Table 7 Definition of hypertension [a]

Normal blood pressure (BP)	Both systolic and diastolic BP are less than 90th percentile
Prehypertension	Systolic and/or diastolic blood pressure levels are greater than or equal to the 90th percentile but less than the 95th percentile, or if BP exceeds 120/80 mmHg (even if BP is less than the 90th percentile for gender, age, and height)
Hypertension	Systolic and/or diastolic blood pressure that is greater than or equal to the 95th percentile for gender, age, and height on three or more separate occasions.
	Stage 1: systolic and/or diastolic BP between the 95th percentile and 5 mmHg above the 99th percentile
	Stage 2: systolic and/or diastolic BP higher than 5 mmHg above the 99th percentile

Table 8 Blood pressure levels of 50th percentile height based on gender, age of children and adolescents in the USA [a]

Age	Boys			Girls		
(year)	90th	95th	99th	90th	95th	99th
1	99/52	103/56	110/64	100/54	104/58	111/65
2	102/57	106/61	113/69	101/59	105/63	112/70
3	105/61	109/65	116/73	103/63	107/67	114/74
4	107/65	111/69	118/77	104/66	108/70	115/77
5	108/68	112/72	120/80	106/68	110/72	117/79
6	110/70	114/74	121/82	108/70	111/74	119/81
7	111/72	115/76	122/84	109/71	113/75	120/82
8	112/73	116/78	123/86	111/72	115/76	122/83
9	114/75	118/79	125/87	113/73	117/77	124/84
10	115/75	119/80	127/88	115/74	119/78	126/86
11	117/76	121/80	129/88	117/75	121/79	128/87
12	120/76	123/81	131/89	119/76	123/80	130/88
13	122/77	126/81	133/89	121/77	124/81	132/89
14	125/78	128/82	136/90	122/78	126/82	133/90
15	127/79	131/83	138/91	123/79	127/83	134/91
16	130/80	134/84	141/92	124/80	128/84	135/91
17	132/82	136/87	143/94	125/80	129/84	136/91

Systolic/diastolic BP (mmHg)

sodium concentration in dialysate will be taken to correct the serum sodium in the patients.

Supplementary articles

a. KDIGO clinical practice guideline for acute kidney injury: Timing of renal replacement therapy in AKI. Kidney Int Suppl 2012;2:89–92.
b. Gibney N, et al. Timing of initiation and discontinuation of renal replacement therapy in AKI: unanswered key questions. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 2008;3:876–880.
c. Bellomo R, et al. Indications and criteria for initiating renal replacement therapy in the intensive care unit. Kidney Int Suppl. 1998;66:S106–109.

Table 9 Antihypertensive agents for children

Generic name	Brand name	Dosage and administration
Nifedipine	Sepamit® fine granules 1 %	0.25–0.5 mg/kg/dose orally every 4–6 h. Maximum: 10 mg/dose or 3 mg/kg/day
Amlodipine besylate	Norvasc® Amlodin® Tablets/OD Tablets (2.5, 5 mg)	2.5 mg once daily in children ≥6 years. Dosage must be titrated according to age, body weight, and patient's response, but does not exceed the dosage for adult
Nicardipine hydrochloride	Nicardipine® injection (1 mg/ml)	Initial: 0.1–1.0 μg/kg/min; titrate dose according to blood pressure: rate of infusion may be increased every 15–30 min; maximum dose: 4–5 μg/kg/min
Enalapril maleate	Renivace® Tablets (2.5, 5, 10 mg)	Initial: 0.08 mg/kg/day every 24 h in children ≥1 month. Dosage must be titrated according to age, patient's response
Lisinopril	Longes® Tablets Zestril® Tablets (5, 10, 20 mg)	Initial: 0.07 mg/kg/dose once daily in children ≥6 years. Dosage must be titrated according to age, patient's response
Valsartan	Diovan® Tablets (20, 40, 80, 160 mg)	Initial: dose dependent upon patient weight: <35 kg: 20 mg; ≥35 kg: 40 mg/day every 24 h orally. Dosage may titrate to age, body weight, and patient's response up to a maximum dose of 40 mg < 35 kg

d. Palevsky PM: Clinical review: timing and dose of continuous renal replacement therapy in acute kidney injury. Crit Care 2007;11:232–237.

2. Modality of renal replacement therapy for patients with AKI arising from HUS

> Modalities of renal replacement therapy are peritoneal dialysis (PD), intermittent hemodialysis (HD) and continuous hemo-dia-filtration (CHDF), including continuous hemo-dialysis (CHD) and continuous hemo-filtration (CHF). [Grade of Recommendation: B]
>
> We suggest to take CHD For PD (for 24h) for patients with AKI complicated with acute encephalopathy. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Comments

We suggest to take PD, IHD or CRRT (such as CHD, CHF and CHDF) depending on the status of the patients

and nature of the institution. Characteristics of PD, IHD and CRRT are shown in Table 10. However, there are no randomized control studies which modality shows most effective.

CHD and CHDF are usually the first line method for AKI due to HUS, because CHF shows lower efficacy than CHD or CHDF. CHD is usually selected when patient manifests AKI with no neurological involvement. On the other hand, when patient with HUS manifests acute encephalopathy, CHDF is chosen to reduce serum inflammatory cytokines. In cases of patients with unstable circulation, CHDF is preferred over CHD.

AKI guideline of KDIGO suggests CHDF or PD (for 24 h), rather than intermittent renal replacement therapy (IRRT such as IHD), for AKI patients with acute brain injury, increased intracranial pressure or generalized brain edema (Grade 2B: we suggest the Quality of Evidence Moderate) [a]. IHD can worsen neurological status by changing cerebral perfusion pressure. That is why CHDF or 24-h PD is taken. IHD can induce sudden disequilibrium syndrome or an increase of intracranial pressure (dialysis disequilibrium) [b]. Both types of therapy usually do not produce disequilibrium syndrome, brain edema or hypotension due to the slow removal of fluids and solutes [1]. The characteristics of modalities of renal replacement therapy are shown in Table 11.

Commercially available dialysates for patients with AKI contained low potassium (2 mEq/L), low magnesium (1 or 1.5 mEq/L) and no phosphorus. As CRRT is usually maintained for over 24 h, potassium, magnesium and phosphorus can be added to dialysates to maintain the appropriate serum levels in patients [c].

Supplementary articles

a. KDIGO clinical practice guideline for acute kidney injury: Modality of renal replacement therapy for patients with AKI. Kidney Int suppl 2012:107–110.
b. Davenport A: Continuous renal replacement therapies in patients with liver disease. Semin Dial 2009;22:169–172.
c. Sawada M, et al. Necessity of adding phosphorus and magnesium to dialysate in CHDF. J Jpn Soc Pediatr Dialysis Transplantation 2007;27:95–97 [in Japanese].

3.4 Plasma exchange therapy

Plasma exchange therapy has no beneficial effect to reduce nephropathy in HUS. [Grade of Recommendation: C2]

When plasma exchange therapy is performed, we must prevent fluid overload by using renal replacement therapy in the patients with HUS. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Comments

For aHUS, plasma exchange therapy is the first line treatment. Conversely, plasma exchange shows no beneficial effect for patients with HUS due to STEC infection [1, 2, a] (See Sect. 3.6).

Plasma exchange therapy can increase plasma osmolality, as it promotes the migration of fluids from the third space to the intravascular space. Precise management of fluid, electrolytes and acid–base balance is mandatory. Rapid increase of intravascular volume leads to severe complications such as hypertension, cardiac failure, pulmonary edema and brain edema. When plasma exchange therapy is performed, fluid overload must be avoided by using renal replacement therapy in the patients with HUS [3]. We suggest plasma exchange therapy for infants with HUS in hospitals with adequate clinical experience.

