## Supplement 8| Clinical Evidence Profiles (GRADE tables)

## Key question 1.1.

#### Clinical evidence profiles: clinical outcomes of early vs. late commencement of hemodialysis based on eGFR

			Certainty assess	sment			№ of p	atients	Ef	fect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Early	Late	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance

#### All-cause mortality: events - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	152/404 (37.6%)	155/424 (36.6%)	<b>RR 1.03</b> (0.86 to 1.23)	<b>11 more</b> <b>per 1,000</b> (from 51 fewer to	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
										84 more)		

#### All-cause mortality: events - HD planned

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	50/171 (29.2%)	59/191 (30.9%)	<b>RR 0.95</b> (0.69 to 1.30)	<b>15 fewer</b> <b>per 1,000</b> (from 96 fewer to 93 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	IMPORTANT
										95 more)		

#### All-cause mortality: time to event - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	152/404 (37.6%)	155/424 (36.6%)	<b>HR 1.04</b> (0.83 to 1.30)	<b>11 more</b> <b>per 1,000</b> (from 51 fewer to 81 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	IMPORTANT
---	----------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--	-------------	-----------

#### All-cause mortality: time to event - HD planned

trials (29.2%) (30.9%) (0.66 to <b>per 1,000</b> LOW (from 93 fewer to	1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	50/171 (29.2%)	59/191 (30.9%)	<b>HR 0.97</b> (0.66 to 1.43)	8 fewer per 1,000 (from 93 fewer to	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	IMPORTANT
--	---	----------------------	------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	--	-------------	-----------

											102 more)		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	--	--

All-cause mortality: events - HD

3	observational studies	serious <sup>a</sup>	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	6292/17965 (35.0%)	8829/31790 (27.8%)	<b>RR 1.62</b> (0.97 to	172 more	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
									2.69)	per		
										1,000		
										(from 8		
										fewer to		
										469		
										more)		

### All-cause mortality: time to event - HD

3	observational studies	serious <sup>a</sup>	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	none			<b>HR 1.31</b> (1.05 to 1.63)	<b>1 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 2 fewer to 1 fewer)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	NOT IMPORTANT
---	--------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	------	--	--	-------------------------------	---	------------------	------------------

### All-cause mortality: 1mL/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup> GFR greater - HD or PD

3	observational studies	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	dose response gradient			<b>HR 0.99</b> (0.88 to 1.11)	<b>1 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 1 fewer to 1 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	IMPORTANT
---	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------	---	-------------	-----------

#### Hospitalization: average days - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	307	335	-	MD 8 higher (1.2 lower to 17.2 higher)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
										mgner)		

### Hospitalization: average contacts - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	307	335	-	MD <b>0</b> (0.93	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL	
---	----------------------	------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	-----	-----	---	----------------------	------------------	----------	--

					lower to	
					higher)	

Non-admitted hospital visits - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	very serious <sub>a,b</sub>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	307	335	-	MD <b>0</b> (2.73 lower to 2.73 higher)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	IMPORTANT
---	----------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	-----	-----	---	---	-------------	-----------

### Visit to health care professional - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	very serious <sub>a,b</sub>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	307	335	-	MD <b>0</b> (2.73 lower to 2.73 higher)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	IMPORTANT
---	----------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	-----	-----	---	---	-------------	-----------

#### Composite cardiovascular events - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	none	139/404 (34.4%)	127/424 (30.0%)	<b>RR 1.15</b> (0.94 to 1.40)	45 more per 1,000 (from	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
										(110111		
										18		
										fewer to		
										120		
										more)		

#### Composite cardiovascular events - HD planned

1	randomized	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	50/171	51/191	<b>RR 1.10</b>	27 more	$\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$	IMPORTANT
	trials						(29.2%)	(26.7%)	(0.79  to)	per	LOW	
									1.32)	1,000 (from		
										56		
										fewer to		
										139		
										more)		

### Composite Infectious events (death or hospitalization from infection) - HD or PD

1	randomized	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	148/404	174/424	RR 0.89	45	$\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$	IMPORTANT
---	------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	------	---------	---------	---------	----	-----------------------------------	-----------

trials			(36.6%)	(41.0%)	(0.75 to	fewer	LOW	
					1.06)	per		
						1,000		
						(from		
						103		
						fewer to		
						25		
						more)		

Composite Infectious events (death or hospitalization from infection) - HD planned

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	60/171 (35.1%)	72/191 (37.7%)	<b>RR 0.93</b> (0.71 to	26 fewer	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	IMPORTANT
									1.22)	per		
										1,000		
										(from		
										109		
										fewer to		
										83		
-										more)		

