Revised manuscript
Original Investigation

Title:
Handgrip strength is an independent predictor of renal outcomes in patients with chronic kidney diseases

Authors:
Yu-Tzu Chang[1,*], Hung-Lien Wu[2,*], How-Ran Guo[3], Ya-Yun Cheng[3], Chin-Chung Tseng[1], Ming-Cheng Wang[1], Ching-Yuang Lin[4], and Junne-Ming Sung[1]

Institutions:
From the [1]Department of Internal Medicine and [2] Department of Nutrition, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, Tainan, Taiwan; [3]Graduate Institute of Environmental and Occupational Health, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan; [4]Children's Medical Center, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan

Running title:
HGS predicts renal outcomes in CKD

Correspondence and offprint requests to: Junne-Ming Sung, MD, Department of Internal Medicine, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, 138 Shing-Li Rd., Tainan 70428, Taiwan. Email: jmsung@mail.ncku.edu.tw.
Phone: +886-6-2353535 ext: 2591
Fax:+886-6-2766175
*Chang YT and Wu HL contributed equally to this study

Background. In dialysis patients, protein-energy wasting (PEW) is associated with high mortality, and some indicators of PEW, such as serum albumin value, subjective global assessment (SGA) score and handgrip strength (HGS), may predict mortality. However, whether PEW is associated with poor renal outcomes and whether the indicators of PEW can predict renal outcomes in patients with non-dialysis-dependent chronic kidney disease (CKD-ND) are still unclear.

Methods. We enrolled 128 clinically stable patients with CKD-ND and followed-up for 33.8±9.2 months. Baseline characteristics, echocardiographic information, laboratory data, HGS, SGA scores, anthropometric parameters, bioimpedance analyses, and other indicators of PEW were examined in relation to the risk of reaching renal composite end points of pre-dialysis mortality or dialysis-dependent end stage renal disease (ESRD).

Results: Twenty-six patients reached composite renal end points. Multivariate Cox regression analyses showed that HGS was an independent predictor of renal outcome in patients with CKD-ND of stages 1 to 5 (CKD_{1-5}, hazard ration [HR]=0.90, p=0.004) or advanced CKD-ND of stages 3b (defined as estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] of 30 to 44 ml/min per 1.73m^2) to 5 (CKD_{3b-5}, HR=0.91, p=0.031), but not serum albumin, SGA score or other indicators of PEW. When the cutoffs were set at 24.65kg in men with CKD_{1-5}, 20.15kg in men with CKD_{3b-5}, and 10.15kg in women

with CKD_{1-5} or CKD_{3b-5}, which were deduced from receiver-operating characteristics analyses, patients with lower HGS had significantly poor renal outcomes in Kaplan-Meier survival analyses in all subgroups and higher HR for reaching renal end points in multivariate Cox regression analyses in all subgroups except for women with CKD_{3b-5}, whose HR had marginal significance (HR=3.78, p=0.068) after adjusting for age and eGFR.

Conclusions. This is the first study demonstrating HGS is an independent predictor of composite renal outcomes in CKD-ND patients. HGS can be incorporated to clinical practice for assessing nutrition status and renal prognosis in patients with CKD-ND.

INDEX WORDS: Chronic kidney disease (CKD); handgrip strength (HGS); Subjective global assessment (SGA); serum albumin.

Summary of main message:

This is the first study demonstrated that low handgrip strength, but not other nutritional indicators of protein-energy wasting, independently predicts poor composite renal outcomes in patients with non-dialysis-dependent CKD. We suggest measurement of handgrip can be used in clinical practice for assessing nutrition status and renal prognosis in patients with non-dialysis-dependent CKD.

Introduction:

Individuals with chronic kidney disease (CKD), including non-dialysis-dependent CKD (CKD-ND) or dialysis-dependent end-stage renal diseases (ESRD), experience high cardiovascular and all-cause mortality rates [1,2]. In dialysis patients, the high mortality rates are associated with protein-energy wasting (PEW) [3-5]. It is now clear that PEW is not only prevalent in dialysis patients but also in patients with CKD-ND [6,7], and recent studies demonstrated some indicators of PEW (such as serum albumin levels and percent of lymphocytes) are associated with cardiovascular events, cardiovascular mortality and all-cause mortality in CKD-ND patients [8-11], suggesting PEW may make great impact on clinical course of CKD-ND. However, most of these studies did not report the pre-dialysis and post-dialysis mortalities separately [8-11], and there is little information about the association between the indicators of PEW and composite renal outcomes of pre-dialysis mortality or reaching ESRD in CKD-ND population. The assessment of composite renal outcomes is clinically relevant because there is a competition between pre-dialysis mortality and reaching ESRD in patients with CKD-ND, and the goal of clinical reno-protection strategies is to prevent both of them. It is feasible that PEW contributes to pre-dialysis mortality and rapid decline of renal function. As an example, PEW is strongly associated with cardiovascular disease (CVD) in patients with CKD-ND [8-11], and

CVD is not only the leading cause of pre-dialysis mortality but also a strong risk factor for rapid decline of renal function [8-10, 12, 13].

CKD has emerged as a global public health burden. If PEW is clinical significant, identification of useful, easily performed and inexpensive tools to assess nutritional status is essential in clinical practice for the large population of patients with CKD-ND. Currently, several biochemical parameters (such as serum albumin and prealbumin levels), anthropometric measurements, biophysical methods (such as bioimpedance, handgrip muscle strength [HGS]), biochemical methods (such as dual energy X-ray absorptiometry) and nutritional scoring systems (such as Subjective Global Assessment of Nutrition [SGA]), which have been used clinically as nutritional assessment tools in dialysis patients, may be indicatives of PEW. Among these, serum albumin value is the most common used and has strong outcome predictability [5, 12], and SGA is suggested for the routine monitoring the nutritional status by the Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative (K/DOQI) guidelines [14] in dialysis patients. In addition, HGS measurement, a simple, easily performed, bedside test [15], has also emerged as a reliable tool to assess nutrition status and as a prognostic factor in dialysis patients [16-18]; however, use of theses parameters as renal outcome predictors in patients with CKD-ND has not been established.

