

Renal Failure

renai

ISSN: 0886-022X (Print) 1525-6049 (Online) Journal homepage: informahealthcare.com/journals/irnf20

Meta-analysis of statin therapy in maintenance dialysis patients

Ling Sun, Luxi Zou, Maojie Chen & Bicheng Liu

To cite this article: Ling Sun, Luxi Zou, Maojie Chen & Bicheng Liu (2015) Meta-analysis of statin therapy in maintenance dialysis patients, Renal Failure, 37:7, 1149-1156, DOI: 10.3109/0886022X.2015.1061871

To link to this article: <u>https://doi.org/10.3109/0886022X.2015.</u>1061871

4	1	(1
Е			
Е			

Published online: 03 Jul 2015.



🕼 Submit your article to this journal 🗗



View related articles

View Crossmark data 🗹

Citing articles: 5 View citing articles 🕑

RENAL FAILURE http://informahealthcare.com/rnf ISSN: 0886-022X (print), 1525-6049 (electronic) Ren Fail, 2015; 37(7): 1149–1156 © 2015 Informa Healthcare USA, Inc. DOI: 10.3109/0886022X.2015.1061871

CLINICAL STUDY

Meta-analysis of statin therapy in maintenance dialysis patients

Ling Sun¹*[†], Luxi Zou¹*, Maojie Chen¹, and Bicheng Liu²

¹Department of Nephrology, Xuzhou Central Hospital Southeast University, Xuzhou City, Jiangsu Province, P.R. China and ²Department of Nephrology, Zhongda Hospital Southeast University, Nanjing City, Jiangsu Province, P.R. China

Abstract

The effects of statin therapy in patients on maintenance dialysis remained uncertain. We conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the effects of statin on major clinical outcomes. We systematically searched Pubmed, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and Chinese Technological Journal of Database for randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Criteria for inclusion were RCTs on statins therapy versus placebo, >3 months of follow-up. The outcomes were serum level of low density lipoproteincholesterol (LDL-C), high-density lipoprotein-cholesterol (HDL-C), triglyceride (TG), highsensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) and albumin (ALB), all cardiac events, cardiovascular deaths and all-cause mortality. Twenty-one trials were identified, providing data for 8186 patients on maintenance dialysis. Statin therapy reduced LDL-C (weighted mean difference [WMD] = -0.74 mmol/L; 95%CI [-0.96, -0.52], p < 0.00001), TG (WMD = -0.36 mmol/L; 95%CI [-0.57, -0.14], p = 0.001), and hs-CRP (WMD = -3.98 mg/L; 95%Cl [-5.24, -2.72], p < 0.00001), elevated HDL-C (WMD = 0.25 mmol/L; 95%CI [0.10, 0.39], p = 0.0007) and ALB (WMD = 1.70 g/L; 95%CI [0.19, 3.21], p = 0.03) significantly comparing with placebo. Statin therapy also had benefit in reducing all cardiac events (relative risk [RR] = 0.90; 95%CI [0.83, 0.97], p = 0.006), but had no effect on cardiovascular deaths (RR = 0.97; 95%CI [0.88, 1.07], p = 0.54) or all-cause mortality (RR = 0.98; 95%CI [0.93, 1.04], p = 0.49). In conclusion, statins had no impact on allcause or cardiovascular mortality, while there was an overall significant improvement for dyslipidemia, hs-CRP, hypoalbuminemia and cardiovascular events in dialysis patients.

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in maintenance dialysis patients, the prevalence of CVD in those patients is 10-20 times higher than in the general population, after controlling for age, gender, race and diabetes.¹ Lipid abnormalities are a strong risk factor for CVD. Statins, a group of 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase inhibitors, have been demonstrated to improve these abnormalities. With benefit of reducing CVD risk greatly outweighing potential adverse effects, ACC/AHA recommended statin therapy for primary prevention in patients with CVD risk, especially in aging patients.² Many clinical trials suggested that statins reduce the risk of CVD in chronic kidney disease (CKD) population, while statin therapy in dialysis patients was quite controversial.³ Unlike in the general population, some studies suggested that both hypercholesterolemia and hypocholesterolemia were associated with an excess risk of

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Keywords

Cardiovascular, dialysis, dyslipidemia, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein, meta-analysis, statin

informa

healthcare

History

Received 7 February 2015 Revised 13 April 2015 Accepted 31 May 2015 Published online 3 July 2015

death in dialysis patients,⁴ especially cardiovascular death, suggesting a "U-shape" survival curve.⁵

Several clinical trials had been performed to figure out whether statins should be used in dialysis patients or not. The Study of Heart and Renal Protection (SHARP) suggested benefit, the lipid-lowering therapy safely reduced the incidence of major atherosclerotic events in patients with advanced CKD, but the study also included non-dialysis CKD patients.⁶ The 4D study (Die Deutsche Diabetes Dialyse Studie)⁷ and AURORA study (A Study to Evaluate the Use of Rosuvastatin in Subjects on Regular Hemodialysis: An Assessment of Survival and Cardiovascular Events)⁸ both randomized patients on hemodialysis, but found no benefit in reducing cardiovascular death, non-fatal myocardial infarction or stroke. In this report, we systematically reviewed the data from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to evaluate the impact of statin therapy on maintenance dialysis patients.

Methods

We searched Pubmed, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and VIP (Chinese Technological Journal of Database). The key words were: "randomized controlled trial (RCT) AND (one of: hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, dialysis) AND

[†]Current address: Department of Nephrology, Zhongda Hospital Southeast University, Nanjing City, Jiangsu Province, P.R. China.