Supplementary article

a. Michael M, Elliott EJ, Ridley GF, Hodson EM, Craig JC, Editorial Group: Cochrane Renal Group: Interventions for haemolytic uraemic syndrome and thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura. 21 Jan 2009.

3.5 Antithrombotic therapy for HUS

We do not recommend administration of antithrombotics including heparin, dipyridamole, and urokinase for HUS patients, especially those without complications of disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC). To date, there is no clinical evidence that it is beneficial. [Grade of Recommendation: D]

For patients with HUS complicated by DIC, it is reasonable to use agents including nafamostat mesilate, gabexate mesilate, recombinant human thrombomodulin alpha, or antithrombin (AT, formerly known as antithrombin III). [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Comments

Differential diagnosis between HUS and DIC is usually difficult, and can only be made on the basis of results of examinations and careful observation of symptoms. DIC is a thrombotic microangiopathy resulting from activation of the coagulation system, accompanied by deposition of fibrin clots in the lumina of blood vessels, consumption of coagulation factors, and microangiopathic hemolysis. These in turn lead to thrombocytopenia, a decreased plasma fibrinogen level, prolongation of prothrombin time (PT) and activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT). HUS, on the other hand, is a thrombotic microangiopathy resulting from primary platelet activation due to primary

endothelial injury, with the levels of coagulation factors, PT and aPTT all within the normal range. Therefore, the differences in coagulation abnormalities between these two disorders usually permit them to be distinguished [a].

Four prospective trials have compared combination of supportive care with antithrombotic agents (e.g. either urokinase and heparin, or dipyridamole and heparin) or supportive care alone [1–4]. However, thrombocytopenia, microangiopathic hemolytic anemia and the duration of renal failure were similar in both the control and treated groups. Accordingly, these studies did not demonstrate any advantages of these treatments, nor the comparison between streptokinase therapy and heparin therapy with supportive care alone. Hemorrhagic complications were more common in the group treated with streptokinase. Therefore, antithrombotic therapy has not been deemed suitable for use in HUS patients.

On the other hand, HUS patients complicated by DIC are often reported [5, 6]. To date, the published data are insufficient to allow any conclusions to be drawn about the efficacy or safety of treatment for HUS complicated by DIC. Therefore, we suggest administration of agents such as nafamostat mesilate, gabexate mesilate, recombinant human thrombomodulin alpha and antithrombin, in accordance with the diagnostic and therapeutic guidelines for HUS caused by enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* infection (established by the Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology) [b], as well as expert consensus based on evidence for the treatment of DIC due to infection (established by the Japanese Society for Thrombosis and Hemostasis) [c]. However, it is important to note that hyperkalemia may occur during treatment with nafamostat mesilate, and that any bleeding tendency can be exacerbated by treatment with antithrombin. Further, it is noteworthy that the established data are insufficient to allow any conclusions to be drawn about the efficacy of recombinant human thrombomodulin alpha for treatment of symptoms of HUS, including encephalopathy, although this treatment may be effective for DIC.

Supplementary articles

a. UpToDate: Treatment and prognosis of Shiga toxin associated (typical) hemolytic uremic syndrome in children. (Accessed on April 17, 2012)
b. The Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology [Diagnostic and therapeutic guideline for hemolytic uremic syndrome associated with enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* infection (revised version)], in Japanese. http://www.jspn.jp/gakujyutsu.html
c. Maruyama I, et al. Scientific Standardization Committee of the Japanese Society on Thrombosis and Hemostasis: Expert consensus based on the evidence for the treatment of disseminated intravascular coagulation arising from intravascular infection. Jap J Thrombo Hemost. 2009;20:77–113, in Japanese.
d. Aoki N, et al. Revision of examination data and findings for diagnosis of disseminated intravascular coagulation. Research Report 1988: 37–41. Grant-in-Aid for Research of Special Disease of Blood Coagulation Abnormalities from the Ministry of Health and Welfare of Japan, in Japanese.

Table 10 Characteristics of PD, IHD, and CRRT

	PD	IHD	CRRT
Duration	Continuously for 24 h	Intermittent	Continuously for 24 h
Simplicity	Technically simple	Technically complex	Technically more complex
Influence on hemodynamics	Small	Large	Small
Control of the removed fluids	Not accurately	Accurately	Accurately and easily
Anticoagulation	Not necessary	Necessary	Necessary
Disequilibrium syndrome	No	Yes	No
Catheter related trouble	Obstruction, fluid leak, and peritonitis	Hemorrhage, thrombosis, and sepsis	Hemorrhage, thrombosis, and sepsis
Availability to infant	Available, good indication	Available	Available but depend on the institute activity
Restraint to the patients	Not necessary	Necessary	Necessary

PD Peritoneal dialysis, *IHD* intermittent hemodialysis, *CRRT* continuous renal replacement therapy

3.6 Treatment of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection

1. Supportive therapy for encephalopathy associated with STEC infection

> Supportive therapy includes the basic treatment of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection. To suppress brain edema and seizures (convulsions), management of systemic organs and treatment of the central nervous system (CNS) signs are critical. The former aims to stabilize circulation and respiration; while the latter, to treat seizures (convulsions) and to lower the intracranial pressure. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Comments

(1) Factors to be considered in the treatment of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection.

Main symptoms of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection are seizures (convulsions) and impaired consciousness. Many of the severe cases show diffuse brain edema and/or bilateral deep gray matter lesions (basal ganglia or thalamus) on cranial imaging studies (CT or MRI) (See

Table 11 Applications of renal replacement therapy in various complications

Complications	Modalities	Reasons of indication
Unstable circulation	CRRT · PD	Both can prevent hypotension
Hyperkalemia	IHD	IHD can reduce plasma potassium concentration rapidly
	CRRT	CRRT cannot rapidly normalize hyperlkalemia compared to IHD. Iit is recommended to infants
Acute encephalopathy/ increased intracranial pressure	CRRT · PD	Both are preferred to IHD. Both can keep the intracranial pressure stable
Bleeding tendency	PD	Anticoagulation is not necessary. PD will not accelerate bleeding tendency
	IHD	Treatment time of IHD is shorter than that of CRRT, resulting in less use of anticoagulants
Severe fluid overload	CRRT	CRRT can enable precise and continuous removal of fluid
During mechanical ventilation	CRRT	CRRT easily and accurately can control fluid balance. CRRT is also helpful to restore from mechanical ventilation
Intestinal perforation	CRRT	PD can not be used in patients with intestinal perforation

PD Peritoneal dialysis, *IHD* intermittent hemodialysis, *CRRT* continuous renal replacement therapy

Sect.2.3). To correct the pathology and pathogenesis for such cases, supportive therapy is performed. Since neither randomized nor case–control studies with regard to the treatment of encephalopathy associated with STEC has been done to date, there is no report of any therapy that has a high degree of evidence. It should be reasonable, however, to apply a therapeutic strategy similar to that against acute encephalopathy associated with influenza and other viral infections [a].

It should be kept in mind that, in cases of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection, most patients have acute kidney injury associated with HUS, prompting the consideration for water overload, electrolytes imbalance, as well as changes in blood concentration of drugs due to hemodialysis. Secondary injuries to other organs, such as the liver and heart, may also occur, although they are less serious compared to the some severe cases of influenza-associated encephalopathy. Taken together, encephalopathy associated with STEC infection differs in several aspects from other encephalopathies.

While encephalopathy associated with STEC is the main cause of death in HUS [1], there have been several case reports that described patients recovering after several weeks of coma [2, 3]. Thus, active and continuous therapy should be kept in mind.

