine learning classification algorithm combining an ensemble of Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) with a reported Area Under the Curve of 0.987 (95% Confidence Interval (CI), 0.984 to 0.989) for RCT classification. We adjusted the parameters of RobotSearch to perform a sensitive search to increase

the proportion of RCTs that are correctly identified (15). Studies classified as likely to be randomized clinical trials were sourced for the full text systematic review.

Full text Systematic Review – Adaptive Design Methods

We used Recoll for Windows to perform a full text systematic review on our dialysis randomized clinical trial search results. Recoll is based on the Xpian search engine library and provides a powerful text extraction layer and a graphical interface. The adaptive design search terms were adapted from Bothwell et al., 2018 (19) and included phase ii/iii, treatment switching, biomarker adaptive, biomarker adaptive design, biomarker adjusted, adaptive hypothesis, adaptive dose-finding, pick-the-winner, drop-the-loser, sample size re-estimation, re-estimations, adaptive randomization, group sequential, adaptive seamless, adaptive design, interim monitoring, bayesian adaptive, flexible design, adaptive trial, play-the-winner, adaptive method, adaptive AND dose AND adjusting, response adaptive, adaptive allocation, adaptive signature design, treatment adaptive, covariate adaptive and sample size adjustment (Supplementary Table 2).

Manual full text review

We then performed manual full text review to confirm studies that were included in the final systematic review. This process is summarised in a PRISMA flowchart (Figure 1). Full text review was performed by CJ, RM and CR. Disagreements were resolved by consensus and where a resolution was not reached by discussion, a consensus was reached through a third reviewer (MOD).

Inclusion/exclusion criteria for the selection of studies

Type of study design and participants

Randomized clinical trials of interventions in patients with ESKD, acute kidney injury undergoing renal replacement therapy (RRT) including haemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, haemodiafiltration and haemofiltration. We did not limit our population to any specific disease. Additionally, we included studies that included dialysis as either a primary or secondary outcome.

Type of intervention and outcome

We did not place a restriction on the intervention type and included trials that studied medications during dialysis, medical devices, dialysis parameters and dialysis modality. We included all outcomes including surrogate markers, patient-centred outcomes and hard clinical outcomes.

Selection and analysis of trials

CJ, RM and CR extracted the study characteristics independently and in parallel. Data collected included the type of the adaptive design, stopping rule, impact of adaptive design (i.e., stopping for futility or efficacy, sample size changes, etc.), trial population, intervention, dialysis modality, the country of the lead investigator and the funder of the study (Adapted from Hatfield et al., 2016 (20))(Supplementary Table 3).

Assessment of the quality of the studies: risk of bias

We used the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 Tool (21) to assess methodological quality of eligible trials including random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and health care personnel, blinded outcome assessment, completeness of outcome data, evidence of selective reporting and other biases. Risk of bias assessments were performed independently by (CJ, RM, CR, SC), and disagreements were resolved by consensus. If one or more domains was rated as high, the study was considered at high risk of bias. We summarised our findings in a risk of bias table using the Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (22)(Supplementary Table 4).

Data synthesis

A descriptive synthesis of the data was performed. We reported overall outcomes and outcomes by (i) frequency and type of adaptive design; (ii) adaptive designs as a proportion of studies classified as dialysis RCTs by RobotSearch (iii) Population, Intervention and Outcome including dialysis modality (haemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, haemodiafiltration and haemofiltration); (iv) publication in high impact journals; (v) geographic location and funding; (vi) reporting of adaptive design methods in title and abstract; and (vii) a risk of bias assessment.

Results

The systematic search of articles with dialysis keywords published before 01 June 2020, identified 209,033 results. 5,452 articles were classified as probable RCTs by the machine learning classifier RobotSearch (15). Full text articles were sourced (n=5,022) and we performed a full text systematic review using adaptive design keywords which identified 358 studies for manual screening. 50 studies, available as 66 articles, were included after full text review (Figure 1). 31 studies were conducted in dialysis populations and 19 studies included RRT as a primary or secondary outcome.

Study characteristics

Frequency and type of Adaptive Design

Figure 2 reports the number of adaptive design designs by year and alongside the proportion of all dialysis RCTs that used adaptive design methods. The absolute amount of dialysis trials using adaptive designs has increased each year, but this has not matched the overall increase in dialysis trials and resulted in a relative decrease over time in the use of adaptive design methods in dialysis trials ranging from 6.1% in 2009 to 0.3% in 2019 with a mean of 1.76%.

Group sequential designs were the most common type of adaptive design method used, 31 (62%) trials (22 (71%) in dialysis populations and 9 (47.4%) in dialysis outcome trials) (Table 1). The O'Brien-Fleming stopping boundary was the most common stopping rule, used in 8 trials (25.8%), followed by Lan DeMets used in 7 trials (22.6%). 18 trials (58.1%) were impacted by the use of group sequential adaptive design including 6 trials (33.3%) that stopped early for futility, 3 trials (16.7%) that stopped early for efficacy and 4 trials (22.2%) that stopped early for safety. Sample-Size Re-estimation was the second most common type of adaptive design, used in 14 trials (28%) (8 (25.8%) in dialysis populations and 6 (31.6%) in dialysis outcome trials) (Table 2). 8 trials (57.1%) were impacted by the use of Sample-Size Re-estimation adaptive design including 5 trials (62.5%) that increased sample size. Phase II/III seamless design was the third most common type of adaptive

design, 3 trials (6%) (1 (3.23%) in dialysis populations and 2 (10.52%) in dialysis outcome trials)
(Table 3). Adaptive Dose-Escalation and Interim analysis were used in one trial each.

Population, Intervention, and Outcome studied

Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) was studied in 27 trials (54%), End Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) was studied in 22 trials (44%) and Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) was studied in 1 trial (2%). Figure 3 reports the number of each population under study per year and shows a larger increase in adaptive design methods in AKI populations compared to ESKD populations. Medications were the most common intervention type, evaluated in 28 trials (56%), followed by Dialysis Modality in 6 trials (12%), and Dialysis Parameter in 4 trials (8%). Haemodialysis was the most common dialysis modality studied in 26 trials (52%), followed by Haemodialysis and haemodiafiltration in 8 trials (16%), Haemodialysis, haemodiafiltration and haemofiltration in 7 trials (14%) and Peritoneal Dialysis in 4 trials (8%). Hard clinical outcomes were selected in 30 trials (60%), followed by surrogate outcomes in 17 trials (34%) and mixed in 3 trials (6%). The outcome measure was continuous in 11 trials (22%) and dichotomous in 39 trials (78%). Phase III studies were the most common study phase, studied in 40 trials (80%) (Table 1-3).

Publication in High Impact Journals

30 studies (60%) were published in a high impact journal (Impact Factor > 9). 13 studies (26%) were published in the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM), 5 studies (10%) were published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 4 studies (8%) were published in Trials, and 2 studies (4%) were published in the Journal of the American Society of Nephrology (JASN).

Geographic location and Funding

The most common country of the lead author was the United States of America in 20 studies (40%), followed by Germany in 6 studies (12%), France in 4 studies (8%), The Netherlands in 4 studies (8%), Australia in 3 studies (6%), and the United Kingdom in 3 studies (6%) (Tables 1-3). 43 studies (86%) were multicentre trials. 26 studies (52%) were supported by public funding, 17 studies (34%) were

supported by private funding, 5 studies (10%) were supported by both public and private funding and 2 studies (4%) did not report the source of funding.

Reporting of Adaptive Design Method in Title and Abstract

41 studies (82%) did not report their adaptive design method in the title or abstract and would not be detected by a standard systematic review search.