Address correspondence to Bicheng Liu, Department of Nephrology, Zhongda Hospital Southeast University, Nanjing City, Jiangsu Province, P.R. China. Tel/Fax: +86 02583262422; E-mail: liubc64@163.com

(one of: lipid-lowering therapy, statin, atorvastatin, simvastatin, fluvastatin, pravastatin, rosuvastatin, ezetimibe)". All articles were identified by searching from June 1990 to May 2014. In addition, manual searches of selected specialty journals were performed to identify all pertinent literature. Qualitative reviews and published clinical trials were also searched. Criteria for study inclusion: RCTs of statins therapy versus placebo in patients on maintenance dialysis, with a minimum of 3 months of follow-up.

Two reviewers (Ling Sun and Luxi Zou) independently extracted the following information from each study: study population characteristics, experimental drug administration, duration of follow-up and outcomes. The individually recorded decisions of the two reviewers were compared, and any disagreements were resolved by a third reviewer (Bicheng Liu). The risk of bias for included trials was assessed according to the following aspects: Adequacy of randomization (selection bias), allocation concealment (selection bias), blinding (performance bias and detection bias), incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), selective reporting (reporting bias) and other bias.

We used the following outcomes to evaluate the benefit of statin therapy in maintenance dialysis patients: serum level of low density lipoprotein-cholesterol (LDL-C), high density lipoprotein-cholesterol (HDL-C), triglyceride (TG), highsensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) and albumin (ALB), all cardiac events, cardiovascular deaths and all-cause mortality.

We conducted the analysis using the statistical package Review Manager, Version 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). We statistically analyzed the dichotomous outcomes using relative risk (RR) as the summary statistic. Continuous outcomes were analyzed using the weighted mean difference (WMD). The meta-analysis was performed using the fixed-effect or random-effect models depending on the absence or presence of significant heterogeneity. Heterogeneity was measured using chi-square (χ^2) and I^2 tests, and statistical significance was considered to be present when p < 0.05. In the absence of heterogeneity, the Mantel– Haenszel method of the fixed-effect model was used for the meta-analysis. Otherwise, the DerSimonian and Laird method for the random-effect model was selected. The RR and WMD with 95% CI were used to assess the treatment efficacy.

Results

Our searches identified 424 studies. After the initial screen, 113 citations were selected for further review. Twenty-one trials⁶⁻²⁶ with 8168 patients were included based on the criteria mentioned (Figure 1). Table 1 describes characteristics, baseline and outcomes of the 21 RCTs included in this report. Table 2 describes the risk of bias for included studies.

Efficacy of statin therapy for LDL-C, HDL-C and TG

The efficacy of statin therapy for reducing LDL-C was assessed from 14 trials. The total number of patients was 4664. A significant difference was found between statin therapy and placebo groups, with a greater reducing LDL-C in the statin therapy group (WMD = -0.74 mmol/L; 95%CI [-0.96, -0.52], p < 0.00001), with significant heterogeneity



Figure 1. Flowchart showing the study selection process.

between the trials ($l^2 = 96\%$, p < 0.00001) (Figure 2). The efficacy of statin therapy for reducing TG was assessed from 11 trials. The total number of patients was 3288. A significant difference was found, with a greater reducing TG in the statin therapy group (WMD = -0.36 mmol/L; 95%CI [-0.57, -0.14], p = 0.001), with significant heterogeneity between the trials ($l^2 = 82\%$, p < 0.00001) (Figure 3). The efficacy of statin therapy for reducing TG was assessed from 11 trials. The total number of patients was 3289. A significant difference was found, with a greater elevating HDL-C in the statin therapy group (WMD = 0.25 mmol/L; 95%CI [0.10, 0.39], p = 0.0007), also with significant heterogeneity between the trials ($l^2 = 83\%$, p < 0.00001) (Figure 4).

Efficacy of statin therapy for hs-CRP

Thirteen trials provided data on the decrease in hs-CRP, as a protective effect of statin therapy, with 817 patients. There was a significant difference between statin therapy and placebo groups, a greater reducing hs-CRP in the statin therapy group (WMD = -3.98 mg/L; 95%CI [-5.24, -2.72], p < 0.00001), with significant heterogeneity between the trials ($I^2 = 98\%$, p < 0.00001) (Figure 5).

Efficacy of statin therapy for ALB

Six trials provided data on the improvement in ALB as a protective effect of statin therapy, with 370 patients. There was a significant difference between statin therapy and placebo groups, with a greater elevating ALB in the statin therapy group (WMD = 1.70 g/L; 95%CI [0.19, 3.21], p = 0.03), and there was no significant heterogeneity between the trials ($l^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.80) (Figure 6).

Efficacy of statin therapy for all cardiac events

Five trials provided data on reducing all cardiac events as a protective effect of statin therapy, with 7211 patients. A significant difference was found, with significantly lower all cardiac events in the statin therapy group (RR = 0.90; 95%CI

