



International Journal Of
**Recent Scientific
Research**

ISSN: 0976-3031

Volume: 7(1) January -2016

ACUTE RENAL FAILURE AFTER MYELOABLATIVE AND NON-
MYELOABLATIVE HEMATOPOIETIC CELL TRANSPLANT: RISK FACTORS

Howayda Abdel Hameed., Dawlat Sany and
Yasser Elshahawy



THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RECENT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (IJRSR)
<http://www.recentscientific.com/> recentscientific@gmail.com



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol.7, Issue, 1, pp. 8096-8100, January, 2015

International Journal
of Recent Scientific
Research

RESEARCH ARTICLE

ACUTE RENAL FAILURE AFTER MYELOABLATIVE AND NON-MYELOABLATIVE HEMATOPOIETIC CELL TRANSPLANT: RISK FACTORS

Howayda Abdel Hameed., Dawlat Sany and Yasser Elshahawy

Division of Nephrology, Ain-Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15th October, 2015

Received in revised form 21st
November, 2015

Accepted 06th December, 2015

Published online 28st

January, 2016

Key words:

Acute renal failure, hematopoietic cell transplant, myeloablative and non-myeloablative conditioning therapy, risk factors.

ABSTRACT

Background: Bone marrow transplantation (BMT) is a major modality for malignant and hematologic disorders. This procedure is associated with a high morbidity and mortality such as acute kidney injury (AKI). Many factors, such as therapeutic agents, irradiation, and graft versus host disease (GVHD) can cause AKI. Bone marrow transplantation conditioning therapy in Egypt is based on drugs such as busulfan and cyclo phosphamide with and without irradiation therapy. The aim of this study was to evaluate the risk factors for AKI among patients who underwent BMT.

Methods: One hundred patients were retrospectively studied from time of transplant till 3 months after. Acute renal failure (ARF) was defined as a doubling of baseline serum creatinine at any time during the first 100 days post-transplant. We conducted a case-control study to identify precipitants of ARF. For each person who developed ARF, one controls were selected at random from patients who had not developed ARF as of that time. An exposure period was defined for each case as the 2 weeks prior to the day on which the matched case met the criteria for ARF. The risk of ARF in relation to demographic and anthropometric characteristics, comorbidity, types of treatment and post transplant complications was examined using univariable and multivariable conditional logistic regression models. Odds ratios for the associations with ARF were estimated, taking into account the matching.

Results: Fifty patients (50%) developed ARF at a mean 11.8 ± 6.1 days after myeloablative transplant versus 9.8 ± 4.1 days among non-myeloablative transplant ($p=0.17$). Elevated risks were observed in patients who were hypertensive (OR 4.25; 95%CI 1.45–29.95), patient who had post transplant ICU admission (OR 7.57; 95%CI 0.79–16.55), those with sinusoidal obstruction syndrome (SOS) (OR 4.16; 95%CI 2.29–38.38), high cyclosporine trough level (OR 2.96; 95%CI 0.79–16.55), and those with post transplant weight gain (OR 2.95; 95%CI 0.79–16.55). Neither graft versus host disease (GVHD), nor CMV reactivation was associated with an increased risk of ARF.

Conclusion: The cumulative incidence of ARF after HCT remains high. Cyclosporine trough level and presence of hepatic sinusoidal injury increased the risk of ARF within the first 100 days after HCT. Higher levels of serum creatinine at baseline were associated with a higher risk of ARF.

Copyright © Howayda Abdel Hameed., Dawlat Sany and Yasser Elshahawy., 2015, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

There are three major SCT modalities that include autologous SCT (auto), myeloablative allogeneic SCT (m-allo) and non-myeloablative allogeneic SCT (nm-allo), with selection depending on stem cell sources and preconditioning procedures¹. Hematopoietic cell transplant (HCT) is an increasingly utilized treatment for many malignancies, aplastic anemias, and certain inborn errors of metabolism. However, patient survival may be limited by substantial treatment-related toxicities. Among the most severe of these toxicities is acute renal failure (ARF), which occurs frequently in the first 100

days following HCT. Mortality rates among transplanted patients with renal disease in this setting are higher than among those who retain normal renal function²⁻⁵. Schrier *et al.*¹ showed the frequency of acute kidney injury (AKI) increased significantly from auto (21%) to nm-allo (40%) to m-allo (69%). In 2 large retrospective reviews of patients undergoing HCT in the 1980s, the frequency of ARF (defined as a doubling of baseline serum creatinine within the first 30 days post-transplant) was 26% of 275 patients and 53% of 272 patients, respectively^{2,3}. Identified risk factors included sinusoidal obstruction syndrome, older age, jaundice, weight gain, and exposure to amphotericin B^{2,3}. In other study, hepatic toxicity, sinusoidal obstruction syndrome, and lung toxicity were