We hypothesized that PEW is associated with poor composite renal outcomes in

patients with CKD-ND. The aim of the present study is to evaluate the renal outcome predictability of various potential indicators of PEW, including HGS, SGA score, serum albumin and other nutritional markers, in patients with CKD-ND for testing the hypothesis and identifying useful indicator(s) for clinical patient care.

Subjects and methods

Study design and participants

We conducted a prospective observational study to evaluate the association between potential indicators of PEW and the composite renal outcomes in patients with CKD-ND in Nephrology out-patient unit of National Cheng Kung University Hospital, Tainan, Taiwan. This study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee at the institute, and informed consent was obtained from each enrolled patient. From July 1 to December 31, 2005, patients with CKD-ND, who had received multidisciplinary CKD-education (focused on lifestyle, nephrotoxin avoidance, dietary principles and pharmacological regimens) every 3 months for at least half year, were eligible to enroll. Exclusion criteria included age younger than 18 or older than 75, inability to communicate with examiners, arthritis or neuromuscular diseases involved bilateral hands, an acute illness necessitating admission within previous 6 months, malignancy diagnosed before enrollment, Class III or IV congestive heart failure (CHF), severe nephrotic syndrome (defined as an increase of body weight of $\geq$ 5kg from baseline

due to heavy proteinuria), intercurrent steroid therapy, gastrointestinal disease (such as ulcerative colitis and Crohn's disease), or other severe organ failure that may influence nutritional data or survival time.

GFR was estimated (eGFR) using an IDMS traceable formula derived by the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD) study group: eGFR=175 X (serum creatinine)$^{1.154}$ X age$^{0.203}$X (0.742 if female) [19]. CKD was staged according to National Kidney Foundation (NKF) guidelines with minor modifications as the following: eGFR (ml/min per 1.73 m^2) of 45 to 59 was assigned to CKD stage 3a, and eGFR of 30 to 44 was assigned to CKD stage 3b. In addition, all enrolled patients with CKD stages 1 and 2 were required to have urine albumin to creatinine ratio > 30. For the final statistic analysis, we further defined three groups: $CKD_{1\text{-}5}$ group, patients with CKD-ND stage1 to 5; $CKD_{1\text{-}3a}$ subgroup, patients with CKD stage1 to 3a; $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$ subgroup, patients with CKD-ND stage3b to 5.

Patients were followed up every 1 to 3 months till December 31, 2008. The end point was composite renal end point of pre-dialysis mortality (mortality before commencing long-term dialysis) or reaching ESRD (uremia receiving long-term dialysis). The indications of starting long-term dialysis, which were consistent with the clinical practice and the recommendations of the National Health Insurance of Taiwan, were eGFR $\leq$ 5 or serum creatinine level $\geq$ 10 mg/dl or the presence of

uremic symptoms [20]. Since the use of nephrotoxic agents may affect the renal outcomes, participants with episode of documented drug-related (such as herbal medicine or non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs) or contrast media-related acute deterioration of renal function (defined arbitrarily as an increase in serum creatinine of 25 percent or more from the baseline [21] during the follow-up period would be excluded from statistic analyses.

Clinical assessments and data collection

We collected baseline clinical data (such as age, sex, height, body weight, clinical etiology of CKD if possible, co-morbidities, blood pressure, use of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors [ACEIs]/angiotensin II-receptor blockers [ARBs], and laboratory measures [such as serum creatinine, albumin, C-reactive protein {CRP}, total cholesterol, complete blood counts, urine routines, urine total protein to creatinine ratio and albumin to creatinine ratio], anthropometric information and various potential indicators of PEW [such as body mass index, waist/hip ratio, midarm circumference, triceps skinfold thickness, midarm muscle circumference, midarm muscle area, SGA, bioimpedance analyses, HGS, and pinch strength]). For the laboratory tests, fasting blood and urine samples were obtained from each patient within one month after enrollment and were performed in the Department of Clinical

Pathology, National Cheng-Kung University Hospital, by means of routine methods. The daily urine protein loss was estimated by urine total protein to creatinine ratio. All patients received echocardiograms studies performed within 3 months after enrollment, which were used to estimate CHF (defined as an ejection fraction of <50%), or left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH, defined as left ventricle mass index ≥ 125g/m^2 in men and 100g/m^2 in women). CVD was defined as a previous history of CHF, LVH, ischemic heart disease (including prior history of angina, myocardial infarction, coronary artery bypass grafting and percutaneous cardiac catheter intervention) or cerebrovascular disease (including prior history of transient ischemic attack and stroke).

Assessments of nutritional status and potential indicators of PEW

We applied a modified SGA with a 7-point scale and a single renal dietitian, who has worked in this field for 20 years, assessed the nutritional status of all patients. The actual body weight (BW) and height on the day of assessment was used. Anthropometric measurements include triceps skinfold thickness (TSF) used skinfold calipers (Lange Skinfold Caliper Beta Technology Inc, Cambridge, Maryland, USA); midarm circumference (MAC) measured by a stretchable measuring tape, midarm muscle circumference (MAMC) equals MAC (cm) - 3.14 x TSF (mm)/10, and

midarm muscle area (MAMA) equals ($MAMC^2/4\pi$). Muscle strength as HGS test was measured by Lafayette Hand Dynamometer (Model 78010, Lafayette Instrument Co., Indiana, USA). HGS was measured 3 times for both left and right hands with patients in a standing position using a dynamometer in units of kilograms. Patients held the dynamometer at thigh level and were encouraged to squeeze the instrument as hard as possible for 3 seconds. The maximum grip strength among all measurements was used for the present study. Pinch strength (PS) test was measured by pinch gauge (Pinch Gauge Operating Instruction, B & L Engineering Pinsco Inc. CA, USA). Single frequency bioimpedance (Bodystat1500; Bodystat Limited, Douglas, Isle of Man) was used to estimate body composition when patients were resting in a supine position.