						LDL-C (I	mmol/L)	TG (mr	nol/L)	HDL-C (r	amol/L)	hs-CRP (1	mg/L)	ALB (g/L)			
Study [references]	Year	Population	No. of patients	Intervention	Follow-up (mo)	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	All cardiac C events	Cardiovascular deaths	All-cause mortality
$4D^8$	2005	MHD	619 636	Atorvastatin 20 mg/d Placeho	48 48	3.23 ± 0.75 3.28 ± 0.78	1.87 ± 0.44 3.21 ± 0.76	2.95 ± 1.86 3.01 ± 1.91	NA NA	0.93 ± 0.34 0.93 ± 0.36	NA NA	5.00	4.40 6.00	NA NA	NA NA	205 (33) 246 (39)	121 (20) 149 (73)	297 (48) 320 (50)
AURORA ⁹	2009	OHM	1389	Rosuvastatin 10 mg/day Placebo	6 4 4 8 8 8	2.59 ± 0.91 2.56 ± 0.88	1.5 ± 0.39 7.51 ± 0.85	1.77 ± 1.07	1.48 ± 0.8 1 75 + 0.81	1.16 ± 0.39	1.19 ± 0.41 1 17+0 41	4.8 (2.0–13.6) 5.2 (2 1–144)	6.4 6.7 0	AN	AN	434 (31) 468 (34)	324 (23) 374 (23)	636 (46) 660 (48)
Doh^{27}	2012	PD	31	Rosuvastatin 10 mg/day Placebo	ي و و	3.05 ± 0.74 3.00 ± 0.96	1.78 ± 0.56 3 16 + 0 99	1.08 (0.81–1.72)	1.03 (0.71–1.52)	1.37 ± 0.39 1 37 + 0 47	1.29 ± 0.41	2.05 ± 1.57 1 90 + 1 33	1.21 ± 0.84 1.85 + 1.14	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kishimoto ²⁶	2010	DHM	14 14 14 10	Simvastatin 10 mg/day Simvastatin 5 mg/day Dlacebo	444	2.83 ± 0.87 2.15 ± 0.89 2.42 ± 0.89	1.93 ± 0.79 1.67 ± 0.73 2.46 ± 0.85	1.51 ± 0.7 1.13 ± 0.65 1.72 ± 0.46	1.16 ± 0.5 1.14 ± 0.55 1.3 ± 0.61	0.83 ± 0.16 0.84 ± 0.3 0.86 ± 0.2	0.93 ± 0.24 0.91 ± 0.35 0.87 ± 0.23	NA NA NA	AN NA NA	AN NA NA	NA NA	NA NA NA	NA NA NA	NA NA NA
Diepeveen ²⁵	2005	MHD, PD	13	Atorvastatin 40 mg/day	t σ	2.6 ± 0.9	1.3 ± 0.8	3.8 ± 3.3	2.4 ± 1.9	0.97 ± 0.3	0.94 ± 0.3	NA	AN	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA
SHARP ⁷	2011	MHD, PD	$10 \\ 1533$	Placebo Simvastatin 20 mg/day + ezetimibe 10 mg/dav	3 60	2.7 ± 0.8 NA	3.0 ± 0.8 NA	2.6 ± 1.7 NA	2.3 ± 1.2 NA	0.92 ± 0.3 NA	0.92 ± 0.3 NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA 230(15)	NA 172(11)	NA (07(33)
<u></u>			1490	Placebo	60	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	246(17)	161(11)	80(32)
Cui ¹²	2011	CAPD	30 30	Simvastatin 20 mg/d Placebo	0 0	AN NA	NA NA	NA NA	A N A	NA NA	NA NA	AN NA	NA NA	NA NA	AN NA	5(18) 8(27)	NA NA	A N N
He ²¹	2009	MHD	30	Simvastatin 40 mg/day Dlacebo	4.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.43 ± 12.01	10.09 ± 6.09 14 07 +8 28	33.20 ± 4.50	37.90 ± 5.50	NA	NA	NA NA
He JF ¹⁰	2012	CAPD	30	Atorvastatin 20 mg/day	for	2.71 ± 0.80	1.91 ± 0.78	AN	AN	AN	AN	1.23 ± 0.62	0.73 ± 0.66	VN NA NA	NA	AN AN	AN AN	AN N
Hu ²⁴	2011	OHM	2 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Simvastatin 20 mg/day Placeho	o m m	NA NA NA	NA NA NA	AN NA	AN	AN	AN AN	3.9 ± 1.5 4.2 ± 1.9	3.2 ± 1.0 3.4 ± 1.0	AN	AN	NA NA	AN	A N N
Jin ²⁰	2005	DHM	30	Simvastatin 20 mg/d Placebo	n n	4.4 ± 1.3 4.2 ± 1.2	3.8 ± 0.6 4.0 ± 1.0	3.0 ± 0.8 2.8 ± 1.1	2.8 ± 0.7 2.9 ± 1.2	1.3 ± 0.5 1.3 + 0.7	1.9 ± 0.6 1.2 ± 0.6	10 ± 1.3 9.6 ± 1.0	4.8 ± 0.9 9.3 ± 1.1	30 ± 10 31 + 8.9	34 ± 11 30.5 + 12	N N N	A N A N	NA