*Corresponding author: Howayda Abdel Hameed

Division of Nephrology, Ain-Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

associated with an increased risk of ARF⁵. The conditioning regimen of cyclo phosphamide and total body irradiation has also been implicated in pediatric studies^{4,6}. We studied a cohort of patients transplanted with allogeneic donor cells following a uniform conditioning regimen based on drugs, consisting of busulfan and cyclophosphamide (CY), without radiation therapy, to determine risk factors related to the development of ARF.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients

Between January 2013 and January 2014 allogeneic myeloablative and non-myeloablative SCT was performed on 100 adult patients aged 17–57 years, at the BMT Research Center, Naser institute Cairo, Egypt. Patient data were collected and analysed retrospectively using a database and computerized patient records. Patients gave informed consent and were approved by the Institutional Review Board and were treated according to clinical protocols approved by the local investigation review board.

Stem Cell Transplantation Procedure

Patients with hematologic, nonhematologic malignancies and thalassemia major who underwent BMT after a conditioning regimen of cyclophosphamide without total body irradiation were enrolled for evaluation of risk factors for AKI post BMT. All of the consecutive 100 patients underwent an initial evaluation prior to treatment that included history and physical examination, baseline laboratory testing, chest radiography, pulmonary function tests, and electrocardiography. Patients were accepted for transplantation only if they had adequate kidney, liver, pulmonary, and cardiac functions according to the evaluation results provided by respective specialists. All of the patients had normal kidney function based on serum creatinine (Cr) levels, before transplantation.

Conditioning Regimen

All of the patients were hospitalized and the conditioning regimen included cyclophosphamide, 30 mg/kg for m-allo and 50 mg/kg for nm-allo, and busulfan 16mg/kg. None of the patients received total body irradiation. In allogeneic transplantation, bone marrow and peripheral stem cells from related donors were used as the source of hematopoietic progenitors. In some patients, cryo preserved umbilical cord blood was used as the source of hematopoietic progenitor cells, as well. Broad-spectrum antibacterial prophylaxis was used for neutropenia and empiric treatment of fever.

Graft Versus Host Disease Prophylaxis

All patients received GVHD prophylaxis with cyclosporine, which started on day – 2 at a dose of 3 mg/kg/day by continuous infusion for 3–4 weeks. It was thereafter given orally for 4–6 weeks at a dose that gave comparable trough levels, followed by tapering.

Dose adjustments were made to keep cyclosporine trough levels between 200 and 450 ng/ml. Serum creatinine and cyclosporine trough levels were measured at least twice a week during the first month, and at least once a week thereafter until the cyclosporine was stopped. When no active GVHD was present, cyclosporine was discontinued within 3 months after transplantation. GVHD was diagnosed according to the Seattle criteria.⁷

Anti-Thymocyte Globulin Therapy

The graft was partially T-cell-depleted, as described. In recipients of his to compatibility leukocyte antigen (HLA)-matched unrelated donor or a single HLA-antigen mismatched family donor, anti-thymocyte globulin (Rabbit ATG, Thymoglobulin, Sang stat, Amstelveen, the Netherlands) was given before cyclo phosphamide was infused.

Infection Prophylaxis

consisted of ciprofloxacin, fluconazole given orally until granulocyte counts exceeded 500 cell/ml. Cephalotin was given intravenously from day p3 until day p13. Co-trimoxazole 480mg twice daily and valacyclovir 500mg twice daily were given orally from day p1 until 12 months after transplantation (or longer in cases of active GVHD).

Study Design

We used a case-control study design to explore risk factors for ARF, defined as a doubling of baseline serum creatinine within the first 100 days after transplant. Baseline serum creatinine was the value obtained prior to the start of conditioning therapy. Fifty controls were selected at random from among patients in the study cohort who were event-free for at least as long as the time preceding the onset of ARF in the matched case.

An exposure period of 2 weeks prior to the onset of ARF was defined, in which potential time-varying risk factors were examined. The exposure period for a control patient was defined as the 2 weeks prior to the study day on which the matched case developed ARF. Thus, 50 cases and 50 control observation periods comprised the study population.

