16. Al-Wakeel J, Malik GH, Al-Mohaya S et al. Liver disease in dialysis patients with antibodies to hepatitis C virus. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 1996;11:2265–8.
17. Pawa S, Ehrinpreis M, Mutchnick M, Janisse J, Dhar R, Siddiqui FA. Percutaneous liver biopsy is safe in chronic hepatitis C patients with end-stage renal disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2007;5:1316–20.
18. Simon N, Couroucé AM, Lemarrec N, Trépo C, Ducamp S. A twelve year natural history of hepatitis C virus infection in hemodialyzed patients. *Kidney Int* 1994;46:504–11.
19. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Kilpatrick RD, McAllister CJ et al. Hepatitis C virus and death risk in hemodialysis patients. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2007;18:1584–93.
20. Nakayama E, Akiba T, Marumo F, Sato C. Prognosis of anti-hepatitis C virus antibody-positive patients on regular hemodialysis therapy. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2000;11:1896–902.
21. Stehman-Breen CO, Emerson S, Gretch D, Johnson RJ. Risk of death among chronic dialysis patients infected with hepatitis C virus. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1998;32:629–34.
22. Pereira BJ, Natov SN, Bouthot BA et al. Effects of hepatitis C infection and renal transplantation on survival in end-stage renal disease. The New England Organ Bank Hepatitis C Study Group. *Kidney Int* 1998;53:1374–81.
23. Goodkin DA, Bragg-Gresham JL, Koenig KG et al. Association of comorbid conditions and mortality in hemodialysis patients in Europe, Japan, and the United States: the Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study (DOPPS). *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2003;14:3270–7.
24. Di Napoli A, Pezzotti P, Di Lallo D, Petrosillo N, Trivelloni C, Di Giulio S, Lazio Dialysis Registry. Epidemiology of hepatitis C virus among long-term dialysis patients: a 9-year study in an Italian region. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2006;48:629–37.
25. Nakai S, Shinzato T, Sanaka T et al. The Current State of Chronic Dialysis Treatment in Japan (as of December 31, 2000). *Ther Apher Dial* 2002;7:3–35.
26. Fabrizi F, Takkouche B, Lunghi G, Dixit V, Messa P, Martin P. The impact of hepatitis C virus infection on survival in dialysis patients: meta-analysis of observational studies. *J Viral Hepat* 2007;14:697–703.
27. Al Meshari K, al Ahdal M, Alfurayh O, Ali A, De Vol E, Kessie G. New insights into hepatitis C virus infection of hemodialysis patients: the implications. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1995;25:572–8.
28. Akiba T, Kawaguchi Y, Kuroda M et al. Investigation of the real state of HCV infection at Japanese dialysis facilities. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 1994;27:2777–82.
29. Okuda K, Yokosuka O. Natural history of chronic hepatitis C in patients on hemodialysis: case control study with 4–23 years of follow-up. *World J Gastroenterol* 2004;10:2209–12.
30. Ishida H, Agishi T, Koyama I et al. Hemodialysis paradox: survey on the incidence rate of hepatocellular carcinoma in antihepatitis virus C-antibody-positive chronic hemodialysis patients. *Artif Organs* 2001;25:58–60.
31. Espinosa M, Martin-Malo A, Alvarez de Lara MA, Aljama P. Risk of death and liver cirrhosis in anti-HCV-positive long-term haemodialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2001;16:1669–74.
32. Yoshida H, Shiratori Y, Moriyama M et al. Interferon therapy reduces the risk for hepatocellular carcinoma: national surveillance program of cirrhotic and noncirrhotic patients with chronic hepatitis C in Japan. IHIT Study Group. Inhibition of Hepatocarcinogenesis by Interferon Therapy. *Ann Intern Med* 1999;131:174–81.
33. Buccianti G, Maisonneuve P, Ravasi B, Cresseri D, Locatelli F, Boyle P. Cancer among patients on renal replacement therapy: a population-based survey in Lombardy, Italy. *Int J Cancer* 1996;66:591–3.
34. Iseki K, Osawa A, Fukiyama K. Evidence for increased cancer deaths in chronic dialysis patients. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1993;22:308–13.
35. Furusyo N, Hayashi J, Kanamoto-Tanaka Y et al. Liver damage in hemodialysis patients with hepatitis C virus viremia: a prospective 10-year study. *Dig Dis Sci* 2000;45:2221–8.
36. Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. Present state of chronic dialysis therapy in Japan (as of December 31, 1999). 2001;34:1–31.
37. Rampino T, Arbustini E, Gregorini M et al. Hemodialysis prevents liver disease caused by hepatitis C virus: role of hepatocyte growth factor. *Kidney Int* 1999;56:2286–91.
38. Furusyo N, Hayashi J, Ariyama I et al. Maintenance hemodialysis decreases serum hepatitis C virus (HCV) RNA levels in hemodialysis patients with chronic HCV infection. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2000;95:490–6.
39. Azevedo HA, Villela-Nogueira CA, Perez RM et al. Similar HCV viral load levels and genotype distribution among end-stage renal disease patients on hemodialysis and HCV-infected patients with normal renal function. *J Nephrol* 2007;20:609–16.
40. Butt AA, Evans R, Skanderson M, Shakil AO. Comorbid medical and psychiatric conditions and substance abuse in HCV infected persons on dialysis. *J Hepatol* 2006;44:864–8.
41. Matsumura H, Moriyama M, Goto I, Tanaka N, Okubo H, Arakawa Y. Natural course of progression of liver fibrosis in Japanese patients with chronic liver disease type C—a study of 527 patients at one establishment. *J Viral Hepat* 2000;7:268–75.
42. Nishida C, Uto H, Oketani M et al. Clinical significance of alanine aminotransferase levels and the effect of ursodeoxycholic acid in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *J Gastroenterol* 2010;45:326–34.
43. Odagiri E, Jibiki K, Takeda M et al. Effect of hemodialysis on the concentration of the seven tumor markers carcinoembryonic antigen, alpha-fetoprotein, squamous cell carcinoma-related antigen, neuron-specific enolase, CA125, CA19-9 and CA15-3 in uremic patients. *Am J Nephrol* 1991;11:363–8.
44. Kato A, Yasuda H, Togawa A et al. Measurement of des-gamma-carboxy prothrombin levels in hemodialysis patients positive for anti-hepatitis virus C antibody. *Clin Nephrol* 2002;58:296–300.
45. Ando R, Akiba T. Present state of preventive measures against nosocomial hepatitis virus infections at hemodialysis facilities. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2009;42:423–33.
46. Gordon CE, Balk EM, Becker BN et al. KDOQI US commentary on the KDIGO clinical practice guideline for the prevention, diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment of hepatitis C in CKD. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2008;52:811–25.
47. Japan Society of Hepatology, ed. *Guidelines for the Treatment of Chronic Hepatitis 2008*. Tokyo: Bunkodo, 2008.
48. Clemente MG, Congia M, Lai ME et al. Effect of iron overload on the response to recombinant interferon-alfa treatment in transfusion-dependent patients with thalassemia major and chronic hepatitis C. *J Pediatr* 1994;125:123–8.
49. Kato J, Miyanishi K, Kobune M et al. Long-term phlebotomy with low-iron diet therapy lowers risk of development of hepatocellular carcinoma from chronic hepatitis C. *J Gastroenterol* 2007;42:830–6.
50. Caramelo C, Albalate M, Bermejillo T et al. Relationships between plasma ferritin and aminotransferase profile in haemodialysis patients with hepatitis C virus. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 1996;11:1792–6.
51. Kurihara I, Saito T. Significance of intravenous iron injection therapy in HCV-antibody-positive dialysis patients. *J Jpn Soc Nephrol* 2002;44:389–95.
52. Kato A, Odamaki M, Nakamura H, Yodoi J, Hishida A. Elevation of blood thioredoxin in hemodialysis patients with hepatitis C virus infection. *Kidney Int* 2003;63:2262–8.
53. Altintepe L, Kurtoglu E, Tonbul Z, Yeksan M, Yildiz A, Türk S. Lower erythropoietin and iron supplementation are required in hemodialysis patients with hepatitis C virus infection. *Clin Nephrol* 2004;61:347–51.

54. Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. 2008 edition of the Guidelines for the Treatment of Renal Anemia in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease, Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2008;41:661–716.

INDICATIONS OF ANTIVIRAL THERAPIES IN DIALYSIS PATIENTS

[Statements]

1. Performance of antiviral therapy in HCV-infected dialysis patients is recommended if the prognosis is expected to be improved. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)
2. Performance of antiviral therapy in HCV-infected dialysis patients is recommended in case of expecting kidney transplantation. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)
3. If a dialysis patient has contracted acute HCV infection and the virus cannot be eliminated within 12 weeks spontaneously, performance of antiviral therapy is desirable. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: None)

[Comments]

1. Performance of antiviral therapy in HCV-infected dialysis patients is recommended if the prognosis is expected to be improved. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

Dialysis patients are at high-risk of HCV infection, and many patients are suffering from chronic hepatitis C. Patients with chronic hepatitis C tend to develop liver cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma during its long-term course (1,2). While HCV infection has been reported to increase the mortality due to liver cirrhosis and/or hepatocellular carcinoma in dialysis patients, prognosis of HCV-infected dialysis patients is known to be poor regardless of the presence or absence of liver disease (3–5). In Japan, patients who are undergoing dialysis for 20 years or longer are not rare (6), and thus the management of HCV infection, which affects the prognosis, is important.

HCV can be eliminated by antiviral therapy using interferon (IFN), and viral elimination contributes to the control of hepatitis and prevention of its progression to liver cirrhosis or hepatocellular carcinoma. In the past, introduction of antiviral therapy tended to be uncertain in dialysis patients with HCV infection, while recently, we came to consider that antiviral therapy should be performed aggressively in dialysis patients in whom long-time survival is expected. According to a survey by the Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy, 48% of the anti-HCV-positive dialysis patients are HCV RNA-positive (7), and many of these HCV RNA-positive patients are considered to have indications of antiviral therapy. Antiviral therapy not only improves the prognosis of the HCV-infected patients themselves but also reduces sources of infection to other patients. Presently, most new HCV infections in dialysis patients are considered to be nosocomial ones (8). Thus, antiviral therapy should further be considered in HCV-infected patients.

A basic consensus has been made concerning the indications of antiviral therapy for chronic hepatitis C in patients with normal renal function (9,10). Guidelines for antiviral therapy for chronic hepatitis C patients with reduced renal function, which must be evaluated individually, have not been issued for a long time. Recently, guidelines for the treatment of hepatitis C in patients with chronic kidney disease (11) have been proposed by KDIGO (Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes), and patients whose prognosis is expected to be improved are considered to have indications for aggressive antiviral therapy. The KDIGO Guideline defines patients whose prognosis is expected to be improved as young patients who have no severe cardiovascular complication and are expected to live for at least 5 years. The Japanese guideline is created along with this proposal.

In selecting patients with indications for antiviral therapy, the severity of liver disorder, age, comobidities, and tolerability to treatment are important factors, and candidates are selected in consideration of the therapeutic effect and the patient's condition (12,13). Particularly, patients in whom IFN is expected to be effective from the viewpoint of cost-effectiveness are optimal candidates for aggressive treatment. Among the predictive factors of the effectiveness of IFN accumulated in non-dialysis patients, those that predict marked response to IFN, i.e. SVR (sustained virological response) are: (i) As factors of HCV, (1) a low viral load and (2) HCV genotypes other than 1a and 1b; (ii) as host factors, (1) no advanced fibrosis (≤F3 according to the New Inuyama Classification), (2) age under 45 years, (3) a 5-year or shorter infection period, (4) no obesity, and (5) a low γGTP level (14,15). According to data in Japan, IFN therapy is expected to suppress hepatocarcinogenesis even if SVR cannot be achieved (15). Incidentally, liver biopsy is reliable for the evaluation of liver fibrosis, but liver fibrosis can also be estimated to an extent from the platelet count, liver fibrosis markers, AST/platelet count ratio, and findings on abdominal ultrasonography (16).