Risk of Bias

Risk of bias was assessed for forty trials (protocols were excluded) (Supplementary Figure 1, Supplementary Table 4). Overall risk of bias was deemed to be “low” in 17 trials (42.5%), “some concerns” in 13 trials (32.5%), and “high risk” in 10 trials (25%). The randomization process led to some concerns for 10 studies (25%). Deviations from intended interventions led to some concerns for 4 studies (10%) and “high risk” for 6 studies (15%). Missing outcome data were deemed to be “some concerns” for 2 studies (5%) trials and ‘high risk’ of bias for 2 studies (5%). Measurement of outcome measures were deemed to be “some concerns” for 2 studies (5%) trials and ‘high risk’ of bias for 1 study (2.5%). Selection of the reported result were deemed to be “some concerns” for 6 studies (15%) trials and ‘high risk’ of bias for 1 study (2.5%).

Discussion

In this systematic review, we report that adaptive design methods were used in 50 dialysis randomized clinical trials over a 20-year period. While the absolute number has increased over time, the relative use of adaptive design methods in dialysis RCTs has decreased.

First, we report that the relative proportion of adaptive design methods in dialysis trials has reduced over time. The absolute amount of dialysis trials using adaptive designs has increased each year, but this has not matched the overall increase in dialysis trials and therefore resulted in a relative decrease. We were unable to compare this result with other specialities because recent systematic reviews have not reported the relative use of adaptive designs (20,23). Second, we report that group sequential designs are the most used type of adaptive design in dialysis trials. This is similar to previous systematic reviews in cardiology (24), oncology (23) and in a review of registered clinical trials covering multiple specialities on clinicaltrials.gov (20). Third, we report that adaptive designs were more common in Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) (54% of trials) than End Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) (44% of trials). This may reflect increasing use of adaptive design methodology in critical care (25) and sepsis related trials (26), where AKI is most common. There were very few trials of CKD with a dialysis outcome (2%) that used an adaptive design. Many reasons for the paucity of CKD trials have been previously suggested including the use of treatments in CKD despite a lack of evidence, difficulty recruiting to CKD trials due to stringent eligibility criteria and underpowered subgroup analysis (3,27). The infrequent usage of adaptive designs in CKD trials may become a self-perpetuating barrier to using adaptive designs in future trials (20). Fourth, we report that adaptive design methods impacted the conduct of the randomised trial in the majority of studies (52%). For example, 18 (58.1%) trials were impacted by the use of group sequential adaptive design including 6 trials (33.3%) stopped early for futility, 3 trials (16.7%) stopped early for efficacy and 4 trial (22.2%) stopped early for safety. This finding is similar to a systematic review of published and publicly available trials where the most common reason for stopping group sequential trials was futility (19).

Fifth, we found that most common country of the lead author was the United States of America, 20 studies (40%) and the most common funding source was public, 26 studies (52%). This finding was different to a systematic review of published and publicly available trials where 65% of trials reported industry funding (19). Funding for kidney research reached an all-time low in 2013 (4), but this has recently changed in the United States with advocacy from scientific societies such as the American Society of Nephrology, an executive order to reform the US End-Stage Kidney Disease treatment industry was signed in 2020 (28). Adaptive designs are one part of the solution for optimizing the design of clinical trials in dialysis and nephrology and will benefit from the improvement in the funding landscape (27).

Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, we limited our search to one database (Pubmed) due to the scale of studies sourced (209,033 results). This was a deviation from our protocol but necessary to make this full text review feasible. Second, we decided to include randomised clinical trials with RRT outcomes in addition to patients currently on dialysis. This permitted a more comprehensive review of the full landscape of AKI, ESKD and CKD trials, but was a deviation from our original protocol. Third, the denominator for calculating the proportion of adaptive designs in all dialysis RCTs, will include some false negatives i.e., either not RCTs or nor dialysis. We modified the parameters of the machine learning classifier to perform a sensitive search to include as many true positives as possible. We expect this mis-classification bias to be independent of time and bias every year equally and therefore not affect the trend.

Strengths

We developed a novel full text systematic review search strategy. 41 studies (82%) did not report their adaptive design method in the title or abstract and would not be detected by a standard systematic review search methodology. This could introduce a pseudo reporting bias where adaptive design methods are reported in the main paper but not in the abstract. Our novel strategy combined

classical systematic review, machine learning classifiers and a novel full text systematic review. This new method has broad applications in medical evidence synthesis and evidence synthesis in general.

Conclusion

Adaptive design methods improve efficiency of randomised clinical trials in dialysis, but their relative use is decreasing over time. Greater knowledge of adaptive design examples in dialysis will further improve uptake in dialysis randomised clinical trials.

Author contributions

CJ, RM and MOD designed the study. CJ drafted the manuscript. CJ, RM, CR, SC, AS, MOH, MOD reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

None

Disclosures

None

Funding

This work was performed within the Irish Clinical Academic Training (ICAT) Programme, supported by the Wellcome Trust and the Health Research Board (Grant Number 203930/B/16/Z), the Health Service Executive, National Doctors Training and Planning and the Health and Social Care, Research and Development Division, Northern Ireland. The funding source had no role in the study design, analysis or writing of report.

References

1. Bothwell LE, Greene JA, Podolsky SH, Jones DS. Assessing the Gold Standard — Lessons from the History of RCTs. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 Jun 2;374(22):2175–81.
2. Kovesdy CP. Clinical trials in end-stage renal disease—priorities and challenges. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2019 Jul 1;34(7):1084–9.
3. Baigent C, Herrington WG, Coresh J, Landray MJ, Levin A, Perkovic V, et al. Challenges in conducting clinical trials in nephrology: conclusions from a Kidney Disease—Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) Controversies Conference. *Kidney Int*. 2017 Aug 1;92(2):297–305.
4. Bryan L, Ibrahim T, Zent R, Fischer MJ. The Kidney Research Predicament. *J Am Soc Nephrol JASN*. 2014 May;25(5):898–903.
5. Chatzimanouil MKT, Wilkens L, Anders H-J. Quantity and Reporting Quality of Kidney Research. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2019 Jan 1;30(1):13–22.
6. Yaseen M, Hassan W, Awad R, Ashqar B, Neyra J, Heister T, et al. Impact of Recent Clinical Trials on Nephrology Practice: Are We in a Stagnant Era? *Kidney Dis*. 2019;5(2):69–80.
7. Chow S-C, Chang M, Pong A. Statistical Consideration of Adaptive Methods in Clinical Development. *J Biopharm Stat*. 2005 Jul 1;15(4):575–91.
8. Pallmann P, Bedding AW, Choodari-Oskooei B, Dimairo M, Flight L, Hampson LV, et al. Adaptive designs in clinical trials: why use them, and how to run and report them. *BMC Med* [Internet]. 2018 Dec [cited 2020 Apr 23];16(1). Available from: <https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-018-1017-7>
9. Research C for DE and. Adaptive Design Clinical Trials for Drugs and Biologics [Internet]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 2019 [cited 2019 Nov 18]. Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/adaptive-design-clinical-trials-drugs-and-biologics>
10. Novak JE, Inrig JK, Patel UD, Califf RM, Szczech LA. Negative trials in nephrology: what can we learn? *Kidney Int*. 2008 Nov;74(9):1121–7.
11. Chaitman BR. Effects of Ranolazine With Atenolol, Amlodipine, or Diltiazem on Exercise Tolerance and Angina Frequency in Patients With Severe Chronic AnginaA Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA*. 2004 Jan 21;291(3):309.
12. Wanner C, Krane V, März W, Olschewski M, Mann JFE, Ruf G, et al. Atorvastatin in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Undergoing Hemodialysis. *N Engl J Med*. 2005 Jul 21;353(3):238–48.
13. Cheung BM, Lau C-P, Kumana CR. Meta-analysis of large randomized controlled trials to evaluate the impact of statins on cardiovascular outcomes. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2004 May;57(5):640–51.
14. Velenosi TJ, Urquhart BL. Pharmacokinetic considerations in chronic kidney disease and patients requiring dialysis. *Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol*. 2014 Aug;10(8):1131–43.

