

1 Depression screening in chronic hemodialysis patients.

2

3

4 Kubanek Alicja^{1*}, Przybylak Mateusz², Paul Przemysław¹, Kowalska Anna Sylwia³, Błaszczuk Michał⁴,
5 Macul-Sanewska Aleksandra⁴, Czarnacka Kamila⁵, Bednarski Krzysztof⁵, Kanclerz Katarzyna¹,
6 Szydłowska Aleksandra¹, Świetlik Dariusz⁶, Rutkowski Przemysław⁷, Bidzan Leszek², Renke Marcin¹,
7 Grabowski Jakub^{2&}

8

9

10

11 ¹Department of Occupational, Metabolic and Internal Diseases, Medical University of Gdańsk, Poland

12 ²Division of Developmental, Psychotic and Geriatric Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Medical
13 University of Gdańsk, Poland

14

15 ³Individual Specialist Medical Practice Anna Sylwia Kowalska, Gdańsk, Poland

16 ⁴Adult Psychiatry Scientific Circle, Division of Developmental, Psychotic and Geriatric Psychiatry,
17 Department of Psychiatry, Medical University of Gdańsk, Poland

18

19 ⁵Fresenius Nephrocare Ostróda, Poland

20 ⁶Department of Biostatistics and Neural Networks, Medical University of Gdańsk, Poland

21 ⁷Department of Internal and Paediatric Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, Medical University of
22 Gdańsk, Poland.

23

24

25 Corresponding author

26 E-mail: akubanek@gumed.edu.pl (AK)

27

28 **Abstract**

29 **Purpose**

30 Depressive disorder is common among hemodialysis (HD) patients and is associated with higher
31 mortality rate. However, depression screening and treatment in dialysis population remains

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32 insufficient. The aim of the study was to show the prevalence of depression in patients on maintenance
33 HD and to discuss the proper diagnostic approach, including dementia screening.

34 **Patients and methods**

35 We conducted a cross-sectional study that included 103 HD patients from one Dialysis Centre in
36 Gdańsk (Poland). Cognitive functions were evaluated using Mini–Mental State Examination (MMSE).
37 The screening for depression was assessed using Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II). The diagnosis of
38 depressive disorder was confirmed and its severity evaluated by psychiatrists based upon clinical
39 assessment and scales. Sociodemographic, laboratory and dialysis data were also collected.

40 **Results**

41 According to BDI-II depressive symptoms were present in 43% of patients while the diagnosis of clinical
42 Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) was confirmed by the psychiatrists in 13% of all subjects. In the
43 depressive disorder group there was a prevalence of female and patients suffering from diabetes
44 mellitus, levels of calcium phosphate index (CaxPi) were higher and Kt/V was lower. The optimal cut-
45 off score for diagnosing major depressive disorder using BDI-II was ≥ 20 points. Cognitive impairment
46 on the level of major neurocognitive disorder (dementia) was found in 18 % of the study group.

47 **Conclusions**

48 The prevalence of depression assessed using self- or clinician-administered questionnaires was higher
49 than reported by clinical interview performed by the psychiatrist. Higher scores of CaxPi and lower
50 Kt/V in depressive patients may suggest worse compliance in this group. The psychiatrist's examination
51 as a part of care at the Dialysis Centre could improve diagnosis of depression and its treatment with
52 the goal to improve quality of life and lower the mortality rate in this population.

53

54

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Unipolar depression is highly prevalent in adult population worldwide with twelve month
58 prevalence of major depressive disorder (MDD) being around five percent [1]. The lifetime prevalence
59 of MDD and persistent depressive disorder (dysthymia) is approximately 18 percent in developed
60 countries [2,3]. Among outpatients with general medical disorders prevalence of depressive
61 syndromes is even higher than in general population [4]. MDD and its life prevalence is more common
62 in younger population [3], women [5] as well as in divorced and widowed adults [3].

63 Kidney diseases have significant impact on global health. The number of patients with all-stage
64 chronic kidney disease (CKD) reached almost 700 million in 2017. The prevalence of patients requiring
65 dialysis is over 3 million in the world's population [6]. The incidence of end-stage renal disease (ESRD)

66 is increasing in recent years and in-centre hemodialysis (HD) remains the most common form of renal
67 replacement therapy (RRT) [7]. The median country-specific use of HD is depending mostly on its
68 variable availability [8]. The number of people receiving RRT is expected to keep rising in next decade
69 and reach over 5.4 million in 2030 driven by population ageing and increasing prevalence of diabetes
70 and hypertension [9].