(2) Supportive therapy of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection

In the acute period of encephalopathy, principle of treatment consists of several aspects. First, management of systemic organs should be done vigorously. Circulation and respiration should be continuously monitored and stabilized by hydration, drug therapy, dialysis and mechanical ventilation. Carbon bicarbonate concentration in arterial blood should be maintained at the normal range, and the volume of body fluid managed adequately to avoid both overhydration and dehydration. Abnormalities of the body fluid components, such as serum electrolytes and glucose, if any, should be corrected.

Second, CNS signs and symptoms should be treated. The level of consciousness and seizures (convulsions) should be monitored continuously. Seizures are to be halted primarily with intravenous antiepileptic drugs. Many patients respond to benzodiazepines (diazepam, midazolam and others), whereas some intractable cases have clusters of seizures or status epilepticus, necessitating intravenous injection of a large amount of barbiturates (thiopental and others). To prevent the recurrence of seizures, antiepileptic drugs (midazolam, phenobarbital, fosphenytoin and others) are given with monitoring of their blood concentration. Attention should be paid to seizures due to hyponatremia and other abnormalities of electrolytes, as well as hypoglycemia. Treatment of increased intracranial pressure includes sedation and hyperosmolar therapy (glycerol and fructose). Mannitol is not recommended for encephalopathy associated with HUS, since this is excreted via kidneys and may aggravate renal failure. Monitoring of intracranial pressure should be considered in severe cases. Cooling must be introduced to the patients with hyperthermia [a, 4].

(3) Follow-up during convalescence and after discharge

During convalescence, patients should undergo cranial imaging studies, electroencephalography and, if necessary, developmental tests to check for residual abnormalities, immediately before or after discharge. If a patient is left with disabilities in intellect, higher cortical and motor function, or epilepsy, treatment and rehabilitation should be started for each condition. Even if no apparent sequelae were noted at discharge, learning disabilities or behavioral problems may manifest later in life. Thus, a long-term follow-up on the mental development is required.

Supplementary article

a. Morishima T, et al. Guideline for influenza encephalopathy: Revised edition. Jpn J Pediatr. 2009;62:2483–2528. [in Japanese]

2. Specific therapy of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection

> Many cases of encephalopathy associated with STEC have an unfavorable prognosis. To date, no specific therapy has been established for this condition. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]
>
> Methylprednisolone (mPSL) pulse therapy may be considered in patients with severe STEC-associated encephalopathy whereby poor outcome is predicted with regard to neurologic function and/or survival. However, its efficacy has not established. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]
>
> Plasma exchange may be considered in patients with STEC-associated encephalopathy (when its safety is verified) although its efficacy has not been established. This therapy should be performed in a medical facility with adequate experience. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Comments

Encephalopathy (CNS involvement) associated with STEC infection is recognized globally to be a predictor of poor outcome. The management of encephalopathy is primarily based on systemic supportive care [a]. Although no specific interventions have been shown to be efficacious, there may be a role for mPSL pulse therapy, plasma exchange and other treatments. The efficacy of these agents is still unclear due to the small number of clinical experience reports.

(1) Methylprednisolone (mPSL) pulse therapy

To date, there are no studies that have evaluated the efficacy of mPSL pulse therapy for STEC-associated encephalopathy. There are only a few case reports in Japan. To determine whether steroids could be of clinical benefit in the treatment of HUS, Perez et al. [5] conducted trials of mPSL (5 mg/kg/day over seven days). They reported that there was no significant difference between the treatment groups in terms of the number of convulsive episodes or transfusion requirements.

In April 2011, an outbreak of STEC O111 infection occurred principally in Toyama prefecture, Japan. During this outbreak, mPSL pulse therapy was introduced for encephalopathy. 20 children with STEC O111 infection were eventually identified with eight of them developed encephalopathy. Three children without mPSL pulse therapy died, while all five children treated with mPSL therapy survived without neurological sequelae [b]. However, there is still insufficient evidence to establish the effectiveness of mPSL pulse therapy for STEC-associated encephalopathy (as other interventions, such as plasma exchange, were used concurrently).

STEC–HUS is systemic disorder characterized by thrombotic microangiopathy (TMA). However, postmortem examination of brain tissue has shown little evidence of TMA. Affected patients often have generalized cerebral edema and enlarged spaces around blood vessels that indicate increasing permeability [b]. Previous studies showed that the pathogenesis of STEC-associated encephalopathy involves inflammatory cytokines such as TNF-α and IL-6 [6, 7]. Moreover, two cases of HUS complicated by acute necrotizing encephalopathy (ANE) were reported [8]. The efficacy of mPSL pulse therapy has been established for ANE. Although there were no obvious side effects of mPSL pulse therapy in the STEC O111 outbreak, this therapy should only be administered for STEC-associated encephalopathy when close attention is paid to the potential side effects, such as infections, thrombus formation and hypertension.

In spite of the treatment of STEC-associated encephalopathy with mPSL pulse therapy not being established, we suggest that it can be considered in patients with severe STEC-associated encephalopathy (with the safety of the patients ensured as a prerequisite).

(2) Plasma exchange therapy

Plasma exchange therapy is sometimes used to treat severe STEC–HUS (especially when there is CNS involvement) based upon the reported benefits of plasma exchange in adults with TTP. Dundas et al. [9] reported that five of 16 adult cases (31 %) treated with plasma exchange died, while five of the six cases without plasma exchange (83 %) died. Nathanson et al. recently investigated 52 patients with severe initial neurological involvement associated with D + HUS (HUS associated with diarrhea). Eleven patients were treated with plasma exchange within 24 h after the first presentation of neurological signs. However, the outcome of this group was not significantly different from that of the others who were not treated with plasma exchange [10]. Colic et al. reported that an earlier start of plasma exchange for five patients with STEC O104:H4 associated HUS reduced the lactate dehydrogenase concentrations more effectively than later treatment, possibly indicating that early therapy ameliorates the course of severe HUS [11].

The efficacy and mechanism(s) of plasma exchange for severe HUS and CNS involvement are currently unknown. Moreover, this therapy is associated with problems such as pulmonary edema, infection and the high cost of treatment.

While the treatment of STEC-associated encephalopathy with plasma exchange is not established, we suggest that it can be considered in patients with severe STEC-associated encephalopathy (with the safety of the patients ensured as a prerequisite).

(3) Other treatments

In a German outbreak of STEC O104 in 2011, it was reported that eculizmab, a monoclonal antibody against complement factor C5, was beneficial in patients with

STEC–HUS and CNS involvement [12]. In contrast, eculizmab did not show any efficacy in a cohort study by Menne et al. [13]. Recombinant human soluble thrombomodulin (rTM) has effects on the complement control and has anti-inflammatory properties. There was one report of a small number of patients that evaluated the efficacy of rTM in children with STEC–HUS [14]. More evidence is needed to establish a new therapeutic strategy for STEC-associated encephalopathy.

Supplementary articles

a. UpToDate: Treatment and prognosis of Shiga toxin associated (typical) hemolytic uremic syndrome in children. (Accessed on December 16, 2012).
b. Sata T (ed.): 2011 Annual Report of the Research Committee on Epidemiologic, Bacteriologic and Clinical Studies of Cases of Food Poisoning due to STEC/O111.

3.7 Renal sequelae of HUS

Renal sequelae of HUS are albuminuria, proteinuria, decreased renal function and hypertension.
About 20–40% of HUS patients developed chronic kidney disease (CKD), a risk factor of end-stage kidney disease and cardiovascular complications. We recommend patient monitoring by examining albuminuria, proteinuria and measurement of blood pressure according to the severity in the acute phase:

(1) At least for fifteen years in patients who needed dialysis in acute phase, or anuria for more than 6 days.
(2) At least for fifteen years in patients under two years old at the onset, whose peak serum creatinine was higher than or equal to 1.5 mg/dL.
(3) Throughout the life in HUS patients who are positive for albuminuria, proteinuria, decreased renal function, or hypertension during follow-up.
(4) For 5 years in patients without any of the above mentioned conditions or renal sequelae.