- 365 15. Pushpakom S, Kolamunnage-Dona R, Taylor C, Foster T, Spowart C, García-Fiñana M, et al.
366 TAILoR (TelmisArtan and InsuLin Resistance in Human Immunodeficiency Virus [HIV]): An
367 Adaptive-design, Dose-ranging Phase IIb Randomized Trial of Telmisartan for the Reduction of
368 Insulin Resistance in HIV-positive Individuals on Combination Antiretroviral Therapy. Clin Infect
369 Dis [Internet]. 2019 Jul 3 [cited 2020 Apr 23]; Available from:
370 <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciz589/5527878>
- 371 16. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, for the PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for
372 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. BMJ. 2009 Jul 21;339(jul21
373 1):b2535–b2535.
- 374 17. Judge C, Murphy RP, Cormican S, Smyth A, O'Halloran M, O'Donnell M. Adaptive design
375 methods in dialysis clinical trials: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open. 2020 Aug
376 27;10(8):e036755.
- 377 18. Beaubien-Souligny W, Kontar L, Blum D, Bouchard J, Denault AY, Wald R. Meta-analysis of
378 Randomized Controlled Trials Using Tool-Assisted Target Weight Adjustments in Chronic
379 Dialysis Patients. Kidney Int Rep. 2019 Jul;S2468024919314044.
- 380 19. Bothwell LE, Avorn J, Khan NF, Kesselheim AS. Adaptive design clinical trials: a review of the
381 literature and ClinicalTrials.gov. BMJ Open. 2018 Feb 1;8(2):e018320.
- 382 20. Hatfield I, Allison A, Flight L, Julious SA, Dimairo M. Adaptive designs undertaken in clinical
383 research: a review of registered clinical trials. Trials [Internet]. 2016 Dec [cited 2020 Aug
384 21];17(1). Available from: <http://www.trialsjournal.com/content/17/1/150>
- 385 21. Higgins JP. Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2). In RoB2
386 Development Group; 2019. Available from:
387 <https://sites.google.com/site/riskofbiastool/welcome/rob-2-0-tool/current-version-of-rob-2>
- 388 22. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane
389 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2011 Oct 18;343(oct18
390 2):d5928–d5928.
- 391 23. Mistry P, Dunn JA, Marshall A. A literature review of applied adaptive design methodology
392 within the field of oncology in randomised controlled trials and a proposed extension to the
393 CONSORT guidelines. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2017 Jul 18;17(1):108.
- 394 24. Clayton JA, Arnegard ME. Taking cardiology clinical trials to the next level: A call to action. Clin
395 Cardiol. 2018 Feb;41(2):179–84.
- 396 25. van Werkhoven CH, Harbarth S, Bonten MJM. Adaptive designs in clinical trials in critically ill
397 patients: principles, advantages and pitfalls. Intensive Care Med. 2019 May 1;45(5):678–82.
- 398 26. Talisa VB, Yende S, Seymour CW, Angus DC. Arguing for Adaptive Clinical Trials in Sepsis. Front
399 Immunol [Internet]. 2018 Jun 28 [cited 2021 Jan 14];9. Available from:
400 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6031704/>
- 401 27. Perkovic V, Craig JC, Chailimpamontree W, Fox CS, Garcia-Garcia G, Benghanem Gharbi M, et
402 al. Action plan for optimizing the design of clinical trials in chronic kidney disease. Kidney Int
403 Suppl. 2017 Oct;7(2):138–44.

28. Zoccali C, Vanholder R, Wagner CA, Anders H-J, Blankestijn PJ, Bruchfeld A, et al. Funding kidney research as a public health priority: challenges and opportunities. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 4 [cited 2021 Jan 14];(gfaa163). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfaa163>
29. Bove T, Zangrillo A, Guarracino F, Alvaro G, Persi B, Maglioni E, et al. Effect of Fenoldopam on Use of Renal Replacement Therapy Among Patients With Acute Kidney Injury After Cardiac Surgery: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2014 Dec 3;312(21):2244.
30. Joannes-Boyau O, Honoré PM, Perez P, Bagshaw SM, Grand H, Canivet J-L, et al. High-volume versus standard-volume haemofiltration for septic shock patients with acute kidney injury (IVOIRE study): a multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Intensive Care Med*. 2013 Sep;39(9):1535–46.
31. Thiele H, Akin I, Sandri M, de Waha-Thiele S, Meyer-Saraei R, Fuernau G, et al. One-Year Outcomes after PCI Strategies in Cardiogenic Shock. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 Nov;379(18):1699–710.
32. Thiele H, Desch S, Piek JJ, Stepinska J, Oldroyd K, Serpytis P, et al. Multivessel versus culprit lesion only percutaneous revascularization plus potential staged revascularization in patients with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: Design and rationale of CULPRIT-SHOCK trial. *Am Heart J*. 2016 Feb;172:160–9.
33. Mehta RH, Leimberger JD, van Diepen S, Meza J, Wang A, Jankowich R, et al. Levosimendan in Patients with Left Ventricular Dysfunction Undergoing Cardiac Surgery. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 May 25;376(21):2032–42.
34. Mehta RH, Van Diepen S, Meza J, Bokesch P, Leimberger JD, Tourt-Uhlig S, et al. Levosimendan in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction undergoing cardiac surgery on cardiopulmonary bypass: Rationale and study design of the Levosimendan in Patients with Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction Undergoing Cardiac Surgery Requiring Cardiopulmonary Bypass (LEVO-CTS) trial. *Am Heart J*. 2016 Dec;182:62–71.
35. Intensity of Renal Support in Critically Ill Patients with Acute Kidney Injury. *N Engl J Med*. 2008 Jul 3;359(1):7–20.
36. Sharma S, Kelly YP, Palevsky PM, Waikar SS. Intensity of Renal Replacement Therapy and Duration of Mechanical Ventilation. *Chest*. 2020 Oct;158(4):1473–81.
37. Ejaz AA, Martin TD, Johnson RJ, Winterstein AG, Klodell CT, Hess PJ, et al. Prophylactic nesiritide does not prevent dialysis or all-cause mortality in patients undergoing high-risk cardiac surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2009 Oct;138(4):959–64.
38. Acker CG, Singh AR, Flick RP, Bernardini J, Greenberg A, Johnson JP. A trial of thyroxine in acute renal failure. *Kidney Int*. 2000 Jan;57(1):293–8.
39. Gaudry S, Hajage D, Schortgen F, Martin-Lefevre L, Pons B, Boulet E, et al. Initiation Strategies for Renal-Replacement Therapy in the Intensive Care Unit. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 Jul 14;375(2):122–33.
40. Gaudry S, Hajage D, Schortgen F, Martin-Lefevre L, Tubach F, Pons B, et al. Comparison of two strategies for initiating renal replacement therapy in the intensive care unit: study protocol for

