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Résumé
Le choix de la modalité de dialyse est devenu une décision importante qui affecte non seulement la politique de santé du pays dans la prise en charge de l’insuffisance rénale chronique terminale, mais aussi la qualité de vie des patients et leur survie. La dialyse péritonéale constitue une alternative pour la prise en charge de ces malades.
L’objectif de notre travail est de rapporter les résultats épidémiologiques, cliniques et biologiques au sein de l’unité de DP au CHU de Rabat et d’élucider les freins au développement de la DP au Maroc.

Matériel et Méthodes :
Nous avons mené une étude rétrospective descriptive dans notre unité de DP de juillet 2006 à juillet 2017, incluant tous les patients mis en DP par choix ou par nécessité et qui sont inscrits dans le RDPLF.

Résultats :
En 10 ans, 159 patients ont été mis en DP, avec un âge moyen de 50.44 +/- 17.42 ans et un sex-ratio de 1.36. L’indication de la mise en DP était le choix du patient dans 34% des cas, sociale dans 52% des cas et médicale dans 14% des cas. Les complications mécaniques sont dominées par les migrations du cathéter dans 38% des cas. Les complications infectieuses sont représentées par les péritonites, dues dans 42% des cas à une erreur d’hygiène.

Conclusion :
Les freins au développement de la DP sont la méconnaissance de la technique par les malades, les préjudices ou mythes sur la technique.

Mots clés : Insuffisance rénale chronique terminale, Dialyse péritonéale, Education thérapeutique

Summary
The choice of dialysis modality has become an important decision that affects not only the country’s health policy in the management of chronic end stage renal failure, but also the quality of life of patients and their survival. Peritoneal dialysis is an alternative for the treatment of these patients. The objective of our work is to report the epidemiological, clinical and biological results in the unit of PD, UHC of Rabat and to clarify the obstacles to the development of PD in Morocco.

Material and Methods:
We conducted a descriptive retrospective study in our PD unit from July 2006 to July 2017, including all patients who were in PD by choice or necessity and enrolled in the French Peritoneal Dialysis Registry (RDPLF).

Results: In 10 years, 159 patients were placed in PD, with an average age of 50.44 +/- 17.42 years and a sex ratio of 1.36. The indication for placement of setting in PD was by choice in 34% of the cases, social in 52% and medical in 14% of cases. Mechanical complications were dominated by catheter migrations. Infectious complications were represented by peritonitis, caused by poor of hygiene in 42% of cases.

Conclusion: The obstacles to the development of PD are the lack of knowledge of the technique by the patients, as well as the prejudices or myths about the technique.
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INTRODUCTION

Peritoneal dialysis (PD) is a method of renal replacement therapy (RRT) that is complementary and non-competitive with the other two methods, hemodialysis (HD) and renal transplantation (TR) [1].

PD has several advantages. First, it is a physiological, continuous and well tolerated hemodynamic RRT technique. The patient remains professionally active longer, and the technique also allows better schooling for children. The quality of life seems better than that of patients in HD [2]. Several studies show that the long-term survival of patients with PD is comparable to that in HD, or better in the first two to three years after initiation of treatment [2-3]. Finally, PD would be more economically advantageous than HD (30 to 45%) [4-5].

The PD technique was introduced at Ibn Sina Hospital in Rabat for the first time in July 2006. The aim was to respond to urgent medical indications, including the exhaustion or the existence of contraindication to the creation of a vascular access, and severe heart failure. It was also indicated for reasons of a social order (absence of HD center in the city of residence or saturation of existing HD centers).

During this period, the technique has grown significantly thanks to the Therapeutic Education Program (TEP) for patients with CKD, the training of physicians in the technique and the importance of the information offered by our PD nurse to all CKD patients.

The purpose of our work is to report the results of our experience, by analyzing demographic, clinical and biological profiles, and to elucidate the obstacles to the development of PD.

Material and methods

This is a descriptive retrospective study conducted at the PD unit of Rabat University Hospital Ibn Sina from July 2006 to July 2017, involving peritoneal dialysis patients who are all registered in the RDPLF, which has been supporting our experience since its initiation.

The PD unit is directed by a professor of Nephrology and has included a dedicated nurse since 2006; a second nurse joined the team in 2016. The resident doctors were transiting during their training for a 6-month curriculum. We are the only center which has a peritoneal dialysis unit independently of Nephrology department. Only our residents are transiting for a 6-month period. During their internship, residents are responsible for several tasks: Dialysis patient’s consultations, updating the RDPLF register, therapeutic education sessions, but also assisting for KT insertion. Their activity is supervised by a Professor of Nephrology; they are also guided by the department’s protocols.