The present consensus is that there is no age restriction for administering antiviral therapy, but as

the response rate to IFN is low, and the frequency of the occurrence of adverse effects is high, in patients aged 65 years or older, whether they should be treated aggressively needs careful evaluation in considering their prognosis. Also, severe complications, e.g., psychiatric disorders such as depression, severe hypertension, heart failure, significant coronary artery disease, poorly controlled diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, untreated thyroid disease, uncompensated liver cirrhosis, and active or suspected malignancy, are contraindications for the treatment (12,13). Patients with poor compliance and children are also excluded. In antiviral therapy for patients with normal renal function, peginterferon (PEG-IFN) and ribavirin are usually used in combination. However, ribavirin is contraindicated, in principle, because it causes hemolytic anemia that can be particularly dangerous in dialysis patients and cannot be eliminated by dialysis, so the treatment using PEG-IFN alone is generally recommended. The SVR rate achieved by PEG-IFN in dialysis patients is similar to or better than that in non-dialysis patients, but the frequency of adverse effects and dropout rate of the therapy are slightly higher (17–19).

Recently, antiviral therapy has become recommended in HCV carriers with normal renal function showing persistently normal ALT (PNALT) (20), because it has been learned that the risk of progression of liver fibrosis (i.e. hepatocarcinogenesis) is high in many patients with a platelet count of 150 000/mm^3 or below regardless of the ALT level (21). In Japan, a treatment guideline setting an ALT of 30 IU/mL and a platelet count of 150 000/μL as cut-off values (22) for PNALT patients has already been prepared. The ALT level is significantly lower in dialysis patients than in patients with normal renal function, and patients with a low ALT level may have liver disorders. Therefore, antiviral therapy should be considered regardless of the ALT level.

2. Performance of antiviral therapy in HCV-infected dialysis patients is recommended in case of expecting kidney transplantation. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)

Many patients waiting for kidney transplantation are young, have few serious complications, and are expected to survive over a long period. Further, the prognosis is expected to be more favorable in patients after successful kidney transplantation than in dialysis patients. Therefore, antiviral therapy is positively recommended to patients waiting for kidney transplantation.

In HCV-antibody-positive recipients of kidney transplantation, both the survival rate and graft survival rate are reported to be lower than in HCV-antibody-negative recipients (23,24). In principle, antiviral therapy is not recommended after kidney transplantation, because it may induce rejection or exacerbate liver disorders. However, elimination of HCV by antiviral therapy from patients waiting for kidney transplantation is expected to not only prevent the exacerbation of hepatitis after transplantation, avoid graft loss by preventing hepatitis C-related nephropathy and acute rejection, and suppress the occurrence of new diabetes but also improve the prognosis (25,26).

3. If a dialysis patient has contracted acute HCV infection and the virus cannot be eliminated within 12 weeks spontaneously, performance of antiviral therapy is desirable. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: None)

The therapeutic effect of IFN in patients with acute hepatitis C is higher than in those with chronic hepatitis C. IFN therapy is particularly effective if conducted early after the onset of acute hepatitis, and as high as over 80% of SVR rate can be expected (27,28). However, acute hepatitis C cures spontaneously in some patients within 12 weeks after the onset (29), and the possibility of spontaneous HCV RNA clearance in the general population has been reported to be 30–50% (29,30). However, 12 or more weeks after the onset, the disease rarely cures spontaneously and often takes a chronic course. Therefore, IFN therapy is recommended to be initiated as early as possible in patients not showing seroclearance of HCV-RNA within 12 weeks after the onset. Early initiation of treatment is particularly necessary in genotype 1 (28). If the treatment is initiated after 20 weeks, the condition approaches chronic hepatitis, and the SVR rate declines (28). The SVR rate improves with the duration of IFN therapy, and the administration should be continued for 24 weeks in patients with genotype 1 and for 8–12 weeks in those with other genotypes (31). The incidence of acute hepatitis C is high in dialysis patients, and its spontaneous cure rate is 5–30% (1), which is lower than in the general population. Therefore, IFN therapy for acute hepatitis C should be conducted more actively in patients on dialysis than in those not on it. There have been some reports indicating that SVR rate tends to be lower in dialysis patients than in patients with normal renal function (32,33). However, it is generally considered that antiviral therapy such as IFN therapy is useful for the treatment of acute hepatitis C even in patients on hemodialysis.

REFERENCES

1. Seeff LB. Natural history of hepatitis C. *Hepatology* 2002;36: S35–S46.
2. Kiyosawa K, Sodeyama T, Tanaka E et al. Interrelationship of blood transfusion, non-A, non-B hepatitis and hepatocellular carcinoma: analysis by detection of antibody to hepatitis C virus. *Hepatology* 1990;12:671–5.
3. Nakayama E, Akiba T, Marumo F, Sato C. Pathogenesis of anti-hepatitis C virus antibody-positive patients on regular hemodialysis therapy. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2000;11:1896–902.
4. Espinosa M, Martin-Malo A, Alvarez de Lara MA, Aljama P. Risk of death and liver cirrhosis in anti-HCV-positive long-term haemodialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2001; 16:1669–74.
5. Fabrizi F, Takkouche B, Lunghi G, Dixit V, Messa P, Martin P. The impact of hepatitis C virus infection on survival in dialysis patients: meta-analysis of observational studies. *J Viral Hepat* 2007;14:697–703.
6. Statistical Investigation Committee, Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. State of chronic dialysis therapy in Japan, illustrated (as of December 31, 2008). 22, 2009.
7. Statistical Investigation Committee, Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy. State of chronic dialysis therapy in Japan, illustrated (as of December 31, 1999). 13, 2000. (In Japanese)
8. Kobayashi M, Tanaka E, Oguchi H, Hora K, Kiyosawa K. Prospective follow-up study of hepatitis C virus infection in patients undergoing maintenance hemodialysis: comparison among hemodialysis units. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1998;13: 604–9.
9. Patel KP, Muir AJ, McHutchinson JG. Diagnosis and treatment of chronic hepatitis C infection. *BMJ* 2006;332:1013–7.
10. Shamoun DK, Anania FA. Which patients with hepatitis C virus should be treated? *Semin Gastrointest Dis* 2000;11:84–95.
11. KDIGO Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention, diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment of hepatitis C in chronic kidney disease. *Kidney Int* 2008;73(Suppl 109):S20–5.
12. Girndt M. Viral hepatitis in elderly haemodialysis patients: current prevention and management strategies. *Drugs Aging* 2008;25:823–40.
13. Pol S, Vallet-Pichard A, Fontane H, Lebray P. HCV infection and hemodialysis. *Semin Nephrol* 2002;22:331–9.
14. Matsumoto A, Tanaka E, Suzuki T, Ogata H, Kiyosawa K. Viral and host factors that contribute to efficacy of interferon-alpha 2a therapy in patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Dig Dis Sci* 1994;39:1273–80.
15. Yoshida H, Shirotori Y, Moriyama M et al. Interferon therapy reduces the risk for hepatocellular carcinoma: National surveillance program of cirrhotic and noncirrhotic patients with chronic hepatitis C in Japan. *Ann Intern Med* 1999;131:174–81.
16. Strader DB, Wright T, Thomas DL, Seeff LB American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Diagnosis, management, and treatment of hepatitis C. *Hepatology* 2004;39:1147–71.
17. Russo MW, Goldsweig CD, Jacobson IM, Brown RS Jr. Interferon monotherapy for dialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C: an analysis of the literature on efficacy and safety. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003;98:1610–5.
18. Fabrizi F, Dixit V, Messa P, Martin P. Interferon monotherapy of chronic hepatitis C in dialysis patients: meta-analysis of clinical trials. *J Viral Hepatol* 2008;15:79–88.
19. Gordon CE, Uhlig K, Lau J, Schmid CH, Levey AS, Wong JB. Interferon treatment in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection: a systemic review of the literature and meta-analysis of treatment efficacy and harms. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2008;51:263–7.
20. Okanoue T, Makiyama A, Nakayama M et al. A follow-up study to determine the value of liver biopsy and need for antiviral therapy for hepatitis C virus carries with persistently normal serum aminotransferase. *J Hepatol* 2005;43:599–605.
21. Okanoue T, Itoh Y, Minami M et al. Guidelines for the antiviral therapy of hepatitis C virus carriers with normal serum aminotransferase based on platelet counts. *Hepatol Res* 2008; 38:27–36.
22. Treatment Standardization Committee. Guidelines for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Tokyo, 2008.
23. Mathurin P, Mouquet C, Poynard T. Impact of hepatitis B and C virus on kidney transplant outcome. *Hepatology* 1999;29: 257–63.
24. Fabrizi F, Martin P, Dixit V, Bunnapsdist S, Dulai G. Hepatitis C virus antibody status and survival after renal transplantation: meta-analysis of observational studies. *Am J Transplant* 2005;5:1452–61.
25. Cruzado JM, Casanovas-Taitavull T, Torras J. Pretransplant interferon prevents hepatitis C virus-associated glomerulonephritis in renal allografts by HCV-RNA clearance. *Am J Transplant* 2003;3:357–60.
26. Gursoy M, Guvener N, Koksal R. Impact of HCV infection in development of posttransplantation diabetes mellitus in renal allograft recipients. *Transplant Proc* 2000;32:561–2.
27. Nomura H, Sou S, Tanimoto H et al. Short-term interferon-alpha therapy for acute hepatitis C: a randomized controlled trial. *Hepatology* 2004;39:1213–9.
28. Kamal SM, Fouly AE, Kamel RR et al. Peginterferon alfa-2b therapy in acute hepatitis C: impact of onset of therapy on sustained virologic response. *Gastroenterology* 2006;130: 632–8.
29. Gerlach JT, Diepolder HM, Zachoval R et al. Acute hepatitis C: high rate of both spontaneous and treatment-induced viral clearance. *Gastroenterology* 2003;125:80–8.
30. Tanaka E, Kiyosawa K. Natural history of acute hepatitis C. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2000;15:E97–104.
31. Kamal SM, Moustafa KN, Chen J et al. Duration of peginterferon therapy in acute hepatitis C: a randomized trial. *Hepatology* 2006;43:923–31.
32. Urbanek P, Tesar V, Prochazkova-Francisi E, Lachmanova J, Marecek Z, Svobodnik A. Treatment of early diagnosed HCV infection in hemodialyzed patients with interferon-alpha. Treatment of hepatitis C. *Blood Purif* 2004;22:344–50.
33. Rocha CM, Perez RM, Narciso JL et al. Interferon-alpha therapy within the first year after acute hepatitis C infection in hemodialysis patients: efficacy and tolerance. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2007;19:119–23.

