



# Characteristics and Growth of a Multi-center US Home Hemodialysis Program

Joel D. Glickman M.D., F.A.C.P., University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine

Joe Weldon, Ron Levine and David Franklin, DaVita

*DaVita.*  
AT HOME

 UNIVERSITY OF  
PENNSYLVANIA  
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE



# Background

- As home hemodialysis (HHD) becomes more popular, many clinicians have questions regarding the characteristics of patients on HHD as well as potential growth of this modality.
- There is no data reporting the characteristics of HHD patients from multiple centers.
- Age, diabetes, and Charlson index all predict outcomes for in-center (IC) hemodialysis patients.
- In this retrospective study we report demographics of home hemodialysis patients compared to IC hemodialysis (HD) patients for a large, multi-center, national, dialysis provider.

# Patient Population

- All patients participating in the Davita At Home Hemodialysis program in the years 2005 through 2007.
- Clinical data are collected by the HHD nurse for each patient and are entered into a DaVita database
  - first date of dialysis (FDOD) and first date of Davita dialysis (FDODD)
  - first and last dates of HHD treatments
  - demographics (date of birth, gender, race)
  - comorbidities included in the Charlson Comorbidity Index



# Definitions of Cohorts

- Participating is defined as any patient who has had a dialysis service charge record within the index month (December) of the reference years 2005, 2006, 2007.
- IC/HH refers to the last HD treatment date within the index month. For example: If the last treatment was IC, the patient is classified as IC for that year; if the last treatment was HH, the patient is classified as HH.
- Vintage refers to the time from the first date of dialysis (FDOD) to the last date of HH or IC treatment.



# Analytical Calculations

- Charlson Index
  - Charlson ME, et al. J Chron Dis. 40(5)373-83,1987
- Age
  - DOB to the first index month
- Regular Vintage
  - First day of dialysis



# Statistical Analysis

- For comparison between groups, T-test and overall chi-square were performed.



# Demographics – number of patients

| <b>Number of Patients</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> | <b>2007</b> |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| HHD                       | 148         | 365         | 876         |
| In-Center Total           | 85,844      | 91,369      | 95,551      |



# Demographics – Age of patients

| Characteristic         |           | 2005            | 2006            | 2007            |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age<br>(mean $\pm$ SD) | HHD       | 50.8 $\pm$ 15.7 | 50.9 $\pm$ 14.6 | 51.5 $\pm$ 13.9 |
|                        | In-Center | 61.1 $\pm$ 15.2 | 61.1 $\pm$ 15.1 | 60.8 $\pm$ 15.1 |
| <i>P</i> < 0.0001      |           |                 |                 |                 |





# Demographics – Sex

| <b>Characteristic</b> |           | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> | <b>2007</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| % Male                | HHD       | 64.2        | 67.7        | 66.6        |
| $P < 0.0001$          | In-Center | 54.8        | 55.1        | 55.3        |



# Demographics – Race

| <b>Characteristic</b> |           | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> | <b>2007</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| % Caucasian           | HHD       | 54.1        | 59.7        | 63.8        |
| $P < 0.0001$          | In-Center | 38.1        | 38.3        | 38.2        |



# Demographics – Diabetes

| <b>Characteristic</b> |           | <b>2005</b>  | <b>2006</b>  | <b>2007</b>  |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| % Diabetic            | HHD       | 48.0         | 49.3         | 50.9         |
|                       | In Center | 51.8         | 57.9         | 59.1         |
|                       |           | $P < 0.3512$ | $P < 0.0001$ | $P < 0.0001$ |



# Vintage Days

| Characteristic |           | 2005              | 2006              | 2007              |
|----------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Vintage Days   | HHD       | 2035.40           | 1717.50           | 1488.10           |
|                | In Center | 1094.68           | 1118.69           | 1203.58           |
|                |           | <i>P</i> < 0.0001 | <i>P</i> < 0.0001 | <i>P</i> < 0.0001 |



# Demographics – Charlson Index

| Characteristic              |           | 2005          | 2006          | 2007          |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Charlson<br>(mean $\pm$ SD) | HHD       | 4.6 $\pm$ 2.2 | 4.7 $\pm$ 2.3 | 4.8 $\pm$ 2.2 |
|                             | In Center | 5.4 $\pm$ 2.2 | 5.5 $\pm$ 2.2 | 5.4 $\pm$ 2.1 |
| <i>P</i> < 0.0001           |           |               |               |               |

[Regression Trend test *P* T < 0.3979]



# Summary of Results

- Over one-year periods the HHD program grew 147% from 2005 to 2006 and 134% from 2006 to 2007
- The average age of the HHD patients was significantly lower compared to IC patients
- There were more males on HHD than on IC HD
- Similarly there were more Caucasians in the HHD cohort
- After the first year, there was a significantly smaller percentage of diabetics in the HHD than the IC cohort
- Patients on HHD were on dialysis longer than IC patients
- The Charlson was significantly lower in the HHD patients than the IC patients



# Conclusions

- HHD patients are significantly younger, are more likely to be Caucasian males and have lower comorbidities (prevalence of diabetes and Charlson co-morbidity scores) than IC HD patients.
- Studies that report outcomes for HHD patients need to control for these differences.



# Acknowledgements

- We acknowledge the support of DaVita at Home and DaVita Clinical Research with this analysis.