Li ¹³	2013	QHM	50	Atorvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	00	2.8 ± 1.6 2.7 ± 1.7	2.4 ± 1.4 2.5 ± 1.5	1.5 ± 0.5 1.4 ± 0.6	1.1 ± 0.5 1.3 ± 0.7	0.9 ± 0.3 1.0 ± 0.4	$1.0 \pm \pm 0.5$ 0.9 ± 0.3	NA NA	AN	31.8 ± 9.2 32.6 ± 10.5	32.8 ± 7.6 31.6 ± 9.7	7(14) 11(22)	NA NA	NA NA
Li ¹⁵	2009	MHD	30 35	Atorvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	<i>ლ ლ</i>	3.34 ± 0.18 3.41 ± 0.20	$2.71 \pm \pm 0.18$ 3.02 ± 0.15	2.30 ± 0.55 2.27 ± 0.45	1.18 ± 0.29 1.64 ± 0.42	NA NA	NA NA	5.13 ± 1.43 5.54 ± 1.04	$\begin{array}{c} 2.11 \pm 0.53 \\ 3.18 \pm 0.60 \end{array}$	35.00 ± 4.70 35.10 ± 7.10	36.80 ± 5.60 36.10 ± 5.10	NA	NA NA	NA NA
Pan ¹⁶	2008	OHM .	5 3 3 30 30	Fluvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	0 0 V	4.3 ± 1.2 4.2 ± 1.2	3.5 ± 0.8 4.3 ± 1.1	3.1 ± 0.7 3.0 ± 0.8	2.7 ± 0.8 2.9 ± 0.9	1.2 ± 0.3 1.3 ± 0.4	1.9 ± 0.4 1.2 ± 0.5	10.9 ± 1.4 9.9 ± 1.3	4.5 ± 1.1 9.6 ± 1.2	29 ± 10 30 ± 9	34 ± 11 29 ± 11	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Yang	2006	CHM	52	Pravastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	6.25 6.25	3.16 ± 0.23 2.96 ± 0.30	2.72 ± 0.30 3.05 ± 0.20	1.13 ± 0.82 1.00 ± 0.14	0.85 ± 1.50 1.10 ± 0.50	1.05 ± 0.09 1.46 ± 0.14	1.51 ± 0.17 1.36 ± 0.89	11.27 ± 2.3 11.62 ± 1.96	3.8 ± 1.84 11.62 ± 1.84	AA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Yao ¹⁴	2011	MHD	18	Atorvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	99	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	16.3 ± 2.9 17.8 ± 3.4	5.7 ± 2.4 15.9 ± 3.3	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Zhang ¹⁷	2010	MHD	28 28	Fluvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	99	3.17 ± 0.78 3.19 ± 0.62	2.72 ± 0.37 3.14 ± 0.57	1.78 ± 0.54 1.82 ± 0.61	1.36 ± 0.45 1.76 ± 0.55	1.18 ± 0.50 1.21 ± 0.58	1.59 ± 0.53 1.24 ± 0.55	5.23 ± 1.25 5.17 ± 1.48	3.19 ± 0.85 5.08 ± 1.36	AN NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Zhang ²²	2011	QHM	40 40	Simvastatin 20 mg/day Placebo	9	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Zhang ²³	2011	MHD	32 32	Simvastatin 40 mg/day Placebo	99	3.23 ± 0.81 3.24 ± 0.67	2.68 ± 0.35 3.12 ± 0.56	1.89 ± 0.51 1.84 ± 0.63	1.38 ± 0.52 1.81 ± 0.58	1.19 ± 0.52 1.25 ± 0.55	1.61 ± 0.5 1.29 ± 0.58	8.27 ± 1.62 8.48 ± 1.38	5.34 ± 3.85 7.83 ± 1.36	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Zheng ¹⁸	2007	QHM	24 20	Fluvastatin 40 mg/day Placebo	<i>ლ ლ</i>	4.6 ± 1.4 4.5 ± 1.2	3.7 ± 0.8 4.4 ± 1.1	3.2 ± 0.8 3.0 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 0.7 2.9 ± 1.2	1.4 ± 0.6 1.4 ± 0.7	2.0 ± 0.8 1.3 ± 0.8	11.0 ± 2.4 9.9 ± 1.3	4.3 ± 1.2 9.6 ± 1.2	29.0 ± 10 30.0 ± 9.7	34.0 ± 12 30.3 ± 11	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
Zheng ¹⁹	2012	MHD	79 79	Simvastatin 20 mg/d Placebo	<i>ლ</i> ო	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA	NA NA	NA	11.23 ± 6.95 11 12 + 6.75	3.41 ± 2.24 11 08 + 6 80	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA
			2	2022 MI	2	* 76.*	****	* ***	¥747	* 71.7	* 74.*	7110777111	11.70 ± 0.01	****	× 71.7	× 74.7	****	****