- 444 a randomized controlled trial (AKIKI). *Trials* [Internet]. 2015 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];16(1).
445 Available from: <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-015-0718-x>
- 446 41. Weisbord SD, Gallagher M, Jneid H, Garcia S, Cass A, Thwin S-S, et al. Outcomes after
447 Angiography with Sodium Bicarbonate and Acetylcysteine. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 Feb
448 15;378(7):603–14.
- 449 42. Schanz M, Wasser C, Allgaeuer S, Schricker S, Dippon J, Alscher MD, et al. Urinary [TIMP-
450 2]-[IGFBP7]-guided randomized controlled intervention trial to prevent acute kidney injury in
451 the emergency department. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2019 Nov 1;34(11):1902–9.
- 452 43. Zarbock A, Küllmar M, Kindgen-Milles D, Wempe C, Gerss J, Brandenburger T, et al. Effect of
453 Regional Citrate Anticoagulation vs Systemic Heparin Anticoagulation During Continuous
454 Kidney Replacement Therapy on Dialysis Filter Life Span and Mortality Among Critically Ill
455 Patients With Acute Kidney Injury: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2020 Oct
456 27;324(16):1629.
- 457 44. Meersch M, Küllmar M, Wempe C, Kindgen-Milles D, Kluge S, Slowinski T, et al. Regional citrate
458 versus systemic heparin anticoagulation for continuous renal replacement therapy in critically
459 ill patients with acute kidney injury (RICH) trial: study protocol for a multicentre, randomised
460 controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Jan;9(1):e024411.
- 461 45. Combes A, Bréchet N, Amour J, Cozic N, Lebreton G, Guidon C, et al. Early High-Volume
462 Hemofiltration versus Standard Care for Post–Cardiac Surgery Shock. The HEROICS Study. *Am J*
463 *Respir Crit Care Med*. 2015 Nov 15;192(10):1179–90.
- 464 46. Robinson S, Zincuk A, Larsen UL, Ekstrøm C, Toft P. A feasible strategy for preventing blood
465 clots in critically ill patients with acute kidney injury (FBI): study protocol for a randomized
466 controlled trial. *Trials* [Internet]. 2014 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];15(1). Available from:
467 <https://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1745-6215-15-226>
- 468 47. Zarbock A, Kellum JA, Schmidt C, Van Aken H, Wempe C, Pavenstädt H, et al. Effect of Early vs
469 Delayed Initiation of Renal Replacement Therapy on Mortality in Critically Ill Patients With
470 Acute Kidney Injury: The ELAIN Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2016 May 24;315(20):2190.
- 471 48. Zarbock A, Gerß J, Van Aken H, Boanta A, Kellum JA, Meersch M. Early versus late initiation of
472 renal replacement therapy in critically ill patients with acute kidney injury (The ELAIN-Trial):
473 study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* [Internet]. 2016 Dec [cited 2020 Oct
474 27];17(1). Available from: <http://www.trialsjournal.com/content/17/1/148>
- 475 49. Dember LM, Beck GJ, Allon M, Delmez JA, Dixon BS, Greenberg A, et al. Effect of Clopidogrel on
476 Early Failure of Arteriovenous Fistulas for Hemodialysis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA*.
477 2008 May 14;299(18):2164.
- 478 50. Irish AB, Viecelli AK, Hawley CM, Hooi L-S, Pascoe EM, Paul-Brent P-A, et al. Effect of Fish Oil
479 Supplementation and Aspirin Use on Arteriovenous Fistula Failure in Patients Requiring
480 Hemodialysis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017 Feb 1;177(2):184.
- 481 51. Viecelli AK, Polkinghorne KR, Pascoe EM, Paul-Brent P-A, Hawley CM, Badve SV, et al. Fish oil
482 and aspirin effects on arteriovenous fistula function: Secondary outcomes of the randomised
483 omega-3 fatty acids (Fish oils) and Aspirin in Vascular access Outcomes in REEnal Disease
484 (FAVOURED) trial. Puebla I, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Mar 26;14(3):e0213274.

- 485 52. Chapman WC, Singla N, Genyk Y, McNeil JW, Renkens KL, Reynolds TC, et al. A Phase 3,
486 Randomized, Double-Blind Comparative Study of the Efficacy and Safety of Topical
487 Recombinant Human Thrombin and Bovine Thrombin in Surgical Hemostasis. *J Am Coll Surg*.
488 2007 Aug;205(2):256–65.
- 489 53. Ismail-Beigi F, Craven T, Banerji MA, Basile J, Calles J, Cohen RM, et al. Effect of intensive
490 treatment of hyperglycaemia on microvascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: an analysis of the
491 ACCORD randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2010 Aug;376(9739):419–30.
- 492 54. Freedman BI, Wuerth J-P, Cartwright K, Bain RP, Dippe S, Hershon K, et al. Design and Baseline
493 Characteristics for the Aminoguanidine Clinical Trial in Overt Type 2 Diabetic Nephropathy
494 (ACTION II). *Control Clin Trials*. 1999 Oct;20(5):493–510.
- 495 55. Johnson DW, Badve SV, Pascoe EM, Beller E, Cass A, Clark C, et al. Antibacterial honey for the
496 prevention of peritoneal-dialysis-related infections (HONEYPOT): a randomised trial. *Lancet*
497 *Infect Dis*. 2014 Jan;14(1):23–30.
- 498 56. Pascoe EM, Lo S, Scaria A, Badve SV, Beller EM, Cass A, et al. The Honeypot Randomized
499 Controlled Trial Statistical Analysis Plan. *Perit Dial Int J Int Soc Perit Dial*. 2013 Jul;33(4):426–35.
- 500 57. Besarab A, Bolton WK, Browne JK, Egrie JC, Nissenson AR, Okamoto DM, et al. The Effects of
501 Normal as Compared with Low Hematocrit Values in Patients with Cardiac Disease Who Are
502 Receiving Hemodialysis and Epoetin. *N Engl J Med*. 1998 Aug 27;339(9):584–90.
- 503 58. Dixon BS, Beck GJ, Vazquez MA, Greenberg A, Delmez JA, Allon M, et al. Effect of Dipyridamole
504 plus Aspirin on Hemodialysis Graft Patency. *N Engl J Med*. 2009 May 21;360(21):2191–201.
- 505 59. Torres VE, Abebe KZ, Chapman AB, Schrier RW, Braun WE, Steinman TI, et al. Angiotensin
506 Blockade in Late Autosomal Dominant Polycystic Kidney Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2014 Dec
507 11;371(24):2267–76.
- 508 60. Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, Bompoint S, Heerspink HJL, Charytan DM, et al. Canagliflozin
509 and Renal Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes and Nephropathy. *N Engl J Med*. 2019 Jun
510 13;380(24):2295–306.
- 511 61. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, Mosenzon O, Kato ET, Cahn A, et al. Dapagliflozin and
512 Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med*. 2019 Jan 24;380(4):347–57.
- 513 62. Knoll GA, Fergusson D, Chassé M, Hebert P, Wells G, Tibbles LA, et al. Ramipril versus placebo
514 in kidney transplant patients with proteinuria: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised
515 controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2016 Apr;4(4):318–26.
- 516 63. Knoll GA, Cantarovitch M, Cole E, Gill J, Gourishankar S, Holland D, et al. The Canadian ACE-
517 inhibitor trial to improve renal outcomes and patient survival in kidney transplantation study
518 design. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2007 Aug 17;23(1):354–8.
- 519 64. Blankestijn PJ, Fischer KI, Barth C, Cromm K, Canaud B, Davenport A, et al. Benefits and harms
520 of high-dose haemodiafiltration versus high-flux haemodialysis: the comparison of high-dose
521 haemodiafiltration with high-flux haemodialysis (CONVINCE) trial protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2020
522 Feb;10(2):e033228.