Statistical Analyses

Continuous variables were presented as mean ± standard deviation. Comparisons of variables with normal distribution were assessed by using Student's *t*-test, and comparisons of non-parametric data were assessed by Mann-Whitney U test. The categorical variables were presented as number of case (percentage) and compared using the chi-square test. Cox proportional hazards analysis was used to evaluate the impact of patients' baseline parameters on renal composite outcome. Since the gender may influence HGS, receiver-operating characteristic curves (ROC curves) were used

to evaluate outcome predictability of HGS by comparing the areas under curve (AUCs) between unadjusted and adjusted (for serum albumin and SGA), and to set the cutoffs of HGS to predict renal outcomes in different gender subgroups, including men with $CKD_{1\text{-}5}$, women with $CKD_{1\text{-}5}$, men with $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$, and women with $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis with the log-rank test and multivariate Cox proportional hazards analysis were subsequently performed to evaluate the renal survival difference and hazard ratio (HR) for reaching end points by using different cutoffs values of HGS in different subgroups respectively. In $CKD_{1\text{-}5}$ men and women subgroups, we constructed the final Cox's models by starting with a full model with all relevant predictor variables and then keeping those with $p \leq 0.2$; thus, age, eGFR, the presence of CVD, systolic blood pressure and urine daily protein loss were included in the final models. In $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$ subgroups, only age and eGFR were put into final models because of the limitation of sizes. A *P* value of less than 0.05 was considered significant. Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS 17.0 statistical software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

There were 164 CKD-ND patients were eligible and 31 patients refused to participate. Five patients withdrew because of drugs-related or contrast media-induced acute renal function deterioration. No patients were lost to follow-up or received pre-empty

kidney transplantation. Finally, there were 128 patients entering the statistic analysis. Among them, 9 had CKD stage 1, 35 had CKD stage 2, 18 had CKD stage 3a, 17 had CKD stage 3b, 31 had CKD stage 4, and 18 had CKD-ND stage 5 when enrolled. During follow-up period, 26 participants reached end point: 10 patients had pre-dialysis mortality and 16 reached ESRD. The causes of death included CVD (n=5, including coronary heart diseases, n=2; heart failure, n=1; aortic dissection, n=1; and ischemic bowel disease, n=1), septic shock (n=2), acute pancreatitis (n=1), malignancy with sepsis (n=1), and massive gastrointestinal bleeding (n=1).

Baseline clinical characteristics of patients with or without reaching renal composite end points

Tables 1 and2 showed the baseline data, measurements of various potential indicators of PEW, and the results of the statistical analysis. Patients reaching renal end points had more advanced renal disease, higher systolic blood pressure, higher CVD prevalence, and fewer patients using ACEIs/ARBs. They also had higher blood urea nitrogen, creatinine and phosphate levels, while having lower eGFR, calcium and hematocrit levels, than patients not reaching end points. Furthermore, their serum albumin levels were lower (p=0.003) and daily urine protein losses were heavier (p=0.004).

Among various potential indicators of PEW, only HGS (p=0.004) and SGA

scores (p=0.011) were significantly different between patients with and without reaching composite renal end points. Average HGS by age-, sex- and CKD group-specific categories were shown in **Supplementary Fig. S1**. Data of the health control group was deduced from a Japanese population-based study which included persons of 35 to 74 years old [22]. A gradual decrease was found in both sexes when the age increased in $CKD_{1\text{-}3a}$ and $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$ patients (trend tests, all P<0.05). There were significant differences of HGS between men and women according to age-, sex- and CKD group-specific categories (t tests, all P<0.05); however, there was no significant difference in HGS values between CKD1-3a and CKD3b-5 subgroups in both sexes in all categories (t tests, all P>0.05). We also noted that HGS correlated with MAMA, MAMC, SGA scores, and serum albumin levels though not as strong (**Supplementary Table S1**). In addition, we observed that malnourished patients (SGA1-5) had significant lower HGS than well-nourished participants (SGA6-7) (20.3±9.7 kg *vs* 24.7±9.8 kg, p=0.02).

Assess the outcome predictability of clinical parameters and indicators of PEW in patients with $CKD_{1\text{-}5}$ and $CKD_{3b\text{-}5}$

We subsequently analyzed the potential risk factors predicting the composite renal outcomes deduced from **Tables 1 and 2**. Blood urea nitrogen, calcium, phosphate, and hematocrit values, which were significantly different between patients

with or without reaching renal end points, were not included in risk factor analysis, because they were significantly associated with eGFR levels by Person's correlation analysis and they were not significantly associated with the composite renal end point by Cox regression analysis after adjusted eGFR (**Supplementary Tables S2-A and S2-B)**. Age, sex, and the presence of diabetes were included since previous studies suggested they had a potential impact on renal outcomes [9, 10, 13]. Participants with mild renal failure (CKD_{1-3a}) were less likely to reach renal end points during the follow-up period and tend to have higher HGS, which might confound the statistical results, so we evaluated the potential risk factors in both CKD_{1-5} group as a whole CKD population and CKD_{3b-5} subgroups as a high risk group in terms of reaching composite renal endpoints. Univariate Cox regression analyses showed HGS, eGFR level, CVD history, use of ACEIs/ARBs, SGA scores, systolic blood pressure, serum albumin value, serum CRP value and daily urine protein loss are significant prognostic indices for renal outcomes (**Table 3**, all $p<0.05$). Neither age nor diabetes was significant predictor.

Since three potential indicators of PEW, including serum albumin value, HGS and SGA score, were significant predictor in univariate model, we further assessed their outcome predictability by multivariate Cox survival analysis. **Table 4** showed HGS was an independent outcome predictor (HR, 95% CI=0.90, 0.84-0.97 in CKD_{1-5}

group and 0.91, 0.83-0.99 in CKD_{3b-5} subgroup respectively); whereas, serum albumin level and SGA score were not significantly associated with renal outcomes. In addition, we evaluated outcome predictability of HGS by using ROC curve analysis. As shown in **Supplementary Fig. S2**, adjusting for SGA and serum albumin for ROC curves of HGS would not increase prediction powers significantly in different subgroups, indicating HGS was the major nutritional marker for predicting composite renal outcomes.