TREATMENT OF DIALYSIS PATIENTS BY ANTIVIRAL THERAPIES

[Statements]

1 It is recommended that for dialysis patients with HCV infection, interferon of antiviral therapy is the first choice.

2 In dialysis patients, the response rate of interferon therapy is comparable or superior to that in patients with normal renal function, but as the frequency of adverse effects is also high, sufficient observation is recommended. (Evidence level: Low, Recommendation level: Strong)

3 Since the blood levels of both standard interferon α and pegylated interferon α increase excessively in dialysis patients if they are administered at standard dose, an adjusted dose reduction to the level of renal function is recommended. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)

4 It is recommended not to use ribavirin contraindicated in dialysis patients. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)
5 The therapeutic guidelines for patients with normal renal function mention the selection of drugs depending on the viral level and viral type and whether ribavirin should be used concomitantly. However, there is no recommendation for the selection of drugs according to the viral level or viral type for dialysis patients, in whom ribavirin administration is a contraindication.
6 In dialysis patients, treatment with pegylated interferon α monotherapy is more effective and less frequently causes adverse effects than treatment with standard interferon α monotherapy. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)
7 Interferon β can be used in dialysis patients at the standard dose
   • However, as its intravenous injection over a short period may cause adverse effects due to a rapid increase in its plasma concentration, it is recommended to administer it by intravenous drip infusion over 30–60 min for dialysis patients. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)
8 It is recommended that HCV-infected dialysis patients accepted for kidney transplantation be treated before transplantation. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)
9 It is recommended that treatment of HCV-infected kidney transplant recipients be considered only when the benefits of treatment clearly outweigh the risk of allograft rejection due to interferon therapy. (Evidence level: High, Recommendation level: Strong)

[Comments on treatments for HCV-infected dialysis patients]

1. Treatment with interferon (IFN) monotherapy

Monotherapy with standard interferon. Many of the studies of IFN therapy for dialysis patients have been case reports of a small number of patients, making its evaluation difficult. According to the reports of a relatively large number of patients published since 2000, the sustained virological response (SVR) rate varies widely from 19% to 62% (1–5).

The results of meta-analyses of treatments using IFNα monotherapy including these reports are reviewed. In the reports by Fabrizi et al., which covered 28 studies and 645 dialysis patients, the SVR rate by treatment using IFNα monotherapy was 39%, and the dropout rate from the treatment was 19% (6). According to the report by Gordon et al., which reviewed 20 studies and 459 dialysis patients, the SVR rate by IFNα monotherapy was 41%, and the dropout rate was 26% (7). Important factors that contributed to SVR were the administration of IFNα at 3 MU or above 3 or more times/week, a low HCV-RNA level, mild liver fibrosis, and a genotype other than genotype 1. In all meta-analyses, the effectiveness of IFN was similar or superior, but the dropout rate due to adverse effects was higher, in dialysis patients compared with patients with normal renal function. Since the treatment is discontinued more frequently due to cytopenia and psychiatric symptoms in dialysis patients than in patients with normal renal function, sufficient observation and management are needed.

Also, concerning the pharmacokinetics of IFNα2b, the AUC and Cmax are about two times higher, and the half-life is also prolonged in dialysis patients compared with patients with normal renal function. In dialysis patients, the dose must be reduced to a half of the usual dose for patients with normal renal function or below (8).

Monotherapy with IFNβ. As for studies on treatments using IFNβ monotherapy, there are data of 20 patients reported by Zeniya et al. in Japan. These patients, consisting of 60% genotype 1 (12/20) and 40% genotype 2 (8/20), in whom the HCV-RNA level was 15–150 KIU/mL, showed a high SVR rate of 90% (18/20) with no serious adverse effect such as depression during administration (9). There has been no other report of a large number of dialysis patients who underwent IFNβ therapy, and the SVR rate in dialysis patients is unclear. In Japan, however, IFNβ has been used widely in patients with normal renal function, and both its efficacy and safety are established.

Concerning the pharmacokinetics of IFNβ, the peak plasma concentration is higher in dialysis patients than in patients with normal renal function, but its half-life in dialysis patients does not differ markedly compared with that in patients with normal renal function, and there is no tendency for accumulation. Therefore, it is considered possible to administer IFNβ to dialysis patients at the same dose as in patients with normal renal function. Except, in dialysis patients, its intravenous injection over a short period has been reported to induce adverse effects such as headache, nausea, and a decrease in the blood pressure due to a rapid increase in its plasma concentration. Therefore, in dialysis patients, it is recommended to conduct IFNβ therapy by intravenous drip infusion over about 30–60 min (10–14).

2. Treatment with pegylated interferon (pegIFN) monotherapy

Effects of treatment with pegIFN monotherapy. There are 11 reports on treatment of dialysis patients using pegIFN monotherapy published by 2009, consisting of nine on pegIFN α-2a and 2 on pegIFN α-2b. The initial administration of pegIFN α-2a was made subcutaneously at 135–180 μg once a week, the SVR rate was 14–75%, and the dropout rate was 0–73% (15–25). Major adverse effects were fever, reduced appetite, malaise, cytopenia, and depression. The dropout rate was low in reports with a high SVR rate but high in those with a low SVR rate.

Comparison of effectiveness between standard IFNα monotherapy and pegIFNα monotherapy. A randomized controlled trial comparing standard IFNα monotherapy and pegIFNα monotherapy has been reported (25). Fifty hemodialysis patients were randomized to pegIFNα-2a and IFNα-2a therapies, the administration of pegIFNα-2a at 135 μg/week and IFNα-2a at 3 MU×3/week was continued for 24 weeks, and the results were evaluated by an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis. In the pegIFNα-2a and IFNα-2a groups, the SVR rate was 48% and 20% ($P = 0.07$), fever was observed in 12% and 44% ($P = 0.03$), and dropout rate was 0% and 20% ($P = 0.04$), respectively, showing that pegIFN α-2a was more effective and less frequently caused adverse effects than the conventional preparation. Multivariate analysis indicated the use of a pegIFN α-2a preparation ($P = 0.02$) and an HCV-RNA level of less than 800 KIU/mL as factors contributing to SVR. Also, the SVR rate was 65% in the group that showed a rapid virological response (RVR) and 0% in the non-RVR group ($P < 0.001$). It was shown that SVR cannot be attained in patients in whom early negative conversion of HCV-RNA cannot be achieved either by pegIFN α-2a or IFN α-2a.

Pharmacokinetics. The pharmacokinetics after a single subcutaneous administration of pegIFN α-2a at 90 μg in patients with a creatinine clearance of 20 mL/min or above was the same as in healthy adults. However, when pegIFN α-2a was administered once subcutaneously at 45, 90, 135, and 180 μg, its plasma concentration increased in a dose-related manner, and the pharmacokinetics in dialysis patients after the administration at 135 μg was similar to that in healthy adults after the administration at 180 μg (26).

In a report about patients in Japan, Cmax and Tmax after a single administration of pegIFN α-2a at 90 μg were similar to those in healthy adults after the administration at 180 μg, but the disappearance of the drug from blood was delayed. The increase in the plasma concentration was insufficient by a single administration of pegIFN α-2a at 45 μg. Also, the pharmacokinetics on repeated administrations of pegIFN α-2a at 90 μg were similar to those in healthy adults at 180 μg (27). Therefore, the dose of pegIFN α-2a in dialysis patients must be reduced to 90–135 μg.

3. Treatment with combination of pegIFN and ribavirin

There were four reports on treatment of dialysis patients with a combination of pegIFN and ribavirin by 2009 (28–31). pegIFN α-2a was administered initially at 135 μg once a week, and pegIFN α-2b was administered at 50 μg once a week, by subcutaneous injection. The SVR rate was 29–97%, the dropout rate was 0–71%, and the treatment was often discontinued due to severe anemia requiring transfusion. However, in reports with a high SVR rate, the dropout rate was low, and modifications such as an increase in the dose of an erythropoiesis stimulating agent (ESA) and the administration of ribavirin every other day were made.

Also, there is a report that ribavirin is excreted through the kidneys, that its AUC increases three times or more in patients with a creatinine clearance of less than 30 mL/min compared with patients with normal renal function, and that it cannot be eliminated efficiently by hemodialysis (32), so its administration to dialysis patients is a contraindication.

4. Guidelines for IFN therapy in dialysis patients

(1) Drugs and administration methods
- Subcutaneous injection of pegIFN α-2a at 90–135 μg once a week over 24–48 weeks
- Subcutaneous or intramuscular injection of natural IFN α or recombinant IFN α-2b at 3–6 million units once a day, 3 times a week, over 24–48 weeks
- Intravenous drip infusion (30–60 min) of natural IFN β at 3–6 million unites once a day, 3 times a week, over 24–48 weeks

(2) Comments about the guidelines

In dialysis patients undergoing IFN therapy, the SVR rate is similar to, or higher than, in patients with normal renal function, but the dropout rate from the treatment is also high. Factors important for achieving SVR are a low viral level, a genotype other than genotype 1, use of pegIFN, rapid virological response, and no marked liver fibrosis.

While the SVR rate is high in patients in whom the treatment could be continued, the dropout rate is higher in dialysis patients than in patients with normal renal function because of cytopenia and psychiatric symptoms. For achieving SVR, it is important to complete the treatment by promptly using an ESA preparation at a high dose in patients showing anemia and by concomitantly using granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) and reducing the dose of IFN in patients showing neutropenia.

There has also been a report that a low dropout rate and a high SVR rate were obtained in dialysis patients by ribavirin combination therapy with reduced dose and number of administrations. This approach is likely to be effective in patients treated again after no response to IFN monotherapy and genotype 1 patients showing a high viral level. However, as ribavirin accumulates and cannot be eliminated by hemodialysis, the drug is contraindicated for dialysis patients by its package insert, and we recommend not administering it to dialysis patients.

Therefore, we recommend IFNα or IFNβ monotherapy as an antiviral therapy for dialysis patients. Regarding the drug selection for antiviral therapy using IFNα alone, the results of an RCT that the SVR rate was high, that adverse effects were infrequent, and that dropout rate was low with a pegIFNα preparation have been reported. We recommend using pegIFNα for treating dialysis patients. Although there are pegIFNα-2a and pegIFNα-2b, treatment using pegIFNα-2a monotherapy is covered by medical insurance in Japan.

5. *Other treatments*

Drugs of suppressing inflammation in the liver. In patients with normal renal function, Stronger Neo-Minophagen C (SNMC) or ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA, Urso) are administered as drugs of suppressing inflammation to those with liver dysfunction in whom IFN therapy cannot be performed or has been ineffective. RCTs and prospective studies in patients with normal renal function have provided little evidence of suppression of death and liver cirrhosis or liver cancer (33,34), and there is no evidence in dialysis patients. In addition, as no antiviral effect is observed in drugs of suppressing inflammation, they are administered with the objective of reducing ALT in patients with liver dysfunction.

Administration methods

1 Stronger Neo-Minophagen injection, intravenous injection at 40–100 mL per injection, at each dialysis
2 Urso (100 mg), 6–9 tablets/day, daily oral administration t.i.d.

Virus removal and eradication by DFPP (VRAD). VRAD is covered by insurance in patients receiving re-treatment with IFN, those with genotype 1B, and those with an HCV-RNA level of 100 KIU/mL or higher up to five times (there is no evidence regarding the amount of treated plasma or duration, interval, or number of VRAD).