[Grade of Recommendation: B]

Renal biopsy in the acute phase for HUS patients is not recommended, because the bleeding risk is high and pathological findings of the acute stage do not correlate to the renal prognosis.
[Grade of Recommendation: C2]

Comments

1. Renal sequelae

The mortality rate in the acute phase of HUS is 2–6 % in western countries [1] and 1.6 % in Japan [2]. Of the fatal cases, 88 % occurred in the acute phase [3]. The mortality rate has improved markedly by advances in acute renal replacement therapy and pediatric intensive care compared to the 1980s [a]. About 40 % of the HUS patients develop anuria [1] and approximately 40 % [b]–60 % [1, c] of the HUS patients required dialysis in the acute phase. A national survey between 2000 and 2001 in Japan revealed that oliguria or anuria was seen in 47 % and dialysis in 27 % of the patients [2]. Most patients who needed dialysis in the acute phase recovered their renal functions. About 20–40 % of the HUS patients, however, developed chronic kidney disease (CKD) for prolonged periods [4]. Since CKD is a risk factor of end-stage kidney disease and cardiovascular complications, continuous management is needed.

Mortality rate was 9 % and rate of end-stage kidney disease was 3 % based on a meta-analysis of 49 articles that covered 3,476 HUS patients between 1950 and 2001 [5]. Of the 2,372 survivors who were monitored for more than a year, 25 % were complicated by renal sequelae. The symptoms and frequency are as follows: decreased renal function 15.8 % (GFR; 60–80 mL/min/1.73 m^2: 8 %, 30–59 mL/min/1.73 m^2: 6 %, 5–29 mL/min/1.73 m^2: 1.8 %), proteinuria 15 % and hypertension 10 % (multiple answer) [5].

Albuminuria, a more sensitive indicator of renal damage than proteinuria, is useful for early detection of CKD in HUS patients. The frequency of albuminuria at three years [6] and mild renal dysfunction at 6 years [7] after the onset of HUS was high compared to normal control.

Hypertension is the most prominent renal sequela in HUS patients [8]. About 25 % manifested hypertension in the acute phase, while about 10 % did so in chronic periods [5]. Hypertension can also manifest without other complications, but hypertension usually develops in patients with proteinuria and renal dysfunction [9]. Monitoring the ambulatory blood pressure measurement (ABPM) for 24 h can reveal occult hypertension [10].

The frequency of renal sequelae is high in HUS patients and long-term renal prognosis is not always good. Therefore, follow-up of patients according to their condition is necessary.

2. Predictive factor of prognosis for renal function and follow-up

The risk factors of renal sequelae include oliguric or anuric period and dialysis period in acute phase [11]. When anuric period is over 7−10 days, renal sequelae such as proteinuria, renal dysfunction and hypertension increase

[12–15]. In addition, renal sequela correlates to the period of dialysis [5, 10]. The renal function can be decreased in patients who needed dialysis for more than 5 weeks [5].

11–16 % of the patients with HUS manifested renal dysfunction (<80 mL/min/1.73 m^2) during the follow-up period [5]. Furthermore, proteinuria and renal dysfunction manifested after 5 years in patients whose serum creatinine level was higher than 1.5 mg/mL in the acute phase [16].

As 951 children with gastrointestinal STEC O157 infection with no HUS did not manifest hypertension or microalbuminuria, long-term follow-up was not needed for these patients [17].

On the basis of the evidence above, we recommend follow-up of patients with HUS by examining albuminuria, proteinuria, and measurement of blood pressure according to the severity of the disease in the acute phase.

(1) At least for 15 years in patients who needed dialysis in acute phase, or anuria for more than 6 days.
(2) At least for 15 years in patients under 2 years old at the onset, whose peak serum creatinine was higher than or equal to 1.5 mg/dL.
(3) Throughout the life in HUS patients who are positive for albuminuria, proteinuria, decreased renal function, or hypertension during follow-up.
(4) For 5 years for patients without any of the above mentioned conditions or renal sequelae.

Renal pathological findings in the acute phase cannot predict long-term renal prognosis. However, examination of the kidney during the sub-acute phase revealed that patients with cortical necrosis and glomerular microangiopathy (covering more than 50 % of liver area) showed poor long-term renal prognosis (average 18 years) [13]. The indication for renal biopsy in the acute phase is to assist diagnosis [d], and surgical renal biopsy must be considered in the patients with high-risk bleedings. For patients with severe renal dysfunction and persistent proteinuria after the acute phase, renal pathological findings can produce important information for proper treatment. Renal biopsy in the acute phase for HUS patients is not usually recommended.

Supplementary articles

a. Johnson S, et al. Hemolytic uremic syndrome. In: Avner ED, Harmon WE, Niaudet P, Yoshikawa N (eds), Pediatric Nephrology 6th ed. pp. 1155–1180, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009
b. Remuzzi G, et al. The hemolytic uremic syndrome. Kidney Int. 1995;48:2–19.
c. Bakkaloglu SA, et al. Diseases of the Kidney and Urinary Tract in Children. Taal MW, Chertow GM, Marsden PA, Skorecki K, Yu ASL, Brenner BM ed, Brenner and Rector's The Kidney 9th ed. pp. 2622–2679, Elsevier, Philadelphia, 2012.
d. UpToDate: Treatment and prognosis of Shiga toxin associated (typical) hemolytic uremic syndrome in children. (Accessed on January 23, 2013)

3.8 Extra-renal sequelae in patients with HUS

> Patients with HUS can have extra-renal sequelae: sequelae of digestive system, diabetes mellitus, neurological complications, behavioral and cognitive sequelae or cardiovascular sequelae. It is important to conduct follow-up for HUS patients for at least five years after the acute illness. Long-term special care and treatment should be directed to patients with specific sequelae after the acute phase of HUS. [Grade of Recommendation: B]

Comments

1. Sequelae of digestive system

Cholelithiasis, persistent pancreatitis and colon stricture were reported in HUS patients as extra-renal sequelae [1]. Cholelithiasis is related to hemolysis or the use of parenteral nutrition in the acute illness. Pancreatic microthrombi can cause exocrine cell death resulting in persistent pancreatitis. Hemorrhagic colitis can cause severe inflammation of bowels leading to bowel stricture or obstruction. The transverse and ascending colon are most frequently affected. Bowel resection was indicated in patients with bowel stricture or obstruction who manifested persistent abdominal pain and severe constipation intractable to medication [2].

2. Diabetes mellitus

Pancreatic microthrombi can cause islet cell death resulting in diabetes mellitus. The incidence of diabetes mellitus during the acute phase of HUS was 1.7–3.2 % [3, 4]. HUS patients with severe disease (including the need for dialysis and CNS symptoms) were more likely to develop diabetes mellitus. Among those who developed diabetes mellitus, one-third had permanent diabetes mellitus. Relapse of diabetes mellitus can occur years after the acute illness. Patients with STEC infections who do not manifest HUS will not have diabetes mellitus.

3. Neurological sequelae

Convulsion and impaired consciousness in the acute phase of HUS are associated with severe renal damage [5]. In contrast, HUS patients with seizure or impaired consciousness in acute phase can recover without permanent neurological complications. Neurological outcomes including epilepsy, hemiplegia, cortical blindness and psychomotor disturbance were reported [6, 7].

4. Behavioral and cognitive sequelae

Patients who recovered from the acute phase of HUS can manifest mild behavioral and cognitive sequelae [8]. In

contrast, patients who did not manifest neurological complications in the acute phase of HUS did not manifest learning disability, behavioral disturbance and attention deficit [9].

