Assessment of quality of life determinants in hemodialysis patients of a developing country
A cross-sectional study during ongoing COVID-19 pandemic
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Abstract

Background and Objectives: Patients of end-stage renal disease are prone to have a very low quality of life (QoL). Variety of factors influence the QoL among sufferers of chronic kidney disease comprising of type of dialysis, sufficiency/adequacy of dialysis, and associated burden of disease. We conducted this study amidst the pandemic to determine the associated factors for poor QoL in hemodialysis patients during the ongoing pandemic.

Patients and Methods: This cross-sectional study was conducted in a hemodialysis unit of a tertiary care hospital. A total of 118 participants responded to the validated questionnaire of Quality of Life Index-dialysis version-III (QLI). Higher scores signify good QoL, total scores are further categorized into subgroups desirable, relatively desirable and undesirable.

Results: The mean age of the participants was 57.36 ± 10.03 years and mean body mass index of 26.73 ± 5.54 kg/m². The mean total QoL of the study population was found quite low (12.99 ± 5.89). Majority of respondents fell in undesirable category of QoL (49.2%). Total QoL (P = 0.004) and subscale health/functioning (P = 0.003) were significantly lower in females. All the subscales along with total QoL scores were found lower in twice-weekly dialyzed patients (P < 0.001). Marital status (P = 0.049) and twice-weekly dialysis (P < 0.001) were found significant with undesirable QoL. On multivariate analysis, significant determinants of undesirable QoL were twice-weekly dialysis (P = 0.001), catheter access (P = 0.034), phosphate (P = 0.005) and uric acid (P = 0.006).

Conclusion: Inadequate dialysis due to lesser frequency per week leading to poorly cleared toxic substances were most significant contributors of poor QoL in our study.

Abbreviations: AIDS = Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome, AOR = Adjusted odds ratio, AV fistula = Arteriovenous fistula, BMI = Body mass index, BUN = Blood urea nitrogen, CI = Confidence interval, CKD = Chronic Kidney Disease, COVID-19 = Coronavirus disease 2019, ESRD = End-stage Renal Disease, GFR = Glomerular filtration rate, HIV = Human Immunodeficiency Virus, IBM = International Business Machines, IQR = Interquartile range, Kt/V = Clearance x time/Volume, NY = New York, OR = Odds ratio, PTH = Parathyroid hormone, QLI = Quality of Life Index, QoL = Quality of life, SPSS = Statistical Package for Social Sciences, UAE = United Arab Emirates, USA = United States of America.
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1. Introduction

Hemodialysis is preferably opted modality of treatment for survival by more than 70% of patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD). Chronic kidney disease (CKD) imparts a pronounced negative effect on quality of life (QoL) of sufferers prominently due to association with impairment and restrictions in all aspects of daily life. Patients with ESRD are prone to have very low QoL. Variety of factors influence the QoL among sufferers of CKD undergoing hemodialysis comprising of type of dialysis (hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis), sufficiency of dialysis, daily dialysis, night shift of dialysis, depression and anxiety associated with burden of disease, frequent hospital admissions, three times a...
2.2. Data sources/instrument and measurement

The different versions of QLI were available online and showed precision to great degrees in previously conducted studies with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.93. [19] The QLI is divided into 2 parts with 35 items each; first part being satisfaction using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied), and the second part is importance (1 = very unimportant, 6 = very important). The items are grouped into 4 subscales: health/functioning, socioeconomic, psychological/spiritual, and family. [20] Higher scores signify good QoL of the patient and vice versa. [21] The range for the final scores is same for all the subscales and total score, which is 0 to 50. Total scores are further categorized into 3 subgroups: desirable (score: 20–30), relatively desirable (score: 10–19) and undesirable (score: 0–9). [22]

2.3. Bias

Some questions also depend on patients’ perception regarding certain beliefs; hence they might affect the results.