A multi-facility collaborative prospective study in non-dialysis patients is in progress, and SVR is compared between groups undergoing PEG-IFN plus ribavirin (30 patients) and PEG-IFN plus ribavirin plus DFPP (74 patients) (35). In the patients in whom SVR could be evaluated, SVR was observed in 50.0% (29/58) in the PEG-IFN plus ribavirin group and 70.8% (17/24) in the PEG-IFN plus ribavirin plus DFPP group. While the SVR rate was higher in the group treated by combinations including DFPP, the increase was not significant. There is no report comparing SVR between IFN therapy and a combination therapy including DFPP in dialysis patients, and there is no evidence. However, ribavirin administration to dialysis patients is a contraindication, and as VRAD is expected to be effective as a concomitant treatment in re-treatment using IFN, evaluation by accumulation of clinical research is necessary for the future.

[Comments concerning HCV-infected recipients of kidney transplantation]

1. *HCV infection and kidney transplantation*

Fabrizi et al. performed meta-analysis of 10 clinical studies and 2502 kidney transplantation patients and reported the incidences of diabetes after kidney transplantation in HCV-antibody-positive and -negative patients (36). The incidence of diabetes in HCV-antibody-positive patients varied from 7.9–50.0% among reports but was significantly higher than in negative patients with an odds ratio of 3.97 (95% confidence interval = 1.83–8.61, P-value = 0.047). The authors suggested the possibility that this is related to the kidney graft survival rate in HCV-antibody-positive patients.

Mathurin et al. reported the survival rate and graft survival rate 10 years after kidney transplantation in 834 patients (128 were HBs-antigen-positive, 216 were HCV-antibody-positive) (37). The survival rate 10 years after kidney transplantation was 65 ± 5% in HCV-antibody-positive patients and 80 ± 3% in HCV-antibody-negative patients ($P < 0.001$), and the graft survival rate was 49 ± 5% and 63 ± 3%

($P < 0.0001$), respectively, both being lower in the HCV-antibody-positive patients.

2. IFN therapy before transplantation

Kamar et al. performed standard IFN therapy in five HCV-antibody-positive and HCV-RNA-positive hemodialysis patients (38). SVR was observed in 21 (38%), and 16 (76%) of them underwent kidney transplantation. All patients continued to be HCV-RNA-negative throughout an observation period of 22.5 months (2–88 months), with none having developed post-transplantation diabetes.

Cruzado et al. evaluated the occurrence of post-transplantation nephritis in 78 HCV-antibody-positive dialysis patients after kidney transplantation (IFN therapy was performed before transplantation in 15 and not in 63) (39). In those who underwent IFN therapy, 10/15 (67%) showed SVR, and only one patient (6.7%), who could not attain SVR, developed post-transplantation nephritis. In those who did not undergo IFN therapy, 12/63 (19%) developed post-transplantation nephritis. The frequency of post-transplantation nephritis was reduced by IFN therapy before transplantation.

Mahmoud et al. reported the effects of IFN therapy before transplantation on rejection and renal function after transplantation in 50 HCV-RNA-positive kidney transplantation patients (40). The patients consisted of 18 who underwent IFN therapy and 32 who did not, and the percentage of those who showed chronic rejection was significantly higher, and the renal function 5 years after transplantation was significantly lower, in the non-IFN therapy group.

Interferon therapy before transplantation is important to improve the kidney graft survival rate.

3. IFN therapy after transplantation

Fabrizi et al. carried out a meta-analysis concerning 12 studies (102 patients) in which standard IFN therapy and standard IFN plus ribavirin therapy were performed after kidney transplantation (41). The SVR rate was 18.0% (95% CI: 7.0–29.0%), and the dropout rate was 35.0% (95% CI: 20–50%). The most frequent adverse effect was kidney graft dysfunction. IFN therapy after transplantation was unsatisfactory in both efficacy and safety.

4. Guidelines for IFN therapy in kidney transplanted patients

In HCV-infected recipients of kidney transplantation, the post-transplantation incidence of diabetes is high, and the graft survival rate and survival rate are low. IFN therapy before transplantation reduces the incidences of post-transplantation diabetes, post-transplantation nephritis, and chronic rejection. However, IFN therapy after kidney transplantation is associated with a low SVR rate and a high dropout rate, and induces rejection of the kidney graft.

Therefore, in HCV-infected dialysis patients expecting kidney transplantation, IFN therapy should be performed before transplantation. Also, in HCV-infected recipients of kidney transplantation, IFN therapy is likely to induce rejection and should be performed only when the necessity surpasses the risk (fibrosing cholestatic hepatitis [FCH] etc.).

REFERENCES

1. Casanovas-Taltavull T, Baliellas C, Benasco C et al. Efficacy of interferon for chronic hepatitis C virus-related hepatitis in kidney transplant candidates on hemodialysis: results after transplantation. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2001;96:1170–7.
2. Degos F, Pol S, Chaix ML et al. The tolerance and efficacy of interferon-alpha in hemodialysis patients with HCV infection: a multicentre, prospective study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2001;16:1017–23.
3. Rocha CM, Perez RM, Ferreira AP et al. Efficacy and tolerance of interferon-alpha in the treatment of chronic hepatitis C in end-stage renal disease patients on hemodialysis. *Liver Int* 2006;26:305–10.
4. Buargub M, El Huni S, Tagdi M. Tolerance and efficacy of interferon-alpha in hemodialysis patients in Tripoli. *Saudi J Kidney Transplant* 2006;17:338–43.
5. Yildirim B, Durak H, Ozaras R et al. Liver steatosis in hepatitis C positive hemodialysis patients and factors affecting IFN-2a treatment. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2006;41:1235–41.
6. Fabrizi F, Dixit V, Messa P, Martin P. Interferon monotherapy of chronic hepatitis C in dialysis patients: meta-analysis of clinical trials. *J Viral Hepat* 2008;15:79–88.
7. Gordon CE, Uhlig K, Lau J, Schmid CH, Levey AS, Wong JB. Interferon treatment in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection: a systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis of treatment efficacy and harms. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2008;51:263–77.
8. Uchihara M, Izumi N, Sakai Y et al. Interferon therapy for chronic hepatitis C in hemodialysis patients: increased serum levels of interferon. *Nephron* 1998;80:51–6.
9. Zeniya M, Yokoyama K, Imamura N et al. Significance of interferon-β for the treatment of hepatitis C virus infection in hemodialyzed patients. *Hepatol Res* 2010;40:862–9.
10. Nakayama H, Shiotani S, Akiyama S, Gotoh H, Tani M, Akine Y. Pharmacokinetic study of human natural beta-interferon in patients with end-stage renal failure. *Clin Nephrol* 2001;56:382–6.
11. Nakajima F, Fukii M, Kitamura T et al. A case report of interferon beta monotherapy for high hepatitis C viral load in dialysis patients. *Ther Apher Dial* 2007;11:306–8.
12. Umeda S, Minami H, Izumi N, Yamamoto M, Kanno T, Ozaki Y. Treatment of a hemodialysis patient with hepatitis C using interferon β. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 1994;27:63–8.
13. Tachibana N, Ako S, Deura T et al. A dialysis patient treated with interferon β for chronic hepatitis C: Pharmacokinetic evaluation of IFNβ. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2000;33:61–7.
14. Araoka T, Takeoka H, Nishioka K et al. Evaluation of safe and effective interferon β therapy for maintenance hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2009;42:393–402.

15. Teta D, Luscher BL, Gonvers JJ, Francioli P, Phan O, Burnier M. Pegylated interferon for the treatment of hepatitis C virus in haemodialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2005;20: 991–3.
16. Sporea I, Popescu A, Sirli R et al. Pegylated-interferon alpha 2a treatment for chronic hepatitis C in patients on chronic haemodialysis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2006;12: 4191–4.
17. Covic A, Maftei ID, Mardare NG et al. Analysis of safety and efficacy of pegylated-interferon alpha-2a in hepatitis C virus positive hemodialysis patients: results from a large, multicenter audit. *J Nephrol* 2006;19:794–801.
18. Kokoglu OF, Ucmak H, Hosoglu S et al. Efficacy and tolerability of pegylated-interferon alpha-2a in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2006;21:575–80.
19. Chan TM, Ho SK, Tang CS et al. Pilot study of pegylated interferon-alpha 2a in dialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection. *Nephrology (Carlton)* 2007;12:11–7.
20. Casanovas-Taltavull T, Baliellas C, Llobet M et al. Preliminary results of treatment with pegylated interferon alpha 2A for chronic hepatitis C virus in kidney transplant candidates on hemodialysis. *Transplant Proc* 2007;39:2125–7.
21. Ayaz C, Celen MK, Yuce UN, Geyik MF. Efficacy and safety of pegylated-interferon alpha-2a in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *World J Gastroenterol* 2008; 14:255–9.
22. Akhan SC, Kalender B, Ruzgar M. The response to pegylated interferon alpha 2a in haemodialysis patients with hepatitis C virus infection. *Infection* 2008;36:341–4.
23. Russo MW, Ghalib R, Sigal S, Joshi V. Randomized trial of pegylated interferon alpha-2b monotherapy in haemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2006;21:437–43.
24. Tan SS, Abu Hassan MR, Abdullah A et al. Treatment of hemodialysis (HD) patients with chronic hepatitis C (CHC) using an escalating dose regimen of pegylated interferon (PEG-IFN) alpha-2b. *Hepatology* 2007;46:363[a]–4[a].
25. Liu CH, Liang CC, Lin JW et al. Pegylated interferon alpha-2a versus standard interferon alpha-2a for treatment-naive dialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C: a randomized study. *Gut* 2007;57:525–30.
26. Chugai Pharmaceutical. Pegasys Drug Interview Form (10th revised edition). p23, 2008.
27. Akiba T, Kikuchi K. A study of the efficacy and administration method of peg-interferon-α-2a preparations in patients with chronic hepatitis C undergoing chronic hemodialysis. A Grant-in-Aid by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare for research regarding the epidemiology of hepatitis B and C and measures to control hepatitis including mass screening, a research project on emergency measures to conquer hepatitis and other diseases. 2005 Assigned Research Report; 5–11, 2006.
28. Bruchfeld A, Lindahl K, Reichard O, Carlsson T, Schvarcz R. Pegylated interferon and ribavirin treatment for hepatitis C in haemodialysis patients. *J Viral Hepat* 2006;13:316–21.
29. Rendina M, Schena A, Castellaneta NM et al. The treatment of chronic hepatitis C with peginterferon alfa-2a (40kDa) plus ribavirin in haemodialysed patients awaiting renal transplant. *J Hepatol* 2007;46:768–74.
30. van Leusen R, Adang RP, de Vries RA et al. Pegylated interferon alfa-2a (40kD) and ribavirin in haemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2008;23: 721–5.
31. Carriero D, Fabrizi F, Uriel AJ, Park J, Martin P, Dieterich DT. Treatment of dialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C using pegylated interferon and low-dose ribavirin. *Int J Artif Organs* 2008;31:295–302.
32. MSD. Rebetol Drug Interview Form (3rd revised edition). p2, 2005.
33. Kumada H. Long-term treatment of chronic hepatitis C with glycyrrhizin [stronger neo-minophagen C (SNMC)] for preventing liver cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Oncology* 2002;62:94–100.
34. Omata M, Yoshida H, Toyota J et al. Japanese C-Viral Hepatitis Network. A large-scale, multicentre, double-blind trial of ursodeoxycholic acid in patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Gut* 2007;56:1747–53.
35. Fujiwara K, Kaneko S, Kakumu S et al. The Virus Reduction Therapy Study Group. Double filtration plasmapheresis and interferon combination therapy for chronic hepatitis C patients with genotype 1 and high viral load. *Hepatol Res* 2007;37:701–10.
36. Mathurin P, Mouquet C, Poynard T. Impact of hepatitis B and C virus on kidney transplant outcome. *Hepatology* 1999;29: 257–63.
37. Fabrizi F, Martin P, Dixit V, Bunnapradist S, Kanwal F, Dulai G. Post-transplant diabetes mellitus and HCV seropositive status after renal transplantation: meta-analysis of clinical studies. *Am J Transplant* 2005;5:2433–40.
38. Kamar N, Toupance O, Buchler M et al. Evidence that clearance of hepatitis C virus RNA after alpha-interferon therapy in dialysis patients is sustained after renal transplantation. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2003;14:2092–8.
39. Cruzado JM, Casanovas-Taltavull T, Torras J. Pretransplant interferon prevents hepatitis C virus-associated glomerulonephritis in renal allografts by HCV-RNA clearance. *Am J Transplant* 2003;3:357–60.
40. Mahmoud IM, Sobh MA, El-Habashi AF et al. Interferon therapy in hemodialysis patients with chronic hepatitis C: study of tolerance, efficacy and post-transplantation course. *Nephron Clin Pract* 2005;100:133–9.
41. Fabrizi F, Lunghi G, Dixit V, Martin P. Meta-analysis: antiviral therapy of hepatitis C virus-related liver disease in renal transplant patients. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2006;24:1413–22.