5. Cardiovascular sequelae

Myocarditis, cardiac thrombotic microangiopathy, dilated cardiomyopathy, cardiac tamponade and ischemic myocardial involvement were reported as cardiovascular sequelae in HUS patients after the acute phase. However, the long-term outcome of these cardiac complications is not known [a, 10–12].

Secondary evidence

a. Siegler R. Cardiovascular involvement in the hemolytic uremic syndrome. In: Kaplan BS, Trompeter RS, Moake JL (eds), Hemolytic uremic syndrome and thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura. Dekker, New York, pp. 143–149, 1992.

4 Diagnosis and treatment of HUS in adults

4.1 Diagnosis of HUS in adults

1. The diagnosis of adult HUS

> There are a variety of etiologies in HUS in adults. Possibilities other than STEC-associated HUS should be explored particularly when it occurs in the absence of bloody diarrhea. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Comments

The etiologies of adult HUS differ from those in children. Most HUS are caused by secondary diseases such as thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura (TTP) associated with ADAMTS13 (a disintegrin-like and metalloproteinase with thrombospondin type 1 motifs 13) abnormality and various disorders that lead to aHUS [1–4, a–f] (Table 1). Oftentimes, it is difficult to distinguish between HUS and TTP at the onset, and plasmapheresis without delay being considered for most patients. Hence, at the stage of tentative diagnosis, the abbreviation of TTP/HUS (or HUS/TTP) is often used to describe the syndromes. Typical HUS caused by STX, which represents more than 90 % of HUS in children, is seen in only 5–10 % of the TTP/HUS cases in adults [a, b]. Table 12 shows the incidence of various TTP/HUS causes reported in the Japanese registry that covers mainly secondary causes [f].

STEC-associated HUS is usually considered in adult patients if they present with hemorrhagic diarrhea. Otherwise, other causes of secondary TTP/HUS should be explored. It is noteworthy that non-hemorrhagic diarrhea may be seen in about 30 % of non-STEC-associated HUS. On the contrary, hemorrhagic diarrhea can be seen when patients manifest ischemic colitis or peptic ulcers.

As shown in Table 12, the etiologies of TTP and atypical HUS varied and should be investigated according to the patient history and findings (see Sect. 5) [g]. DIC and malignant hypertension, and scleroderma kidney sometimes resemble HUS, but are usually diagnosed separately [a, d].

Prognosis of HUS in adults depends on its causes but is generally worse in the elderly patients. It was reported previously that the magnitude of renal damages could predict patient survival [4].

2. Treatment of HUS in adults

> We recommend treatment of underlying diseases and systemic supportive care for adult patients with HUS according to the guidelines for children. [Grade of Recommendation: B]
>
> We suggest initiating plasmapheresis without delay in adult patients with severe HUS, even if the etiology has not been determined. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]
>
> We suggest plasma infusion when plasmapheresis is not immediately available in adult patients with severe HUS. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Comments

The basis of treatment for adult patients with HUS is supportive care with careful systemic management similar to that for children. In addition, treatment of underlying diseases is of particular importance in adult TTP/HUS. Supportive management encompasses fluid infusion, transfusion of blood and its components, nutritional care and management of AKI including dialysis therapy [g]. The prognosis of TTP/HUS used to be very poor decades ago. However, it has since improved tremendously with the progress in supportive cares and the prevalent use of plasmapheresis [5–9, h]. Indication of plasmapheresis includes TTP with ADAMTS13 abnormality and most cases of complement-mediated aHUS (except for those caused by membrane cofactor protein/CD46 mutation) [9, g–i]. HUS secondary to certain drugs (ticlopidine, clopidogril, quinine) and HIV may also be indicated.

In contrast, HUS secondary to disseminated malignancy and most cases of hematological stem cell transplantation and STEC are not indicated. Plasmapheresis should be avoided for invasive pneumococcus-derived HUS usually seen in children, as anti-Thomsen-Friedenreich IgM antibody in serum may induce hemolysis that could exacerbate

the pathogenesis of HUS (see Sect. 5). In patients with HUS secondary to autoimmune diseases, or for refractory or severe cases, immunosuppressive therapy may be combined with plasmapheresis. Unfortunately, it will take some time before the etiology of HUS is clarified. Prognosis in such cases is extremely poor if the initiation of plasmapheresis is delayed even for one or 2 days. If the diagnosis of TTP and aHUS is highly suspected, we strongly recommend that plasmapheresis be initiated without delay even with no known etiologies. We suggest that patient serum be taken for the purpose of future diagnostic use. Plasmapheresis should be terminated immediately when the etiology has been revealed in which plasmapheresis is not indicated or contraindicated.

Plasmapheresis is to be performed daily at the beginning and continued until the platelet count in the blood has normalized. Thereafter, it should be arranged according to the platelet count in the blood and serum LDH level. Alternatively, plasma infusion may be considered when prompt plasmapheresis is not available [7]. It has been reported that platelet transfusion might induce formation of microvascular thrombosis, but an analysis of the data in Oklahoma TTP-HUS registry revealed no such effect [10]. Therefore, when the risk for bleeding from thrombocytopenia is relatively high, platelet transfusion can be employed after careful consideration.

In autoimmune diseases such as connective tissue disease, treatment with glucocorticoids and immunosuppressive drugs may be considered. The efficacy of rituximab is not established for TTP, but may be considered in refractory or relapsing cases with anti-ADAMTS13 antibody [h]. Antiplatelet agents have not been shown to be effective for TTP and aHUS [h].

Supplementary articles

a. UpToDate: Causes, Diagnosis, and Treatment of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura-hemolytic uremic syndrome in adults. (Accessed on July 24, 2012)
b. Noris M, et al. Hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2005;16:1035–1050.
c. Clark WF, et al. Attending rounds: microangiopathic hemolytic anemia with renal insufficiency. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2012;7:343–347.
d. Kagami S, et al. Diagnostic criteria of atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Nihon Jinzo Gakkai Shi. 2013;55:91–93.
e. Fujimura Y, et al. Registry of 919 Patients with Thrombotic Microangiopathies across Japan: Database of Nara Medical University during 1998-2008. Intern Med 2010;49:7–15.
f. George JN. How I treat patients with thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura: 2010. Blood 2010;116:4060–4069.
g. Taylor CM, et al. On behalf of a working party from the Renal Association, the British Committee for Standards in Haematology and the British Transplantation Society: Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of atypical Haemolytic Uraemic Syndrome in the United Kingdom. Br J Haematol. 2012;148:37–47.
h. Scully M, et al. On behalf of British Committee for Standards in Haematology: Guidelines on the diagnosis and management of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura and other thrombotic microangiopathies. Br J Haematol. 2012;158:323–335.

4.2 Diagnosis and treatment of STEC-associated HUS in adults

1. Clinical features of STEC-associated HUS in adults

> STEC-associated HUS may occur in an outbreak or sporadically in adults, although the incidence is lower compared to in children. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]
>
> Elderly people with STEC infection are likely to develop HUS and prognosis is usually poor for such cases. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Comments

STEC infection is seen in 5–10 % of adult TTP/HUS [a]. Sporadic and community-based infection may occur, with outbreaks being reported in elderly nursing homes. Currently, it is still not known why sporadic infection is seen more frequently in females together with slightly higher incidence of outbreak [1, 2]. O157 is the most common specie that causes HUS in adult, and the same is observed in children. However, O104 in Germany and O111 in Japan accounted for the majority of adult cases [b]. Other species such as O111, O145, O26 and O121 have been reported before [a]. The Oklahoma TTP/HUS registry showed that in comparison with children, 21 adult cases (21–89 years with a median of 59 years) showed more severe manifestations in the CNS, anemia, thrombocytopenia and poor prognosis, although the degree of AKI was similar between adults and children [1].