We work in collaboration with laboratories (Biochemistry, Bacteriology) and with a team of dedicated urologic surgeons for PD catheter insertions.

A systematic visit at home is carried out by the PD nurse before the installation of the catheter, in order to evaluate the safety, the habitat management, and the hygiene of the room intended for the exchanges and the one reserved for the storage of the dialysate. The visit costs are covered by a budget that we collected from community work.
For all patients included in the study, the parameters studied were:

- Sociodemographic: sex, age at the start of the PD, professional and academic activity and intellectual level.

- Clinical: initial nephropathy; medical and surgical history; Body mass index (BMI); diuresis; Charlson score on admission; RRT before the PD if it took place (duration, reason for transfer); catheter placement and the exchange mode (continuous ambulatory PD (CAPD): number of exchanges per day, automated PD (APD).

- Biological: evaluated at admission, then quarterly, taking into account the average over the year.

- Residual renal function (RRF): calculated by the UV / P formula of creatinine and urea

- Biological markers: urea, creatinine, K+, Alkaline reserve, Calcemia, Phosphoremia, uric acid

- Adequacy markers: Kt / v , weekly creatinine clearance (CrCL)

- Nutritional markers: Albuminemia, CRP, lipid profile, nPCR

- Nasal swab (NS) and exit site (ES).

- Evaluation of peritoneal membrane characteristics: evaluated by the Peritoneal Equilibration Test (PET)

- Complications related to the technique:
  - Mechanical complications: catheter migration, aspiration of the omentum by the catheter, obstruction of the catheter, pleuro-peritoneal leak, genital leak and inguinal or umbilical hernia.
  - Infectious complications: infection of the exit of the catheter, and peritonitis.

- Survival: assessed by Kaplan Meyer method according to RDPLF

- The statistical analysis was done using SPSS software version 21.0 for Windows. Quantitative variables were expressed as mean plus or minus standard deviation and qualitative variables in number and percentages. To compare certain parameters, we used uni and multivariate analysis.

### Results

1- Incidence and annual prevalence of patients

Between July 2006 and July 2017, we managed 159 patients in PD: 12 patients were Transferred from HD, 137 patients were PD incidents and 10 from Kidney Transplantation. Recruitment was done through a consultation aimed at monitoring patients in CKD. It was supported by the establishment in 2014 of a therapeutic education program focused on renal replacement therapy (RRT).
2- Admission data

• Sociodemographic data:
The mean age of patients was 50.44 ± 17.42 years (range, 11 to 86 years) with male predominance (Sex ratio: 1.36). The intellectual level of patients was low (illiterate) in about 50% of cases.

More than half of our patients were active at the beginning of the PD and stayed so throughout the follow-up.

• Evaluation of clinical parameters:

Initial nephropathy is indeterminate in 29% of cases. Renal biopsies have been carried out in our nephrology department or in the other University Hospital Centers.

At admission, the average Charlson score was 3.5 ± 1.7. Hypertension (HTN) was found in 52% of patients, with a prevalence of obesity of 10.4% (BMI> 30 kg / m²). Preserved diuresis was noted in 79% of patients. Other clinical features are illustrated in Table I.

Table I: Clinical Characteristics of Patients on Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETERS</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.44 ± 17.42 (11-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX RATIO (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlson Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL NEPHROPATHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate nephropathy</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glomerular</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubulointerstitial</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycystic kidney disease</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>63 (52%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP (mmHg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 ± 8.26 (150-185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP (mmHg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.17 ± 10.5 (95-110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuresis 24H (ml/j)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1601.34 ± 1924 (650-2500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (Admission)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.46 ± 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>71 (58.6%)</td>
<td>22.01 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overweight</td>
<td>36 (29%)</td>
<td>26.90 ± 1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity classe I</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>32.25 ± 1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity classe II, III</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>38.16 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number. SBP: Systolic blood pressure. DBP: Diastolic blood pressure. BMI: Body Mass Index

An assessment of residual renal function (RRF) was performed in all patients with preserved diuresis. At admission the median was 4.77 ml / min with extremes ranging from 0.27 to 16 ml / min.
3- Peritoneal dialysis parameters

• **Indications and preparation of peritoneal dialysis**
  The indication of PD was medical in 14% of cases, social in 52% of cases (patients with academic or professional activity that may be hampered by an HD program, and patients with no center or place for HD in their city) or patient’s choice in 34%.
  None of our patients have been on dialysis for cardio-renal syndrome.