Table 1. Characteristics, baseline and outcomes of included studies in the meta-analysis.

Notes: MHD, maintenance hemodialysis; PD, peritoneal dialysis; CAPD, continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis; LDL-C, low density lipoprotein-cholesterol; HDL-C, high density lipoprotein-cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; ALB, albumin; NA, not specified or available.

1152 L. Sun et al.

Table 2. Risk of bias for included studies.

Study [references]	Random Sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Double blinding	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
$4D^8$	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
AURORA ⁹	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Doh ²⁷	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Kishimoto ²⁶	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Diepeveen ²⁵	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
SHARP ⁷	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Cui ¹²	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
He ²¹	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
He ¹⁰	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
HU ²⁴	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Jin ²⁰	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Li ¹³	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Li ¹⁵	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Pan ¹⁶	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Yang ¹¹	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Yao ¹⁴	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Zhang ¹⁷	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Zhang ²²	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Zhang ²³	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Zheng ¹⁸	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Zheng ¹⁹	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk

	Stati	n therap	y	Р	lacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
4D2005	1.8734	0.435	619	3.2144	0.7644	636	9.2%	-1.34 [-1.41, -1.27]	-
AURORA2009	1.5	0.39	1389	2.51	0.85	1384	9.2%	-1.01 [-1.06, -0.96]	
Fa Mee Doh2012	1.78	0.56	31	3.16	0.99	30	7.0%	-1.38 [-1.79, -0.97]	
He JF2012	1.91	0.78	30	2.72	0.79	30	7.1%	-0.81 [-1.21, -0.41]	
Jin HM2005	3.8	0.6	30	4	1	21	6.4%	-0.20 [-0.68, 0.28]	
Li KL2013	2.4	1.4	50	2.5	1.5	50	5.6%	-0.10 [-0.67, 0.47]	
Li YM2009	2.71	0.18	30	3.34	0.18	30	9.1%	-0.63 [-0.72, -0.54]	-
Noriaki Kishimoto2010	1.93	0.79	14	2.46	0.85	9	4.7%	-0.53 [-1.22, 0.16]	
Pan R2008	3.5	0.8	30	4.3	1.1	20	5.7%	-0.80 [-1.36, -0.24]	
S. H. A. DIEPEVEEN2005	1.3	0.8	13	3	0.8	10	5.0%	-1.70 [-2.36, -1.04]	<u> </u>
Yang F2006	2.72	0.3	22	3.05	0.2	22	8.9%	-0.33 [-0.48, -0.18]	+
Zhang DS2010	2.72	0.37	28	3.14	0.57	28	8.2%	-0.42 [-0.67, -0.17]	-
Zhang ZL2011	2.68	0.35	32	3.12	0.56	32	8.4%	-0.44 [-0.67, -0.21]	-
Zheng MT2007	3.7	0.8	24	4.4	1.1	20	5.6%	-0.70 [-1.28, -0.12]	
Total (95% CI)			2342			2322	100.0%	-0.74 [-0.96, -0.52]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.13;	Chi² = 30	7.65, df	= 13 (F	° < 0.000	01); I² = 9	6%		-	-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.7	71 (P < 0.	00001)							Favours Statin therapy Favours Placebo

Figure 2. Forest plot of comparison for LDL-C: statin therapy versus placebo.

[0.83, 0.97], p = 0.006), and there was no significant heterogeneity between the trials ($I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.77) (Figure 7).

Efficacy of statin therapy for cardiovascular deaths and all-cause mortality

Three trials provided data on cardiovascular deaths and allcause mortality as a protective effect of statin therapy, with 7051 patients. There was no significant difference in reducing cardiovascular deaths (RR = 0.97; 95%CI [0.88, 1.07], p = 0.54), and there was no significant heterogeneity between the trials ($I^2 = 20\%$, p = 0.29) (Figure 8). There was also no significant difference in reducing all-cause mortality (RR = 0.98; 95%CI [0.93, 1.04], p = 0.49), and there was no significant heterogeneity between the trials ($I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.53) (Figure 9).

Discussion

Statins reduced major cardiovascular events, all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in persons with non-dialysis by 40–50%,²⁷ while the benefit of statin therapy in dialysis patients was still unclear. The 2013 clinical practice guideline of KDIGO suggested that statin/ezetimibe combination should not be initiated in adults with dialysis-dependent CKD, and statin/ezetimibe combination should be continued in adults already receiving these agents at the time of dialysis initiation.²⁸ Our results showed that statins reduced serum LDL-C and TG, and elevated serum HDL-C, improving dyslipidemia. Furthermore, statins reduced hs-CRP, elevated serum ALB, improving chronic inflammation and malnutrition in patients on dialysis. More importantly, we found that statin therapy reduced major cardiovascular events, although there was no benefit in reducing all-cause or cardiovascular mortality.

	Stati	thera	npy	Pla	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
AURORA2009	1.48	0.8	1389	1.75	0.81	1384	14.0%	-0.27 [-0.33, -0.21]	
Jin HM2005	2.8	0.7	30	2.9	1.2	21	7.0%	-0.10 [-0.67, 0.47]	-
Li KL2013	1.1	0.5	50	1.3	0.7	50	12.0%	-0.20 [-0.44, 0.04]	-
Li YM2009	1.18	0.29	30	2.3	0.55	30	12.3%	-1.12 [-1.34, -0.90]	*
Noriaki Kishimoto2010	1.16	0.5	14	1.3	0.61	9	8.3%	-0.14 [-0.62, 0.34]	-
Pan R2008	2.7	0.8	30	2.9	0.9	20	8.1%	-0.20 [-0.69, 0.29]	
S. H. A. DIEPEVEEN2005	2.4	1.9	13	2.3	1.2	10	2.3%	0.10 [-1.17, 1.37]	
Yang F2006	0.85	1.5	22	1.1	0.5	22	6.0%	-0.25 [-0.91, 0.41]	-
Zhang DS2010	1.36	0.45	28	1.76	0.55	28	11.6%	-0.40 [-0.66, -0.14]	+
Zhang ZL2011	1.38	0.52	32	1.81	0.58	32	11.5%	-0.43 [-0.70, -0.16]	*
Zheng MT2007	2.7	0.7	24	2.9	1.2	20	6.7%	-0.20 [-0.80, 0.40]	-
Total (95% CI)			1662			1626	100.0%	-0.36 [-0.57, -0.14]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08;	Chi ² = 5	6.27, d	f= 10 (P < 0.00	0001);	I ² = 829	%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.	28 (P = 0	1.001)							Favours Statin therapy Favours Placebo



	Stati	n thera	ру	Pl	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
AURORA2009	1.19	0.41	1389	1.17	0.41	1384	12.9%	0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]	•
Fa Mee Doh2012	1.29	0.41	31	1.27	0.43	30	10.1%	0.02 [-0.19, 0.23]	+
Jin HM2005	1.9	0.6	30	1.2	0.6	21	7.6%	0.70 [0.37, 1.03]	+
Li KL2013	1	0.5	50	0.9	0.3	50	11.1%	0.10 [-0.06, 0.26]	+
Noriaki Kishimoto2010	0.93	0.24	14	0.87	0.23	9	10.4%	0.06 [-0.14, 0.26]	+
Pan R2008	1.9	0.4	30	1.2	0.5	20	9.0%	0.70 [0.44, 0.96]	-
S. H. A. DIEPEVEEN2005	0.94	0.3	13	0.92	0.3	10	9.3%	0.02 [-0.23, 0.27]	+
Yang F2006	1.51	0.17	22	1.36	0.89	22	6.8%	0.15 [-0.23, 0.53]	+
Zhang DS2010	1.59	0.53	28	1.24	0.55	28	8.6%	0.35 [0.07, 0.63]	-
Zhang ZL2011	1.61	0.5	32	1.29	0.58	32	8.9%	0.32 [0.05, 0.59]	-
Zheng MT2007	2	0.8	24	1.3	0.8	20	5.3%	0.70 [0.23, 1.17]	
Total (95% CI)			1663			1626	100.0%	0.25 [0.10, 0.39]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04;	Chi ² = 5	8.11, d	f= 10 (P < 0.00	0001);	l² = 834	%		-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3	37 (P = 0	0.0007;)						Favours Placebo Favours Statin therapy