Patient Monitoring

The following clinical data were collected during the 14 day exposure periods: daily weight, first morning pulse and blood pressure, maximum daily temperature, daily medications, total serum bilirubin, the presence of bacteremia or fungemia, and cyclosporine blood levels.

In addition to time-dependent factors, we examined the following pretransplant patient characteristics for their association with ARF: age, gender, baseline serum Cr, weight, and serum albumin, as well as transplant related factors the occurrence of acute graft versus host disease (GVHD) and sinusoidal obstruction syndrome (SOS) developing any time

prior to the onset of ARF in the index case were also examined as potential risk factors.

Statistical Methods

The distributions of the continuous covariates in the cases and controls were compared using Wilcoxon rank sum tests. The odds ratios (OR) were calculated using conditional logistic regression models, which take into account the matching. All potential predictors were first evaluated in univariable conditional logistic regression models. Those parameters reaching a univariable significance level of $P < 0.1$ were assessed for significance in multiple conditional logistic models. The P values corresponding to the multiple regression model are based on the Wald test. The SPSS software (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 15.0, SPSS Inc, Chicago, Ill, USA) was used for all analyses.

RESULTS

The baseline characteristics of the 50 m-allo patients (25 cases and 25 control), 50 nm-allo patients (25 cases and 25 control) were summarized in Table 1. All patients received allografts, the majority (42%) for AML. Of 100 patients, 50 (50%) developed ARF before day +100, at median day +10 (range day+3 to +27) after transplant. Table 1 lists the mean and SD for the risk factors analyzed among cases and controls, and also shows the univariable associations between ARF and all the potential risk factors.

Table 1 Demographics and baseline characteristics of the patients before and after SCT

Variables	M-allo		Nm-allo	
	Cases N=25	Control N=25	Cases N=25	Control N=25
Age(years)	20.5±12.6	16.3±12.0	23.4±14.6	17.4±14.2
Gender(M/F)	18/7	15/10	17/8	14/11
Weight(kg)	55.6±29.5	42.8±24.9	53.6±21.9	44.2±29.2
Diagnosis				
AML	12(48%)	9(36%)		
ALL	2 (8%)			1(4%)
CML	4 (16%)	3(12%)		
BTM	4 (16%)	6(24%)		
FA			6(24%)	3(12%)
MDS		3(12%)	3(24%)	5(20%)
SOS			16(64%)	13(52%)
Others	3(12%)	4(16%)		2(8%)
History				
HTN(Yes/No)	4/21	4/21	3/22	1/24
DM(Yes/No)	2/23	1/24	2/23	0/25
RD(Yes/No)	1/24	0/25	0/25	0/25
Cr pre- SCT(mg/dl)	0.6±0.2	0.56±0.17	0.69±0.96	0.6±0.16
e GFR (ml/min)	128.9±17.9	134.7±19.1	126.3±15.8	135.1±18.2
C0 after SCT (ng/ml)	116.8±56.5	97.8±58.8	129.6±43.2	122.3±59.2
Cr level at AKI(mg/dl)	1.63±0.59	0.81±0.27*	1.95±0.39	0.81±0.24*
C0 at AKI (ng/ml)	158.4±93.5	147.5±87.2	202.8±70.6	127.8±56.3*
Cr level at 100 day(mg/dl)	0.73±0.29	0.53±0.21*	0.73±0.13	0.58±0.17*

Abbreviations: M-allo= myeloablative allogeneic transplantation; Nm-allo =non-myeloablative allogeneic transplantation; Cr=serum creatinine before transplant; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CML=chronic myelocytic leukemia; MDS=myelodysplastic syndrome; BTM=beta thalassemia major; FA=fanconianemia; SOS= sinusoidal obstruction syndrome; HTN=hypertension ;DM= diabetes mellitus; RD; renal dysfunction ;SCT= stem cell transplant; e GFR= estimated glomerular filtration by MDRD equation; C0=cyclosporine trough level; AKI=acute kidney injury; Asterisk (*) indicates a significant difference between m-allo and nm-allo groups.