2.4. Study size

A sample size of 132 was calculated via OpenEpi sample size calculator, [22] in which we used 5% as a margin of error, 95% as confidence interval (CI), 200 as population size (currently enrolled number of patients in hemodialysis unit) and anticipated frequency of outcome factor in the population of 50%. Hence, the questionnaire was made available in printed form with translation in local language alongside for better understanding. At least, 180 patients were approached for filling out the responses, out of which 137 agreed to participate giving a response rate of 76.1%. A total of 19 questionnaires were excluded due to incomplete responses. Hence, a total of 118 respondents (participants) were recruited in the analysis.

2.5. Statistical methods

Subsequently, data were tabulated, coded then analyzed using the computer program for Windows IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 25.0, Armonk, NY: IBM Corporation.

2.6. Quantitative variables

Descriptive statistics were calculated in the form of mean ± standard deviation, 95% CI, range, median and interquartile range (IQR) and frequency (percentage). In the statistical comparison between the different groups, the significance of difference was tested using either Mann-Whitney used to compare between different groups of nonparametric data and...
inter-group comparison of categorical data was performed by using Pearson chi-square test or Fisher exact test as indicated. Multivariate linear regression was conducted for only the continuous descriptive variables reported unstandardized and standardized coefficients, while multivariate regression analysis was conducted for all the qualitative variables. Crude odds ratio (OR) and adjusted odds ratio (AOR) were reported subsequently. A P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Sociodemographic characteristics of participants

A total of 118 responses were included in the analysis having a mean age of 57.36 ± 10.03 years and mean BMI of 26.73 ± 5.54 kg/m². About 48.3% of participants were enrolled for twice-weekly dialysis and rest 51.7% for thrice weekly, majority dialyzed via AV fistula access (79.7%). Around 55.1% comprised of men, 66.9% were married, 74.6% hypertensive, 56.8% diabetic, and 11.9% suffered from ischemic heart disease (IHD). The mean values of all laboratory markers are shown in Table 1.

3.2. Descriptive data

The mean total QoL of the study population was found quite low (12.99 ± 5.89), with subscales scoring of 11.21 ± 5.85 (Health/Functioning), 14.86 ± 3.70 (Socioeconomic), 12.58 ± 8.34 (Spiritual/Psychological), and 15.63 ± 8.28 (Family). Majority of respondents fell in undesirable category of QoL (49.2%) followed by relatively desirable (30.5%) and desirable (20.3%), as shown in Table 2. In inferential statistics, total QoL (P = 0.004) and subscale health/functioning (P = 0.003) were significantly lower in females. All the subscales along with total QoL scores were found lower in twice-weekly dialysis patients (P < 0.001), as shown in Figures 1 and 2. With respect to diabetes, hypertension and IHD, no such differences were observed. Among categorization, marital status (P = 0.049) and frequency of dialysis (P < 0.001) were found significant, as shown in Figures 3 and 4. Among them, 53.8% unmarried and 75.4% twice weekly dialyzed patients had undesirable QoL. Among others, line access via catheter (54.2%), duration of dialysis (52.7%) and females (52.8%) were having undesirable QoL.

4. Outcome data and main results

All the descriptive variables were analyzed for multiple linear regression with QoL score (total) as dependent variable. Increased age was inversely related to QoL score (P = 0.031), while uric acid levels (P < 0.001), serum phosphate (P = 0.044) and BMI (P < 0.001) were directly associated with QoL score as shown in Table 3. For all categorical variables, univariate and multivariate regression was conducted with desirable QoL as reference category. On univariate model, BMI with OR: 4.857 (1.584–14.890), marital status with OR: 0.200 (0.050–0.794), lower hemoglobin with OR: 0.280 (0.085–0.925), high phosphate with OR 3.788 (1.275–11.254) and calcium with OR: 3.720 (1.060–13.050) were associated with desirable QoL. When adjusted for all the factors, hemoglobin with AOR 0.109 (0.013–0.945), marital status with AOR: 0.109 (0.013–0.945), phosphate with AOR 18.207 (1.880–76.291) and calcium with AOR: 28.468 (1.825–44.104) remained associated with relatively desirable QoL as shown in Table 4.