Figure 4. Forest plot of comparison for HDL-C: statin therapy versus placebo.

	Stati	n thera	ру	Pl	acebo			Mean Difference		Mean Dif	ference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Rando	n, 95% Cl	
Fa Mee Doh2012	1.21	0.84	31	1.85	1.14	30	8.2%	-0.64 [-1.14, -0.14]		-		
He JF2012	0.73	0.66	30	1.21	0.65	30	8.3%	-0.48 [-0.81, -0.15]				
He P2009	10.09	6.09	30	14.07	8.28	30	4.9%	-3.98 [-7.66, -0.30]				
HU FF2011	3.2	1	34	4.4	1.7	34	8.1%	-1.20 [-1.86, -0.54]		•		
Jin HM2005	4.8	0.9	30	9.3	1.1	21	8.2%	-4.50 [-5.07, -3.93]		•		
Li YM2009	2.11	0.53	30	3.18	0.6	35	8.3%	-1.07 [-1.34, -0.80]		-		
Pan R2008	4.5	1.1	30	9.6	1.2	20	8.1%	-5.10 [-5.76, -4.44]		-		
Yang F2006	3.8	1.84	22	11.62	1.84	22	7.8%	-7.82 [-8.91, -6.73]		-		
Yao SQ2011	5.7	2.4	18	15.9	3.3	18	7.0%	-10.20 [-12.09, -8.31]		-		
Zhang DS2010	3.19	0.85	28	5.08	1.36	28	8.2%	-1.89 [-2.48, -1.30]		•		
Zhang ZL2011	5.34	3.85	32	7.83	1.36	32	7.5%	-2.49 [-3.90, -1.08]		-		
Zheng MT2007	4.3	1.2	24	9.6	1.2	20	8.1%	-5.30 [-6.01, -4.59]		•		
Zheng XJ2012	3.41	2.24	79	11.98	6.89	79	7.3%	-8.57 [-10.17, -6.97]		-		
Total (95% CI)			418			399	100.0%	-3.98 [-5.24, -2.72]		•	7	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	4.98; CI	hi² = 64	19.30, d	f= 12 (P < 0.0	0001);	I ^z = 98%		-50	25 0	25	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.19	(P < 0	.00001)					Favours	Statin therapy	Favours Placebo	50

Figure 5. Forest plot of comparison for hs-CRP: statin therapy versus placebo.

Dyslipidemia, both higher level of TC, TG, LDL-C and lower HDL-C could lead to atherosclerosis and CVD.²⁹ Shoji et al. found that the risk of incident myocardial infarction and cerebral infarction was positively associated with the serum non-HDL-C level and inversely with the serum HDL-C level in hemodialysis patients,³⁰ suggested the possibility that statin therapy could reduce the risk of atherosclerotic CVD in some subpopulations of hemodialysis patients. Risk of

	Statin	thera	ру	Pla	icebo)		Mean Difference		Me	an Difference	e	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV.	Fixed, 95% C	I	
He P2009	37.9	5.5	30	36.07	5.3	30	30.7%	1.83 [-0.90, 4.56]			+		
Jin HM2005	34	11	30	30.5	12	21	5.5%	3.50 [-2.97, 9.97]			+		
Li KL2013	32.8	7.6	50	31.6	9.7	50	19.6%	1.20 [-2.22, 4.62]			+		
Li YM2009	36.8	5.6	30	36.1	5.1	35	33.3%	0.70 [-1.92, 3.32]			+		
Pan R2008	34	11	30	29	11	20	5.9%	5.00 [-1.22, 11.22]					
Zheng MT2007	34	12	24	30.3	11	20	4.9%	3.70 [-3.10, 10.50]			+		
Total (95% CI)			194			176	100.0%	1.70 [0.19, 3.21]			•		-
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	2.36, df =	: 5 (P	= 0.80)	; ² = 0%)				-100	-50	ó	50	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.20	(P = 0	.03)							Favours Pla	cebo Favou	s Statin ther	apy





Figure 7. Forest plot of comparison for all cardiac events: statin therapy versus placebo.

	Statin the	erapy	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
4D2005	121	619	149	636	23.2%	0.83 [0.67, 1.03]		
AURORA2009	324	1389	324	1384	51.1%	1.00 [0.87, 1.14]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SHARP2011	172	1533	161	1490	25.7%	1.04 [0.85, 1.27]	†	
Total (95% CI)		3541		3510	100.0%	0.97 [0.88, 1.07]	•	
Total events	617		634					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.51, df = 2 Z = 0.61 (F	2 (P = 0.2) = 0.54	29); I² = 2	20%			0.01 0.1 1 10 1	00
							Favours Statin therapy Favours Placebo	

Figure 8. Forest plot of comparison for cardiovascular deaths: statin therapy versus placebo.