Assess outcome predictability of HGS for different cutoffs

We defined the cutoffs with outcome predictability of HGS by ROC curves of different subgroups. The sensitivity and specificity were 80.4% and 57.1% for the HGS cutoff of 24.65kg in men with CKD_{1-5}, 87.5% and 58.3% for the cutoff of 10.15 kg in women with CKD_{1-5}, 95% and 50% for the cutoff of 20.15kg in men with CKD_{3b-5}, and 87.5% and 58.3% for the cutoff 10.15 kg in women with CKD_{3b-5} (all $p<0.05$). Kaplan-Meier survival curves analyses showed patients with HGS lower than different cutoffs set for all subgroups had significantly poor renal outcomes (**Fig. 1**, all $p<0.05$). Multivariate Cox regression analyses showed patients with lower HGS lower than cutoffs had higher HR for reaching renal end points in all subgroups except for women with CKD_{3b-5}, whose HR had marginal significance (HR=3.78, $p=0.068$) after adjusting for age and eGFR (**Table 5**).

Discussion:

The present study showed that HGS, but not other potential indicators of PEW examined, is a valid predictor of composite renal outcomes in all CKD-ND subgroups, suggesting PEW is one of the underlying mechanisms leading to pre-dialysis mortality or reaching ESRD rapidly. These findings underline the importance of nutritional assessments and suggest that HGS measurement can be used as a reliable and inexpensive tool in clinical practice to assess the nutrition status of patients with CKD-ND. HGS measurement will be very useful especially when dietician is not available such as in local outpatient clinics or in areas with limited medical resources.

In the present study, serum albumin value was not significantly associated with renal outcomes in patients with CKD_{1-5} or CKD_{3b-5} after adjusted for multiple risk factors (**Table 4**). Serum albumin was significantly associated with renal outcome in univariate analyses; however, serum albumin lost its outcome predictability after adjusting for urine protein loss and eGFR, suggesting the renal outcome predictability of serum albumin is largely dependent on the urine protein loss and eGFR in CKD-ND patients. Contradictory to our results, Kovesdy et al. found that serum albumin level <3.7 g/dl was independently associated with poor composite renal outcomes (pre-dialysis mortality and ESRD) in their patients with CKD-ND [11]. This discrepancy might be explained by different study populations. We excluded patients

with severe co-morbidities or acute illness necessitating admission within 6 months before enrollment, resulting in total mortality (including both pre-dialysis and post-dialysis mortality) of 40.1/1000 and 64.3/1000 patient-year in patients with CKD_{1-5} and CKD_{3b-5} respectively; whereas, Kovesdy et al. studied 1220 men (most of whom had CKD stages 3 and 4) enrolled without specific excluding criteria over a period of 16.5 years, resulting in a mortality rate of 125/1000 patient-year [11]. Since serum albumin is highly influenced by inflammatory status, it is possible that the renal outcome predictability of low serum albumin level in the study population of Kovesdy et al [11] reflected more prevalent comorbidities or acute illnesses.

We also found that SGA was not significantly associated with renal outcomes in patients with CKD_{1-5} or CKD_{3b-5} after adjusted for multiple risk factors (**Table 4**). It is not surprising that SGA has some limitations assessing the severity of PEW, and thus failed to predict renal outcomes. Muscle weakness and wasting are important components of PEW since degradation of muscle protein is the main source of amino acids for protein synthesis and gluconeogenesis during starvation or several acute or chronic illnesses [23, 24]; in addition, the inflammatory status of PEW may independently diminish the muscle strength even when the muscle mass is still relatively well-preserved [24, 26]. Therefore, assessments of PEW should include measurements of muscle mass and function [23, 24]. The SGA evaluates nutritional

status by encompassing the patient's history and physical examination, but no functional measurement.

Since measure of muscle compartment is often difficult by traditional methods, measurement of HGS may be an appropriate strategy. HGS has been shown to correlate with force measurements exerted by different muscle groups, underlining its usefulness in assessing the functional status of general muscles. In patients with ESRD, HGS is shown to be a reliable nutritional marker in both hemodialysis [] and peritoneal dialysis patients [27, 17], and low HGS predicts mortality [16-18, 28]. In addition, HGS was associated with arterial stiffness [29] and predicted circulatory congestion in peritoneal dialysis patients [30]. In patients with CKD-ND, HGS was demonstrated to correlate with other nutritional markers, eg, lean body mass and SGA scores [24, 28]. In the present study, we further demonstrated that HGS independently predicted the composite renal end points. Other nutritional indicators such as MAMA, MAMC, serum albumin levels, and SGA scores all failed to predict renal outcomes independently. This suggests HGS uniquely reflects skeletal muscle function additional to muscle mass that is not captured by other nutritional indices and contributes to renal outcome predictability of HGS.

Several potential mechanisms may be involved in the association between low HGS, as an indicator of PEW, and poor composite renal outcomes in CKD-ND

patients. Firstly, inflammatory cytokines, such as CRP, interleukin-6 and tumor necrosis factor-α, and concurrent malnutrition and muscle wasting may worsen patient outcome by aggravating CVD and arterial stiffness, and increasing susceptibility to infection [31,32]. In addition, CVD and arterial stiffness would accelerate the decline of renal function in CKD-ND patients [13, 33]. Secondly, the components of PEW , such as inflammation, acidosis, vitamin D deficiency, and accumulation of ‘‘uremic toxins’’, appear to decrease insulin sensitivity and muscle phosphatidylinositol 3 kinase activity, leading to activation of caspase 3 and the ubiquitin proteasome pathway, and subsequent muscle wasting [34, 35]. It was recently reported that insulin resistance is not only a risk factor of CVD but also of the rapid progression of CKD [36]. It should be mentioned that Castaneda et al. showed in a randomized controlled trial of patients with moderate CKD consuming a low-protein diet that 12 weeks of resistance-exercise training decreased serum CRP and interleukin-6 levels, accompanied by a significant improvements in protein utilization and nutritional status (mid-thigh muscle area, type I and II muscle-fiber cross-sectional area and serum prealbumin) [37, 38]. In addition, they also demonstrated that resistance exercise training could improve glycemic control in older adults with type 2 diabetes [39]. These suggest the possible interactions between inflammation, insulin resistance and muscle wasting, and resistance-exercise training to increase muscle strength and

mass can potentially attenuate the severity of PEW by reducing inflammation and insulin resistance. Further studies are need in this field.