Significant determinants of undesirable QoL were twice the weekly frequency of dialysis with OR: 4.985 (1.767–14.062), BMI >26 kg/m² with OR: 3.206 (1.153–8.909), marital status with OR: 0.252 (0.067–0.945), and high serum phosphate with OR: 0.200 (0.050–0.794) on univariate analysis. While after adjusted for all factors in multivariate analysis, twice-weekly frequency of dialysis with AOR 24.088 (3.974–65.112), line access via catheter with AOR: 14.164 (1.227–63.439), elevated phosphate with AOR 22.043 (2.578–88.464) and uric acid levels with AOR: 10.723 (2.001–57.467) were found associated with undesirable QoL. Obtaining constant COVID-19 updates and fear of contracting the virus were additional associated factors on multivariate analysis for relatively desirable and poor QoL as shown in Table 4.

### Table 1

| Characteristics                          | Frequency/descriptive |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mean age (yr)                            | 57.36 ± 10.03         |
| Mean body mass index (kg/m²)             | 26.73 ± 5.54          |
| Mean duration of hemodialysis onset (yr) | 3.87 ± 3.46           |
| >2 years of hemodialysis onset           | 63 (53.4%)            |
| <2 years of hemodialysis onset           | 55 (46.6%)            |
| Male gender                              | 65 (55.1%)            |
| Female gender                            | 53 (44.9%)            |
| Frequency of dialysis: twice weekly      | 57 (48.3%)            |
| Frequency of dialysis: thrice weekly     | 61 (51.7%)            |
| Marital status: single                   | 39 (33.1%)            |
| Marital status: married                  | 79 (66.9%)            |
| Diabetes                                 | 67 (56.8%)            |
| Hypertension                             | 88 (74.6%)            |
| Ischemic heart disease                   | 14 (11.9%)            |
| Line access: femoral/subclavian catheter | 24 (20.3%)            |
| Line access: arteriovenous fistula       | 94 (79.7%)            |
| Mean hemoglobin (g/dL)                   | 8.69 ± 1.11           |
| Mean albumin (g/dL)                      | 3.53 ± 0.52           |
| Mean uric acid (mg/dL)                   | 6.58 ± 1.03           |
| Mean phosphate (mg/dL)                   | 5.59 ± 2.28           |
| Mean calcium (mg/dL)                     | 8.26 ± 0.91           |
| Mean parathyroid hormone (pg/mL)        | 557.30 ± 453.50       |

Data presented as either mean and standard deviation or frequency and percentage.

### Table 2

| Quality of life index scores of the study population (n = 118). |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scoring/categorization | Subscales | Mean ± SD | Median | IQR | Range | 95% CI |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----|-------|--------|
| Quality of life index scores | Health/functioning | 11.21 ± 5.85 | 7.82 | 12.28 | 17.22 | 10.14–12.28 |
|                        | Socioeconomic | 14.86 ± 3.70 | 12.81 | 4.00 | 11.00 | 14.19–15.54 |
|                        | Spiritual/psychological | 12.58 ± 8.34 | 10.64 | 14.00 | 22.14 | 11.05–14.10 |
|                        | Family | 15.63 ± 8.28 | 16.80 | 19.40 | 22.50 | 14.12–17.14 |
| Quality of life total | 12.99 ± 5.89 | 11.68 | 11.01 | 15.81 | 11.91–14.06 |

| Quality of life (total) categorization | Categories | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Desirable (score: 20–30)               | n = 24     | 20.3%     |
| Relatively desirable (score: 10–19)    | n = 36     | 30.5%     |
| Undesirable (score: 0–9)               | n = 58     | 49.2%     |

CI = confidence interval, IQR = interquartile range, SD = standard deviation.
5. Discussion
Many factors related to QoL of hemodialysis patients were found in the literature. Starting with perceived social support, Iranian population showed direct correlation of this factor with the same index of QoL used in our study in all the subgroups.[23] Poor nocturnal quality sleep and increased daytime sleepiness are associated with decreased quality of life in hemodialysis patients.[24] Data from United Arab Emirates (UAE) suggested lower educational level and presence of chronic illness had the strongest impact on poor QoL.[25] Hemodialysis patients from Saudi Arabia showed higher QoL scores in those undergoing afternoon shift dialysis; furthermore, male gender, employed patients, and nondiabetics also showed higher scores.[26] Data from Bahrain suggested educational level, urban residence, and...
Figure 3 & 4. Categorical distribution of quality of life determinants into subcategories of desirable, relatively desirable and undesirable.
marital status determine poor QoL.[27] Only age and educational level had a negative impact on quality of life of Iranian populations on hemodialysis with either hepatitis B, or C seropositivity.[28] A systematic review from Iran also suggested similar findings when compared with normal population and other chronic illnesses like diabetes and cardiac disease.[29]