In the outbreak of O104 in Germany in 2011, there were almost no differences in clinical features between the cases with and without HUS. The incidence of HUS was lower in adults (average 37 years) than in childhood cases, although hemorrhagic diarrhea was seen more frequently [2]. The reason has not been elucidated; the differential expression of Gb3 receptor for STX in the intestines, which was suggested in animal studies, has not been examined in human cases of HUS [c]. For adults with HUS, it was seen mainly in females.

Outbreak of STEC infection may occur among elderly people in facilities like nursing home, and ages older than 65 years are reported as a risk factor for development of HUS in patients infected with STEC [3]. Therefore, elderly patients with STEC infection should be managed more carefully from the onset. If they present with HUS, systemic treatment should be initiated without delay. Possible

explanations as to why elderly people with infection show poor outcome include decreased antibody titers against STX [4] and reduced defense mechanisms against infection in the stomach. The latter is most likely to be caused by reduced gastric juice secretion, gastrectomy and the use of antacid agents [3].

2. Treatment of adult HUS caused by STEC infection

> We recommend treatment of underlying diseases and systemic supportive care for adult patients with STEC-associated HUS according to guidelines for childhood cases. [Grade of Recommendation: B]
>
> We suggest plasmapheresis or combined therapy of immunoadsorption with IgG infusion in adult patients with severe STEC-associated HUS presented with CNS involvement. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]
>
> For STEC-associated HUS in adults, no evidence is present for the use of antibiotics and eculizumab. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Table 12 Etiology and prevalence of HUS in adults [e]

TTP (ADAMTS13 deficiency and anti- ADAMTS13 antibody) 30–40 %
STEC-HUS 4–10 %
Others (atypical HUS) 50–60 %
Hereditary (abnormality of complement-regulated gene and others) No data available
Idiopathic
Drugs
Antiplatelet drugs: ticlopidine, clopidogril
Anticancer drugs: mitomycin C, gemcitabine
Calcineurin inhibitors: cyclosporine, tacrolimus
Quinine
Pregnancy (HELLP syndrome, pregnancy-associated hypertension, etc.)
Infection (HIV, streptococcus pneumonia, influenza virus, etc.)
Autologous hematological stem cell transplantation
Connective tissue disease (SLE, anti-phospholipid antibody syndrome, systemic sclerosis, etc.)
Malignancy (malignant lymphoma, gastric cancer, etc.)
Others

Comments

Basic management for adult patients with STEC-associated HUS is similar to that for childhood cases. It includes systemic supportive care such as fluid infusion, transfusion of blood and its components, nutritional care and management of AKI. In severe cases, intensive care with respiratory and circulatory management is mandatory. In some reports, plasmapheresis was shown to be beneficial for the improvement of patient survival [5, 6]. In the outbreak of O104 in Denmark in 2011, plasmapheresis was reported to be effective for patients with neurological disturbances showing consciousness loss or convulsion [6]. In contrast, plasmapheresis did not show any efficacy in the 2011 German outbreak of O104 [7]. These are contradicting reports with regard to the efficacy of plasmapheresis. Randomized controlled trials are therefore necessary to determine the efficacy and indication for plasmapheresis. Overall, we suggest performing plasmapheresis for severe patients with poor prognosis who have no other suitable treatment options.

It was reported recently that a combined therapy of immunoadsorption and IgG infusion was effective for 12 HUS patients with severe neurological disturbances [8], and that efficacy was observed even in the patients who were refractory to treatment with plasmapheresis. Although the study has a limited patient number, such combined therapy may be considered for adult patients with refractory cases of severe HUS with neurological disturbances. While it remains unknown which treatment of immunoabsorption and IgG infusion is more important, there was a report that IgG infusion alone was not effective in childhood cases [d].

There are several reports showing the use of antibiotics may worsen the prognosis of HUS patients. On the other hand, it has recently been reported that azithromycin may shorten the duration of bacteremia in adult patients with O104-associated HUS [9], although it did not affect renal and patient survival [9]. In the 2011 German outbreak of 104, it was reported that involvement of the CNS was less as a result of antibiotics use. HUS patients treated with a multiple regimen of antibiotics has better prognosis than those who were not [7]. However, there are no other reports suggesting the usefulness of antibiotic therapy. As such, the efficacy of antibiotics remains to be clarified.

Eculizumab has been used for patients with STEC-associated HUS to suppress activated complement system, and showed good efficacy in childhood cases [10]. However, no efficacy was observed in the cohort study of adult cases (average age 47.7) in the O104 outbreak shown above [7]. We have decided not to show recommendation grade for antibiotics and eculizumab. More evidence is clearly required to determine its efficacy.

Supplementary articles

a. Noris M, et al. Hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2005;16:1035–1050.
b. Sata T. Epidemiologic, microbiological and clinical research in cases of EHEC/O111 food poisoning. Research Report 2011, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific research from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan.

c. Mobassaleh M, et al. Developmentally regulated Gb3 galactosyltransferase and a-galactosidase determine Shiga toxin receptors in intestine. Am J Physiol. 1994;267:G618–G624.
d. Remuzzi G, et al. The hemolytic uremic syndrome. Kidney Int. 1995;48:2–19.

5 Diagnosis and treatment of atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome (aHUS)

5.1 The diagnosis of aHUS

aHUS is a type of HUS characterized by a triad of microangiopathic hemolytic anemia, thrombocytopenia and AKI; and excludes STEC-associated HUS and TTP caused by markedly decreased ADAMTS13. [Grade of Recommendation: Not Graded]

Diagnostic criteria
Definite:
Definitive diagnosis of aHUS based on the presence of the complete triad, but an absence of STEC infection and TTP caused by a marked decrease of ADAMTS13.

1. Microangiopathic hemolytic anemia: the level of hemoglobin (Hb) is less than 10 g/dL (We defined microangiopathic hemolytic anemia as an Hb level of less than 10 g/dL. At diagnosis, the presence of microangiopathic hemolysis should be confirmed on the basis of reference data including elevation of LDH level, a markedly decreased serum haptoglobin level, and the presence of schistocytes in blood smears.)
2. Thrombocytopenia: a platelet count of less than 150,000/μL
3. AKI in pediatric case: a serum creatinine level exceeding 1.5-fold the reference value by age and gender issued by the Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology.

Probable:
Probable diagnosis is based on the presence of two components of the triad with the exclusion of STEC infection and TTP caused by a marked decrease of ADAMTS13.

Comments

aHUS has been traditionally regarded as a disease concept that excludes STX-associated HUS, the most common form of HUS in children. aHUS is a heterogeneous disorder responsible for only 10 % of cases in children. An increased number of cases of aHUS have been reported to develop from the pathogenesis of HUS. In the present guidelines, we followed and adopted the diagnostic criteria established by the Joint Committee of the Japanese Society of Nephrology and the Japanese Society of Pediatrics [a]. In view of the unreliability of diarrhea as a distinguishing feature, aHUS should be suspected if the following characteristics are present, irrespective of whether diarrhea is present: (1) Patient is less than 6 months of age, (2) disease recurrence, (3) latent onset, (4) familial history of the disease with food poisoning excluded. Classification of aHUS is shown in Table 13 [b]. For differential diagnosis of aHUS, examinations should be planned with understanding of the characteristics of the causative disease for HUS.