71 Depression is the most common psychiatric disorder among patients with ESRD treated with
72 maintenance hemodialysis (MHD) [10]. Its prevalence is reaching approximately 20 to 40% and is
73 statistically higher while using self- or clinician administered questionnaires compared to the clinical
74 interview [11]. Estimating the prevalence of depression in MHD population is difficult due to variety of
75 definitions and assessment techniques [12] as well as the overlapping somatic symptoms. The strong
76 association between depression and all-cause mortality risk in patients receiving MHD is observed [13,
77 14]. Affective and cognitive symptoms of depression may be a better predictor of long-term mortality
78 than somatic symptoms in patients undergoing HD [15]. Depressive symptoms are also independently
79 associated with dialysis nonadherence, health resource utilization [16] and decreased quality of life
80 (QoL) [17]. Performing routine screening for depression has been proposed by Centres for Medicare
81 and Medicaid Services in United States [18] and was suggested in Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality
82 Initiative (KDOQI) guidelines for cardiovascular disease in dialysis patients [19]. Nevertheless
83 depression screening and treatment in dialysis population remains insufficient [20].

84 The research evaluating diagnostic accuracy of screening tools for depression in patients with
85 kidney failure is limited and future research is still needed [21]. The best studied assessment tool so
86 far is Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II) [22]. Few studies compared the effectiveness of BDI-II with
87 clinical interview in diagnosing MDD [23, 24, 25, 26], also in the elderly MHD population [27]. According
88 to the studies BDI-II is not a valid tool compared to clinical interview if the traditional cut-off score of
89 10 is used and the threshold of 15 points and above is suggested to be more accurate in hemodialysis
90 population [23,24,25]. On-dialysis assessments using BDI-II can be a convenient screening procedure
91 that could promote regular evaluation compared with the off-dialysis tests [23].

92 Among screening tools used to evaluate the prevalence of depression are the Cognitive
93 Depression Index (CDI) used to eliminate the somatic elements of the BDI-II form [23, 26], the Center
94 for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [28], the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale-
95 Depressive Subscale (HADS-D) [29], Geriatric Depression Scale 15 (GDS-15) [27], Initial Depression
96 Inventory- Maintenance Hemodialysis (ID-MHD) [30] and other.

97 Approximately thirty percent of hemodialysis patients suffer from dementia [31, 32] and its
98 prevalence is even higher among older patients and those with severe somatic conditions [33].

99 Therefore the limitations of self- administered rating scales should be considered as well as excluding
100 cognitive impairment before stating the diagnosis of depression [34].

101 The effects of depression diagnostics in hemodialysis population are unsatisfactory. The aim of the
102 study was to search the most effective method of diagnosing depressive symptoms in hemodialysis
103 patients leading to more efficient treatment.

104

105 **Methodology**

106 The primary aim of the study was to evaluate the prevalence of depression using BDI-II as a
107 screening tool performed by the medical staff in Dialysis Centre compared with the gold standard
108 clinical interview performed by a psychiatrist. We also performed screening for dementia using Mini-
109 Mental State Examination (MMSE) but did not exclude the patients that met the criteria of cognitive
110 impairment in MMSE from the follow-up, due to the possibility of pseudo-dementia in the course of
111 MDD.

112

113 **Study population**

114 Adult ESRD patients of the Hemodialysis Centre in Gdansk (Poland) were involved into the study
115 and were observed for 18 months. We recruited patients that were over 18 years old and had been
116 receiving HD for at least 3 months. We excluded patients with major psychiatric disorders other than
117 depression. The study group received the high-flux hemodialysis or hemodiafiltration three times
118 weekly. Cognitive functions were assessed clinically by the psychiatrists, as well as using the MMSE
119 [35]. MMSE was evaluated subsequently after at least 6 months and in the end of observation. Patients
120 that met the criteria of moderate or severe dementia were excluded from the depression evaluation.
121 The demographic, clinical and laboratory data of the study group was obtained. The severity of
122 comorbidities was scored with the use of Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) [36, 37].