There are several limitations worth noting in our study. Firstly, the sample size is relatively small, which may affect defining the cutoffs of HGS for renal outcome predictability. However, although the CIs were wide in **Table5**, the *P* values were significant except women with CKD_{3b-5}, whose HR had marginal significance (HR=3.78, p=0.068) after adjusting for age and eGFR. In addition, the HRs obtained through a series of models were similar for each subgroup. Taking together, these data suggest acceptable statistic power but small sample size in these models. Furthermore, we cannot analyze the predictability of HGS on pre-dialysis mortality and reaching ESRD separately due to the limitation of size. Secondly, we enrolled clinically stable patients with CKD-ND; thus, the findings in the present study might not be generalized to CKD-ND patients with acute illness or severe comorbidities. Thirdly, we could not study the dynamic changes of various indicators of PEW and further explore their impacts.

In conclusion, we show that low HGS is an independent predictor of the composite renal outcome in CKD-ND patients. Based on our findings, we recommend the measurement of HGS can be incorporated to clinical practice to assess the degree of PEW and renal outcome in patients with CKD-ND. Further studies with larger

sample sizes are warrant to define the cutoffs of HGS for outcome predictability and to evaluate whether strategies to increase HGS, such as resistance-exercise training, can improve renal outcomes in CKD-ND patients.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by grant of DOH94-TD-F-113-069 (2) to HL Wu, and DOH97-HP-1103 to Lin CY and Sung JM from Department of Health ROC, Taiwan

Disclosures

There are no interests to be disclosed.

References:

1. Foley RN, Parfrey PS, Sarnak MJ. Clinical epidemiology of cardiovascular disease in chronic renal disease. Am J Kidney Dis 1998; 32:S112-9.
2. Astor BC, Hallan SI, Miller ER, 3rd, et al. Glomerular filtration rate, albuminuria, and risk of cardiovascular and all-cause mortality in the US population. Am J Epidemiol 2008; 167:1226-34.
3. Adequacy of dialysis and nutrition in continuous peritoneal dialysis: association with clinical outcomes. Canada-USA (CANUSA) Peritoneal Dialysis Study Group. J Am Soc Nephrol 1996; 7:198-207.
4. Avram MM, Goldwasser P, Erroa M, et al. Predictors of survival in continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis patients: the importance of prealbumin and other nutritional and metabolic markers. Am J Kidney Dis 1994; 23:91-8.
5. Fouque D, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Kopple J, et al. A proposed nomenclature and diagnostic criteria for protein-energy wasting in acute and chronic kidney disease. Kidney Int 2008; 73:391-8.
6. Mehrotra R, Kopple JD. Nutritional management of maintenance dialysis patients: why aren't we doing better? Annu Rev Nutr 2001; 21:343-79.
7. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Ikizler TA, Block G, et al. Malnutrition-inflammation complex syndrome in dialysis patients: causes and consequences. Am J Kidney Dis 2003; 42:864-81.
8. Menon V, Greene T, Wang X, et al. C-reactive protein and albumin as predictors of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in chronic kidney disease. Kidney Int 2005; 68:766-72.
9. Muntner P, He J, Astor BC, et al. Traditional and nontraditional risk factors predict coronary heart disease in chronic kidney disease: results from the atherosclerosis risk in communities study. J Am Soc Nephrol 2005; 16:529-38.
10. Weiner DE, Tighiouart H, Elsayed EF, et al. The relationship between nontraditional risk factors and outcomes in individuals with stage 3 to 4 CKD. Am J Kidney Dis 2008; 51:212-23.
11. Kovesdy CP, George SM, Anderson JE, et al. Outcome predictability of biomarkers of protein-energy wasting and inflammation in moderate and advanced chronic kidney disease. Am J Clin Nutr 2009; 90:407-14.
12. Carrero JJ, Park SH, Axelsson J, et al. Cytokines, atherogenesis, and hypercatabolism in chronic kidney disease: a dreadful triad. Semin Dial 2009; 22:381-6.
13. Levin A, Djurdjev O, Beaulieu M, et al. Variability and risk factors for kidney disease progression and death following attainment of stage 4 CKD in a referred cohort. Am J Kidney Dis 2008; 52:661-71.