PREVENTION OF HCV INFECTION AT HEMODIALYSIS FACILITIES

[Statements]

1 It is recommended to apply and implement a strict infection control procedure to prevent blood-borne infection of pathogens including HCV at hemodialysis facilities. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)
2 In addition to a strict infection control procedure, it is recommended to identify or isolate HCV-infected patients and to use special dialysis instruments (consoles) for them. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)
3 It is recommended that the infection control procedure includes hygienic cautions to effectively prevent direct transmission of pathogens between patients through blood or body fluid or via contaminated gloves, medical materials, or instruments. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)
4 In evaluating the results of HCV infection prevention measures at hemodialysis facilities, it is recommended to include observation of the state of

implementation of infection control measures, periodic surveillance of the state of infection, and review of infection control measures depending on the state of infection. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

[Comments]

1. It is recommended to apply and implement a strict infection control procedure to prevent blood-borne infection of pathogens including HCV at hemodialysis facilities. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

The occurrence of nosocomial infection of HCV in dialysis facilities has been documented by epidemiological and viral molecular biological researches (1,2). The most frequent patient-to-patient transmission of HCV is caused by contamination of the drugs administered and the surface of instruments and materials in the dialysis facility including gloves due to manipulations violating the infection control procedure (1,2). With the current equipment, transmission of infection in the dialysis instruments is unlikely (3). Other causes of nosocomial infection include direct contact between patients and medical actions outside the dialysis facility such as transfusion (4), but their frequency is considered to be low. Therefore, for the prevention of HCV infection, it is required to determine and observe effective infection control procedures and to periodically review them and make necessary modifications (5–8). In Japan, the Manual Regarding the Standard Dialysis Procedure and Prevention of Nosocomial Infections in Dialysis Medicine (7) prepared with a Grant-in-Aid for Health and Welfare Science by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare is used widely as a manual of infection control procedures at dialysis facilities.

2. In addition to a strict infection control procedure, it is recommended to identify or isolate HCV-infected patients and to use special dialysis instruments (consoles) for them. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

Since infection experiments cannot be performed due to ethical restrictions, we must depend primarily on the results of observational studies. In Japan, the prevalence of HCV infection is clearly higher than in Western countries (9). On the basis of the results of a multi-facility observational study (9) that the incidence of new HCV infection is high at facilities with a high prevalence of HCV infection and that it is lower at facilities with a larger number of stations for isolated dialysis and the results of an observational study (10) that infection is less frequent at facilities that isolate HCV-infected patients than at those that do not isolate them, we recommend isolation of HCV-infected patients or the use of dedicated HD machines. While this statement differs from the CDC guidelines of the United States (5), these are considered to be necessary infection control measures from the high prevalence of HCV infection in Japan, poorer prognosis of HCV-positive dialysis patients (11), and statement of the German clinical nephrology working group in 2006 (8).

3. It is recommended that the infection control procedure includes hygienic cautions to effectively prevent direct transmission of pathogens between patients through blood or body fluid or via contaminated gloves, medical materials, or instruments. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

According to the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, each hospital must have an "Infection Control Manual" independently prepared by the Infection Control Committee. However, it is difficult for a small facility to prepare a manual, survey the state of infection, and continue its modification. Therefore, the "Manual Regarding the Standard Dialysis Procedure and Prevention of Nosocomial Infections in Dialysis Medicine" (7) was prepared with a Grant-in-Aid for Health and Welfare Science by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare and with the cooperation of the Japanese Association of Dialysis Physicians, Japanese Society for Dialysis Therapy, Japan Association for Clinical Engineering Technologists, and Japan Academy of Nephrology Nursing as a manual of infection control procedure at dialysis facilities (8) and is used as a model of individual hospital manuals (12). In addition, there has been a report of the observation that the incidence of new HCV infection was reduced by its implementation (13).

There are reports that the risk of infection does not increase by the reuse of the dialyzer if it is handled by a professional agent or dedicated machines are operated by strict observance of reliable infection control procedures. In Japan, however, there is no professional agent or dedicated machine, and dialyzers, the cost of which is covered by insurance, are not permitted to be reused. Since infection is expected to increase unless dialyzers are reused with sufficient caution under these conditions (10), it is recommended not to reuse them.

4. In evaluating the results of HCV infection prevention measures at hemodialysis facilities, it is recommended to include observation of the state of implementation of infection control measures, periodic surveillance of the state of infection, and review of infection control measures depending on the state of infection. (Evidence level: Very low, Recommendation level: Strong)

According to the results of inspection of the dialysis operation at nine dialysis facilities in Spain in November 2003, the staff of the dialysis facilities wore gloves in 93% of the manipulations requiring gloves, but the hands were washed 36% of the times after, and only 14% of the times before, contact with patients (14). On direct observation of how infection control manipulations were implemented after an outbreak (15), problems including (i) poor compliance with hand-washing, (ii) poor compliance with glove changes particularly in emergency hemostasis of arteriovenous fistula, (iii) carrying a channel contaminated with blood in the dialysis room without containing it in a bag, (iv) neglect of periodic decontamination of blood-contaminated dialysis system, and (v) neglect of replacement of a contaminated pressure transducer protector were revealed, but these problems are hardly detected by interviews with the staff (16).

In evaluating the results of HCV infection prevention measures at hemodialysis facilities, it is recommended to observe the state of implementation of infection control measures, periodically survey the state of infection, and review infection control measures depending on the state of infection.

REFERENCES

1. Kokubo S, Horii T, Yonekawa O, Ozawa N, Mukaide M. A phylogenetic-tree analysis elucidating nosocomial transmission of hepatitis C virus in a haemodialysis unit. *J Viral Hepat* 2002;9:450–4.
2. Furusyo N, Kubo N, Nakashima H, Kashiwagi K, Etoh Y, Hayashi J. Confirmation of Nosocomial Hepatitis C Virus Infection in a hemodialysis unit. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2004;25:584–90.
3. Noiri E, Nakao A, Oya A, Fujita T, Kimura S. Hepatitis C virus in blood and dialysate in hemodialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2001;37:38–42.
4. Stramer SL, Glynn SA, Kleinman SH et al. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Nucleic Acid Test Study Group. Detection of HIV-1 and HCV infections among antibody-negative blood donors by nucleic acid-amplification testing. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:760–8.
5. Alter HJ, Aragon T, AuBuchon JP et al. Recommendations for prevention and control of hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection and HCV-related chronic disease. *MMWR* 1998; 47(RR19):1–39.
6. Bailey JL, Balter P, Berns J et al. Recommendations for preventing transmission of infection among chronic hemodialysis patients. *MMWR* 2004;50(RR05):1–43.
7. Manual Regarding the Standard Dialysis Procedure and Prevention of Nosocomial Infections in Dialysis Medicine (3rd revised edition). Research Project on Emergency Measures to Overcome Hepatitis and Other Diseases on a Grant-in-Aid for Health, Labour and Welfare Science 2007, Tokyo, 2007
8. Deutschen Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Klinische Nephrologie e.V. in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Verband Deutscher Nierenzentren der DD nÄ e.V. sowie der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Pädiatrische Nephrologie (APN). Dialysestandard 2006.
9. Fissell RB, Bragg-Gresham JL, Woods JD et al. Patterns of hepatitis C prevalence and seroconversion in hemodialysis units from three continents: the DOPPS. *Kidney Int* 2004;65: 2335–42.
10. dos Santos JP, Loureiro A, Cendoroglo Neto M, Pereira BJ. Impact of dialysis room and reuse strategy on the incidence of hepatitis C virus infection in haemodialysis units. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 1996;11:2017–22.
11. Nakayama E, Akiba T, Marumo F, Sato C. Prognosis of anti-hepatitis C virus antibody-positive patients on regular hemodialysis therapy. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2000;11:1896–902.
12. Ando R, Akiba T. Present state of preventive measures against nosocomial infection of viral hepatitis at hemodialysis facilities. *J Jpn Soc Dial Ther* 2009;42:423–33.
13. Tsuruta Y, Watanabe U, Yamazaki C, Maeda K. Present state of hepatitis B and C infection at dialysis facilities in Aichi Prefecture (Part 2). *J Jpn Assoc Dial Physicians* 2002;17: 422–9.
14. Arenas MD, Sanchez-Paya J, Barril G et al. A multicentric survey of the practice of hand hygine in haemodialysis units: factors affecting compliance. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2005; 20:1164–71.
15. Delarocque-Astagneau E, Baffoy N, Thiers V et al. Outbreak of hepatitis C virus infection in a hemodialysis unit: potential transmission by the hemodialysis machine? *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2002;23:328–34.
16. Izopet J, Pasquier C, Sandres K, Puel J, Rostaing L. Molecular evidence for nosocomial transmission of hepatitis C virus in a French hemodialysis unit. *J Med Virol* 1999;58:139–44.

Hepatology Research

Hepatology Research 2013; **43**: 35–43 doi: 10.1111/j.1872-034X.2012.01056.x

Special Report

A multicenter survey of re-treatment with pegylated interferon plus ribavirin combination therapy for patients with chronic hepatitis C in Japan

Tsugiko Oze,[1] Naoki Hiramatsu,[1] Eiji Mita,[3] Norio Akuta,[4] Naoya Sakamoto,[5] Hiroaki Nagano,[2] Yoshito Itoh,[7] Shuichi Kaneko,[8] Namiki Izumi,[6] Hideyuki Nomura,[9] Norio Hayashi[10] and Tetsuo Takehara[1]

Departments of [1]Gastroenterology and Hepatology and [2]Surgery, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine, [3]National Hospital Organization Osaka National Hospital, Osaka, [4]Toranomon Hospital, [5]Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, [6]Japanese Red Cross Musashino Hospital, Tokyo, [7]Molecular Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Kyoto Prefectural University of Medicine Graduate School of Medical Science, Kyoto, [8]Department of Gastroenterology, Kanazawa University, Kanazawa, [9]Shin Kokura Hospital, Kitakyushu, and [10]Kansai Rosai Hospital, Amagasaki, Japan

Aim: This study aimed to clarify the factors associated the efficacy of re-treatment with pegylated interferon (PEG IFN) plus ribavirin combination therapy for patients with chronic hepatitis C who had failed to respond to previous treatment.