123

124 **Study design**

125 The study was performed in one Dialysis Centre and received ethics approval by the Independent
126 Bioethics Committee for Scientific Research of the Medical University of Gdansk. All the tests and
127 interviews were performed during the dialysis sessions, at least one hour after the initiation and one
128 hour before the termination of the procedure.

129 Before performing the depression screening we administered the MMSE questionnaires to all the
130 patients in order to evaluate the cognitive function [35].

131 The screening tool used to measure the symptoms of depression was the Beck Depression Inventory II
132 [22]. The screening was followed by the clinical assessment performed by the psychiatrist. All the
133 clinicians were experienced in examining patients with chronic illnesses and were blind to the results
134 of BDI-II.

135 One of the tools used by the psychiatrists was The Mini International Neuropsychiatry Interview
136 (MINI) [38] determining if the patient fulfills the criteria of MDD according to Diagnostic and Statistical
137 Manual of Mental Disorders V (DSM-V). The Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS)
138 was used by the psychiatrists to define the severity of depressive symptoms [39]. It was used previously
139 in few studies in MHD population [40, 41]. It requires a lot of time and involvement, but is a gold
140 standard in monitoring depressive disorders that accurately reflects improvement during the
141 treatment.

142

143 **Statistical analysis**

144 All statistical calculations were performed using the Statistica, the StatSoft Inc. statistical package
145 (2014) (data analysis software system) version 12.0. (www.statsoft.com) and the Microsoft Excel
146 spreadsheet, developed by Microsoft Inc. Quantitative variables were characterized by the arithmetic
147 mean, standard deviation (SD), median, minimum and maximum value (range) and 95% CI (confidence
148 interval). The variables of the qualitative type were presented in terms of counts and percentages
149 (percentage). The Shapiro-Wilk W test was used to check whether the quantitative variable came from
150 a normally distributed population. The Leven (Brown-Forsythe) test was used to test the hypothesis of
151 equal variances. The significance of differences between the two groups (model of unrelated variables)
152 was tested by means of tests of significance of differences: Student's t-test (or in the case of lack of
153 homogeneity of variance, Welch's test) or the Mann-Whitney U test (in case of failure to meet the
154 conditions of applicability of the Student's t-test or for variables measured on the scale ordinal). The
155 significance of differences between more than two groups was checked with the F (ANOVA) or Kruskal-
156 Wallis test (in case of failure to meet the applicability conditions of ANOVA). When statistically
157 significant differences were obtained between the groups, post hoc tests were used (Tukey's test for
158 F, Dunn's test for Kruskal-Wallis). In the case of the model of two related variables, the Student's t-test
159 or the Wilcoxon-pair-order test was used (in the case of failure to meet the applicability conditions of
160 the Student's t-test or for variables measured on an ordinal scale). The significance of differences
161 between more than two in the model of related variables was checked by analysis of variance with

162 repeated measures or Friedman's test (in case of not meeting the applicability conditions of ANOVA
163 with repeated measures or for variables measured on an ordinal scale). Chi-square tests of
164 independence were used for qualitative variables (using the Yates correction for cell counts below 10,
165 respectively, checking Cochran conditions, Fisher's exact test). In order to establish a relationship,
166 strength and direction between the variables, a correlation analysis was used to calculate the Pearson
167 and /or Spearman correlation coefficients. In all calculations, $p = 0.05$ was adopted as the level of
168 significance.

169 The value under the Beck ROC curve is 1.00. The cut-off point determines the tangent method and the
170 index is ≥ 20 . Sensitivity 1.0, Specificity 1.0, PPV 1.0, NPV 1.0.

171

172 Results

173 The total number of 103 patients agreed to participate in the study. During the observation 13
174 patients died, 3 underwent kidney transplantation and 9 patients resigned during the follow-up. In the
175 study group there was a prevalence of male (66%), the mean age of the participants was 67 years. The
176 most common known primary cause of ESRD was diabetes mellitus (29%) and glomerulonephritis
177 (21%) followed by hypertension and ischemia (13%). Forty three percent of participants were
178 suffering from diabetes mellitus. The dominant vascular access was the permanent catheter (64%),
179 arteriovenous fistula was used in 35% of cases, the temporary catheter in 1%. The mean CCI score was
180 above 6 points, which is interpreted as the severe comorbidity. Mild comorbidity was found in 5%,
181 moderate in 14% and severe in 80% of the patients. The more precise sociodemographic and clinical
182 data are presented in Table 1.