CVD deaths was determined by two factors: the risk of incident CVD, and the risk of fatality after CVD.³¹ Some studies suggested higher cholesterol level was shown to predict a better survival in hemodialysis patients, because lower cholesterol level might be an index of protein-energy wasting, which was an important risk factor of fatality after CVD in hemodialysis patients.³⁰ The sub-analysis of 4D³² and SHARP⁶ showed that statins reduced the composite CVD endpoint significantly in a subgroup with higher cholesterol level, if LDL-C was higher than a certain level, and that the interaction between baseline total cholesterol and the treatment effect was significant. Our results also showed that statins reduced serum LDL-C and TG, elevated serum HDL-C, and reduced all cardiac events, which suggested that statin therapy might be beneficial even in dialysis patients if their lipid level were higher than a certain level.

In addition to improving dyslipidemia, statins also have multiple effects, including anti-inflammatory effect, antioxidation effect,^{10,24} anti-atherosclerotic effects and improving endothelial function.^{14,25} Dialysis patients accompanied with chronic low grade inflammation widely, which suppressed ALB synthesis and caused the development of malnutrition.¹⁵ hs-CRP, an acute phase protein, was an independent risk factor for cardiovascular events in hemodialysis patients.²⁹ ALB correlated with hs-CRP inversely,³³ and hypoalbuminemia was also a powerful predictor for CVD events in dialysis patients.³⁴ Our results showed that statins reduced hs-CRP greatly and elevated ALB slightly but significantly (p = 0.03), indicated that statins improved chronic inflammatory state, which presented as hs-CRP reduced, then ALB elevated as a negative acute phase protein. Subsequently both reduction of hs-CRP and elevation of ALB might contribute to the reduction of CVD events.

	Statin the	erapy	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
4D2005	297	619	320	636	21.6%	0.95 [0.85, 1.07]		-	
AURORA2009	636	1389	660	1384	45.2%	0.96 [0.89, 1.04]			
SHARP2011	507	1533	480	1490	33.3%	1.03 [0.93, 1.14]			
Total (95% CI)		3541		3510	100.0%	0.98 [0.93, 1.04]			
Total events	1440		1460						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.28, df = 3	2 (P = 0.	53); I ² = 0			100			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.69 (F	P = 0.49)		Favours Statin therapy	Favours Placebo	100			

Figure 9. Forest plot of comparison for all-cause mortality: statin therapy versus placebo.

Two meta-analyses^{3,35} about statin therapy in dialysis patients both concluded that statin therapy had no benefit in reducing cardiac events, while the studies included were all performed in Caucasian and Black people. In this report, RCTs performed in Chinese population were included, two of them mentioned the outcomes of cardiac events, which might lead to a different result that statin therapy could reduce all cardiac events significantly comparing with placebo. Shoji et al. conducted an cohort study among 45,390 Japanese hemodialysis patients to exam the relationship between serum lipids and incident CVD, and also got the similar conclusion that therapy for dyslipidemia might be benefit in reducing CVD events.³⁰ Although the KDIGO guideline²⁸ was international guideline for lipid management, evidence specific to Chinese and other Asian populations was still lacking. Further studies were needed to build clinical practice guidelines for more specific subgroups of dialysis patients, such as Asian patients, and patients with higher non-HDL-C level.

Safety concerns had limited the use of statin therapy in dialysis patients, however, our meta-analysis did not show any significant increase of the adverse events, such as myalgia or myopathy, rhabdomyolysis, liver disease or cancer risk in the statins group compared with the placebo group.^{6–8}

The shortcomings of this analysis were that the population samples differed between the RCTs, with the inclusion of diabetic and non-diabetic subject, with prior CVD or without CVD persons, with races, with baseline of lipid level, with follow-up duration, as well as the inclusion of the different dialysis modalities, might lead to significant heterogeneity. The risk of bias was high in some of the included studies. Random sequence generation and allocation concealment was only reported in six studies (29%), and double blinding was unclear in eighteen studies (86%). Meanwhile it was impossible to meta-analyze all the data, because the studies included always present outcomes and comparisons without full statistical details.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis strengthened existing literature on the lack of survival benefits of statin therapy in dialysis patients. Statins corrected dyslipidemia, reduced hs-CRP, improved hypoalbuminemia and also reduced all cardiac events, while they did not impact all-cause or cardiovascular mortality in patients on maintenance dialysis. However, additional studies for Chinese, other Asian populations and specific subgroups of dialysis patients should be performed.

Acknowledgments

All authors had access to the data and participated in writing this manuscript.