#### Complications of dialysis: need for access revision - HD or PD

1	randomized	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	145/404	147/424	RR 1.04	14 more	$\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$	IMPORTANT
	trials						(35.9%)	(34.7%)	(0.86 to	per	LOW	
									1.25)	1,000		
										(from		
										49		
										fewer to		
										87		
										more)		

### Complications of dialysis: need for access revision - HD planned

1	randomized trials	very serious <sub>a,b</sub>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	73/171 (42.7%)	75/191 (39.3%)	<b>RR 1.09</b> (0.85 to	35 more per	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
									1.39)	1,000		
										(from		
										59		
										fewer to		
										153		
										more)		

Complication of dialysis: access site infection - HD or PD

1	randomized	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	47/404	50/424	<b>RR 0.99</b>	1 fewer		IMPORTANT
	uriais						(11.0%)	(11.8%)	(0.08 to 1.43)	1 000	LOW	
									1.45)	(from		
										38		
										fewer to		
										51		
										more)		

### Complication of dialysis: access site infection - HD planned

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	20/171 (11.7%)	27/191 (14.1%)	<b>RR 0.83</b> (0.48 to 1.42)	<b>24</b> <b>fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 74 fewer to 59	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	IMPORTANT
										more)		

#### Complication of dialysis: serious fluid or electrolytes disorder - HD or PD

1	randomized	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	146/404	175/424	RR 0.88	50	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$	IMPORTANT
	trials						(36.1%)	(41.3%)	(0.74 to	fewer	MODERATE	
									1.04)	per		
										1,000		
										(from		
										107		
										fewer to		
										17		
										more)		

Complication of dialysis: serious fluid or electrolytes disorder - HD planned

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	44/171 (25.7%)	73/191 (38.2%)	<b>RR 0.67</b> (0.49 to	126 fewer	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	IMPORTANT
									0.92)	per		
										1,000		
										(from		
										195		
										fewer to		
										31		
										fewer)		

### Complication of dialysis: placement of temporary dialysis catheter - HD or PD

1	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	118/404 (29.2%)	124/424 (29.2%)	<b>RR 1.00</b> (0.81 to	0 fewer per	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	IMPORTANT
									1.23)	<b>1,000</b> (from		
										56		
										fewer to		
										more)		

## Complication of dialysis: placement of temporary dialysis catheter - HD planned

1 rando	lomized ser	erious <sup>a,b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	39/171	41/191	<b>RR 1.06</b>	13 more		IMPORTANT
u.	liais						(22.8%)	(21.5%)	(0.72 to	1 000	LOW	
									1.50)	(from		
										60		
										fewer to		
										120		
										more)		
										fewer to 120 more)		

#### Echocardiographic endpoint: Left ventricular ejection fraction (%)

### Echocardiographic endpoint: Left ventricular mass index (g/m<sup>2</sup>)

1	randomized trials	very serious <sub>a,b</sub>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	91	91	-	MD 11.4 lower (23.09 lower to 0.29 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
										higher)		

#### Echocardiographic endpoint: Left atrial volume index (mL/m<sup>2</sup>)

1	randomized trials	very serious <sub>a,b</sub>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c</sup>	none	91	91	-	MD 0.6 lower	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
---	----------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	------	----	----	---	-----------------	------------------	-----------

					(7.03	
					lower to 5.83	
					higher)	

CI: Confidence interval; MD: Mean difference

Explanations

a. High risk of bias in blinding, b. High risk of bias in the selection, c. Confidence interval crossed minimally important difference

## Key question 1.2.

Not applicable

## Key question 2.1.

### Clinical evidence profiles: clinical outcomes of <4 hours vs. ≥4 hours dialysis time per sessions

	№ of study design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Ot considered constraints considered constraints con						№ of pati	ents	Effe	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	<4hour per session	4hours per session	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Overall	Mortality_RC	Т										
2	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious	none	566/2610 (21.7%)	427/2011 (21.2%)	<b>OR 1.02</b> (0.88 to 1.18)	<b>3 more</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 21 fewer to 29 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL

### Hospitalization

2	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	1831/2610 (70.2%)	1387/2011 (69.0%)	<b>OR 1.38</b> (0.67 to 2.87)	<b>64 more</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 91 fewer to 175 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
---	----------------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	--	------------------	----------

### **Overall Mortality: Time to event**

4 observational not serious not serious not serious not serious	none -/0	-/0 <b>OR 1.34</b> (1.15 to 1.55)	1 fewer per 1,000 (from 2 fewer to 1 fewer)   ⊕⊕○○ LOW	IMPORTANT
---	----------	-----------------------------------	--	-----------

### **Overall Mortality: 2/week vs 3/week**

3	observational	not	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	-/0	-/0	<b>2.02</b>	per		IMPORTANT
	studies	serious							(1.01 to	1,000	LOW	
									4.07)	(from		
										to)		