183 **Table 1. Sociodemographic and clinical data**

Parameter	<i>n</i> =103
Gender	
Men, <i>n</i> (%)	69 (67.0%)
Women, <i>n</i> (%)	34 (33.0%)
Mean age, yr (SD)	67,3 (13,5)
Transplantation during observation, <i>n</i>	3 (2.9%)
Death during observation, <i>n</i>	13 (12.6%)
Dialysis vintage, yr (SD)	3,9 (3,6)
Vascular access	
arteriovenous fistula	36 (34,9%)
permanent catheter	66 (64%)
temporary catheter	1 (0,97%)
Primary etiology of CKD, <i>n</i> (%)	
Diabetes mellitus	30 (29,1%)
GN	22 (21,3%)

Hypertension and ischemia	14 (13,5%)
ADPKD	7 (6,8%)
Other	17 (16,5%)
Unknown	13 (12,6%)
Diabetes, <i>n</i>	57 (55,3%)
Charlson Comorbidity Index, medium (SD)	6,7 (2,6)

184 SD-standard deviation, CKD- chronic kidney disease, GN- glomerulonephritis, ADPKD- Autosomal
185 Dominant Polycystic Kidney Disease

186

187

188 The percentage of patients that met the criteria of dementia according to MMSE was 18. Mild
189 cognitive impairment (MCI) was found in 17% of the patients, mild dementia in 14% and moderate in
190 4% (Table 2). Thirty six percent of the patients that were later diagnosed with major depressive
191 disorder met the criteria of MCI or mild dementia. Patients with moderate and severe dementia were
192 excluded from depression evaluation.

193 **Table 2. Dementia screening in MMSE**

<i>n</i> =82			
Normal range	53 (64,6%)		
Mild cognitive impairment	14 (17,1%)		
Mild dementia	12 (14,6%)		
Moderate dementia	3 (3,7%)		
Data of the three groups	I- with depressive symptoms according to BDI II and non-depressive according to clinical interview performed by psychiatrist	II- with major depressive disorder diagnosed by psychiatrist	III- non-depressive group
<i>n</i> =78	<i>n</i> =21	<i>n</i> =13	<i>n</i> =44
Normal range	10 (58,8%)	7 (63,6%)	46 (65,7%)
Mild cognitive impairment	4 (23,5%)	2 (18,2%)	12 (17,1%)
Mild dementia	2 (11,8%)	2 (18,2%)	10 (14,3%)
Moderate dementia	1 (5,9%)	0 (0,0%)	2 (2,9%)

194 MMSE- Mini-Mental State Examination

195

196

197 In the study group 34 patients (43.6%) were diagnosed with depressive symptoms according to
198 BDI-II. The mean BDI-II score in the study group was 12 points (SD 8,1). The percentage of patients that
199 met criteria of depressive symptoms according to the MADRS alone with the cut-off of 10 or more
200 points was 43.6%. Mild depression was diagnosed in 26,9% of patients, moderate in 10,3% and severe
201 in 6.4%. The criteria of major depressive disorder which took into account clinical evaluation, MINI-
202 scale, MADRS cut-off points, CGI-S and MMSE results were met by 13 participants (16,7%). In the MDD
203 group the mean BDI-II score was 26 points compared with non-MDD group with mean 9 points. All the
204 patients that were diagnosed with moderate or severe depressive symptoms using BDI-II were later
205 diagnosed with MDD by the psychiatrist. The optimal cut-off point for BDI-II in diagnosing MDD was
206 equal or greater than 20 points (Table 3).

207 **Table 3. The optimal BDI-II cut-off point for diagnosing major depressive disorder**

BDI-II	Depression <i>n</i> =13	No depression <i>n</i> =65	P-value
mean(SD)	26,5 (4,5)	9,2 (5,1)	<0.0001
range	20,0-34,0	0,0-19,0	
median	26,0	9,0	

208 BDI-II- Beck Depression Inventory II, SD- standard deviation

209

210

211 We compared the group of participants that met no criteria of depression (neither in BDI-II, nor in
212 clinical interview) with the group having depressive symptoms according to BDI-II which was not
213 confirmed in the clinical interview and the group of patients that met both the criteria of BDI-II and
214 the gold standard clinical interview (Table 4). Out of 44 patients diagnosed with depressive symptoms
215 only one person was being treated for depression before the study, including none in the group with
216 MDD.