14. Clinical practice guidelines for nutrition in chronic renal failure. K/DOQI, National Kidney Foundation. Am J Kidney Dis 2000; 35:S1-140.
15. Bohannon RW. Dynamometer measurements of hand-grip strength predict multiple outcomes. Percept Mot Skills 2001; 93:323-8.
16. Stenvinkel P, Barany P, Chung SH, et al. A comparative analysis of nutritional parameters as predictors of outcome in male and female ESRD patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2002; 17:1266-74.
17. Wang AY, Sea MM, Ho ZS, et al. Evaluation of handgrip strength as a nutritional marker and prognostic indicator in peritoneal dialysis patients. Am J Clin Nutr 2005; 81:79-86.
18. Leal VO, Mafra D, Fouque D, et al. Use of handgrip strength in the assessment of the muscle function of chronic kidney disease patients on dialysis: a systematic review. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2010. [Epub ahead of print].
19. Levey AS, Bosch JP, Lewis JB, et al. A more accurate method to estimate glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine: a new prediction equation. Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group. Ann Intern Med 1999; 130:461-70.
20. Hwang SJ, Yang WC, Lin MY, et al. Impact of the clinical conditions at dialysis initiation on mortality in incident haemodialysis patients: a national cohort study in Taiwan. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2010; 25:2616-24.
21. Marenzi G, Assanelli E, Marana I, et al. N-acetylcysteine and contrast-induced nephropathy in primary angioplasty. N Engl J Med 2006; 354:2773-82.
22. Sasaki H, Kasagi F, Yamada M, Fujita S: Grip strength predicts cause-specific mortality in middle-aged and elderly persons. *Am J Med* 2007, 120(4):337-42
23. Daniel PM. The metabolic homoeostatic role of muscle and its function as a store of protein. Lancet 1977; 2:446-8.
24. Pagels A, Heiwe S, Hylander B. [Nutritional status of pre-dialysis patients]. J Ren Care 2006; 32:162-6.
25. Sasaki H, Kasagi F, Yamada M, et al. Grip strength predicts cause-specific mortality in middle-aged and elderly persons. Am J Med 2007; 120:337-42.
26. Ali NA, O'Brien JM, Jr., Hoffmann SP, et al. Acquired weakness, handgrip strength, and mortality in critically ill patients. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2008; 178:261-8.
27. Qureshi AR, Alvestrand A, Danielsson A, et al. Factors predicting malnutrition in hemodialysis patients: a cross-sectional study. Kidney Int 1998; 53:773-82.
28. Heimburger O, Qureshi AR, Blaner WS, et al. Hand-grip muscle strength, lean body mass, and plasma proteins as markers of nutritional status in patients with chronic renal failure close to start of dialysis therapy. Am J Kidney Dis 2000;

36:1213-25.
29. Tang W, Cheng LT, Lu XH, et al. Effect of nutrition on arterial stiffness in peritoneal dialysis patients. Am J Nephrol 2009; 30:120-5.
30. Wang AY, Sanderson JE, Sea MM, et al. Handgrip strength, but not other nutrition parameters, predicts circulatory congestion in peritoneal dialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2010.[Epub ahead of print]
31. Pecoits-Filho R, Lindholm B, Stenvinkel P. The malnutrition, inflammation, and atherosclerosis (MIA) syndrome -- the heart of the matter. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2002; 17 Suppl 11:28-31.
32. Kuzniar J, Porazko T, Klinger M. Relationship between fetuin-A concentration, elevated levels of inflammatory markers, and arterial wall stiffness in end-stage kidney disease. J Ren Nutr 2008; 18:83-6.
33. Taal MW, Sigrist MK, Fakis A, et al. Markers of arterial stiffness are risk factors for progression to end-stage renal disease among patients with chronic kidney disease stages 4 and 5. Nephron Clin Pract 2007; 107:c177-81.
34. Chen J, Muntner P, Hamm LL, et al. Insulin resistance and risk of chronic kidney disease in nondiabetic US adults. J Am Soc Nephrol 2003; 14:469-77.
35. Lee SW, Dai G, Hu Z, et al. Regulation of muscle protein degradation: coordinated control of apoptotic and ubiquitin-proteasome systems by phosphatidylinositol 3 kinase. J Am Soc Nephrol 2004; 15:1537-45.
36. Kobayashi H, Tokudome G, Hara Y, et al. Insulin resistance is a risk factor for the progression of chronic kidney disease. Clin Nephrol 2009; 71:643-51.
37. Castaneda C, Gordon PL, Parker RC, et al. Resistance training to reduce the malnutrition-inflammation complex syndrome of chronic kidney disease. Am J Kidney Dis 2004; 43:607-16.
38. Castaneda C, Gordon PL, Uhlin KL, et al. Resistance training to counteract the catabolism of a low-protein diet in patients with chronic renal insufficiency. A randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 2001; 135:965-76.
39. Castaneda C, Layne JE, Munoz-Orians L, et al. A randomized controlled trial of resistance exercise training to improve glycemic control in older adults with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2002; 25:2335-41.

Table 1. Baseline clinical characteristics of the study populations[1]

Parameters	**Total (n=128)**	**Reaching renal composite end point**		***P value*[2]**
		No (n=102)	**Yes (n=26)**	
Age (year)	60.7 ± 14.8	60.3 ± 14.0	62.5 ± 18.0	0.491
Height (cm)	159.2 ± 7.3	158.8 ± 7.4	160.4 ± 7.2	0.329
Body weight (kg)	62.9 ± 10.7	62.7 ± 10.9	63.6 ± 9.8	0.725
Male/female (n)	60/68	46/56	14/12	0.425
Chronic kidney disease stage (n (%))				< 0.0001
Stage 1-3a	62(48.4%)	59(57.8%)	3(11.5%)	
Stage 3b-5	66(51.6%)	43(42.2%)	23(88.5%)	
Past medical history (n[%])				
Chronic glomerulonephritis	34(26.6%)	30(29.4%)	4(15.4%)	0.148
Tubulointerstitial nephritis	36(28.1%)	29(28.4%)	7(26.9%)	0.879
ADPKD	7(5.5%)	6(5.9%)	1(3.9%)	0.684
Hypertensive nephrosclerosis	8(6.3%)	7(6.9%)	1(3.8%)	0.571
Diabetes mellitus	45(35.1%)	33(32.4%)	12(46.2%)	0.188
Cardiovascular disease	36(28.1%)	22(21.6%)	14(53.8%)	0.001
Renal survival time during the study period (month)	33.8 ± 9.2	37.6 ± 3.6	18.9 ± 11.6	<0.0001
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	130.0 ± 15.7	127.6 ± 14.8	137.6 ± 17.0	0.007
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	74.5 ± 10.6	74.7 ± 10.7	73.5 ± 10.5	0.630
Use of ACEIs/ARBs (n[%])	70(54.7%)	61(59.8%)	9(34.6%)	0.021
Education level (n[%])				0.290
Junior high school or below	62(48.4%)	47(46.1%)	15(57.7%)	
Senior high school or above	66(51.6%)	55(53.9%)	11(42.3%)	
Blood urea nitrogen (mg/dl)	33 ± 11.2	27.2 ± 9.2	55.8 ± 25.9	< 0.0001
Creatinine (mg/dl)	2.0 ± 0.4	2.0 ± 0.9	3.7 ± 1.7	< 0.0001*
eGFR (ml/min)	46.6 ± 28.2	53.0 ± 26.6	21.6 ± 12.3	< 0.0001*
Calcium (mg/dl)	9.5 ± 0.6	9.6 ± 0.5	9.2 ± 0.8	0.040
Phosphate (mg/dl)	4.1 ± 0.8	3.9 ± 0.6	4.5 ± 1.0	0.002
Sodium (mmol/L)	140.6 ± 3.4	140.5 ± 3.5	141.0 ± 3.2	0.542
Potassium (mmol/L)	4.4 ± 0.5	4.3 ± 0.4	4.5 ± 0.7	0.165
Glucose (mg/dl)	112.1 ± 51.5	114.9 ± 50.3	112.3 ± 58.1	0.863
Albumin (g/dl)	4.3 ± 0.37	4.3 ± 0.3	4.0 ± 0.5	0.003
Urine daily protein loss (g/day)	1.6 ± 2.7	1.0 ± 1.6	3.9 ± 4.4	0.004
White blood cell (1000/mm^3)	7.0±2.4	6.9 ± 2.6	7.4 ± 1.5	0.420