## Key question 2.2.

Clinical evidence profiles: high-dose dialysis versus low-dose dialysis for ESRD patients

			Certainty as	sessment			Nº of	patients	Ef	fect		
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High dose	Low dose	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Mortality	7											
11	observational studies	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	dose response gradient	In total, 1 reported t evaluated associated patients n the relation eKt/V>1.4 showed h	1 observation hat low dialy using spKt/V 1 increased m maintaining he onship betwee 4 or spKt/V> eterogeneity	al studies con sis dose, which 7, eKt/V, or U cortality in ad emodialysis. 1 en high-dose 1.6, and mort between stud	nsistently ch was JRR, was ult ESRD However, dialysis, tality ies.	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	IMPORTANT
Mortality	Ţ			-	-	•	+					•
1	1 • 1				· h		421/020	140/026	00.00			CDITICAL

1	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	none	431/920 (46.8%)	440/926 (47.5%)	<b>OR 0.97</b> (0.81 to	8 fewer per 1,000	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
							(,		1.17)	(from 52 fewer to 39 more)		

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio

#### Explanations

a. Some studies presented relationship between dialysis dose and mortality only in subgroups according to body mass index or sex, not for all cohort patients. b. There was a high risk of imprecision because only one randomized controlled trial was included for this issue.

# Key question 3.1.

### Clinical evidence profiles: high-flux compared to low-flux membranes for end-stage kidney disease

			Certainty a	ssessment			№ of p	patients	Effe	et		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High-flux	low-flux membranes	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
All-caus	se mortality											
10	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	599/1789 (33.5%)	662/1860 (35.6%)	<b>RR 0.87</b> (0.76 to 0.99)	<b>46 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 85 fewer to 4 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Cardiov	ascular mort	ality										
5	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	234/1644 (14.2%)	288/1652 (17.4%)	<b>RR 0.81</b> (0.70 to 0.95)	<b>33 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 52 fewer to 9 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Hospita	lization - Any	v cause										
2	randomized trials					none	20/64 (31.3%)	18/60 (30.0%)	<b>RR 0.80</b> (0.53 to 1.22)	<b>60 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 141 fewer to	-	IMPORTANT

Predialysis β-2 microglobulin

66 more)

6	randomized			none	1371	1378	-	MD <b>9.9</b>	-	IMPORTANT
	trials							lower		
								(12.14		
								lower to		
								7.65		
								lower)		

Equilibrated Kt/Vurea

4	randomized			none	1332	1340	-	MD 0	-	IMPORTANT
	trials							(0.02		
								lower to		
								0.01		
								higher)		

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; MD: Mean difference

## Key question 3.2.

Online hemodiafiltration compared to High-flux hemodialysis for outcomes

	Certainty assessment							ients	Effe	et		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Online hemodiafiltration	High-flux hemodialysis	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance

**Overall mortality** 

2	randomized trials	serious <sub>1,a</sub>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	88/581 (15.1%)	108/582 (18.6%)	<b>OR 0.78</b> (0.57 to 1.07)	<b>35 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 71 fewer to 10 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
---	----------------------	---------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	----------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	---	------------------	----------

Hospitalization rate

			Certainty a	assessment			№ of pat	ients	Effe	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Online hemodiafiltration	High-flux hemodialysis	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
2	randomized trials	serious a	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	none	456/1313 (34.7%)	449/1311 (34.2%)	<b>RR 1.01</b> (0.93 to 1.10)	<b>3 more</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 24 fewer to 34 more)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio; RR: Risk ratio

# Key question 4.1.

### Clinical evidence profiles: clinical outcomes of LMWH vs. UFH of hemodialysis

	Certainty assessment							patients	Effe	ct		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	low molecular weight heparin (LMWH)	unfractionated heparin (UFH)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance

**Outcome: bleeding complications** 

6	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	21/219 (9.6%)	27/219 (12.3%)	<b>RR 0.74</b> (0.24 to 2.31)	<b>32 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 94 fewer to 162 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
---	----------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	------------------	----------------	-------------------------------	---	------------------	----------

**Outcome: circuit thrombosis** 

			Certainty a	ssessment			№ of	patients	Effe	ct		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	low molecular weight heparin (LMWH)	unfractionated heparin (UFH)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
3	randomized trials	serious <sup>a</sup>	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	none	129/6534 (2.0%)	125/6720 (1.9%)	<b>RR 0.99</b> (0.56 to 1.77)	<b>0 fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 8 fewer to 14 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	CRITICAL

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio

#### Explanations

a. no description of randomization process and blinding of participants and/or researchers

b. significant heterogeneity within studies

## Key question 4.2.

Not applicable

## Key question 5.1.

Clinical evidence profiles: increased inter-dialytic weight gain (IDWG) of reference value as risk factor for mortality