217 No statistically significant differences were found in the three groups considering comorbidity.
218 However in the MDD group all the patients met the criteria of severe comorbidity while in the other
219 two groups the percentage was around 75%.

220 **Table 4. Data of the three groups:**

221 I-with depressive symptoms according to BDI II and non-depressive according to clinical interview
222 performed by psychiatrist, II-with major depressive disorder diagnosed by psychiatrist, III- non-
223 depressive group

224

Parameter	Group I <i>n</i> =21	Group II <i>n</i> =13	Group III <i>n</i> =44	Together <i>n</i> =78	P-value

Sex	female male	14 (66.7%) 7 (33.3%)	5 (38.5%) 8 (61.5%)	33 (75.0%) 11 (25.0%)	52 (66.7%) 26 (33.3%)	0.0491 ¹
Age	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	69.4 (15.4) 36.0-93.0 67.0 [62.4;76.4]	67.2 (16.2) 36.0- 86.0 72.0 [57.4;77.0]	66.0 (10.9) 26.0-87.0 68.0 [62.6;69.3]	67.1 (13.1) 26.0-93.0 69.0 [64.2;70.1]	0.4472 ³
BMI	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	27.0 (4.4) 17,5-37.2 27.0 [25,0;29.0]	25.3 (4.8) 18.6-34.3 25.4 [22.4;28.2]	27.2 (5.3) 17.5-40.8 26.9 [25.6;28.8]	26.8 17.5-40.8 26.9 [25.7;28.0]	0.4753 ²
Dry weight	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	72,6 (13.6) 46,0-104,5 75.0 [70,0;82,4]	71.0 (12.9) 52,0- 92,0 73,5 [63,3;78,8]	78,7 (16,3) 51,5-125,0 75,8 [73,8;83,7]	76,8 (15,2) 46,0-125,0 74,8 [73,3;80,2]	0.3791 ³
Diabetes		11 (52,4%)	9 (69,2%)	14 (31,8%)	34 (43,6%)	0.0366 ¹
Charlson Index	1-2 3-4 ≥5	2 (9.5%) 3 (14.3%) 16(76.2%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 13 (100.0%)	2 (4.5%) 8 (18.2%) 34 (77.3%)	4 (5.1%) 11 (14.1%) 63 (80.8%)	0.1597 ³
Hb g/dl	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	10,9 (1,2) 9,3-13,2 10,8 [10,4;11,4]	10,8 (1,4) 9,0-13,3 10,7 [9,9;11,7]	10,8 (1,3) 8,4-13,8 10,7 [10,4;11,1]	10,8 (1,2) 8,4-13,8 10,7 [10,5;11,1]	0.9204 ²
K mmol/l	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	4,9 (0,6) 3,8-6,0 4,7 [4,6;5,2]	4,9 (0,8) 3,4-5,9 5,2 [4,3;5,4]	5,0 (0,6) 4,0-6,4 5,0 [4,9;5,2]	5,0 (0,6) 3,4-6,4 5,0 [4,8;5,1]	0.7282 ³
Ca x Pi	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	44,8 (11,4) 28,0-62,4 43,0 [39,6;50,0]	54,9 (14,5) 29,0-71,0 58,5 [45,7;64,1]	44,6 (12,9) 18,0-68,0 44,5 [40,7;48,6]	46,3 (13,1) 18,0-71,0 45,0 [43,3;49,3]	0.0690 ³
Ca x Pi	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	44,781 (11,441) 28,000-62,400 43,000 [39,573;49,989]	54,917 (14,526) 29,000-71,000 58,500 [45,688;64,146]	-	-	0,0473
Kt/V	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	1,6 (0,3) 1,2-2,3 1,6 [1,5;1,7]	1,5 (0,7) 0,9-3,1 1,2 [1,0;2,0]	1,5 (0,3) 0,9-2,2 1,6 [1,4;1,6]	1,5 (0,4) 0,9-3,1 1,5 [1,5;1,6]	0.0867 ³
Kt/V	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	1,600 (0,303) 1,200-2,250 1,590 [1,458;1,742]	1,459 (0,657) 0,890-3,130 1,240 [0,954;1,964]	-	-	0,0477
Albumin g/l	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	39,5 (4,3) 29,0-46,0 40,0 [37,4;41,5]	38,2 (4,1) 31,0-44,0 38,5 [35,6;40,8]	40,7 (3,4) 33,0-46,0 41,0 [39,6;41,7]	39,9 (3,8) 29,0-46,0 40,0 [39,0;40,8]	0.1813 ²
PTH pg/ml	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	711,8 (609,3) 94,0-2517,0 546,0 [418,1;1005,5]	702,4 (569,8) 262,0-2104,0 438,0 [319,6;1085,2]	801,9 (710,8) 3,0-3000,0 529,0 [564,9;1038,9]	760,0(654,4) 3,0-3000,0 529,0 [600,4;919,6]	0.9875 ³