Table 2 Post Stem cell transplant complications

Variables	M-allo		Nm-allo	
	Cases N=25	Control N=25	Cases N=25	Control N=25
AGVHD(Yes/No)	1/24	0/25	2/23	1/24
SOS(Yes/No)	14/11	7/18*	13/12	4/21*
ICU admission(Yes/No)	0/25	0/25	6/19	2/23
CMV reactivation(Yes/No)	0/25	0/25	2/23	0/25

Abbreviations: AGVHD=acute graft versus host disease;SOS= sinusoidal obstruction syndrome; ICU=intensive care unit; CMV= cytomegalovirus Asterisk (*) indicates a significant difference between the m-allo and nm-allo groups.

Table 3 Odds ratio of acute kidney injury post stem cell transplantation with 95% confidence intervals

variable	case	control	Chi-square	P-value	Odds ratio	P-value																																																																																																																																																																						
History of HTN																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	14	5	7.294	0.0069	4.235	0.0130																																																																																																																																																																						
no	36	45					History of DM							Yes	4	1	1.895	0.687	4.246	0.2023	no	46	49	History of RD							Yes	1	0	1.010	0.3149			no	49	50	ICU admission							Yes	10	2	8.366	0.004	7.579	0.0107	no	40	48	Acute GVHD							Yes	3	1	1.042	0.307	3.128	0.3308	no	47	49	S O S							Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013	no	23	39	CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278
History of DM																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	4	1	1.895	0.687	4.246	0.2023																																																																																																																																																																						
no	46	49					History of RD							Yes	1	0	1.010	0.3149			no	49	50	ICU admission							Yes	10	2	8.366	0.004	7.579	0.0107	no	40	48	Acute GVHD							Yes	3	1	1.042	0.307	3.128	0.3308	no	47	49	S O S							Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013	no	23	39	CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47													
History of RD																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	1	0	1.010	0.3149																																																																																																																																																																								
no	49	50					ICU admission							Yes	10	2	8.366	0.004	7.579	0.0107	no	40	48	Acute GVHD							Yes	3	1	1.042	0.307	3.128	0.3308	no	47	49	S O S							Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013	no	23	39	CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																														
ICU admission																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	10	2	8.366	0.004	7.579	0.0107																																																																																																																																																																						
no	40	48					Acute GVHD							Yes	3	1	1.042	0.307	3.128	0.3308	no	47	49	S O S							Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013	no	23	39	CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																															
Acute GVHD																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	3	1	1.042	0.307	3.128	0.3308																																																																																																																																																																						
no	47	49					S O S							Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013	no	23	39	CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																
S O S																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	27	11	10.866	0.0010	4.162	0.0013																																																																																																																																																																						
no	23	39					CMV reactivation							Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531			no	48	50	C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																																	
CMV reactivation																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	2	0	2.041	0.1531																																																																																																																																																																								
no	48	50					C0 increase							Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102	no	19	32	Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																																																		
C0 increase																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	31	18	6.763	0.0093	2.961	0.0102																																																																																																																																																																						
no	19	32					Wt gain							Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257	no	32	42	Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																																																																			
Wt gain																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	18	8	5.198	0.0226	2.953	0.0257																																																																																																																																																																						
no	32	42					Fever development							Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655	no	42	44	HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																																																																																				
Fever development																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	8	6	0.332	0.5644	1.397	0.5655																																																																																																																																																																						
no	42	44					HTN development							Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655	no	45	47																																																																																																																																																					
HTN development																																																																																																																																																																												
Yes	5	3	0.543	0.4610	1.278	0.4655																																																																																																																																																																						
no	45	47																																																																																																																																																																										

Abbreviations: HTN=hypertension; DM= diabetes mellitus; RD; renal dysfunction AGVHD=acute graft versus host disease;SOS= sinusoidal obstruction syndrome; ICU=intensive care unit; CMV= cytomegalovirus;C0 = increase in cyclosporine trough level during exposure period

There was significant higher cyclosporine trough level at the time of AKI between Nm-allo cases and control. Table 2 showed that SOS was the most common post SCT complication among patients with AKI. Table 3 Regression analysis showed that the largest ORs for development of AKI were observed in patients who had ICU admission post SCT(OR 7.57, 95% CI 1.86–14.43), history of HTN (OR 4.23,95% CI 1.86–14.43), those who had a clinical diagnosis of SOS prior to the date of onset of ARF (OR 4.16,95% CI 1.86–14.43). The risk of ARF was also associated with a 5% greater gain in weight from baseline (initial weight at clinic visit prior to the start of cyclophosphamide) to the end of the exposure period (OR 2.95, 95% CI 1.05–1.78). Also higher cyclosporine trough levels (OR 2.96, 95% CI 1.05–1.78) increase the risk of AKI in these patients.