• **Realization of peritoneal dialysis**
  The placement of PD catheter was performed in the majority of our patients by mini-laparotomy, sedation and local anesthesia. In 82% the exit site is on the right. The start of the exchanges is on average 19 ± 17.57 days after PD Catheter Placement. However, 13.5% started exchange on day 1 of catheter placement due to a dialysis emergency. A transition through a CAPD phase was systematic for all patients prior to decision of the patient-specific mode, based on the results of the exchanges and acquisition and patient availability.
  In CAPD, performed daily, the number of exchanges varied from one patient to another between 2 to 3 exchanges per day, depending on the patient’s clinical condition, its residual renal function and the peritoneal membrane characteristics. We only have 2 l solutions for CAPD, generally, we infuse 2 l, and sometimes we lower the volume in special cases (PKD, hernias).
  The average duration in DP was 27.49 months ± 24.79 (6 months to 10 years). During the follow-up, there was been a gradual increase in the APD prescription, since its introduction for the first time in 2011, while the Extraneal solution was introduced only in 2013. The PET was conducted in variable delays between two and nine months after the start of exchanges, due to lack of premises. To take the test, we must sacrifice a room for at least 6 hours.
  Regarding the Staph nasal carriage, we perform 2 nasal swabs before KT insertion, then every 3 months, and each time we have peritonitis. The exit site swab is done every 3 months and at each peritonitis.

4- Evolution

1 / Clinical and biological parameters

The evolution of hypertension during PD follow-up was marked by a decrease in the prevalence of hypertension at 45% after 9 months. At 24 months of follow-up, 50.8% of our patients were still hypertensive.

To investigate the factors associated with RRF decline, we selected patients with a RRF ≥ 2ml / min at admission (68 patients) and divided them into 2 groups: Group 1: RRF<2ml / min after 12 months of PD and group 2 follow-up: RRF= 2 ml / min after 12 months of PD follow-up. In multivariate analysis, high proteinuria ≥ 1 g / day on admission, APD, and RRF≤ 4ml / min at admission are associated with risk of RRF decline after 12 months of PD follow-up.

KT / V and weekly creatinine clearance (CrCL) are summarized in Table II. The mean KT / V of our patients at 24 months is 1.35 ± 0.2 in CAPD and 1.57 ± 0.14 in ADP.
We assessed nutritional markers in our patients. They are summarized in Table III.

### Table III: Nutritional Markers of Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>1 week</th>
<th>First month</th>
<th>3 months</th>
<th>6 months</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>24 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albumin (g/L)</td>
<td>40 ± 2,83</td>
<td>40 ± 0,61</td>
<td>39 ± 2,7</td>
<td>34 ± 3,8</td>
<td>35 ± 4,7</td>
<td>36 ± 5,71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP (mg/L)</td>
<td>2,06±0,2</td>
<td>4,1±0,3</td>
<td>4,5±1,31</td>
<td>6,5±3,02</td>
<td>3,6±0,33</td>
<td>5,02±1,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nPCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0,9±0,23</td>
<td>0,8±0,21</td>
<td>0,83±0,11</td>
<td>0,73±0,1</td>
<td>0,6±0,15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Cholesterol (g/L)</td>
<td>1,92±0,31</td>
<td>2,08±0,2</td>
<td>2,11±0,3</td>
<td>2,03±0,1</td>
<td>1,91±0,2</td>
<td>1,81±0,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triglyceride g/L</td>
<td>1,24±0,25</td>
<td>1,37±0,48</td>
<td>1,36±0,54</td>
<td>1,51±0,42</td>
<td>1,61±0,16</td>
<td>1,48±0,31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb g/dl</td>
<td>9,1±2,4</td>
<td>9,5±2,6</td>
<td>10,2±1,8</td>
<td>11,5±1,7</td>
<td>12,2±2,1</td>
<td>11,1±1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AR : Alcalin Reserve . ADP : Automated peritoneal dialysis. CAPD: Continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis
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2 / Complications related to the PD

2-1 Mechanical complications :

Mechanical complications were dominated by PD catheter migrations, observed in 38.8% of patients, requiring surgical repositioning in 10% of cases. The obstructions of the catheter represent 20, 66%.

2.2 Infectious complications :

Exit site :

Exit site infections were noted in 48% of patients associated with tunnelitis in 12% of cases. The most common germ found in infection of the exit site was Staphylococcus aureus in 37% of cases, with an association with nasal carriage of Staphylococcus aureus in 72.5% of cases. The evolution was favorable under adapted oral antibiotic therapy with the need for removal of the catheter in 6 patients (tunnelitis).
Peritonitis:

Based on the peritonitis module of the RDPLF we have evaluated the rate of peritonitis on all patients (159 patients) since the opening of the center. Over a period of 11 years, we had 157 episodes of peritonitis, a rate of 26.58 (months x patients / peritonitis) according to the RDPLF.

Patients are generally treated on an outpatient basis, by a peritoneal ATB, after an IV loading dose at day 0.