Since frequency of dialysis was the major factor contributing to poor QoL in our patients, most of the comparisons drawn from the other studies revolve around this factor. The frequency of hemodialysis sessions has a vital role in the survival and prevalence of complications in patients enduring ESRD.[30] Abundant studies conducted regarding frequency of twice or thrice sessions a week in sufferers of CKD reported age range of 50–60 years in maximum individuals.[8,30–33] No gender discrimination was observed in encountering CKD among both genders, while in terms of sessions of dialysis, increased frequency of twice-weekly dialysis was detected among females.[8,30–33] Significant frequency of thrice-weekly dialysis was reported in males.[8] Primary causes of CKD were diabetes mellitus and glomerulonephritis in multiple studies.[7,30,32,33] Significant prevalence of cardiovascular diseases, stroke, dementia, hemiplegia, chronic pulmonary diseases were detected in patients of CKD undergoing 3 sessions of dialysis per week in numerous studies.[30–32] While no difference regarding comorbidities was reported by a trivial study.[33] Higher glomerular filtration rate (GFR), urine output, and decreased creatinine levels were observed in sufferers undergoing thrice-weekly dialysis in study regulated by Park et al.[7] On contrary, study regulated within population of USA reported lower serum creatinine levels in individuals opting for twice-weekly sessions of dialysis when compared with thrice-weekly sessions.[33] Thaweeathcharoen et al, reported no difference in creatinine levels.[33] Hanson et al, reported decreased creatinine levels and elevated levels of albumin as distinctive features encountered in individuals undergoing twice-weekly sessions of dialysis.[32]

According to the Chinese renal data system, inhabitants of China suffering from ESRD undergo twice-weekly sessions of dialysis, factors leading to this management plan are patient comorbidities, residual function status, desire of gradual initiation of dialysis and insurance status.[31] Previous studies regulated in a similar pattern concluded that twice-weekly sessions of dialysis were utilized for patients of old age, females, sufferers with low BMI and patients with residual renal function at initiation of renal replacement therapy on contrast this regimen is not recommended recently by international guidelines or in sufferers with urea clearance of <2 ml/min.[10,14] Multiple studies documented the comparison of clinical outcomes between fewer weekly sessions of dialysis versus thrice-weekly plan of dialysis concluding that fewer consecutive sessions of dialysis favor the conservation of residual renal function and do not result in decline of QoL and patient survival.[7] Lower clearance rate, increased Kt/V, elevated blood urea nitrogen levels (BUN), PTH and phosphate levels while decreased levels of calcium were detected in patients settling for twice-weekly program of dialysis in a study conducted within inhabitants of China and Thailand.[9,31] Anemia was prominently suffered by patients with increased frequency of thrice-weekly sessions of dialysis.[34] While no statistically significant difference was observed in another study conducted in similar fashion.[8] Twice-weekly sessions of dialysis were popular among older Caucasian women and individuals suffering from Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) according to study mentioned above.[32] Majority of studies stated better QoL among individuals adjusting with twice-weekly sessions of dialysis as compared to thrice-weekly sessions.[1,2,7,30,33] While a study recorded no difference of QoL among both frequencies of dialysis.[30] Impaired mental status, disturbances of sleep, decline in sexual and cognitive function was prominent among patients with thrice-weekly schedule of dialysis.[17] Social interaction and support were prevalent within individuals with twice-weekly sessions of dialysis.[2,7] Decline in mortality rate was observed in patients with twice-weekly sessions of dialysis[32] while prevalence of infection was high among patients with thrice-weekly sessions of dialysis.[33] No difference within BMI, nutritional status and weight in association with frequency of dialysis was detected in patients of CKD.[7,31]