DISCUSSION

Acute renal failure, defined as a doubling of baseline serum creatinine, remains common after SCT. In spite of recent advances in the care of patients undergoing SCT, the cumulative incidence of ARF was 50% in this cohort. Major factors associated with an increased risk of the development of ARF were identified by multivariable analysis: pre-transplant hypertension, SOS, ICU admission, increase cyclosporine trough level, weight gain post transplant. There was no evidence in the data that the incidence of ARF was related to cyclophosphamide exposure levels, sepsis, GVHD, nor older age. Unlike previous studies of ARF after HCT, all of our patients received the same conditioning regimen, allowing us to cleanly evaluate other risk factors. We investigated blood levels of cyclosporine in relation to the occurrence of ARF. Much of the renal toxicity of cyclosporine is thought to be dose dependent⁸, we found that higher levels of cyclosporine were associated with an increased risk of ARF in this patient population. Our data suggest that an elevated baseline serum creatinine was associated with a high risk for ARF. Zager *et al*³ found a high baseline serum creatinine (>0.7 mg/dL) was independently associated with the development of dialysis requiring ARF. Similarly, in the pediatric population, high pretransplant serum creatinine has been associated with an increased risk of renal failure in the first 3 months after transplant⁹. Previous studies in adults have identified SOS or elevated serum bilirubin levels (used as a surrogate marker for liver injury) as risk factors for the development of ARF^{2,3,5}. In our study, the presence of SOS was associated with an increase in the risk of ARF. There is a well-known association between sinusoidal liver injury and renal insufficiency in patients after hematopoietic cell transplant¹⁰. It has been postulated that portal hypertension resulting from hepatic sinusoidal injury leads to both decreased renal perfusion¹¹ and tubular injury¹², the former probably being the more important in the genesis of ARF. Weight gain was highly correlated with SOS. Weight gain can be a result of portal hypertension, leading to decreased renal perfusion and sodium avidity that precedes the development of ARF. Thus, weight gain likely serves as a marker of impending renal injury rather than being the result of renal injury. Zager *et al* identified weight gain within the first 21 days post-transplant as a risk factor for the development of ARF and ARF requiring dialysis. Weight gain of 10% of baseline at the onset of dialysis for ARF in pediatric stem cell transplant patients was associated with persistence of renal failure⁴. Though some have advocated keeping weight gain per se to a minimum (<10% fluid overload) to improve outcomes in this patient population¹³, it is unclear if the weight gain is causal or the result of other insults to these patients. Thus, prevention of SOS may be the more important strategy. The reported prevalence of thrombotic microangiopathic (TMA) syndromes [hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS) and thrombocytopenic purpura (TTP)] ranges from 2% to 21% after HCT¹⁴⁻¹⁶. The clinical spectrum of renal dysfunction in HCT patients with TMA varies from an indolent course resulting in chronic renal insufficiency to fulminant disease with acute renal failure and death. Several risk factors for TMA have been proposed: unrelated donor stem cell source¹⁶, conditioning with TBI¹⁷⁻¹⁹, age and female gender¹⁴; and cyclosporine

exposure 15, 20–24. Our study didn't record any case of TTP, the presence of TMA is not a risk factor for the development of ARF in our patient population.