PSP	mean (SD) range median 95%CI	63,3 (17,5) 25,0-91,0 63,0 [54,9;71,8]	52,8 (21,3) 25,0-90,0 45,0 [39,2;66,3]	66,1 (21,5) 30,0-100,0 60,5 [59,2;73,0]	63,1 (20,8) 25,0-100,0 60,0 [58,2;68,0]	0.1436 ³
Antidepressant treatment	yes no indications refusal during treatment	1 (5,3%) 10 (52,6%) 7 (36,8%) 1 (5,3%)	4 (33,3%) 5 (41,7%) 3 (25,0%) 0 (0,0%)	3 (7,5%) 29 (72,5%) 7 (17,5%) 1 (2,5%)	8 (11,3%) 44 (62,0%) 17 (23,9%) 2 (2,8%)	0.8926 ¹
Antipsychotic treatment before the study		1 (4,8%)	2 (16,7%)	0 (0,0%)	3 (4,1%)	0.0380 ¹

225 ¹Chi-square²ANOVA,³Kruskal-Wallis;⁴post-hoc, SD- standard deviation, CI- confidence interval

226 BMI- body mass index, Hb- hemoglobin, K- potassium, Ca x Pi- calcium phosphate index, Kt/V-
227 parameter used to quantify hemodialysis treatment adequacy (K-dialyzer clearance of urea, t- dialysis
228 time, V-volume of distribution of urea), PTH- parathyroid hormone, PSP- personal and social
229 performance scale

230 In the MDD group the number of females and patients with diabetes mellitus was statistically
231 higher. There were also statistically significant differences found between the groups according to
232 calcium phosphate index (Ca x Pi) and Kt/V (K – dialyzer clearance of urea t– dialysis time V– volume
233 of distribution of urea). In the MDD group Ca x Pi score was higher and Kt/V was statistically lower
234 compared with the non-MDD groups. We found no statistically significant differences in albumin level,
235 body mass index (BMI) and dry weight.

236

237

238 Discussion

239 In the study group the mean age of the participants was over 65 years with the high prevalence of
240 comorbidities. The prevalence of female, patients with diabetes and severe comorbidity was higher in
241 the depressive group. The number of patients diagnosed with depressive symptoms using BDI-II was
242 nearly three times higher compared with the gold standard psychiatrist examination. The optimal cut-
243 off point for BDI-II in diagnosing major depressive disorder was higher than the one for the general
244 population. The percentage of patients that met the criteria of mild cognitive impairment and
245 dementia was significant.

246 The aging of HD population and the increase in number of chronic diseases is observed in recent
247 years [7, 42]. Women predominated among patients with depression, which is consistent with the

248 trend observed in general population. The mortality of the studied population is noteworthy. The
249 mortality rate among hemodialysis population is high and its risk may be increased in the elderly
250 population, especially in the first months after initiating dialysis [43]. Diabetes mellitus and high
251 comorbidity are suggested among risk factors for the development of depression in HD population
252 [44].