1. Invasive pneumococcal infection

Invasive pneumococcal infection is defined as severe pneumococcal disease manifested as severe pneumonia, meningitis, bacteremia, sepsis, empyema, and other conditions. The pathogenesis of pneumococci-associated HUS has been suggested to involve the release of *N*-acetylneuraminidase, which cleaves *N*-acetylneuraminic acid in the glycocalyx, resulting in the exposure of the Thomsen-Friedenreich antigen on red blood cells, platelets, and glomeruli. Thomsen-Friedenreich antigen is recognized by a natural IgM antibody normally present in plasma leading to polyagglutination of the patient's red cells and hemolysis [c]. For diagnosis of pneumococci-associated HUS, identification of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* is necessary by culture, as well as detection of Thomsen-Friedenreich antigen on red cells [d].

2. Disorder of regulatory components of the complement system

Dysregulatory changes in complement system components should be estimated through measurement of homolytic complement activity (CH50), assay of complement protein and complement regulatory protein, detection of auto-antibody against complement factor H (CFH), and measurement of membrane cofactor protein (MCP, CD46) expression level on monocytes [e]. Thereafter, genetic complement-associated HUS can be definitively diagnosed through gene analysis of complement proteins and complement regulatory proteins. However, missense mutations of complement proteins typically result in functional impairment without affecting serum complement protein levels [f]. Therefore, analysis of known candidate genes is recommended, if possible.

3. Deficiency of ADAMTS13

ADAMTS13 deficiency consists of two types, congenital type (Upshaw-Schulman syndrome) and acquired type due to its inhibitor, anti-ADAMTS13 antibody. A marked decrease of ADAMTS13 activity to a level of less than 5 % has been demonstrated in 60–90 % of patients with TTP. Therefore, patients with congenital or acquired TTP should be diagnosed and ruled by measuring the activity of ADAMTS13 and its inhibitor.

4. Cobalamine metabolism abnormality

Inborn error of cobalamine C metabolism is a rare cause of HUS, especially in young infants (less than 6 months of age). The diagnosis is suggested by a marked increase of homocysteine and a decrease of methionine demonstrated by plasma amino acid chromatography.

5. Recessive mutation in diacylglycerol kinase ε (DGKE) gene

Mutations in diacylglycerol kinase ε (DGKE) gene were identified using exome sequencing in four patients with aHUS [g]. Most patients with DGKE gene mutation presented with aHUS in the first year of life show episodes of relapse before 5 years of age. It was reported that 13 (27 %) of 49 patients with aHUS in the first year of life had DGKE gene mutations and that three of six familial disease kindreds had these mutations. Affected individuals present with aHUS in the first year of life have persistent hypertension, hematuria and proteinuria (sometimes in the nephrotic range), and commonly show progression to CKD stage 4 and 5 by the second decade of life. Therefore, DGKE gene mutations should be suspected if characteristic symptoms such as hypertension, hematuria and proteinuria occur after recovery from aHUS attacks, and that there are no pathogenic mutations in known aHUS-related genes or antibodies against CFH.

6. HIV infection

Definitive diagnosis is performed by serological test for anti-HIV antibody.

7. Others

Definitive diagnosis is performed with various examinations including serological examinations for anti-nuclear antibody and anti-phospholipid antibody.

5.2 Treatment of aHUS

Treatment of aHUS includes supportive therapy for control of overall body conditions and specific therapy for the causative disease. [Grade of Recommendation: B]

(1) Pneumococcal-associated aHUS

Plasma therapy, including plasma exchange and plasma infusion with fresh frozen plasma, should be avoided in therapy for pneumococcal-associated HUS as plasma (which contains natural IgM-class antibodies against Thomsen-Friedenreich antigen) may aggravate hemolysis. It is preferable to transfuse washed RBC or platelets. [Grade of Recommendation: D]

(2) aHUS associated with complement dysregulation and other abnormalities

The guideline indicates that plasma therapy, including plasma exchange and plasma infusion, should be started as soon as possible at diagnosis of aHUS (excluding cobalamine metabolism disorder and pneumococcal-associated HUS). [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Patients diagnosed with aHUS (based on the diagnostic criteria proposed by the Joint Committee of the Japanese Society of Nephrology and the Japanese Society of Pediatrics) should be treated with eclizumab. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Living-related donor transplantation should not be performed in patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD) due to aHUS. [Grade of Recommendation: C2]

Preventive plasma therapy should be performed in the perioperative period for patients with ESRD due to aHUS undergoing cadaveric unrelated renal transplantation. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Prophylactic eclizumab administration in the perioperative period is acceptable for patients with ESRD due to aHUS and undergoing cadaveric unrelated renal transplantation. [Grade of Recommendation: C1]

Table 13 Classification of aHUS (excluding TTP due to ADAM-TS13 deficiency)

1. Advanced Etiology
(i) Infection induced
Streptococcus pneumoniae infection
(ii) Disorders of complement regulation
Genetic disorders of complement regulation: complement factor H (CFH), complement factor I (CFI), membrane cofactor protein (MCP, CD46), C3, complement factor B (CFB), thrombomodulin
Acquired disorders of complement regulation: auto-antibody
(iii) Defective cobalamine metabolism
(iv) DGKE mutation
(v) Quinine induced
2. Clinical associations
(i) HIV
(ii) Malignancy, cancer chemotherapy, ionizing radiation
(iii) Transplantation, Immunosuppressant use
(iv) Pregnancy: HELLP syndrome
(v) Autoimmune disease, collagen disease
(vi) Others

Comments

As described in Sect. 5.1, aHUS has several etiologies that can affect presentation, management and outcome. Supportive care including dialysis and various type of intensive care to control patient's general conditions is important, as is the case for STEC-associated HUS. Specific therapy is needed for various etiologies. Therefore, we have described the importance of supportive care for treatment of patients with aHUS in the opening statement of this guideline.

1. Pneumococci-associated aHUS

Children with pneumococci-associated HUS are usually younger at presentation and show a more severe course than those with STEC-associated HUS. The mortality rate of pneumococci-associated HUS in the acute phase has been reported to be 12.5 % [c], and 26 % [l]. It has been reported that 10.1 % [c], with 8 % of patients develop end-stage renal disease [l]. These rates are between two to three times higher than those for STEC-associated HUS. As for the pathophysiology of pneumococci-associated HUS, it has been proposed that neuraminidase, produced by pneumococci, cleaves *N*-acetyl neuraminic acid from the cell surface of erythrocytes, platelets, and glomerular endothelial cells, exposing the Thomsen–Friedenreich antigen. The latter is identified by a natural IgM antibody as a normal plasma constituent that initiates the cascade of events leading to HUS. Transfusion of plasma products containing anti-Thomsen–Friedenreich IgM antibodies further accelerates hemolysis, and such cases have been documented [2, 3]. The reported morbidity rate of CKD or end-stage renal disease is significantly lower in patients treated with washed blood products than in those treated with unwashed products [1]. These circumstances dictate that plasma therapy, including plasma infusion and plasma exchange with fresh frozen plasma, should not be performed in patients with pneumococci-associated HUS. Washed blood products should be used for blood transfusion and filler in the dialysis circuit for infant dialysis.

2. aHUS associated with complement dysregulation and other abnormalities

The guideline recommends that daily plasma therapy, including plasma exchange and plasma infusion, should be started at the point of diagnosis of aHUS (excluding cobalamine metabolism disorder for which vitamin B12 supplementation is the established therapy) [d, h]. Plasma exchange is commonly undertaken daily using 1.5–2 plasma volume per session, employing fresh frozen plasma. Plasma exchange is more efficient than plasma infusion, as the former supplies a large amount of normal complement regulatory protein, avoids any risk of volume overload, and removes fluid-phase causative agents (such as abnormal complement regulatory proteins, anti-CFH antibodies, inflammatory cytokines, and other triggers of platelet hyperaggregability) [f, h]. The results of a case series study suggested that the response to short-term plasma therapy varies according to genotype [j, k, 4, 5]. Patients with CFH mutations have the poorest prognosis. On the other hand, patients with MCP mutations have the best short-term prognosis, with 90 % of such patients reported to survive and remain dialysis-free in the long term [4]. Therefore, in patients with MCP mutations, plasma therapy does not affect outcome. This is consistent with the fact that MCP is not a circulating complement regulatory protein.