Other significant factors contributing to improved QoL in hemodialysis patients were illness acceptance and enough disease knowledge.[1,33] Data from Ethiopia suggested socioeconomic and educational status on top of higher hemoglobin levels were significant determinants for improved QoL.[5] Higher BMI and duration of dialysis onset >5 years were associated with poor QoL in an Iranian population; however, these variables are insignificant in our findings.[33] Previous studies from Pakistan have suggested presence of diabetes and duration of dialysis onset negatively correlating with QoL.[5] But no association was found in frequency of dialysis per week with QoL in their study participants contrary to our findings. Data from Poland suggested female gender, elderly age and fatigue during dialysis were profound determinants for poor QoL[4] as opposed to socioeconomic and educational well-being for good QoL.[1,3] A randomized trial from China rendered twice-weekly dialysis more favorable toward quality of life with certain socioeconomic and social support factors related to it, thus opposing our results,[30] while a study from India suggested equal effects of twice and thrice-weekly dialysis on QoL.[14] In another study, less frequent dialysis sessions per week have a higher score of QoL on physical and mental scales than more frequent sessions, again contradicting our results.[15] More recently, COVID-19 pandemic has also affected the QoL of hemodialysis patients as evident by our results; however, not much literature is available on it to compare our results.

### Table 3

| Model                          | Unstandardized coefficients (B) | Standard error | Standardized coefficients (β) | t-statistic | P value | 95% Confidence Interval for B |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|------------------------------|
| (Constant)                    | 35.591                          | 9.224          | –                             | 3.859       | <0.001* | 17.309–53.764                |
| Age                           | –0.148                          | 0.068          | –0.251                        | –2.184      | 0.031*  | –0.282 to –0.014             |
| Hemoglobin                    | –1.044                          | 0.531          | –0.198                        | –1.967      | 0.052   | –2.096 to 0.008              |
| Albumin                       | 0.795                           | 0.070          | 0.037                         | 0.758       | 0.540   | 0.283 to 2.872               |
| Uric acid                     | –1.940                          | 0.512          | –0.341                        | –3.793      | <0.001* | –2.955 to –0.926             |
| Phosphate                     | 0.01                              | 0.001         | 0.017                         | 0.017       | 0.223   | 0.0004 to 0.00010            |
| Calcium                       | –0.05                           | 0.016          | –0.004                        | –0.614      | 0.540   | –1.323 to 0.912              |
| Parathyroid hormone           | –0.002                          | 0.001          | –0.117                        | –1.936      | 0.236   | 0.0004 to 0.00010            |
| Duration of hemodialysis onset| –0.087                          | 0.156          | –0.051                        | –0.557      | 0.579   | –0.397 to 0.223              |
| BMI                            | 0.495                           | 0.128          | 0.466                         | 3.860       | <0.001* | 0.241 to 0.749               |

B = unstandardized coefficient, BMI = body mass index, β = standardized coefficient.

*Indicates significant P value of <0.05.
### Table 4
Univariate and multivariate logistic regression model for quality of life in hemodialysis patient (n = 118).