- 523 65. Fellström BC, Jardine AG, Schmieder RE, Holdaas H, Bannister K, Beutler J, et al. Rosuvastatin
524 and Cardiovascular Events in Patients Undergoing Hemodialysis. *N Engl J Med*. 2009 Apr
525 2;360(14):1395–407.
- 526 66. Fellström B, Holdaas H, Jardine AG, Rose H, Schmieder R, Wilpshaar W, et al. Effect of
527 Rosuvastatin on Outcomes in Chronic Haemodialysis Patients: Baseline Data from the AURORA
528 Study. *Kidney Blood Press Res*. 2007;30(5):314–22.
- 529 67. Grooteman MPC, van den Dorpel MA, Bots ML, Penne EL, van der Weerd NC, Mazairac AHA, et
530 al. Effect of Online Hemodiafiltration on All-Cause Mortality and Cardiovascular Outcomes. *J*
531 *Am Soc Nephrol*. 2012 Jun;23(6):1087–96.
- 532 68. the CONTRAST study group, Penne EL, Blankestijn PJ, Bots ML, van den Dorpel MA, Grooteman
533 MP, et al. Effect of increased convective clearance by on-line hemodiafiltration on all cause and
534 cardiovascular mortality in chronic hemodialysis patients – the Dutch CONvective TRANsport
535 STudy (CONTRAST): rationale and design of a randomised controlled trial [ISRCTN38365125].
536 *Curr Control Trials Cardiovasc Med [Internet]*. 2005 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];6(1). Available
537 from: <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1468-6708-6-8>
- 538 69. Karunanithy N, Mesa IR, Dorling A, Calder F, Katsanos K, Semik V, et al. Paclitaxel-coated
539 balloon fistuloplasty versus plain balloon fistuloplasty only to preserve the patency of
540 arteriovenous fistulae used for haemodialysis (PAVE): study protocol for a randomised
541 controlled trial. *Trials [Internet]*. 2016 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];17(1). Available from:
542 <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-016-1372-7>
- 543 70. Kopple JD, Cheung AK, Christiansen JS, Djurhuus CB, El Nahas M, Feldt-Rasmussen B, et al.
544 OPPORTUNITY®: a large-scale randomized clinical trial of growth hormone in hemodialysis
545 patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2011 Dec 1;26(12):4095–103.
- 546 71. Kopple JD, Cheung AK, Christiansen JS, Djurhuus CB, El Nahas M, Feldt-Rasmussen B, et al.
547 OPPORTUNITY™: A Randomized Clinical Trial of Growth Hormone on Outcome in Hemodialysis
548 Patients. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2008 Nov;3(6):1741–51.
- 549 72. Kwiatkowski DM, Goldstein SL, Cooper DS, Nelson DP, Morales DLS, Krawczeski CD. Peritoneal
550 Dialysis vs Furosemide for Prevention of Fluid Overload in Infants After Cardiac Surgery: A
551 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017 Apr 1;171(4):357.
- 552 73. Lemkes JS, Janssens GN, van der Hoeven NW, Jewbali LSD, Dubois EA, Meuwissen M, et al.
553 Coronary Angiography after Cardiac Arrest without ST-Segment Elevation. *N Engl J Med*. 2019
554 Apr 11;380(15):1397–407.
- 555 74. Lemkes JS, Janssens GN, Straaten HMO, Elbers PW, van der Hoeven NW, Tijssen JGP, et al.
556 Coronary angiography after cardiac arrest: Rationale and design of the COACT trial. *Am Heart J*.
557 2016 Oct;180:39–45.
- 558 75. Douglas IS, Alapat PM, Corl KA, Exline MC, Forni LG, Holder AL, et al. Fluid Response Evaluation
559 in Sepsis Hypotension and Shock. *Chest*. 2020 Oct;158(4):1431–45.
- 560 76. Vinsonneau C, Camus C, Combes A, Costa de Beauregard MA, Klouche K, Boulain T, et al.
561 Continuous venovenous haemodiafiltration versus intermittent haemodialysis for acute renal
562 failure in patients with multiple-organ dysfunction syndrome: a multicentre randomised trial.
563 *The Lancet*. 2006 Jul;368(9533):379–85.

- 564 77. Pettilä V, Merz T, Wilkman E, Perner A, Karlsson S, Lange T, et al. Targeted tissue perfusion
565 versus macrocirculation-guided standard care in patients with septic shock (TARTARE-2S):
566 study protocol and statistical analysis plan for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* [Internet].
567 2016 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];17(1). Available from:
568 <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-016-1515-x>
- 569 78. The ANDROMEDA-SHOCK Study Investigators, Hernández G, Cavalcanti AB, Ospina-Tascón G,
570 Zampieri FG, Dubin A, et al. Early goal-directed therapy using a physiological holistic view: the
571 ANDROMEDA-SHOCK—a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Intensive Care* [Internet]. 2018 Dec
572 [cited 2020 Oct 27];8(1). Available from:
573 <https://annalsofintensivecare.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s13613-018-0398-2>
- 574 79. Tumlin JA, Galphin CM, Tolwani AJ, Chan MR, Vijayan A, Finkel K, et al. A Multi-Center,
575 Randomized, Controlled, Pivotal Study to Assess the Safety and Efficacy of a Selective
576 Cytopheretic Device in Patients with Acute Kidney Injury. Cravedi P, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2015
577 Aug 5;10(8):e0132482.
- 578 80. Riley AA, Jefferies JL, Nelson DP, Bennett MR, Blinder JJ, Ma Q, et al. Peritoneal Dialysis does
579 not Adversely Affect Kidney Function Recovery after Congenital Heart Surgery. *Int J Artif*
580 *Organs*. 2014 Jan;37(1):39–47.
- 581 81. Hayashi T, Maruyama S, Nangaku M, Narita I, Hirakata H, Tanabe K, et al. Darbepoetin Alfa in
582 Patients with Advanced CKD without Diabetes: Randomized, Controlled Trial. *Clin J Am Soc*
583 *Nephrol*. 2020 May 7;15(5):608–15.
- 584 82. Imai E, Maruyama S, Nangaku M, Hirakata H, Hayashi T, Narita I, et al. Rationale and study
585 design of a randomized controlled trial to assess the effects of maintaining hemoglobin levels
586 using darbepoetin alfa on prevention of development of end-stage kidney disease in non-
587 diabetic CKD patients (PREDICT Trial). *Clin Exp Nephrol*. 2016 Feb;20(1):71–6.
- 588 83. Marsen TA, Beer J, Mann H. Intradialytic parenteral nutrition in maintenance hemodialysis
589 patients suffering from protein-energy wasting. Results of a multicenter, open, prospective,
590 randomized trial. *Clin Nutr*. 2017 Feb;36(1):107–17.
- 591 84. Fishbane S, Jamal A, Munera C, Wen W, Menzaghi F. A Phase 3 Trial of Difelikefalin in
592 Hemodialysis Patients with Pruritus. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jan 16;382(3):222–32.
- 593 85. Kammerer T, Brettner F, Hilferink S, Hulde N, Klug F, Pagel J-I, et al. No Differences in Renal
594 Function between Balanced 6% Hydroxyethyl Starch (130/0.4) and 5% Albumin for Volume
595 Replacement Therapy in Patients Undergoing Cystectomy. *Anesthesiology*. 2018 Jan
596 1;128(1):67–78.
- 597 86. Kammerer T, Klug F, Schwarz M, Hilferink S, Zwissler B, von Dossow V, et al. Comparison of 6 %
598 hydroxyethyl starch and 5 % albumin for volume replacement therapy in patients undergoing
599 cystectomy (CHART): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* [Internet]. 2015
600 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];16(1). Available from:
601 <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-015-0866-z>
- 602 87. Kratochwill K, Boehm M, Herzog R, Gruber K, Lichtenauer AM, Kuster L, et al. Addition of
603 Alanyl-Glutamine to Dialysis Fluid Restores Peritoneal Cellular Stress Responses – A First-In-
604 Man Trial. Eller K, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2016 Oct 21;11(10):e0165045.