№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Certainty	Importance

**IDWG: Prospective observational study** 

			Certainty assess	ment				
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Certainty	Importance
7	Prospective observational study	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL

## **IDWG: Retrospective study**

5	Retrospective study	serious	not serious	not serious	serious	none	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL

# Key question 5.2.

Clinical evidence profiles: clinical outcomes of low vs. conventional dialysate sodium levels for chronic hemodialysis

			Certainty ass	essment			№ of patient	S	Eff	`ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Low dialysate	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Interdia	lytic weight ga	in										
3	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious	none	84	85	-	MD <b>0.37</b> <b>higher</b> (0.11 higher to 0.62 higher)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	

Interdialytic weight gain

4	observational studies	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly	96	96	-	MD <b>0.6</b> higher	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	
						05						
						suspected				(0.34		
										higher to		
										0.86		
l.										higher)		

### Predialysis BP

1	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious	publication bias strongly suspected	18	20	-	MD <b>12.02</b> <b>higher</b> (0.74 lower to 24.78	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	
										24.78 higher)		

## Predialysis BP

3 ob	bservational studies s	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	37	37	-	MD <b>15.6</b> <b>higher</b> (4.52 higher to 26.69 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	
------	---------------------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	----	----	---	---	------------------	--

## Antihypertensive medication

1	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious	publication bias strongly suspected	29	28	-	MD <b>1.5</b> <b>higher</b> (0.23	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	
										higher to		
										2.77		
										higher)		

### Echocardiographic parameter - Posterior wall thickness (mm)

2	observational studies	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	67	67	-	MD <b>0.14</b> <b>higher</b> (0.29 lower to 0.57 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	
---	--------------------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	----	----	---	---	------------------	--

Echocardiographic parameter - LV ejection fraction (%)

2	observational	not	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication	67	67	-	MD 1.32	$\oplus OOO$	
	studies	serious				bias strongly				lower	VERY LOW	
						suspected				(4.55		
						_				lower to		
										1.92		
										higher)		

#### Echocardiographic parameter - pulmonary artery pressure (mmHg)

2	observational studies	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	67	67	-	MD 7.14 higher (2.67 higher to 11.61 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
										nigner)		

#### Echocardiographic parameter - inferior vena cava diameter (mm)

2	observational studies	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	67	67	-	MD 2.17 higher (1.62 higher to	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	
										2.72 higher)		

## Predialysis serum [Na<sup>+</sup>]

2	observational studies	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	publication bias strongly suspected	29	29	-	MD <b>0.4</b> <b>higher</b> (0.5 lower to 1.3 higher)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	
---	--------------------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	----	----	---	--	------------------	--

## Key question 6.1.

Not applicable

## Key question 6.2.

Clinical evidence profiles: cool dialysate compared to Standard dialysate for Hemodialysis patients

			Certainty assess	ment					
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Impact	Certainty	Importance
Intradialyti	c hypotension: RCT								
4	Randomized trials	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	In total 4 randomized crossover trial, cool dialysate reduced intradialytic hypotension compared with standard dialysate.	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL

#### Intradialytic hypotension: non-RCT

2	Observational studies	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	In total 2 observational studies, cool dialysate reduced intradialytic hypotension compared with standard dialysate.	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
---	--------------------------	---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------	--	------------------	----------

## Key question 7.1.

Not applicable

## Key question 8.1.

Clinical evidence profiles: dialysis vs. conservative treatment for elderly ESRD patients.

Certainty assessment						№ of patients		Effect				
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Dialysis	conservative treatment	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance

Mortality

11	observational studies	not serious	not serious	serious	not serious	none	1401/3274 (42.8%)	1092/1735 (62.9%)	<b>OR 0.42</b> (0.37 to 0.47)	<b>213</b> <b>fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 244 fewer to 186 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
----	--------------------------	----------------	-------------	---------	-------------	------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	---	------------------	----------

## Prospective cohort data only

4	observational studies	not serious	not serious	serious	not serious	none	231/761 (30.4%)	191/321 (59.5%)	<b>OR 0.20</b> (0.15 to 0.28)	<b>368</b> <b>fewer</b> <b>per</b> <b>1,000</b> (from 414	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	CRITICAL
										fewer to 304 fewer)		

### Retrospective data only

7	observational studies	not serious	not serious	serious	not serious	none	1170/2513 (46.6%)	901/1414 (63.7%)	<b>OR 0.48</b> (0.42 to 0.56)	180 fewer per 1,000	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	IMPORTANT
										(from		
										213		
										fewer to		
										141		
										fewer)		

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio

# Key question 8.2.

Not applicable