



Nutrition Profile and Quality of Life of Chronic Kidney Disease Patients on Maintenance Hemodialysis in India

Nutritional imbalances are common in chronic kidney disease (CKD) patients due to disrupted renal regulation of systemic homeostasis. Protein-energy malnutrition is a particularly severe complication of CKD, worsening with advancing CKD stages and having significant consequences for patients on dialysis, including reduced quality of life, increased morbidity, hospitalization, and mortality.¹

Nutritional management poses a significant challenge in dialysis patients. The presence of comorbidities, including diabetes and hypertension, as well as complications associated with CKD, such as mineral bone disease, electrolyte imbalances, fluid disorders, and inflammatory status, complicates the management of nutrition in this diverse patient population.

The prevalence of malnutrition among individuals receiving hemodialysis (HD) ranges from 20% to 60%.² Studies conducted by various researchers have revealed a substantially high prevalence of malnutrition in HD patients from India. For instance, Janardhan *et al.* reported malnutrition in 91% of a cohort comprising 66 HD patients, while Tapiawala *et al.* observed it in 58% of a cohort comprising 28 HD patients.^{3,4}

Nutritional status significantly impacts the quality of life (QOL). Malnutrition is linked to higher morbidity rates, reduced functional capacity, and more frequent and prolonged hospital admissions, ultimately leading to a lower health-related quality of life. Therefore, early diagnosis and treatment of malnutrition are crucial.

Assessing nutritional status accurately remains a problem. Various methods are commonly employed, including dietary recall, anthropometric measurements such as height, weight, body mass index (BMI), subcutaneous fat (measured by triceps skin fold thickness), mid-arm circumference (MAC), and mid-arm muscle circumference (MAMC). Biochemical parameters such as albumin, pre-albumin, and transferrin are also used. Additionally, Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) is a simple, reliable, and dynamic tool offers a reasonable estimation of nutritional status. It is important to note that despite being a subjective tool, SGA has been found to be reliable.⁵

Considering the importance of the issue and the intricacy of the situation, it is evident that evaluating nutritional status, as well as preventing and managing malnutrition in patients undergoing hemodialysis, is of paramount importance. Table 1 shows some of the common cases of malnutrition in dialysis patients.

This journal issue presents the findings of a cross-sectional study by Ekbote *et al.*,⁶ which focuses on assessing the dietary intake and quality of life of 107 adult patients undergoing MHD in dialysis centers across India. This study includes data on sociodemographic profiles, anthropometric measurements, biochemical parameters, dietary habits, and QOL, utilizing tools such as the Euro QoL EQ-5D-3L, and compared dietary intake with Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative (KDOQI) Guidelines.

Table 1: Reasons for poor nutritional profile among hemodialysis patients

Decreased nutritional intake	Increased losses	Increase in protein catabolism
Overzealous dietary restriction	Intradialytic nitrogen losses (hemodialysis, 6–8 g amino acid per procedure; peritoneal dialysis, 8–10 g protein per day)	Catabolism associated with hemodialysis (due to activation of proinflammatory cytokines)
Inadequate dialysis	Gastrointestinal blood loss (100 mL blood = 14–17 g protein)	Intercurrent illnesses and hospitalizations
Delayed gastric emptying		Dysfunction of the growth hormone–insulin growth factor endocrine axis
Intercurrent illnesses and hospitalizations		Insulin resistance
Medications causing dyspepsia (phosphate binders, iron preparations)		Catabolic effects of other hormones (parathyroid hormone, cortisol, glucagon)
Inadequate dialysis		Other medical comorbidities, including diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease
Monetary restrictions		
Depression		

The study findings reveal significant deficiencies in both energy and protein intake among patients undergoing hemodialysis, with averages falling below recommended levels (energy ~21 kcal/kg vs. 30–35 kcal/kg body weight and protein ~0.7g/kg vs. 1–1.2 g/kg body weight). A majority of the participants (>75%) had inadequate energy and protein intake. Furthermore, sodium intake was higher than the suggested limit. Although overall quality of life was satisfactory, more than one-third of the participants faced moderate problems with pain, discomfort, mobility, and usual activities.