- 605 88. Fujimoto K, Adachi H, Yamazaki K, Nomura K, Saito A, Matsumoto Y, et al. Comparison of the
606 pain-reducing effects of EMLA cream and of lidocaine tape during arteriovenous fistula
607 puncture in patients undergoing hemodialysis: A multi-center, open-label, randomized
608 crossover trial. Wu P-H, editor. PLOS ONE. 2020 Mar 25;15(3):e0230372.
- 609 89. Himmelfarb J, Chertow GM, McCullough PA, Mesana T, Shaw AD, Sundt TM, et al.
610 Perioperative THR-184 and AKI after Cardiac Surgery. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2018 Feb;29(2):670–9.
- 611 90. Hosgood SA, Saeb-Parsy K, Wilson C, Callaghan C, Collett D, Nicholson ML. Protocol of a
612 randomised controlled, open-label trial of ex vivo normothermic perfusion versus static cold
613 storage in donation after circulatory death renal transplantation. BMJ Open. 2017
614 Jan;7(1):e012237.
- 615 91. Bestle MH, Clausen NE, Søre-Jensen P, Kristiansen KT, Lange T, Johansson PI, et al. Efficacy and
616 safety of iloprost in patients with septic shock-induced endotheliopathy—Protocol for the
617 multicenter randomized, placebo-controlled, blinded, investigator-initiated trial. Acta
618 Anaesthesiol Scand. 2020 May;64(5):705–11.
- 619 92. Pickkers P, Mehta RL, Murray PT, Joannidis M, Molitoris BA, Kellum JA, et al. Effect of Human
620 Recombinant Alkaline Phosphatase on 7-Day Creatinine Clearance in Patients With Sepsis-
621 Associated Acute Kidney Injury: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2018 Nov 20;320(19):1998.
- 622 93. E P, RL M, PT M, J H, M J, JA K, et al. Study protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled
623 trial: Safety, Tolerability, efficacy and quality of life Of a human recombinant alkaline
624 Phosphatase in patients with sepsis-associated Acute Kidney Injury (STOP-AKI). BMJ Open.
625 2016;6(9):e012371.
- 626 94. Kassimatis T, Qasem A, Douiri A, Ryan EG, Rebollo-Mesa I, Nichols LL, et al. A double-blind
627 randomised controlled investigation into the efficacy of Mirococept (APT070) for preventing
628 ischaemia reperfusion injury in the kidney allograft (EMPIRIKAL): study protocol for a
629 randomised controlled trial. Trials [Internet]. 2017 Dec [cited 2020 Oct 27];18(1). Available
630 from: <http://trialsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13063-017-1972-x>

631

632

633 Tables

634 Table 1 – Groups Sequential Trials in Dialysis Randomized Clinical Trials

<u>Study Name, Year</u>	<u>Stopping Rule</u>	<u>Impact of Adaptive design</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Intervention</u>	<u>Primary Outcome</u>	<u>Nature of primary outcome</u>	<u>Dialysis Modality</u>	<u>Sample Size of Study</u>	<u>Country of lead investigator</u>	<u>Funder</u>	<u>Funder Details</u>	<u>Study Phase</u>
Acute Kidney Injury												
FENO HSR, 2014, (29)	Reboussin et al and Lan-DeMets Stopping Rule	Stopped due to futility after the 3rd interim analysis.	Critically ill cardiac surgery patients with acute kidney injury	Fenoldopam	Rate of renal replacement therapy.	Hard clinical	Any RRT	667	Italy	Public	Grant from the Italian Ministry of Health	Phase III
IVOIRE, 2013, (30)	Not reported	One interim analysis performed as planned, trial d/c due to difficulty recruiting.	Critically ill patients with septic shock and AKI.	High-volume HF (HVHF)	28-day mortality	Hard clinical	HF	140	France	Public	Grant from the French Health Ministry	Phase III
CULPRIT-SHOCK, 2018, (31,32)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	NA	Patients with cardiogenic shock complicating acute myocardial infarction.	Culprit lesion only Primary Coronary Intervention.	30-day mortality or AKI requiring RRT.	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	706	Germany	Public	EU; German Heart Research Foundation; German Cardiac Society.	Phase III
LEVO-CTS, 2017, (33,34)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	Not reported.	Patients with a EF<35% who were undergoing cardiac surgery with the use of cardiopulmonary bypass.	Intravenous levosimendan	Composite of 30-day mortality, RRT, peri operative MI, or mechanical cardiac assist device through day 5.	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	882	USA	Private	Tenax Therapeutics	Phase III
ATN, 2008, (35,36)	Haybittle-Peto rule	Two interim analyses performed as planned, trial continued per protocol.	Critically ill patients with acute kidney injury and failure of at least one nonrenal organ or sepsis.	Intensive or less intensive renal-replacement therapy.	Death from any cause by day 60	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	1124	USA	Public	Cooperative Studies Program VA and by the NIDDKD.	Phase III
Ejaz et al., 2009, (37)	Z-boundary	The study was stopped after completion of stage I.	Patients undergoing high-risk cardiac surgery.	Nesiritide	Dialysis and/or all-cause mortality within 21 days.	Hard clinical	HD	94	USA	Private	Scios, Inc.	Phase III

Acker et al., 2000, (38)	Pocock	Significant difference in mortality was observed at first analysis and trial was terminated.	Patients with acute renal failure.	Thyroxine	Percentage requiring dialysis.	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	59	USA	Not reported	Not reported	Phase III
AKIKI, 2016, (39,40)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	Two interim analysis before final analysis. No change to trial.	Patients with severe acute kidney injury who required mechanical ventilation, catecholamine infusion, or both.	Early or a delayed strategy of renal replacement therapy.	Overall survival at day 60.	Hard clinical	HD	620	France	Public	Funded by the French Ministry of Health	Phase III
PRESERVE, 2018, (41)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	The sponsor stopped the trial after a prespecified interim analysis.	Patients at high risk for renal complications who were scheduled for angiography.	1.26% sodium bicarbonate or intravenous 0.9% sodium chloride and 5 days of oral acetylcysteine or oral placebo.	Composite of death, the need for dialysis, or a persistent increase of at least 50% from baseline in the serum creatinine level at 90 days.	Hard clinical	HD	5177	USA	Public	U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Research and Development and the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia.	Phase III
Schanz et al., 2019, (42)	Jennison and Turnbull	The study was stopped prematurely after interim analysis.	Patients at high risk for AKI.	Screened with urinary [TIMP-2][GFBP7]	Incidence of moderate to severe AKI within the first day after admission.	Surrogate	HD	100	Germany	Public	Robert-Bosch-Foundation	Phase III
RICH, 2020, (43,44)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	The interim analysis showed that the preplanned end of the trial according to the protocol was reached before the complete number of patients was recruited.	Critically ill Patients With Acute Kidney Injury	Regional citrate anticoagulation, compared with systemic heparin anticoagulation.	Filter life span and 90-day mortality	Hard clinical	HDF	596	Germany	Public	German Research Foundation	Phase III
HEROICS, 2015, (45)	Triangular test (Whitehead 1978)	At the third sequential interim analysis the trial was stopped for futility.	Patients with severe shock requiring high-dose catecholamines 3-24 h postcardiac surgery.	Early high volume haemofiltration	30-day mortality	Hard clinical	HF/HDF	224	France	Public and Private	French Ministry of Health and Hospal-Gambro.	Phase III
FBI, 2014, (46) Protocol	Fleming-Harrington (O'Brien-Fleming boundary)	NA	Critically ill patients with acute kidney injury receiving continuous renal replacement therapy.	Enoxaparin	Occurrence of venous thromboembolism.	Hard clinical	HD/HDF/HF	266	Denmark	Public	Danish society of anesthesiology & intensive medicine's research initiative	Phase III