Hematocrit (%)	35.4 ± 5.4	37.1 ± 7.4	31.4 ± 4.4	0.001
Total Cholesterol (mg/dl)	203.1 ± 40.7	203.4 ± 40.1	201.8 ± 44.0	0.868
Triglyceride (mg/dl)	168.4 ± 116.7	167.8 ± 121.8	171.2 ± 93.4	0.899
High density lipoprotein cholesterol (mg/dl)	45.3 ± 14.1	46.3 ± 13.9	41.1 ± 14.6	0.166
Low density lipoprotein cholesterol (mg/dl)	119.9 ± 38.8	120.1 ± 39.7	118.7 ± 35.8	0.899
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	3.6 ± 3.5	3.2 ± 3.1	5.3 ± 4.9	0.021*

1. Abbriviations: ADPKD: autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease; ACEI: angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB: angiotensin II receptor blocker, eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate; All data are expressed as mean ± SD
2. *P* values for comparisons between patients with and without reaching renal composite end point by Students' *t*-test for parametric data, and by *Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric data. .

Table 2. The anthropometric parameters, muscle strength, and nutritional markers of the study populations[1]

Parameters	Total (n=128)	Reaching renal composite end point		*P value*
		No (n=102)	Yes (n=26)	
BMI (kg/m^2)	24.9 ± 4.1	24.9 ± 4.0	24.9 ± 4.6	0.984
IBW (kgw)	55.8 ± 5.1	55.6 ± 5.2	56.7 ± 5.1	0.334
MAC (cm)	28.0 ± 3.6	28.1 ± 3.5	27.8 ± 4.1	0.699
TSF (mm)	21.7 ± 9.2	21.5 ± 8.9	22.5 ± 10.7	0.641
MAMC (cm)	21.3 ± 3.4	21.5 ± 3.5	20.8 ± 3.3	0.358
MAMA (cm^2)	36.9 ± 11.4	37.4 ± 11.6	35.1 ± 10.7	0.363
HGS (kg)	21.9 ± 9.9	23.2 ± 9.6	16.9 ± 9.8	0.004
Male (n=60)	28.0 ± 9.4	30.1 ± 8.1 (n=46)	21.2 ± 10.3 (n=14)	0.001
Female (n=68)	16.5 ± 6.8	17.5 ± 6.5 (n=56)	11.9 ± 6.5 (n=12)	0.008
PS (kg)	6.0 ± 2.1	6.2 ± 2.2	5.4 ± 2.0	0.095
SGA(score)	5.1 ± 1.0	5.3 ± 0.9	4.6 ± 1.2	0.011
Waist (cm)	84.6 ± 10.7	84.0 ± 10.8	86.8 ± 10.5	0.249
Hip (cm)	96.5 ± 8.1	96.4 ± 7.5	96.9 ± 10.0	0.788
Waist/Hip ratio	0.88 ± 0.07	0.87 ± 0.08	0.90 ± 0.06	0.113
Body fat (%)	27.1± 9.9	27.6 ± 9.7	25.3 ± 10.8	0.232
BIA data				
Total fat in body (kg)	17.4 ± 7.2	17.4 ± 7.2	16.4 ± 8.3	0.524
Lean body mass (kg)	45.2 ± 9.2	45.2 ± 9.5	47.2 ± 7.7	0.327
Total body water (kg)	33.3 ± 7.4	33.3 ± 7.4	35.4 ± 6.1	0.217
Total body water (%)	54.3 ± 9.0	53.9 ± 9.0	56.9 ± 9.0	0.179
Lean body mass (%)	73.8 ± 7.0	73.6 ± 7.4	74.9 ± 3.7	0.265
Resistance (Ω)	523.3 ± 125.9	532.2±129.5	489.0±106.8	0.180
Reactance (Ω)	84.4 ± 44.3	87.6±43.7	72.2±45.2	0.166
Phase angle	9.3 ± 4.8	9.5±4.7	8.5±5.0	0.334

[1]Abbriviations: BIA: bioimpedance; BMI: body mass index; IBW: ideal body weight; MAC: midarm circumference; TSF: triceps skinfold thickness; MAMC: midarm muscle circumference; MAMA: midarm muscle area; HGS: hand-grip strength; PS: pinch strength; SGA: subjective global assessment (1~7 scores).