| Variables                           | Relatively desirable (score: 10-19) | Undesirable (score: 0-9) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                     | Crude OR (95%CI)                     | AOR (95%CI)              |
| Gender                              |                                     |                          |
| Male                                | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| Female                              | 2.429 (0.812–7.268)                 | 0.474 (0.060–3.725)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.113                                | 0.478                    |
|                                     | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **P** value                         | 0.06** (0.029–1.814)                | 0.026*                   |
| Age                                 | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<50 years**                        | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>50 years**                        | 1.800 (0.588–5.511)                 | 0.807 (0.112–5.834)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.303                                | 0.832                    |
| Frequency of hemodialysis           | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
|                              | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| Thrice weekly                       | 1.069 (0.345–3.309)                 | 3.901 (0.639–23.813)     |
| **P** value                         | 0.908                                | 0.140                    |
| BMI                                 | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<25.0 kg/m²**                      | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>25.0 kg/m²**                      | 4.857 (1.584–14.890)                | 0.385 (0.029–5.184)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.006*                               | 0.472                    |
| Line access                         | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| Fistula                             | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **Catheter**                        | 1.167 (0.347–3.924)                 | 0.445 (0.038–5.235)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.803                                | 0.520                    |
| Marital status                      | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **Single**                          | 0.200 (0.050–0.794)                 | 0.109 (0.013–0.945)      |
| **Married**                         | 0.022*                               | 0.044*                   |
| Duration of dialysis onset          | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<2 years**                        | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>2 years**                        | 1.185 (0.418–3.355)                 | 0.870 (0.155–4.875)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.750                                | 0.874                    |
| Hypertension                        | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **Absent**                          | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **Present**                         | 1.185 (0.418–3.355)                 | 2.969 (0.555–15.890)     |
| **P** value                         | 0.750                                | 0.204                    |
| **Hemoglobin**                      | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<9 g/dL**                         | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>9 g/dL**                         | 0.280 (0.085–0.925)                 | 0.045 (0.004–0.457)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.037**                              | 0.009*                   |
| Albumin                             | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<3.4 g/dL**                       | 1.400 (0.495–3.956)                 | 0.331 (0.046–2.402)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.526                                | 0.274                    |
| Uric acid                           | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<6.5 mg/dL**                      | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>6.5 mg/dL**                      | 1.667 (0.381–4.779)                 | 4.420 (0.028–23.591)     |
| **P** value                         | 0.034                                | 0.082                    |
| Phosphate                           | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<4.5 mg/dL**                      | 3.788 (1.275–11.254)                | 18.207 (1.880–76.291)    |
| **P** value                         | 0.017*                               | 0.012*                   |
| Calcium                             | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<8.6 mg/dL**                      | 3.720 (1.060–13.050)                | 28.468 (1.825–44.104)    |
| **P** value                         | 0.040*                               | 0.017*                   |
| Parathyroid hormone                 | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **<300 pg/mL**                      | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| **>300 pg/mL**                      | 2.071 (0.634–6.767)                 | 0.201 (0.024–1.702)      |
| **P** value                         | 0.228                                | 0.141                    |
| Obtaining constant COVID-19 updates | 1.00                                 | 1.00                     |
| Yes                                 | 0.169 (0.102–0.281)                 | 0.439 (0.218–0.886)      |
| No                                  | 5.921 (3.559–9.851)                 | 2.277 (1.129–4.592)      |

(Continued)
6. Limitations

There were some limitations of the current study. The study sample was not that adequate to represent a larger hemodialysis population, but a convenience sample from a single institution. The study was cross-sectional hence not signifying the causal relationship between the factor variables and QoL. Finally, because the data was collected during the dialysis unit visits accompanying by their family members, influence of those family members in answering the questions of the participants could not be certainly ruled out. Some questions also depend on patients’ perception regarding certain beliefs; hence they might affect the results. The strengths of the study were validated tools utilized, and inclusion of biochemical parameters in the analysis which are usually not a part of such surveys while reporting QoL in hemodialysis patients.

7. Conclusions

Our study concluded many determinants associated with relatively desirable and undesirable QoL using a validated index. Certain biochemical markers were the major contributor towards poor QoL, which can be asserted to the fact these molecules are poorly cleared from the bloodstreams by various factors including poor compliance to dialysis or lesser Kt/V. Hence, lesser frequency of dialysis implying to inadequate dialysis was found the most significant contributor towards poor QoL in our study population.

Acknowledgment

An expert statistician from Dow University Hospital has reviewed the results.