ELAIN-Trial, 2016, (47,48)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	One interim analysis was performed after half of the total number of deaths across both treatment groups.	Critically ill patients with AKI and plasma neutrophil gelatinase "associated lipocalin level higher than 150 ng/mL.	Early or delayed initiation of RRT.	Mortality at 90 days	Hard clinical	HD/HDF/HF	231	Germany	Private	Else-Kröner Fresenius Stiftung	Phase III
End Stage Kidney Disease												
DAC, 2008, (49)	Lan-DeMets (O'Brien-Fleming boundary)	NA	Participants with ESKD and undergoing new fistula creation.	Clopidogrel	Fistula thrombosis	Surrogate	HD	877	USA	Public	National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases of the National Institutes of Health.	Phase III
FAVOURED, 2017, (50,51)	Haybittle-Peto rule	Early cessation of recruitment, only 1st interim analysis was performed.	Participants with stage 4 or 5 chronic kidney disease after arteriovenous fistula creation.	Fish oil supplementation	Fistula failure, a composite of fistula thrombosis and/or abandonment and/or cannulation failure, at 12 months	Hard clinical	HD	567	Australia	Public and Private	Grants from National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, Amgen Australia Pty Ltd and Mylan EPD.	Phase III
Chapman et al., 2007, (52)	Constrained stopping boundaries	Two interim analysis, trial continued.	Liver resection, spine, peripheral arterial bypass, and dialysis access surgery.	Recombinant human thrombin (rhThrombin)	Time to hemostasis	Surrogate	HD	76	USA	Private	ZymoGenetics, Inc	Phase III
ACCORD, 2010, (53)	Lan-DeMets	Intensive therapy was stopped before study end due to increased mortality.	Volunteers with established T2DM, HbA1c levels $\geq 7.5\%$ and CVD or two or more CVD risk factors	Target HbA1c of $<6.0\%$.	Dialysis or renal transplantation, or serum creatinine >291.7 micromol/L, or retinal photocoagulation or vitrectomy.	Hard clinical	HD	10251	USA	Public	National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute.	Phase III
ACTION II, 1999, (54), Protocol	Lan-DeMets	ACTION II terminated enrollment	Type 2 diabetic patients with renal disease.	Aminoguanidine	Doubling of serum creatinine concentration.	Surrogate	HD	900	USA	Not reported	Not reported	Phase III
HONEYPOT, 2014, (55,56)	Haybittle-Peto rule	Stopping rule for efficacy was not met, and the study was completed as per protocol	Participants undergoing PD	Daily topical exit-site application of antibacterial honey	Time to first infection related to PD	Hard clinical	PD	371	Australia	Public and Private	Baxter Healthcare, Queensland Government, Comvita, and Gambro.	Phase III

Besarab et al., 1998, (57)	Lan-DeMets (O'Brien-Fleming boundary)	The trial was stopped at the third interim analysis.	Patients with clinical evidence of congestive heart failure or ischemic heart disease who were undergoing hemodialysis.	Epoetin and target hematocrit.	Length of time to death or a first nonfatal myocardial infarction.	Hard clinical	HD	1233	USA	Private	Amgen	Phase III
DAC, 2009, (58)	Lan-DeMets (Wang-Tsiatis boundary)	Five planned interim analyses were performed before the final analysis. No change to trial.	Participants with placement of a new arteriovenous graft.	Extended-release dipyridamole plus aspirin	Loss of primary unassisted patency	Hard clinical	HD	649	USA	Public and Private	NIDDKD, NIH, and Boehringer Ingelheim.	Phase III
HALT-PKD, 2014, (59)	Lan-DeMets (O'Brien-Fleming boundary)	The study was extended due to a lower-than-expected number of end points.	Patients with autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease.	Lisinopril and telmisartan	Time to death, end-stage renal disease, or a 50% reduction from the baseline estimated GFR.	Hard clinical	HD	486	USA	Public	NIDDKD	Phase III
CREDENCE, 2019, (60)	Alpha spending function	The prespecified efficacy criteria for early cessation had been achieved and recommended that the trial be stopped.	Patients with type 2 diabetes and albuminuric chronic kidney disease.	Canagliflozin	Composite of end-stage kidney disease (dialysis, transplantation, sustained GFR <15), a doubling of the serum creatinine level, or death from renal or cardiovascular causes.	Both	HD	4401	Australia	Private	Janssen Research and Development	Phase III
DECLARE "TIMI 58, 2019, (61)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	NA	Patients with type 2 diabetes who had or were at risk for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease.	Dapagliflozin	Cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or ischemic stroke or hospitalization for heart failure.	Hard clinical	HD	17160	USA	Private	AstraZeneca	Phase III
Knoll et al., 2015, (62, 63)	O'Brien-Fleming boundary	NA	Kidney transplant patients with proteinuria and an estimated GFR 20-55 ml/min/1.73 m ² .	Ramipril	Doubling of serum creatinine, end stage renal disease or death.	Both	HD	528	Canada	Public	Canadian Institutes of Health Research.	Phase III
CONVINCE, 2020, (64), Protocol	Haybittle-Peto rule	Trial not complete.	Patients with ESKD treated with HD.	High-dose HDF versus conventional high-flux HD.	All-cause mortality	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	1800	The Netherlands	Public	European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme.	Phase III

AURORA, 2009, (65, 66)	Event-driven	Continuation of the study was recommended by the data and safety monitoring board.	Patients who were undergoing maintenance hemodialysis.	Rosuvastatin	Death from cardiovascular causes, nonfatal myocardial infarction, or nonfatal stroke	Hard clinical	HD	2776	Sweden	Private	AstraZeneca	Phase III
CONTRAST, 2012, (67, 68)	Double triangular test (Whitehead 2007)	The board recommended to stop the trial because enough evidence was provided for futility.	Patients with ESRD.	Online hemodiafiltration.	All-cause mortality	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	714	The Netherlands	Public and Private	Dutch Kidney Foundation, Fresenius Medical Care, and Gambro Lundia.	Phase III
PAVE, 2016, (69), Protocol	Lan-DeMets (O'Brien-Fleming boundary)	Trial not complete.	Patients with a native arteriovenous fistula.	Paclitaxel-coated balloons	Time to end of target lesion primary patency.	Surrogate	HD	211	United Kingdom	Public	National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) EME programme	Phase III
OPPORTUNITY, 2011, (70, 71)	Event-driven	NA	Adult maintenance hemodialysis patients.	Recombinant human growth hormone.	Mortality	Hard clinical	HD	695	USA	Private	Novo Nordisk	Phase III

Figure 1 Legend – HD – Haemodialysis, HDF – Haemodiafiltration, HF – Haemofiltration, PD – Peritoneal Dialysis

637 Table 2 – Sample-Size Re-estimation in Dialysis Randomized Clinical Trials

<u>Study Name, Year</u>	<u>Impact of Adaptive design</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Intervention</u>	<u>Primary Outcome</u>	<u>Nature of primary outcome</u>	<u>Dialysis Modality</u>	<u>Sample Size of Study</u>	<u>Country of lead investigator</u>	<u>Funder</u>	<u>Funder Details</u>	<u>Study Phase</u>
Sample-Size Re-estimation											
Acute Kidney Injury											
Kwiatkowski et al., 2017, (72)	Not reported.	Infants after congenital heart surgery.	PD	Negative Fluid Balance	Surrogate	PD	73	USA	Public	American Heart Association "Great Rivers Affiliate and internal funding from Cincinnati Childrens Hospital Medical Center.	Phase II
COACT, 2019, (73,74)	After this interim analysis, the data and safety monitoring committee advised that the sample size not be increased.	Post "cardiac arrest patients without signs of STEMI.	Immediate coronary angiography and percutaneous coronary intervention.	90-day mortality	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	552	The Netherlands	Public	Netherlands Heart Institute.	Phase III
FRESH, 2020, (75)	NA	Patients presenting to the ED with sepsis or septic shock and anticipated ICU admission.	Dynamic assessment of fluid responsiveness (passive leg raise).	Difference in positive fluid balance at 72 hours or ICU discharge.	Surrogate	HD/HDF/HF	124	USA	Private	Cheetah Medical	Phase III
Hemodiafe, 2006, (76)	The sample size was adjusted to include 180 patients per group.	Critically ill patients with acute renal failure as part of multiple-organ dysfunction syndrome.	Intermittent HD versus continuous venovenous HDF	60-day survival	Hard clinical	HD/HDF	360	France	Public	Supported by the Societe de Reanimation de Langue Francaise, with a grant from the Delegation a la Recherche Clinique de l'Assistance Publique-Hopitaux de Paris (Projet Hospitalier de Recherche Clinique) and Hospal Inc (Lyon, France).	Phase III