In 42% of cases, peritonitis was due to a lack of asepsis. Peritonitis secondary to tunnelitis was observed in 8% of cases. Other causes were represented mainly by endogenous causes (7%) and catheter cracking (5%). The germs found were gram-positive cocci in 41% of cases: Staphylococcus aureus meti-S (35%) and Staphylococcus epidermidis (31%), and Gram-negative bacilli in 26% of cases (Pseudomonas (28%), Klebsiella (25%), and Escherichia coli (22%). In 24% of cases, peritonitis culture was negative. We report a case of tuberculous peritonitis and 4 cases of fungal peritonitis.

We assessed risk factors for peritonitis. Only intake diuresis ≤ 500ml / day emerged as a factor associated with the risk of peritonitis (Table IV). Regarding this relationship this is a statistical result that surprised us too; we are working on it. This can be explained by the increased number of exchanges and manipulations in patients with low RRF.

Table IV. Factors associated with the risk of occurrence of peritonitis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Univariate analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female gender</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.6-2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.77-3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI≥ 25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.4-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24h diuresis ≤ 500ml</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.14-4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intellectual Level</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.66-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of HD</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.34-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.6-2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the high frequency of Staphylococcal peritonitis in our series, we also investigated the existence of a relationship between the nasal carriage of Staphylococcus and the occurrence of Staphylococcal peritonitis. The risk of Staphylococcus aureus peritonitis was multiplied by 7 when the nasal swab was positive for S. aureus.

The majority of peritonitis cases evolved favorably on antibiotic therapy, with the occurrence of encapsulating peritonitis in two patients transferred to HD. Only one death was secondary to nosocomial peritonitis. The free survival of peritonitis at 2 years was 50%, with a transfer rate in HD secondary to peritonitis of 33% (16 patients out of 48 transferred in HD).

3 / Survival

In our series, the mean duration of PD was 27.49 ± 24.79 months with a technique survival of 55% at 27 months. The causes of dropout were mainly due to hemodialysis transfer for 60% of patients, death (35%) and renal transplantation for 5% of patients. Causes of HD transfer
were dominated by peritonitis in 33% of cases, psychological causes (15%), and loss of UF and catheter dysfunction (13%).

The survival rate of PD patients at 4 years was 60%. The causes of death were in 97% of cases unrelated to the PD.

**DISCUSSION**

PD is a technique that can be offered as a first-line option for renal replacement therapy (RRT). Many studies have shown identical patient survival in PD and HD [2, 3, 4], with a better quality of life for PD.

Over the last 30 years, the PD has experienced great technical progress, in terms of hardware by creating the dual-pocket connection, and the cycler allowing the reduction of the rate of peritoneal infections. But also in terms of dialysis solution, by the availability of more biocompatible solutions for better tolerance, prolonged protection of the peritoneal membrane and prolonged maintenance of residual renal function (RRF) [6,7]. The latter contributes to obtaining a better hydro-sodic equilibrium, to the decrease of the inflammatory state incriminated in the increase of the cardiovascular mortality, and to a better survival of the technique [8].

An orientation of the health policy towards the PD, and a reassessment of the social security system could constitute a definitive solution to this paradox [9].

Besides the political will, our experience in the department has shown us that the therapeutic education of patients on RRT techniques is a favorable factor in the choice of PD, and that the training of the residents in the technique plays an important role, because informing the patient alone does not guarantee access to the technique if the nephrologists themselves do not master it.

This is confirmed by the results of the Necosad study which showed that a good information about the two dialysis techniques associated with the respect of contraindications for one or the other allowed achievement of 38% incidence of PD and 29% in terms of prevalence in the Netherlands [10,11].

Thus, the incidence in the department has increased from an average of 10 patients per year to more than 20 patients per year from 2015, with a prevalence of complications related to the technique, both mechanical and infectious, identical to those reported by the literature, and an identical survival rate [12-17]. This result could not take place without the development of human resources, dedicated to the technique, to ensure a continuous and efficient effort with a great expertise.

The results of our study are satisfying after 10 years, especially since renal transplantation is not yet well developed in our country. Regarding the survival of the technique, our work has shown that it is greater than 50% at 24 months, which is reported in the literature. In contrast, the survival rate of PD patients is 70% at 4 years. Compared with the literature, there is better survival among our patients, probably due to their young age, with a low Charlson score at admission.
CONCLUSION

PD represents an interesting choice for any patient who is concerned about independence and maintaining an active lifestyle. Ignorance about this technique among patients and doctors hinders its promotion. Also, the high cost of PD solutions and the lack of mediatization constitute obstacles to the development of PD. The training of young nephrologists, therapeutic education, and the interest shown by the University Hospital management has significantly supported the development of PD in our unit.
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