This research unequivocally suggests that patients undergoing hemodialysis are plagued by numerous complications. Malnutrition is especially pervasive among this population, resulting in a negative impact on their quality of life. To address this issue effectively, it is imperative to conduct individualized nutritional evaluations and provide counseling. Collaboration with renal dietitian, combined with ongoing nutrition education and support from healthcare teams, are crucial to enhancing dietary adherence and ultimately improving quality of life for patients on maintenance hemodialysis. However, the study has a few limitations: convenience sampling may restrict the generalizability of the findings, the dietary recall was conducted for only one day and may not reflect usual intake patterns, and the study population included a higher proportion of males and participants from higher-income groups, which may skew the results.

A few general recommendations can be made – the need for tailored dietary advice and regular follow-up, crucial for better dietary compliance, regular monitoring of nutritional status and dietary intake to identify and address gaps, and continuous motivation and support from dietitians and medical care teams to enhance adherence to dietary recommendations.

A renal diet imposes numerous restrictions, which can make adherence challenging and stressful. Therefore, the diet must be individualized to account for each patient's unique circumstances, including palatability, cost, comorbid medical conditions, and cultural eating habits. It is essential to provide regular nutrition education, encourage and motivate patients and their families to follow the dietary advice to achieve a healthy life with improved quality. The recommended dietary protein and calorie intake for MHD patients are 1.2–1.4 g/kg and 25–35 kcal/kg, respectively.⁷

In chronic dialysis patients who are unable to meet their dietary needs, additional nutritional support must be considered. These can include oral supplements, tube feeds (if medically appropriate), intradialytic parenteral nutritional supplements, resistance exercise combined with nutritional supplementation, anabolic steroids and appetite stimulants such as megestrol acetate, dronabinol, melatonin, thalidomide, and ghrelin.

Non-medical factors that hinder nutritional optimization must be rectified. These include identifying and mitigating barriers to proper nutrition, such as poor appetite, dietary restrictions, and financial constraints. This may involve providing financial assistance, food subsidies, and palatable, nutrient-dense food options. Much of this effort requires access to trained nutritionists, which are scarce in India.

In conclusion, the nutritional management of patients undergoing hemodialysis in India is a multifaceted challenge that requires a comprehensive and individualized approach. The high prevalence of malnutrition among these patients significantly affects their quality of life, morbidity, and mortality. To effectively address these issues, it is essential to conduct individualized nutritional evaluations and provide continuous dietary counseling. Collaborating with renal dietitians and the healthcare team, alongside ongoing education and support, is crucial for improving dietary adherence and enhancing the quality of life for hemodialysis patients. Despite the limitations of the study, the general recommendations underscore the necessity for tailored dietary advice, regular monitoring, and continuous motivation to ensure better dietary compliance. Addressing non-medical barriers such as financial constraints and access to trained nutritionists is also essential for optimizing the nutritional status of these patients.

Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

**Umesh Khanna¹, Neil Saldanha¹,
Chintan Paresh Gandhi¹**

¹Department of Nephrology, Namaha Healthcare Hospital, Kandivali West, Mumbai, India

Corresponding author: Umesh Khanna, Department of Nephrology, Namaha Healthcare Hospital, Kandivali West, Mumbai, India.
E-mail: ubkhanna@gmail.com

References

1. Feroze U, Noori N, Kovesdy CP, Molnar MZ, Martin DJ, Reina-Patton A, *et al.* Quality-of-life and mortality in hemodialysis patients: roles of race and nutritional status. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2011;6:1100-11.
2. de Mutsert R, Grootendorst DC, Boeschoten EW, Brandts H, van Manen JG, Krediet RT, *et al.* Subjective global assessment of nutritional status is strongly associated with mortality in chronic dialysis patients. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;89:787-93.
3. Janardhan V, Soundararajan P, Rani NV, Kannan G, Thennarasu P, Chacko RA, *et al.* Prediction of malnutrition using modified subjective global assessment-dialysis malnutrition score in patients on hemodialysis. *Indian J Pharm Sci* 2011;73:38.
4. Tapiawala S, Vora H, Patel Z, Badve S, Shah B. Subjective global assessment of nutritional status of patients with chronic renal insufficiency and end stage renal disease on dialysis. *Japi* 2006;54:923-6.