Methods: One hundred and forty-three patients who had previously shown relapse ($n = 79$), non-response ($n = 34$) or intolerance ($n = 30$) to PEG IFN plus ribavirin were re-treated with PEG IFN plus ribavirin.

Results: Twenty-five patients with intolerance to previous treatment completed re-treatment and the sustained virological response (SVR) rates were 55% and 80% for hepatitis C virus (HCV) genotype 1 and 2, respectively. On re-treatment of the 113 patients who completed the previous treatment, the SVR rates were 48% and 63% for genotype 1 and 2, respectively. Relapse after previous treatment and a low baseline HCV RNA level on re-treatment were associated with SVR in genotype 1 ($P < 0.001$). Patients with the interleukin-28B major genotype responded significantly better and earlier to re-treatment, but the difference in the SVR rate did not reach a significant level between the major and minor genotypes ($P = 0.09$). Extended treatment of 72 weeks raised the SVR rate among the patients who attained complete early virological response but not rapid virological response with re-treatment (72 weeks, 73%, 16/22, vs 48 weeks, 38%, 5/13, $P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: Relapse after previous treatment and a low baseline HCV RNA level have predictive values for a favorable response of PEG IFN plus ribavirin re-treatment for HCV genotype 1 patients. Re-treatment for 72 weeks may lead to clinical improvement for genotype 1 patients with complete early virological response and without rapid virological response on re-treatment.

Key words: chronic hepatitis C, pegylated interferon and ribavirin combination therapy, re-treatment

INTRODUCTION

PEGYLATED INTERFERON (PEG IFN) plus ribavirin combination therapy can show antiviral efficacy for patients with chronic hepatitis C (CH-C). However, a sustained virological response (SVR), which is defined as undetectable serum hepatitis C virus (HCV) RNA at 24 weeks after the treatment, remains at 50% for patients with HCV genotype 1 and 80% for those with HCV genotype 2 treated with PEG IFN plus ribavirin.[1–6] The number of patients who fail to achieve a SVR increases over time, requiring urgent action to eradicate HCV in them.

Recently, addition of the first-wave protease inhibitor telaprevir to PEG IFN plus ribavirin combination therapy, which has been reported to improve antiviral efficacy, has become commercially available, but this

Correspondence: Dr Tetsuo Takehara, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine, 2-2, Yamadaoka, Suita City, Osaka 565-0871, Japan. Email: takehara@gh.med.osaka-u.ac.jp

Received 18 April 2012; revision 19 May 2012; accepted 21 May 2012.

triple therapy increases side-effects, especially severe anemia and skin rash.[7–11] Second-wave protease inhibitors, such as TMC435, which not only improve antiviral efficacy but also decrease side-effects, have been developed and are undergoing clinical trials.[12] Also, IFN-free regimens, such as protease inhibitor and polymerase inhibitor combination therapy, have been developed.[13,14] In Japan, HCV carriers are increasing in an aging population, and large numbers of patients are ineligible for triple therapy with telaprevir due to potential anemia. That is why re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin is a possible choice for patients who failed to achieve SVR to previous antiviral therapy or patients ineligible for triple therapy with telaprevir who must wait until next-generation antiviral therapies, such as triple therapy with second-wave protease inhibitors or IFN-free regimens, become commercially available.

As for re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin, some studies have been reported but the subjects and treatment protocols were varied.[15–20] According to past reports, the previous treatment response is associated with the efficacy of the re-treatment[17,20] and the SVR rates in re-treatment ranged 4–23%.[16–18] Recently, host factors, such as single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) located near the interleukin (IL)-28B gene, and virus factors, such as the amino acid substitutions in the HCV core region, were revealed to have a strong impact on SVR in PEG IFN plus ribavirin combination therapy for naïve CH-C patients.[21–26] Moreover, response-guided therapy which extends treatment duration until 72 weeks for patients with a slow virological response can raise the SVR rate for naïve CH-C patients.[27–29] However, the value of IL-28B SNP has been uncertain in re-treatment and the most appropriate treatment duration in re-treatment is still unclear. Although it remains obscure which factors are associated with SVR in re-treatment with standard PEG IFN plus ribavirin therapy as pointed out above, some patients do respond to re-treatment and it is very important to be able to identify them. Such findings will be valuable for optimizing the antiviral treatment for CH-C patients by making it possible to decide which patients should be considered for re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin therapy and which should wait for next-generation antiviral treatment.

In the present study, we tried to determine which patients could benefit from re-treatment and to identify the factors associated with SVR in re-treatment, including the host genome SNP and treatment duration.

METHODS

Patients

THIS RETROSPECTIVE, MULTICENTER study was conducted by the Study Group of Antiviral Therapy for Difficult-to-Treat Chronic Hepatitis C supported by the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan. This study was conducted with 143 CH-C patients, 113 patients (genotype 1, $n = 86$; genotype 2, $n = 27$) who had previously completed PEG IFN-α-2b plus ribavirin combination therapy but had failed to attain SVR, and 30 patients (genotype 1, $n = 22$; genotype 2, $n = 8$) who had previously discontinued this combination therapy due to adverse events.

Treatment

For the previous treatment, patients had been treated with PEG IFN-α-2b (PEGINTRON; MSD, Whitehouse Station, NJ, USA) plus ribavirin (REBETOL; MSD). For re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin, patients were treated PEG IFN-α-2a (PEGASYS; Roche, Basel, Switzerland) plus ribavirin (COPEGUS; Roche) or PEG IFN-α-2b plus ribavirin. In principle, as a starting dose, PEG IFN was given once weekly at a dose of 180 μg of PEG IFN-α-2a and 1.5 μg/kg of PEG IFN-α-2b and ribavirin was given at a total dose of 600–1000 mg/day based on bodyweight (bodyweight, ≤60 kg, 600 mg; 60–80 kg, 800 mg; ≥80 kg, 1000 mg), according to the standard treatment protocol for Japanese patients and the decision of the investigator at the participating clinical center. Dose modification followed, as a rule, the manufacturer's drug information on the intensity of the hematological adverse effects.

Laboratory tests and virological assessment

Examination of peripheral blood, transaminase and the serum HCV RNA level were tested at the start of treatment, weeks 4, 12 and 24, end of treatment (EOT), and 24 weeks after the treatment. Sequences of the IFN-sensitivity determining region (ISDR) and the core region of HCV were determined at start of the previous treatment, and the number of mutations in the ISDR, the amino acid substitutions at core 70 and 91, glutamine (Gln) or histidine (His) at core 70 and methionine (Met) at core 91, were analyzed. Genetic polymorphisms located near the IL-28B gene (rs8099917) and ITPA gene (rs1127354) were determined. As for the IL-28B gene, homozygosity for the major sequence (TT) was defined as having the IL-28B major allele, whereas homozygosity (GG) or heterozygosity (TG) of the minor sequence was defined as having

the IL-28B minor allele. As for the ITPA gene, homozygosity for the major sequence (CC) was defined as having the ITPA major allele, whereas homozygosity (AA) or heterozygosity (CA) of the minor sequence was defined as having the ITPA minor allele. The serum HCV RNA level was quantified using the COBAS AMPLICOR HCV MONITOR test ver. 2.0 (detection range, 6–5000 KIU/mL; Roche Diagnostics, Branchburg, NJ, USA) or COBAS TaqMan HCV test (detection range, 1.2–7.8 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL) and qualitatively analyzed using the COBAS AMPLICOR HCV test ver. 2.0 (lower limit of detection, 50 IU/mL). When the serum HCV RNA level quantified by the COBAS TaqMan HCV test was less than 1.7 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL, which was equivalent to 50 IU/mL of HCV RNA, that case was judged as HCV RNA negativiation against the lower limit of detection of the COBAS AMPLICOR HCV test.

Definition of virological response

A rapid virological response (RVR) was defined as undetectable serum HCV RNA level at week 4, partial early virological response (p-EVR) as a more than 2-log decrease in the HCV RNA level at week 12 compared with the baseline, complete EVR (c-EVR) as undetectable serum HCV RNA at week 12, late virological response (LVR) as detectable serum HCV RNA at week 12 and undetectable at week 24, and SVR as undetectable serum HCV RNA at 24 weeks after the treatment. Relapse was defined as undetectable serum HCV RNA at the EOT but a detectable amount after the treatment. Patients without p-EVR or without clearance of HCV RNA at week 24 were considered to be showing non-response (NR), and treatment was stopped in both the previous treatment and this re-treatment. A patient who attained HCV RNA negativiation during the re-treatment continued to be treated for 48 weeks or 72 weeks according to response-guided therapy or the decision of the investigator at the participating clinical center.

Statistical analysis

Baseline data of the patients are expressed as means ± standard deviation or median values. In order to analyze the difference between baseline data or the factors associated with SVR, univariate analysis using the Mann–Whitney *U*-test or χ^2-test and multivariate analysis using logistic regression analysis were performed. A two-tailed *P*-value of less than 0.05 was considered significant. The analysis was conducted with SPSS ver. 17.0J (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

RESULTS

THE PATIENT FLOW in this study is shown in Figure 1. Among the patients who had previously discontinued PEG IFN-α-2b plus ribavirin combination therapy, two patients underwent splenectomy to increase platelet count prior to re-treatment, 25 completed re-treatment of PEG IFN plus ribavirin combination therapy and 15 achieved SVR (genotype 1, $n = 11$; genotype 2, $n = 4$).

All of the patients who completed previous treatment also completed re-treatment and the baseline characteristics of those patients are shown in Table 1. Of the 86 genotype 1 patients, 54 were relapsers and 32 had shown NR to previous treatment. Of the 27 patients with genotype 2, 25 were relapsers and two had shown NR to previous treatment. Thirty-seven patients with genotype 1 and 14 patients with genotype 2 were assessed as IL-28B genotype, and 27 patients with genotype 1 and 10 patients with genotype 2 were assessed as ITPA genotype. There was no significant difference in the baseline characteristics between the previous treatment and the re-treatment with respect to peripheral blood cell counts, amino transaminase level and serum HCV RNA at the start of treatment (Table 1).

The baseline characteristics of patients with genotype 1 according to antiviral efficacy of the previous treatment are shown in Table 2. Among those with NR in the previous treatment, the rate of the minor allele of IL-28B was significantly higher than those with relapse in the previous treatment ($P < 0.01$). For genotype 1, the HCV RNA negative rate on re-treatment was 20% (17/86) at week 4, 61% (52/85) at week 12 and 76% (65/86) at week 24, and the SVR rate was 48% (41/86). The factors associated with SVR were assessed by univariate analysis and the factors of relapse after previous treatment and the serum HCV RNA level at the start of re-treatment were selected as being significant (Table 3). The SVR



Figure 1 Patient flow for this study. SVR, sustained virological response.