TARTARE-2S, 2016, (77), Protocol	Trial not complete.	Patients with septic shock.	Targeted tissue perfusion versus macrocirculation-guided standard care	Alive at 30 days with normal arterial blood lactate and without any inotropic or vasopressor agent.	Hard clinical	HD/HDF/HF	200	Switzerland	Public	Sigrid Juselius Foundation, Instrumentarium Foundation, and Helsinki University Hospital	Phase III
ANDROMEDA-SHOCK, 2018, (78), Protocol	Trial not complete.	Patients with septic shock.	Peripheral perfusion 'targeted resuscitation	28 'day mortality	Hard clinical	HD/HDF/HF	422	Chile	Public	Departamento de Medicina Intensiva, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.	Phase III
SCD, 2015, (79)	The study was terminated by the sponsor at the interim analysis because the SCD treatment was often outside the recommended iCa range, and therefore, resulted in ineffective therapy	ICU patients with AKI	Selective CytoPheretic Device	60-day mortality	Hard clinical	HDF	134	USA	Private	CytoPherx, Inc.	Phase III
Riley et al., 2014, (80)	Data from the initial ten randomized patients demonstrated >50% difference in urine output, revealing adequate power would be achieved with only 20 randomized patients.	Infants <90 days old with congenital heart disease who underwent bypass surgery and were post-operatively treated with CPD.	Continue 24 h more CPD or discontinue CPD.	Urine output (ml/kg per h)	Surrogate	PD	20	USA	Public	Baylor College of Medicine and Cincinnati Children 's Hospital Medical Center.	Phase II
End Stage Kidney Disease											
PREDICT, 2020, (81, 82)	The sample size was amended from 220 to 238 for each group.	Patients with CKD without diabetes.	High and low hemoglobin groups (Darbepoetin alfa)	Kidney composite end point (starting maintenance dialysis, kidney transplantation, eGFR<6 ml/min per 1.73 m ² , and 50% reduction in eGFR).	Both	HD	491	Japan	Private	Kyowa Hakko Kirin, Otsuka, Dainippon Sumitomo, and Mochida.	Phase III
IDPN-Trial, 2017, (83)	Sample size was increased. Primary outcome was significant.	Maintenance hemodialysis patients suffering from Protein-energy wasting (PEW).	Intradialytic parenteral nutrition (IDPN)	Prealbumin	Surrogate	HD	107	Germany	Private	Fresenius Kabi Germany GmbH, Bad Homburg, Germany.	Phase IV

KALM-1, 2019, (84)	Not reported	Patients undergoing hemodialysis who had moderate-to-severe pruritus.	Intravenous difelikefalin	24-hour Worst Itching Intensity Numerical Rating Scale (WI-NRS)	Surrogate	HD	378	USA	Private	Cara Therapeutics	Phase III
CHART, 2018, (85,86)	NA	Urologic patients undergoing elective cystectomy.	Albumin 5% or balanced hydroxyethyl starch 6%	Ratio of serum cystatin C between the last visit at day 90 and the first preoperative visit.	Surrogate	HD	100	Germany	Private	CSL Behring GmbH	Phase III
Kratochwill et al., 2016, (87)	Led to premature termination of patient recruitment	Stable PD outpatients.	Alanyl-glutamine addition to glucose-based PD Fluid.	Heat-shock protein 72 expression	Surrogate	PD	20	Austria	Public	ZIT - Technology Agency of the City of Vienna and FFG - the Austrian Research Promotion Agency	Phase II
Fujimoto et al., 2020, (88)	The sample size was calculated by the intermediate analysis of the first 30 samples enrolled.	Patients undergoing maintenance hemodialysis thrice/week.	Lidocaine/prilocaine cream (EMLA).	Puncture pain relief, which was measured using a 100-mm visual analog scale.	Surrogate	HD	66	Taiwan	Public	Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.	Phase II

Figure 2 Legend – HD – Haemodialysis, HDF – Haemodiafiltration, HF – Haemofiltration, PD – Peritoneal Dialysis

642 Table 3 – Seamless Design/Adaptive Dose-Escalation in Dialysis Randomized Clinical Trials

<u>Study Name, Year</u>	<u>Impact of Adaptive design</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Intervention</u>	<u>Primary Outcome</u>	<u>Nature of primary outcome</u>	<u>Dialysis Modality</u>	<u>Sample Size of Study</u>	<u>Country of lead investigator</u>	<u>Funder</u>	<u>Funder Details</u>	<u>Study Phase</u>
<u>Seamless Design/Adaptive Dose-Escalation</u>											
<u>Acute Kidney Injury</u>											
<u>Two-stage seamless adaptive design</u>											
Himmelfarb et al., 2018, (89)	At the end of each stage, data from the patients are used to select the THR-184 dose arms for next stage.	Patients at high risk for AKI after cardiac surgery.	THR-184	Proportion of patients who developed AKI	Hard clinical	HD/HDF/HF	452	USA	Private	Thrasos Therapeutics, Inc.	Phase II
<u>Interim analysis</u>											
Hosgood et al., 2017, (90), Protocol	Trial not complete.	Patients receiving a kidney from a donation after circulatory death donor.	Ex vivo normothermic perfusion	Rates of delayed graft function (DGF) defined as the need for dialysis in the first week post-transplant.	Surrogate	HD	400	United Kingdom	Public	Kidney Research UK; University of Cambridge and University Hospitals of Cambridge Foundation Trust.	Phase II
<u>Phase II/III seamless design</u>											
COMBAT-SHINE, 2020, (91), Protocol	Trial not complete.	Patients with septic shock-induced endotheliopathy.	Infusion of iloprost	Mean daily modified Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score	Surrogate	HD	384	Denmark	Public	Danish Independent Research Organisation	Phase II
<u>Phase IIa/IIb seamless design</u>											
STOP-AKI, 2018, (92,93)	NA	Critically ill patients with sepsis associated AKI.	Human recombinant alkaline phosphatase	Area under the time-corrected endogenous creatinine clearance curve from days 1 to 7.	Surrogate	HD	301	The Netherlands	Private	AM-Pharma	Phase IIa/IIb
<u>Adaptive Dose-Escalation</u>											
EMPIRIKAL, 2017, (94), Protocol	Trial not complete.	Patients after receiving cadaveric renal allografts.	Mirococept	Delayed graft function	Surrogate	HD/HDF/HF	560	United Kingdom	Public	Medical Research Council	Phase II

643 Figure 3 Legend – HD – Haemodialysis, HDF – Haemodiafiltration, HF – Haemofiltration, PD – Peritoneal Dialysis

Figures

Figure 1 – PRISMA Flow Diagram

647 Figure 2 – Adaptive Design in Dialysis Randomized Clinical Trials by Year

648

Figure 3 – Populations with Adaptive Design in Dialysis Randomized Clinical Trials by Year