253 Dementia can distort diagnosis of depression and influence the results of its treatment. However
254 the suggestion of cognitive impairment in MMSE doesn't exclude the depressive pseudo-dementia and
255 doesn't take into consideration conditions of examination. Dialysis patients with greater burden of
256 depressive symptoms may perform worse in tests of cognition related to processing speed and
257 executive function [45]. Therefore patients which met the criteria of mild cognitive impairment and
258 mild dementia in MMSE were not excluded and followed to depression screening, the number of those
259 later diagnosed with MDD by the psychiatrist was significant.

260 The high prevalence of patients reporting depressive symptoms in BDI-II may suggest the
261 limitations of self-administered questionnaires in this population due to numerous comorbidities and
262 the dialysis procedure itself. On the other hand patients may report symptoms more sincerely in self-
263 questionnaire than during the psychiatrist's examination. Even though BDI-II may over diagnose
264 depression, the regular screening using self-administered questionnaires is advisable and easy to
265 perform. Especially patients reporting moderate and severe depressive symptoms should follow to
266 further evaluation. The percentage of patients that met the criteria of depressive symptoms according
267 to MADRS alone was much higher than the one narrowed to moderate or severe depression or the
268 one taking into account CGI, MMSE and clinical diagnosis. It can suggest that the majority of
269 hemodialysis patients presenting the depressive symptoms in the clinical scales do not have MDD.
270 From this point of view starting the depression treatment can be ineffective or even harmful. It may
271 also suggest that they have mild symptoms and require psychotherapy, they can be suffering from
272 dementia and require different approach or they have other mental disorders. The lack of precise
273 diagnostics in the studies on the efficacy of antidepressant treatment in this group of patients may be
274 the reason for the ineffectiveness of therapy giving the false negative results. Therefore psychiatrists
275 examination remains the gold standard in diagnosing depression in HD population. In our study the
276 optimal cut-off point for BDI-II in diagnosing major depressive disorder was higher than the one stated
277 for the general population and higher than the scores suggested in previous studies [23, 25]. As
278 mentioned before, HD patients suffer from numerous comorbidities causing somatic symptoms which
279 may be reported in the BDI-II.

280 We found statistically significant differences between the three groups according the CaxPi. In

281 the real depression group the index score was highest which can indicate worse adherence to the
282 dietary recommendations. Phosphate retention is a potentially modifiable risk factor for
283 cardiovascular mortality in patients with CKD [46,47]. There were no significant differences in albumin
284 and hemoglobin levels; other parameters suggested to be associated with future cardiovascular events
285 [47]. In the depression group Kt/V was statistically lower which may suggest worse compliance and
286 affect the adequacy of dialysis treatment. Therefore the proper diagnosis and treatment of depression
287 might have a positive impact on compliance and improve the dialysis parameters.

288 The were no statistically significant differences in body mass index (BMI) and dry weight between
289 the groups. Nevertheless those parameters were higher in the non-MDD group which might suggest
290 the loss of appetite in the depressive group. The higher body mass index has been associated with the
291 better survival in some studies [48], however its limitations as a single parameter should be
292 considered.

293

294 **Limitations and strengths**

295 The limitations of our research is small number of patients, cross-sectional design of the study and
296 Covid-19 pandemic conditions. The strengths are the restrictive criteria of the study and the
297 assessment using different scales and the gold standard clinical interview in accordance with the DSM-
298 V criteria. The study examination schedule was mimicking the real life conditions of screening for
299 depression in Dialysis Centre.

300

301 **Future Outlook**

302 The possible directions of future research may involve correlation between depression and
303 cognitive impairment in hemodialysis patients. The proper screening algorithm might improve the
304 treatment of depression and have an impact on patient QoL and compliance.

305

306 **Conclusions**

307 Taking into consideration the high prevalence of depressive disorder and dementia there is a need
308 of regular screening in HD patients. The prevalence of depressive symptoms was higher while using
309 self-questionnaires compared with clinical interview. None of the patients with MDD was receiving
310 antidepressant treatment before the study. In the depression group we found predominance of
311 female, patients with diabetes and severe comorbidity. BDI-II may be the useful screening tool for the
312 dialysis team however the psychiatrist examination remains the gold standard in diagnosing

313 depression. In the hemodialysis population the BDI-II cut off point for diagnosing depressive symptoms
314 may be higher compared with the general population. The regular psychiatrist examination as a routine
315 approach in Dialysis Centre might improve patients quality of life and compliance.