Declaration of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

- Paraskevas KI, Kotsikoris I, Koupidis SA, Tzovaras AA, Mikhailidis DP. Cardiovascular events in chronic dialysis patients: Emphasizing the importance of vascular disease prevention. *Int Urol Nephrol.* 2010;42:999–1006.
- 2. Robinson JG. Starting primary prevention earlier with statins. *Am J Cardiol*. 2014;114:1437–1442.
- Green D, Ritchie JP, Kalra PA. Meta-analysis of lipid-lowering therapy in maintenance dialysis patients. *Nephron Clin Pract*. 2013; 124:209–217.
- Iseki K, Yamazato M, Tozawa M, Takishita S. Hypocholesterolemia is a significant predictor of death in a cohort of chronic hemodialysis patients. *Kidney Int.* 2002;61: 1887–1893.
- Seliger SL, Stehman-Breen CO. Are HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors underutilized in dialysis patients? *Semin Dialysis*. 2003;16: 179–185.
- Baigent C, Landray MJ, Reith C, et al. The effects of lowering LDL cholesterol with simvastatin plus ezetimibe in patients with chronic kidney disease (Study of Heart and Renal Protection): A randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2011;377:2181–2192.
- Wanner C, Krane V, Marz W, et al. Atorvastatin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus undergoing hemodialysis. *New Engl J Med.* 2005;353:238–248.
- Fellstroem BC, Jardine AG, Schmieder RE, et al. Rosuvastatin and cardiovascular events in patients undergoing hemodialysis. *New Engl J Med.* 2009;360:1395–1407.
- He JF, Wu J, He M, et al. Effect of atorvastatin on the levels of serum homocysteine and carotid intima-media thickness in patients with continuous ambulatory peritoneal dialysis. *MMJC*. 2012;14: 4–6.
- Yang F, Zhong B, Wang N, Jia HY, Li L. Effects of pravastatin on arterial elasticity in hemodialysis patients with type 2 diabetes. *Chin J Blood Purif.* 2006;5:137–140.
- Cui Y, Yang J, Ju L, Ma PL, Li JH, Xie CY. Protective effection of statin therapy in CAPD Patients. *Modern J Integr Tradit Chin Western Med.* 2011;20:1103–1104.
- Li KL, Xiong KL, Li ZH, et al. Protective effection of atorvastatin on cardiovascular in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Chin J Arterioscler*. 2013;21:57–60.
- Yao SQ, Hou L. Effect of atorvastatin on CRP and IL-6 in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Chin J Diffic Compl Cas.* 2011; 10:535–536.
- 14. Li YM, Xu FF, Chen WS. Effect of different doses of atorvastatin on cytokines and blood pressure during maintenance hemodialysis in patients with chronic renal failure. *Zhe Jiang JITCWM*. 2009;19: 471–473.
- Pan R. Effect of fluvastatin on CRP and D-dimer in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *China Prac Med.* 2008;3:53–54.

- 16. Zhang DS. The effect of fluvastation on microinflammation in patients subjected to maintenance hemodialysis. *Guangzhou Med J*. 2010;41:25–27.
- Zheng MT. Effect of fluvastatin on CRP in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Chongqing Med.* 2007;36:2012–2013.
- 18. Zheng XJ. Effect of Simvastatin in improving the micro-inflammatory state of patients treated with maintenance hemodialysis and its action mechanism. *China Modern Doctor.* 2012;50:52–54.
- Jin HM, Zhu SJ, Shen GY. Effects of simvastatin on microinflammation and coagulation in hemodialysis patients. *Chin J Blood Purif.* 2005;4:437–439.
- He P. The effect of different dose of simvastatin on microinflammation in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *J Huaihai Med.* 2009;27:538–539.
- Zhang XD, Li H, Song J, Shi LH, Li Y. Study on the effect of Simvastatin on serum IL-6, IL-8, and TNF-α in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Acta Acad Med CPAF*. 2011;20:337–339.
- Zhang ZL, Wang YR. The effect of simvastatin on microinflammation in patients subjected to maintenance hemodialysis. *Modern Prev Med.* 2011;38:773–776.
- 23. Hu FF. The effect of simvastatin on microinflammation in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Clin Med.* 2011;31:68–69.
- Diepeveen SHA, Verhoeven G, Van der Palen J, et al. Effects of atorvastatin and vitamin E on lipoproteins and oxidative stress in dialysis patients: A randomised-controlled trial. *J Int Med.* 2005; 257:438–445.
- Kishimoto N, Hayashi T, Sakuma I, et al. A hydroxymethylglutaryl coenzyme a reductase inhibitor improves endothelial function within 7 days in patients with chronic hemodialysis. *Int J Cardiol.* 2010;145:21–26.
- Doh FM, Chang T-I, Koo HM, et al. The effect of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor on insulin resistance in patients undergoing peritoneal dialysis. *Cardiovasc Drugs Ther.* 2012;26:501–509.

- Boaz M, Matas Z, Biro A, et al. Comparison of hemostatic factors and serum malondialdehyde as predictive factors for cardiovascular disease in hemodialysis patients. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 1999;34: 438–444.
- Wanner C, Tonelli M, Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes. KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline for Lipid Management in CKD: summary of recommendation statements and clinical approach to the patient. *Kidney Int.* 2014;85:1303–1309.
- Ma KW, Greene EL, Raij L. Cardiovascular risk-factors in chronicrenal-failure and hemodialysis populations. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 1992; 19:505–513.
- Shoji T, Masakane I, Watanabe Y, Iseki K, Tsubakihara Y, Japanese Soc Dialysis T. Elevated non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (Non-HDL-C) predicts atherosclerotic cardiovascular events in hemodialysis patients. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:1112–1120.
- Shoji T. Serum lipids and prevention of atherosclerotic cardiovascular events in hemodialysis patients. *Clin Exp Nephrol*. 2014;18: 257–260.
- 32. Maerz W, Genser B, Drechsler C, et al. Atorvastatin and lowdensity lipoprotein cholesterol in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients on hemodialysis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:1316–1325.
- Zsom L, Zsom M, Fulop T, et al. Correlation of treatment time and ultrafiltration rate with serum albumin and c-reactive protein levels in patients with end-stage kidney disease receiving chronic maintenance hemodialysis: A cross-sectional study. *Blood Purif.* 2010;30:8–15.
- Soriano S, Gonzalez L, Martin-Malo A, Rodriguez M, Aljama P. Creactive protein and low albumin are predictors of morbidity and cardiovascular events in chronic kidney disease (CKD) 3–5 patients. *Clin Nephrol.* 2007;67:352–357.
- 35. Palmer SC, Navaneethan SD, Craig JC, et al. HMG CoA reductase inhibitors (statins) for dialysis patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2013;(9):CD004289.