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of patients and treatment factors in previous treatment and re-treatment

Factor	Genotype 1		Genotype 2	
No.	86		27	
Sex: male/female	46/40		15/12	
Effect of previous treatment: relapse/NR	54/32		25/2	
	Previous treatment	Re-treatment	Previous treatment	Re-treatment
PEG IFN type: α-2a/α-2b	0/86	41/45	0/27	6/21
Age (years)	58.1 ± 8.3	60.0 ± 8.5	58.9 ± 8.2	60.0 ± 8.1
White blood cells (/mm^3)	4779 ± 1383	4610 ± 1443	5195 ± 1473	4724 ± 1266
Neutrophils (/mm^3)	2478 ± 930	2355 ± 1071	2561 ± 827	2389 ± 941
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	13.7 ± 1.2	13.5 ± 1.7	14.4 ± 1.3	14.0 ± 1.2
Platelets (×10^4/mm^3)	16.0 ± 5.9	16.6 ± 6.2	18.0 ± 5.7	16.8 ± 5.2
ALT (IU/L)	75 ± 51	73 ± 72	57 ± 46	42 ± 32
Histology: activity, 0–1/2–3	29/29		11/7	
Fibrosis, 0–2/3–4	45/14		17/1	
Serum HCV RNA (KIU/mL)	1600	850	1500	700
IL-28B SNP: rs8099917; TT/TG	26/11		10/4	
ITPA SNP: rs1127354; CC/CA	20/7		9/1	
Core 70: wild/mutant	11/11			
Core 91: wild/mutant	15/7			
ISDR: 0–1/≥2	15/1			

ALT, alanine aminotransferase; HCV, hepatitis C virus; IFN, interferon; IL, interleukin; ISDR, IFN-sensitivity determining region; NR, non-response; PEG, pegylated; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism.

rates of relapsers were significantly higher than those of patients with NR in the previous treatment (relapse, 67%, 36/54 vs NR, 16%, 5/32, $P < 0.0001$). As for the serum HCV RNA level at the start of re-treatment, although the SVR rate of those patients with 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL or more of HCV RNA was 38% (26/69), all patients with less than 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL of HCV RNA attained SVR (11/11) ($P = 0.0001$). As for the IL-28B genotype, among the patients with the major allele, the p-EVR rate was significantly higher and the EOT response rate showed marginal significance compared to that with the minor allele (p-EVR rate, 100%, 23/23 vs 30%, 3/10, $P < 0.0001$, EOT rate, 92%, 24/26 vs 64%, 7/11, $P = 0.05$). There was no significant difference of the SVR rate between major and minor alleles (major, 65%, 17/26 vs minor, 36%, 4/11, $P = 0.15$).

Figure 2(a) shows the result of stratified analysis according to the previous treatment response and HCV RNA at the start of re-treatment. The significant difference in SVR observed between high (≥5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL) and low (<5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL) baseline viral loads was still found in both previous relapsers ($P = 0.02$) and previous non-responders ($P = 0.02$). In patients with a high baseline viral load, previous relapsers achieved a higher SVR rate than previous non-responders ($P < 0.0001$). Next, the results of stratified analyses according to IL-28B genotype and previous treatment response or HCV RNA at the start of re-treatment showed no significant difference in SVR rates between the IL-28B genotype in patients with relapse after previous treatment ($P = 0.63$) (Fig. 2b). All patients with less than 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL of HCV RNA achieved SVR despite their IL-28B genotype and the SVR rates of patients with 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL or more of HCV RNA did not differ between IL-28B genotypes (Fig. 2c). Multivariate analysis among the factors of relapse to previous treatment response, HCV RNA at the start of re-treatment and IL-28B genotype showed that relapse after previous treatment response bore the most predictable relationship to SVR in re-treatment ($P = 0.074$).

As for the efficacy of re-treatment according to treatment duration among patients with HCV RNA negativity during re-treatment, the SVR rate of 72-week treatment was significantly higher than that of 48-week treatment (72 weeks, 73%, 29/40, vs 48 weeks, 52%, 12/25, $P < 0.05$). This significant difference was especially found in patients who attained c-EVR but not RVR on re-treatment (72 weeks, 73%, 16/22, vs 48 weeks,

Table 2 Baseline characteristics of patients and treatment factors according to the virological response in previous treatment among patients with genotype 1

Factor	Relapser in previous treatment		NR in previous treatment	
No.	54		32	
Sex: male/female	28/26		18/14	
	Previous treatment	Re-treatment	Previous treatment	Re-treatment
PEG IFN type: α-2a/α-2b	0/54	29/25	0/32	12/20
Age (years)	58.1 ± 8.1	60.3 ± 8.4	57.9 ± 8.9	59.6 ± 8.8
White blood cells (/mm^3)	4917 ± 1290	4692 ± 1035	4546 ± 1520	4462 ± 1993
Neutrophils (/mm^3)	2618 ± 846	2479 ± 805	2225 ± 1033	2105 ± 1454
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	13.9 ± 1.2	13.7 ± 1.6	13.5 ± 1.3	13.1 ± 1.9
Platelets (×10^4/mm^3)	17.1 ± 6.3	17.7 ± 6.1	14.1 ± 4.7	14.7 ± 6.2
ALT (IU/L)	75 ± 57	70 ± 76	75 ± 39	78 ± 64
Histology: activity, 0–1/2–3	20/18		9/11	
Fibrosis, 0–2/3–4	31/8		14/6	
Serum HCV RNA (KIU/mL)	1600	980	1550	800
IL-28B SNP: rs8099917; TT/TG	24/5		2/6	
ITPA SNP: rs1127354; CC/CA	15/6		5/1	
Core 70: wild/mutant	6/6		5/5	
Core 91: wild/mutant	9/3		6/4	
ISDR: 0–1/≥2	9/0		6/1	

ALT, alanine aminotransferase; HCV, hepatitis C virus; IFN, interferon; IL, interleukin; ISDR, IFN-sensitivity determining region; NR, non-response; PEG, pegylated; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism.

38%, 5/13, $P < 0.05$) but not in patients who attained RVR or LVR (Fig. 3).

In genotype 2, the HCV RNA negative rate on re-treatment was 59% (16/27) at week 4, 85% (23/27) at week 12 and 93% (25/27) at week 24, and the SVR rate was 63% (17/27). The two patients with NR in previous treatment did not attain SVR with re-treatment. The factors associated with SVR were assessed by univariate analysis and only the factor of younger age at the start of re-treatment showed marginal significance ($P = 0.06$) (Table 4). Among the patients with RVR on re-treatment, the SVR rates were similar at 75% (6/8) to those with 24-week and 48-week treatment.

DISCUSSION

PAST STUDIES HAVE revealed that the factors of age, sex, progression of liver fibrosis, value of HCV RNA, number of mutations in the ISDR, amino acid substitutions in the core region, drug adherence and treatment duration show association with HCV eradication in PEG IFN plus ribavirin combination for naïve patients with CH-C.[3–5,25–33] Recently, the IL-28B genotype has been reported to be the most powerful factor associated with the antiviral effect of this combination therapy.[21–25] While the predictive factors for SVR in PEG IFN plus ribavirin combination therapy for naïve patients have been actively analyzed, those factors for patients who had already experienced this therapy are still unclear. Especially needing assessment is the correlation between IL-28B SNP or the previous treatment response and the antiviral effect in re-treatment. In this study, we tried to determine which factors could most effectively predict the antiviral effect in re-treatment.

In the present study, patients with relapse after the previous treatment and patients with a low serum HCV RNA level at the start of re-treatment showed significantly different results in this study of re-treatment of CH-C patients who had previously failed to attain SVR with PEG IFN plus ribavirin therapy. This result was similar to those of the EPIC[3] study on relapse and NR[17] and the SYREN trial of NR.[18] On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the influence of the IL-28B genotype and SVR. More specifically, if the previous treatment response was the same, there was no difference regardless of the IL-28B genotype. Considering this result, in re-treatment, the previous treatment response was a more effective predictive factor than IL-28B genotype. However, further investigation is needed to clarify the association between IL-28B

Table 3 Factors associated with a sustained virological response in re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin in patients with genotype 1

Factor		SVR	Non-SVR	*P*-value
No. of patients		41	45	
Age (years)		60.2 ± 7.1	59.9 ± 9.6	0.71
Sex: male/female		24/17	22/23	0.40
Serum HCV RNA (log IU/mL)		5.8 ± 1.4	6.4 ± 0.6	0.11
Serum HCV RNA: <5 log/≥5 log		11/28	0/43	<0.001
White blood cells (/mm^3)		4656 ± 1029	4566 ± 1763	0.42
Neutrophils (/mm^3)		2443 ± 804	2259 ± 1301	0.16
Hemoglobin (g/dL)		13.5 ± 1.6	13.4 ± 1.8	0.80
Platelets (×10^4/mm^3)		16.9 ± 5.7	16.3 ± 6.7	0.36
ALT (IU/L)		68 ± 69	78 ± 75	0.43
IL-28B SNP: TT/TG		17/4	9/7	0.15
ITPA SNP: CC/CA		13/3	7/4	0.39
Core 70: wild/mutant		5/4	6/7	1.00
Core 91: wild/mutant		7/3	8/5	1.00
ISDR: 0–1/≥2		9/0	6/1	0.44
PEG IFN: α-2a/α-2b		16/25	25/20	0.14
PEG IFN dose (μg/kg per week)	α-2a	2.91 ± 0.77	2.74 ± 0.69	0.61
	α-2b	1.25 ± 0.39	1.20 ± 0.32	0.59
Ribavirin dose (mg/kg per day)		9.34 ± 2.72	9.64 ± 3.20	0.51
1st treatment virological response	Relapse/NR	36/5	18/27	<0.001

ALT, alanine aminotransferase; HCV, hepatitis C virus; IFN, interferon; IL, interleukin; ISDR, IFN-sensitivity determining region; NR, non-response; PEG, pegylated; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; SVR, sustained virological response.



Figure 2 Sustained virological response (SVR) rates according to previous virological response, hepatitis C virus (HCV) RNA at start of re-treatment and genotype of interleukin (IL)-28B single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) in patients with genotype 1. (a) Stratified analysis of previous virological response and HCV RNA at start of re-treatment. □, HCV RNA <5 log IU/mL at start of re-treatment; ■, HCV RNA ≥5 log IU/mL at start of re-treatment. (b) Stratified analysis of previous virological response and genotype of IL-28B SNP. □, Patients with major allele of IL-28B SNP; ■, patients with minor allele of IL-28B SNP. (c) Stratified analysis of HCV RNA at start of re-treatment and genotype of IL-28B SNP. □, Patients with major allele of IL28B SNP; ■, patients with minor allele of IL-28B SNP.



Figure 3 Sustained virological response (SVR) rates according to virological response in re-treatment and treatment duration in patients with genotype 1. □, Patients treated for 48 weeks; ■, patients treated for 72 weeks. RVR, rapid virological response; cEVR, complete early virological response; LVR, late virological response. *$P < 0.05$; compared to 48 weeks of treatment.

genotype and antiviral effect of re-treatment because of their small number in this study. In this study, only one patient with the minor allele of IL-28B and NR in previous treatment could start and continue with the increased dose of PEG IFN (from 1.37 μg/kg in the previous treatment to 1.79 μg/kg in re-treatment) and ribavirin (from 10.3 mg/kg per day in the previous treatment to 11.1 mg/kg per day in re-treatment) and attained SVR by extended treatment. If the drug adherence does not improve, patients with the minor allele of IL-28B who show NR in the previous treatment should be treated with new drugs.

The next question is how the patients should be re-treated in order to attain SVR on re-treatment. In this study, the patients with a low serum HCV RNA level (<5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL) at the start of re-treatment showed a significant rate of cure on re-treatment, and this is almost the same result as that previously reported.[16,17] In this study, the two patients with NR in the previous treatment and with less than 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL of HCV RNA level (20 KIU/mL and 52 KIU/mL of HCV RNA) at the start of re-treatment attained SVR. On the other hand, even if the previous treatment response was a relapse, the SVR rates were 58% (25/43) among the patients with 5 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL or more of HCV RNA. Because the HCV RNA level changed after the antiviral treatment, it is important to not miss the timing of when the HCV RNA level is low.