5. Blumenkrantz MJ, Kopple JD, Gutman RA, Chan Y, Barbour GL, Roberts C, *et al.* Methods for assessing nutritional status of patients with renal failure. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1980;33:1567-85.
6. Ekbote A, Ghosh-Jerath S, Sharma V, Subbaiyan SS, Shah KD, Joshi VR, *et al.* Nutrition profile and quality of life of adult chronic kidney disease patients on maintenance hemodialysis in India: An exploratory study. *Indian J Nephrol.* 2024;34:493-500.
7. Ikizler TA, Burrowes JD, Byham-Gray LD, Campbell KL, Carrero J-J, Chan W, *et al.* KDOQI clinical practice guideline for nutrition in CKD: 2020 update. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2020;76 (3 Suppl 1):S1-S107.

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, transform, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

How to cite this article: Khanna U, Saldanha N, Gandhi CP. Nutrition Profile and Quality of Life of Chronic Kidney Disease Patients on Maintenance Hemodialysis in India. *Indian J Nephrol.* 2025;35:121-3. doi: 10.25259/IJN_390_2024

Received: 16-07-2024; **Accepted:** 18-07-2024;
Online First: 26-09-2024; **Published:** 25-02-2025

DOI: 10.25259/IJN_390_2024



Peritoneal Dialysis in India is Dying—Is Weaning from the Ventilator Likely?

The global nephrology community has suggested peritoneal dialysis (PD) as the preferred dialysis modality for most patients with kidney failure who cannot get kidney transplantation.¹ The short and long term outcomes of the two dialysis modalities are similar, and PD is generally cost-effective. Indian studies also have shown it to be cost-effective.² However, the use of this excellent therapy has declined in India over the last decade [Figure 1]. It raises doubts and concerns in the minds of the new generation nephrologists. Questions are being raised to centers that were pioneers in PD practice as to the reason for the crash in their PD practice. Of the 490 centers practicing PD in India, only 40 centers implant more than one catheter per month. Early dropouts remain high [Figure 1]. Are we selecting suitable patients? Is our workforce sufficiently skilled to initiate and maintain patients on this therapy? Are we using the appropriate model of care? Are we honest in the way we present choice of therapies to our patients?

This editorial focuses on the determinants of PD practice and possible solutions to revive this dying therapy for the next generation.

Choosing as a modality: Patient’s choice or doctors’ selection

Ideally, the choice of kidney replacement therapy should be made through a “shared” decision-making process—by the patients, in consultation with nephrologists, considering their life goals, comorbidities, available resources, and financial and logistic supports. However, not many nephrologists share all options objectively, allowing patients to make informed decisions. Multiple factors determine the selection^{3,4} [Table 1].

Patient related factors

A large proportion of patients present late with advanced kidney failure with uremic complications, and receive an “urgent start” hemodialysis (HD) while “urgent start” PD is not even considered. The experience in chronic kidney disease (CKD) clinics has been discouraging when discussing the home dialysis option. Referring physicians, unfortunately discourage patients from opting for PD by over-amplifying the issue of infections, the need for a sterile home environment, and personal hygiene. There is no discussion of catheter-related bloodstream infections that are common with HD. The lack of social workers and educators in dialysis




Figure 1: Year wise initiation of peritoneal dialysis (PD) in the last decade and dropouts from PD in the year 2022–2023 (Source: Baxter India Ltd data).