Table 3. Univariate Cox regression model for identifying the potential risk factors for reaching renal composite end point in various populations[1]

	CKD stage 1-5 (n=128)		**CKD stage 3b-5 (n=66)**	
Variable	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	*P value*	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	*P value*
Age (year)	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	0.491	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	0.756
Sex	1.37 (0.63-2.96)	0.425	1.38 (0.61-3.13)	0.438
Creatinine (mg/dl)	2.30 (1.84-2.86)	<0.0001	2.15 (1.65-2.81)	<0.0001
eGFR (ml/min)	0.93 (0.90-0.96)	<0.0001	0.87 (0.82-0.92)	< 0.0001
CVD	3.51 (1.62-7.60)	0.001	3.80 (1.66-8.69)	0.002
Use of ACEI/ARB	0.34 (0.15-0.78)	0.012	0.58 (0.23-1.48)	0.255
HGS (kg)	0.93 (0.89-0.98)	0.002	0.94 (0.90-0.99)	0.015
SGA	0.53 (0.37-0.77)	0.001	0.57 (0.40-0.82)	0.002
SBP (mmHg)	1.03 (1.01-1.06)	0.005	1.03 (1.01-1.06)	0.016
DM	1.55 (0.72-3.36)	0.263	1.64 (0.72-3.75)	0.238
Albumin (g/dL)	0.13 (0.05-0.34)	<0.0001	0.21 (0.07-0.61)	0.004
Urine DPL (g/day)	1.16 (1.09-1.24)	<0.0001	1.12 (1.05-1.20)	0.001
CRP (mg/L)	1.03 (1.02-1.05)	<0.0001	1.03 (1.01-1.04)	0.009

[1]Abbriviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; ACEI: angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor ; ARB: angiotensin II receptor blocker; HGS: hand-grip strength; SGA: subjective global assessment; SBP: systolic blood pressure; DM: diabetic mellitus; DPL: daily protein loss; CRP: C-reactive protein.

Table 4. Multivariate Cox regression models for evaluating the impacts of various nutritional markers on renal outcomes in different patient subgroups[1, 2]

		CKD stage 1-5 (n=128)		CKD stage 3b-5 (n=66)	
Models	**Variables**	Hazard ratio (95%CI)	*P value*	Hazard ratio (95%CI)	*P value*
A	**HGS**	0.90 (0.84-0.97)	0.004	0.91 (0.83-0.99)	0.031
B	**SGA**	0.72 (0.44-1.19)	0.203	0.59 (0.33-1.05)	0.071
C	**Albumin**	0.40 (0.09-1.86)	0.242	0.93 (0.14-6.28)	0.937

[1]Models A, B,C all included DM, CVD, use of ACEI/ARB, Sex, Age, eGFR, SBP, DPL, and CRP as independent variables, in addition to HGS in Model A, SGA in Model B, and albumin in Model C.

[2]Abbriviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; ACEI: angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB: angiotensin II receptor blocker; HGS: hand-grip strength; SGA: subjective global assessment; SBP: systolic blood pressure; DM: diabetic mellitus; DPL: daily urine protein loss; CRP: C-reactive protein; Cr: creatinine; DPL: daily protein loss.

Table 5. Hazard ratios for reaching composite renal end points using different cutoffs of handgrip strength

Subgroups	Hazard ratio[a]	*P value*	Hazard ratio[b]	*P value*	Hazard ratio[c]	*P value*
CKD stage 1-5						
Men (n=60)						
HGS>24.65 kgw	1.0		1.0		1.0	
HGS<24.65 kgw	4.27 (1.48-12.34)	0.007	4.55 (1.49-13.87)	0.008	4.57(1.13-17.08)	0.027
Women (n=68)						
HGS>10.15 kgw	1.0		1.0		1.0	
HGS<10.15 kgw	7.48 (2.37-23.65)	0.001	4.56 (1.27-16.41)	0.020	5.939 (1.10-32.19)	0.039
CKD stage 3b-5						
Men (n=30)						
HGS>20.15 kgw	1.0		1.0			
HGS<20.15 kgw	5.97 (1.87-19.09)	0.003	3.72 (1.03-13.41)	0.045		
Women (n=36)						
HGS>10.15 kgw	1.0		1.0			
HGS<10.15 kgw	4.12 (1.25-13.58)	0.020	3.78 (0.91-15.81)	0.068		

[a]Univariate Cox's regression.

[b]Cox's regression adjusted for age and eGFR.

[c]Cox's regression adjusted for age, eGFR, CVD, SBP, and urine DPL.

Legends

Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival analyses for the composite renal outcomes in non-dialysis-dependent chronic kidney patients with different cutoffs of handgrip strength.

NDT CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM (one per manuscript)

Title: Handgrip strength is an independent predictor of renal outcomes in patients with chronic kidney diseases

Author(s): Yu-Tzu Chang, Hung-Lien Wu, How-Ran Guo, Ya-Yun Cheng, Chin-Chung Tseng, Ming-Cheng Wang, Ching-Yuang Lin, and Junne-Ming Sung

Ms number: NDT-01691-2010

CORRESPONDING OR LEAD AUTHORS: Please complete Part I or II. *NDT* policy requires that the corresponding or lead author of all manuscripts on behalf of all authors in the paper reveal in a signed statement any 1) financial interests or arrangements with a company whose product was used in a study or is referred to in a manuscript, 2) any financial interests of arrangement with a competing company, 3) any direct payment to an author(s) from any source for the purpose of writing the manuscript, and 4) any other financial connections, direct or indirect, or other situations *that might raise the question of bias* in the work reported or the conclusions, implications, or opinions stated – including pertinent commercial or other sources of funding for the individual author(s) or for the associated department(s) or organizations), personal relationships, or direct academic competition.

If the manuscript is published, such information must be communicated in a note following the text, before the references.

When considering whether you should declare a conflicting interest or connection please consider the conflict of interest test:
Is there any arrangement that would embarrass you or any of your co-authors if it was to emerge after publication and you had not declared it?

Upon acceptance of your paper the completed form should be sent to the:
Oxford Journals - NDT
Great Clarendon Street
Oxford
OX2 6DP
UK

I. Conflict of interest statement. Sample statement:

> I hold stock* in [business name], the makers of [product], and am currently conducting research sponsored by this company. I am also a member of the speakers' bureau for [business name].

* Please declare stock where this reveals a potential conflict of interest.

My statement (on behalf of all the authors) is as follows:

Printed name

Signature Date

II. We have had no involvements that might raise the question of bias in the work reported or in the conclusions, implications, or opinions stated.

Junne-Ming Sung

Printed name

Signature Date