With respect to treatment duration among patients with HCV RNA negativiation during re-treatment, 72 weeks of treatment significantly increased the SVR rate compared to 48 weeks. This result was almost the same as that of the REPEAT study.[16] In our present study, the SVR rate among the patients with c-EVR but not RVR in re-treatment was significantly high by 72 weeks of treatment. On the other hand, the SVR rates among the

Table 4 Factors associated with a sustained virological response in re-treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin in patients with genotype 2

Factor		SVR	Non-SVR	*P*-value
No. of patients		17	10	
Age (years)		57.7 ± 8.8	63.7 ± 5.1	0.06
Sex: male/female		7/10	8/2	0.11
Serum HCV RNA (log IU/mL)		5.4 ± 1.4	6.1 ± 0.8	0.15
Serum HCV RNA: <5 log/≥5 log		5/11	1/9	0.35
White blood cells (/mm^3)		5049 ± 1355	4171 ± 910	0.10
Neutrophils (/mm^3)		2556 ± 1064	1999 ± 404	0.24
Hemoglobin (g/dL)		14.1 ± 1.3	13.8 ± 1.6	0.51
Platelets (×10^4/mm^3)		17.9 ± 5.4	14.8 ± 4.3	0.17
ALT (IU/L)		38 ± 19	48 ± 47	0.71
IL-28B SNP: TT/TG		6/2	4/2	1.00
ITPA SNP: CC/CA		5/1	4/0	1.00
PEG IFN: α-2a/α-2b		4/13	2/8	1.00
PEG IFN dose (μg/kg per week)	α-2a	3.23 ± 0.34	2.24 ± 2.25	1.00
	α-2b	1.32 ± 0.28	1.18 ± 0.23	0.21
Ribavirin dose (mg/kg per day)		10.4 ± 2.21	10.1 ± 1.31	0.44
1st treatment virological response	RVR/non-RVR	4/13	3/7	1.00

ALT, alanine aminotransferase; HCV, hepatitis C virus; IFN, interferon; IL, interleukin; ISDR, IFN-sensitivity determining region; PEG, pegylated; RVR, rapid virological response; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; SVR, sustained virological response.

patients with RVR in re-treatment were similar between the patients with 48 weeks and 72 weeks of treatment. Thus, patients with c-EVR but not RVR in re-treatment should be re-treated for a longer period. In order to attain better SVR, extended treatment duration is generally recommended for patients with on-treatment LVR, whereas standard treatment duration is considered to be sufficient for patients with on-treatment c-EVR. However, the present study revealed that, even if patients achieved c-EVR on re-treatment, 72 weeks of treatment seems to be better than 48 weeks for treatment-experienced patients. The majority of naïve patients showing on-treatment c-EVR could eradicate HCV with 48 weeks of treatment while some could not. In a treatment-experienced setting, patients who are able to respond early but not eradicate HCV would be selected, and therefore extended treatment may be needed.

With genotype 2, the SVR rate was relatively high (63%). The patients who could not attain SVR in re-treatment (two patients) showed NR in the previous treatment. Thus, the patients with genotype 2 and showing NR in previous treatment seemed to be difficult to treat and could be treated with other drugs. Among the patients with RVR in re-treatment, the SVR rates were similar among those with RVR in re-treatment between 24 weeks and 48 weeks of treatment. The effectiveness of extended treatment for the patients with genotype 2 in re-treatment could not be demonstrated because of their small number in this study. Further investigation is needed to clarify this.

In conclusion, this study shows that the efficacy of re-treatment for genotype 1 patients who failed to show SVR to previous treatment with PEG IFN plus ribavirin could be predicted from the previous treatment response and a low HCV RNA level at the start of re-treatment. Re-treatment for 72 weeks led to clinical improvement for genotype 1 patients with c-EVR and without RVR on re-treatment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THIS WORK WAS supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Research on Hepatitis from Ministry of Health Labor and Welfare of Japan, and Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture of Japan.

REFERENCES

1 Ghany MG, Strader DB, Thomas DL, Seeff LB. Diagnosis, management, and treatment of hepatitis C: an update. *Hepatology* 2009; **49**: 1335–74.
2 Hayashi N, Takehara T. Antiviral therapy for chronic hepatitis C: past, present, and future. *J Gastroenterol* 2006; **41**: 17–27.
3 Manns MP, McHutchison JG, Gordon SC *et al.* Peginterferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin compared with interferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin for initial treatment of chronic hepatitis C: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001; **358**: 958–65.
4 Fried MW, Shiffman ML, Reddy KR *et al.* Peginterferon alfa-2a plus ribavirin for chronic hepatitis C virus infection. *N Engl J Med* 2002; **347**: 975–82.
5 Hadziyannis SJ, Sette H, Jr, Morgan TR *et al.* Peginterferon-alpha2a and ribavirin combination therapy in chronic hepatitis C: a randomized study of treatment duration and ribavirin dose. *Ann Intern Med* 2004; **140**: 346–55.
6 Zeuzem S, Hultcrantz R, Bourliere M *et al.* Peginterferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin for treatment of chronic hepatitis C in previously untreated patients infected with HCV genotypes 2 or 3. *J Hepatol* 2004; **40**: 993–9.
7 McHutchison JG, Everson GT, Gordon SC *et al.* Telaprevir with peginterferon and ribavirin for chronic HCV genotype 1 infection. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **360**: 1827–38.
8 Hezode C, Forestier N, Dusheiko G *et al.* Telaprevir and peginterferon with or without ribavirin for chronic HCV infection. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **360**: 1839–50.
9 McHutchison JG, Manns MP, Muir AJ *et al.* Telaprevir for previously treated chronic HCV infection. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**: 1292–303.
10 Kumada H, Toyota J, Okanoue T, Chayama K, Tsubouchi H, Hayashi N. Telaprevir with peginterferon and ribavirin for treatment-naive patients chronically infected with HCV of genotype 1 in Japan. *J Hepatol* 2012; **56**: 78–84.
11 Hayashi N, Okanoue T, Tsubouchi H, Toyota J, Chayama K, Kumada H. Efficacy and safety of telaprevir, a new protease inhibitor, for difficult-to-treat patients with genotype 1 chronic hepatitis C. *J Viral Hepat* 2012; **19**: 134–42.
12 Reesink HW, Fanning GC, Farha KA *et al.* Rapid HCV-RNA decline with once daily TMC435: a phase I study in healthy volunteers and hepatitis C patients. *Gastroenterology* 2010; **138**: 913–21.
13 Lok AS, Gardiner DF, Lawitz E *et al.* Preliminary study of two antiviral agents for hepatitis C genotype 1. *N Engl J Med* 2012; **366**: 216–24.
14 Chayama K, Takahashi S, Toyota J *et al.* Dual therapy with the NS5A inhibitor BMS-790052 and the NS3 protease inhibitor BMS-650032 in HCV genotype 1b-infected null responders. *Hepatology* 2012; **55**: 742–8.
15 Bacon BR, Shiffman ML, Mendes F *et al.* Retreating chronic hepatitis C with daily interferon alfacon-1/ribavirin after nonresponse to pegylated interferon/ribavirin: DIRECT results. *Hepatology* 2009; **49**: 1838–46.
16 Jensen DM, Marcellin P, Freilich B *et al.* Re-treatment of patients with chronic hepatitis C who do not respond to peginterferon-alpha2b: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2009; **150**: 528–40.

17 Poynard T, Colombo M, Bruix J *et al.* Peginterferon alfa-2b and ribavirin: effective in patients with hepatitis C who failed interferon alfa/ribavirin therapy. *Gastroenterology* 2009; **136**: 1618–28.
18 Chevaliez S, Hezode C, Soulier A *et al.* High-dose pegylated interferon-alpha and ribavirin in nonresponder hepatitis C patients and relationship with IL-28B genotype (SYREN trial). *Gastroenterology* 2011; **141**: 119–27.
19 Berg C, Goncales FL, Jr, Bernstein DE *et al.* Re-treatment of chronic hepatitis C patients after relapse: efficacy of peginterferon-alpha-2a (40 kDa) and ribavirin. *J Viral Hepat* 2006; **13**: 435–40.
20 Oze T, Hiramatsu N, Yakushijin T *et al.* Efficacy of re-treatment with pegylated interferon plus ribavirin combination therapy for patients with chronic hepatitis C in Japan. *J Gastroenterol* 2011; **46**: 1031–7.
21 Thomas DL, Thio CL, Martin MP *et al.* Genetic variation in IL28B and spontaneous clearance of hepatitis C virus. *Nature* 2009; **461**: 798–801.
22 Suppiah V, Moldovan M, Ahlenstiel G *et al.* IL28B is associated with response to chronic hepatitis C interferon-alpha and ribavirin therapy. *Nat Genet* 2009; **41**: 1100–4.
23 Tanaka Y, Nishida N, Sugiyama M *et al.* Genome-wide association of IL28B with response to pegylated interferon-alpha and ribavirin therapy for chronic hepatitis C. *Nat Genet* 2009; **41**: 1105–9.
24 Thompson AJ, Muir AJ, Sulkowski MS *et al.* Interleukin-28B polymorphism improves viral kinetics and is the strongest pretreatment predictor of sustained virologic response in hepatitis C virus-1 patients. *Gastroenterology* 2010; **139**: 120–9.
25 Kurosaki M, Tanaka Y, Nishida N *et al.* Pre-treatment prediction of response to pegylated-interferon plus ribavirin for chronic hepatitis C using genetic polymorphism in IL28B and viral factors. *J Hepatol* 2011; **54**: 439–48.
26 Akuta N, Suzuki F, Kawamura Y *et al.* Predictive factors of early and sustained responses to peginterferon plus ribavirin combination therapy in Japanese patients infected with hepatitis C virus genotype 1b: amino acid substitutions in the core region and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels. *J Hepatol* 2007; **46**: 403–10.
27 Berg T, von Wagner M, Nasser S *et al.* Extended treatment duration for hepatitis C virus type 1: comparing 48 versus 72 weeks of peginterferon-alfa-2a plus ribavirin. *Gastroenterology* 2006; **130**: 1086–97.
28 Mangia A, Minerva N, Bacca D *et al.* Individualized treatment duration for hepatitis C genotype 1 patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Hepatology* 2008; **47**: 43–50.
29 Oze T, Hiramatsu N, Yakushijin T *et al.* The efficacy of extended treatment with pegylated interferon plus ribavirin in patients with HCV genotype 1 and slow virologic response in Japan. *J Gastroenterol* 2011; **46**: 944–52.
30 Oze T, Hiramatsu N, Yakushijin T *et al.* Indications and limitations for aged patients with chronic hepatitis C in pegylated interferon alfa-2b plus ribavirin combination therapy. *J Hepatol* 2011; **54**: 604–11.
31 McHutchison JG, Manns M, Patel K *et al.* Adherence to combination therapy enhances sustained response in genotype-1-infected patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Gastroenterology* 2002; **123**: 1061–9.
32 Oze T, Hiramatsu N, Yakushijin T *et al.* Pegylated interferon alpha-2b (Peg-IFN alpha-2b) affects early virologic response dose-dependently in patients with chronic hepatitis C genotype 1 during treatment with Peg-IFN alpha-2b plus ribavirin. *J Viral Hepat* 2009; **16**: 578–85.
33 Hiramatsu N, Oze T, Yakushijin T *et al.* Ribavirin dose reduction raises relapse rate dose-dependently in genotype 1 patients with hepatitis C responding to pegylated interferon alpha-2b plus ribavirin. *J Viral Hepat* 2009; **16**: 586–94.