References

[1] Pompey CS, Ridwan MN, Zahra AN, et al. Illness acceptance and QoL among end stage renal disease patients undergoing hemodialysis. Enferm Clin. 2019;29(52):128–133.
[2] Rohmah AS, Ladesvita F. Comparison QoL in patient with chronic kidney disease based on frequency of hemodialysis in the community: a research during covid-19. Advances In Health Sciences Research. 2020;30:363–7.
[3] Gerasimoula K, Lefkothea L, Maria L, et al. QoL in Hemodialysis patients. Mater Sociomed. 2015;27:305–9.
[4] Zazzeroni L, Pasquinelli G, Nanni E, et al. Comparison of hemodialysis, hemofiltration, and acetate-free biofiltration for ESRD: systematic review. Am J Kidney Dis. 2005;45:437–47.
[5] Ferrans CE, Powers MJ. Quality of life index: development and psychometric properties. ANS Adv Nurs Sci. 1985;8:15–24.
[6] Ferrans CE, Powers MJ. Psychometric assessment of the quality of life index. Res Nurs Health. 1992;15:29–38.
[7] Ferrans CE, Powers MJ. Quality of life of hemodialysis patients. ANNA J. 1993;20:575–81; discussion 582.
[8] Ranestad T, Rustoen T. Ferrans and powers quality of life index. Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. 2014:2259–2263.
[9] Kimura M, Silva JV. Ferrans and providers quality of life index. Rev Esc Enferm USP. 2009;43:1098–104.
[10] Halabi JO. Psychometric properties of the Arabic version of quality of life index. J Adv Nurs. 2006;55:604–10.
[11] OpenEpi size calculator. Open source statistics for public health (2013). Accessed on 23rd October, 2020. Available at: https://www.openepi.com/Menu/OE_Menu.htm
[12] Rambod M, Rafie F. Perceived social support and quality of life in Iranian hemodialysis patients. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2010;42:242–9.
[13] Parker KP, Kutner NG, Blowe DL, et al. Nocturnal sleep, daytime sleepiness, and quality of life in stable patients on hemodialysis. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2012;10:115.
[14] Ayoub AM, Hijazi KH. Quality of life in dialysis patients from the United Arab Emirates. J Family Community Med. 2013;20:106–12.
[15] Ajeib A, Saeed A, Aljamaan A, et al. A study of quality of life among hemodialysis patients and its associated factors using kidney disease quality of life instrument-SF36 in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Saudi J Kidney Dis Transpl. 2020;31:1225–33.
[16] Ajeib A, Saeed A, Aljamaan A, et al. A study of quality of life among hemodialysis patients and its associated factors using kidney disease quality of life instrument-SF36 in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Saudi J Kidney Dis Transpl. 2020;31:1225–33.
[17] El-Habashi AE, El-Agroudy AE, Jaradat A, et al. Quality of life and its determinants among hemodialysis patients: a single-center study. Saudi J Kidney Dis Transpl. 2020;31:460–72.
[18] Rostami Z, Lessan Pezheshki M, Soleimani Najaf Abadi A, et al. Health related quality of life in Iranian hemodialysis patients with viral hepatitis changing epidemiology. Hepat Mon. 2013;13:e9611.
[19] Ghiaci B, Sarokhani D, Dehkordi AH, et al. Quality of life of patients with chronic kidney disease in Iran: systematic review and meta-analysis. Indian J Palliat Care. 2018;24:104–11.
[30] Dai L, Lu C, Liu J, et al. Impact of twice- or three-times-weekly maintenance hemodialysis on patient outcomes a multicenter randomized trial. Medicine. 2020;99:e202021–7.

[31] Beiber B, Qian J, Anand S, et al. Two-times weekly hemodialysis in China: frequency, associated patient and treatment characteristics and QoL in the China Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns study. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2014;29:1770–7.

[32] Hanson JA, Hulbert-Shearon TE, Ojo AO, et al. Prescription of twice-weekly hemodialysis in the USA. Am J Nephrol. 1999;19:625–33.

[33] Prakash GK, Vellaboina B. QoL in patients on thrice weekly dialysis versus twice weekly dialysis using sf 36 score. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2019;34:580.

[34] KDOQI Clinical practice guidelines and clinical practice recommendations for anemia in chronic kidney disease. Am J Kidney Dis. 2006;47:11–145.

[35] Pakpour AH, Saffari M, Yekaninejad MS, et al. Health-related QoL in a sample of Iranian patients on hemodialysis. Iran J Kidney Dis. 2010;4:50–9.