CONCLUSION

This study found that ARF remains a common problem after SCT, affecting 50 % of patients. In a multivariable analysis, strong risk factors were identified: history of HTN, ICU admission, SOS, weight gain, high cyclosporine trough level. Prevention, early recognition, and treatment of SOS, offer the best chance to preserve renal function in patients after SCT.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Schrier RW, Parikh CR. Comparison of renal injury in myeloablative autologous, myeloablative allogeneic and non myeloablative allogeneic haematopoietic cell transplantation. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2005; 20: 678–683.
2. Gruss E, Bernis C, Tomas JF, *et al*: Acute renal failure in patients following bone marrow transplantation: Prevalence, risk factors and outcome. *Am J Nephrol* 1995; 15:473–479.
3. Zager ra, O'Quigley J, Zager B, *et al*: Acute renal failure following bone marrow transplantation: A retrospective study of 272 patients. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1989; 13:210–216.
4. Lane Ph, Mauer Sm, Blazar Br, *et al*: Outcome of dialysis for acute renal failure in pediatric bone marrow transplant patients. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1994; 13:613–617.
5. Parikh Cr, Mcsweeney Pa, Korular D, *et al*: Renal dysfunction in allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation. *Kidney Int* 2002; 62:566–573.
6. Van Why S, Friedman A, Wei L, *et al*: Renal insufficiency after bone marrow transplantation in children. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1991; 7: 383–388.
7. Thomas ED, Storb R, Clift RA, Fefer A, Johnson L, Neiman PE *et al*. Bone-marrow transplantation (second of two parts). *N Engl J Med* 1975; 292: 895–902.
8. Atkinson K, Downs K, Ashby M: Clinical correlations with blood levels after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation: An analysis of four different assays. *Transplant Proceedings* 1990; 22:1331–1334.
9. Kist-Van Holthe J, Van Zwet J, Brand R, *et al*: Bone marrow transplantation in children: Consequences for renal function shortly after and 1 year post-BMT. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1998; 22:559–564.
10. McDonald Gb, Hinds Ms, Fisher LB, *et al*: Venocclusive disease of the liver and multiorgan failure after bone marrow transplantation: A cohort study of 355 patients. *Ann Intern Med* 1993; 118: 255–267.
11. Deleve Ld, Shulman Hm, McDonald Gb: Toxic injury to hepatic sinusoids: Sinusoidal obstruction syndrome

- (venocclusive disease). *Semin Liver Dis* 2002; 22:27–41.
12. Fink J, Cooper M, Burkhart K, *et al*: Marked enzymuria following bone marrow transplantation: A correlate of veno-occlusive disease-induced 'hepatorenal syndrome.' *JAm Soc Nephrol* 1995; 6:1655–1660.
 13. Michaelm, Kuehnle I, Goldstein S: Fluid overload and acute renal failure in pediatric stem cell transplant patients. *PediatrNephrol* 2004; 19:91–95.
 14. Fuge R, Bird J, Fraser A, *et al*: The clinical features, risk factors and outcome of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura occurring after bone marrow transplantation. *Br J Hematol* 2001; 113:58–64.
 15. Paquette R, Tran L, Landaw E: Thrombotic microangiopathy following allogeneic bone marrow transplantation is associated with intensive graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1998; 22:351–357.
 16. Uderzo C, Fumagalli M, De Lorenzo P, *et al*: Impact of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura on leukemic children undergoing bone marrow transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 2000; 26:1005–1009.
 17. Lonnerholm G, Carlson K, Bratteby L, *et al*: Renal function after autologous bone marrow transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1991; 8:129–134.
 18. Marshall R, Sweny P: Haemolytic-uraemic syndrome in recipients of bone marrow transplants not treated with cyclosporin A. *Histopathology* 1986; 10:953–962.
 19. Antignac C, Gubler M-C, Leverger G, *et al*: Delayed renal failure with extensive mesangiolytic following bone marrow transplantation. *Kidney Int* 1989; 35: 1336–1344.
 20. Schriber J, Herzig G: Transplantation-associated thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura and hemolytic uremic syndrome. *Semin Hematol* 1997; 42:126–133.
 21. Atkinson K, Biggs J, Hayes J, *et al*: Cyclosporin A associated nephrotoxicity in the first 100 days after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation: Three distinct syndromes. *Br J Hematol* 1983; 54:59–67.
 22. Zeigler Z, Rosenfeld C, Andrews D III, *et al*: Plasma von Willebrand factor antigen (vWF:AG) and thrombomodulin (TM) levels in adult thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura/hemolytic uremic syndromes (TTP/HUS) and bone marrow transplant-associated thrombotic microangiopathy (BMT-TM). *Am J Hematol* 1996; 52:213–220.
 23. Chappell M, Keeling D, Prentice H, *et al*: Haemolyticuraemic syndrome after bone marrow transplantation: An adverse effect of total body irradiation? *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1988; 3:339–347.
 24. Cohen E, Lawton C, Moulder J: Bone marrow transplant nephropathy: Radiation nephritis revisited. *Nephron* 1995; 70:217–222.

How to cite this article:

Howayda Abdel Hameed., Dawlat Sany and Yasser Elshahawy. 2016, Acute Renal Failure After Myeloablative And Non-Myeloablative Hematopoietic Cell Transplant: Risk Factors. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 7(1), pp. 8096-8100.

T.SSN 0976-3031



9 770976 303009 >