In the patients with mutations in genes for complement proteins and their regulators, the outcome of kidney transplantation is poor; overall risk of aHUS recurrence after kidney transplantation is about 50 %, and the risk of graft loss occurs in 80–90 % of patients with recurrence [l–n, 6]. The outcomes of kidney transplantation vary according to the type of mutated gene, being poor inpatients with CFH, complement factor I (CFI), C3 mutations. In contrast, kidney graft outcome is reportedly favorable, and disease recurrence rates are low in patients with MCP mutations, due to the fact that MCP is a transmembrane protein and that kidney grafts show normal expression of MCP [6]. The efficacies and benefits of plasma therapy in the perioperative period have been reported in some case series, with the purpose of preventing aHUS recurrence after kidney transplantation [l–n]. Therefore, preventive perioperative plasma therapy is recommended when

performing kidney transplantation for patients with complement-associated HUS. These data, together with the higher rates of disease recurrence, suggest that living kidney transplantation is not recommended for patients with mutations of CFH, CFI, complement factor B (CFB) and C3. In particular, living-related kidney transplantation is contraindicated, as a living-related donor may be a carrier of mutations and may be at risk of developing de novo aHUS after kidney donation.

As CFH, CFI, CFB and C3 are synthesized in the liver or liver-kidney, combined transplantation has been proposed as a logical curative intervention for severe complement-associated HUS in patients harboring mutations of those complement proteins. There have been over 10 combined liver-kidney transplants [o, p, 7–12], and a few successful cases have been reported [10–12]. However, as data on patient outcome are limited, it is not possible to draw reliable conclusions on this type of transplantation.

Mutations of complement protein components of the alternative complement pathway, including CFH, CFI and MCP, have been reported in many cases of aHUS [f]. The proposed pathological mechanism for the development of HUS is uninhibited continuous activation of the alternative pathway, resulting in the formation of membrane attack comples (MAC, C5–9). Eculizumab, a recombinant monoclonal humanized IgG antibody that targets C5, blocks the cleavage of C5a–C5b, ultimately preventing generation of the proinflammatory peptide C5b, and the cytotoxic MAC. Therefore, eculizmab blocks the complement terminal pathway. Two prospective single-arm studies involving adult patients, and one retrospective study involving pediatric patients, have been performed to investigate the efficacy of eculizumab for aHUS [q]. In the autumn of 2011, the use of eculizumab for treatment of aHUS was approved in the USA and Europe based on the results of these studies [q]. Many reports have described the efficacy of eculizumab for patients with plasma therapy-resistant aHUS [13–15], and its long-term preventive effect against aHUS recurrence after kidney transplantation [16–20]. These reports suggest that eculizumab may be highly beneficial for patients with aHUS and also for prevention of aHUS recurrence after kidney transplantation. However, blockade of the complement terminal pathway by eculizumab increases the risk of infection by encapsulated bacteria, including *Neisseria meningitidis, Haemophilus influenza* type B, and *Streptococcus pneumoniae.* In particular, *Neisseria meningitidis* infection is life-threatening. Patients must be vaccinated against it at least 2 weeks before being treated with eculizumab. If this is not possible, adequate antibiotics, including ciproxan, should be administered prophylactically [r]. Moreover, in children, it should be ascertained if they have been vaccinated against *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Haemophilus influenza* type B. If not, such vaccination ought to be considered [s]. In Japan, the use of eculizumab for treatment of thrombotic microangiopathy due to aHUS was approved in September 2013. Accurate diagnosis of aHUS is important before initiating treatment with eculizumab, as stated in the packaging insert for the agent: "Examine carefully the appropriateness of eculizumab administration and start the medication based on sufficient understanding of its efficacy and safety" and "Appropriate diagnosis based on diagnostic criteria established by the Joint Committee of the Japanese Society of Nephrology and the Japanese Society of Pediatrics is necessary for use of eculizumab" [s]. With regard to these guidelines, Tables 14 and 15 show the recommended dosages and regimens stated in the packaging insert [s].

Table 14 Dosing recommendation of eclizumab for the patients with aHUS

Patient age and body weight	Induction	Maintenance
18 years and older	900 mg weekly for the first 4 weeks	1200 mg at week 5; then 1200 mg every 2 weeks
Less than 18 years		
40 kg and over	900 mg weekly × 4 doses	1200 mg at week 5; then 1200 mg every 2 weeks
30 kg to less than 40 kg	600 mg weekly × 2 doses	900 mg at week 3; then 900 mg every 2 weeks
20 kg to less than 30 kg	600 mg weekly × 2 doses	600 mg at week 3; then 600 mg every 2 weeks
10 kg to less than 20 kg	600 mg weekly × 1 dose	300 mg at week 2; then 300 mg every 2 weeks
5 kg to less than 10 kg	300 mg weekly × 1 dose	300 mg at week 2; then 300 mg every 3 weeks

Treatment with eculizumab is highly effective for patients who depend on or resist to plasma exchange, as well as for those whose risks of plasma exchange outweigh the benefits (e.g. allergic reaction to plasma products, technical difficulties in achieving vascular access). For these patients, treatment with eculizumab may become a first line strategy in Japan, just as it has been reported in the USA and Europe [t]. So far, however, only three cases have been examined in a clinical trial and only a handful of cases have been treated with eculizumab through private importation in Japan. Since the efficacy and safety of treatment with eculizumab for Japanese aHUS patients is still unclear, we have decided on a recommendation grade of C1 for treatment with eculizumab. The treatment protocol for aHUS and preventive therapy protocol for disease recurrence after kidney transplantation may change once treatment experience with eculizumab has been accumulated.

Table 15 Supplemental dose of eculizumab after plasma exchange/plasma infusion

	Most recent eculizumab dose	Supplemental eculizumab dose	Timing of supplemental eculizumab dose
Plasma exchange	300 mg	300 mg per plasma exchange session	Within 60 min after each plasma exchange
	600 mg and over	600 mg per plasma exchange session	
Fresh frozen Plasma infusion	300 mg and over	300 mg per fresh fozen plasma infusion session	60 min prior to fresh frozen plasma infusion session

Eculizumab may be partially lost from plasma due to plasma exchange, and fresh frozen plasma includes complement factor 5 (C5). Therefore, eculizumab supplementations within 60 min after each plasma exchange session or at 60 min before fresh frozen plasma infusion should be considered (dosage shown in Table 15). As the supplemental dose of eculizumab is estimated on the basis of simulation results, it is necessary to observe patients carefully post eculizumab supplementation

In 2013, mutations in the gene coding for DGKE were reported as a cause of aHUS [f]. It is not obvious whether complement activation has a role in patients with DGKE mutations, because DKGE encodes an intracellular enzyme. Moreover, two patients with DGKE mutations have been reported to show recurrent aHUS while receiving anticomplement therapy including eculizumab and plasma infusion. To date, two allografts have survived for 2 years. In three cases of cadaveric kidney transplantation, the patients survived for 4 years. One allograft failed after 6 years due to chronic rejection. It is notable that there were no cases of aHUS recurrence. Additionally, DKGE mutations have been reported to cause membrane proliferative glomerulonephritis with thrombotic microangiopathy [t]. Further analysis is necessary to clarify the pathogenesis and clinical course of aHUS in patients with DGKE mutations.

Supplementary articles

a. Kagami S, et al. Diagnostic criteria of atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Nihon Jinzo Gakkai Shi. 2013;55:91–93.
b. Besbas N, et al. A classification of hemolytic uremic syndrome and thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura and related disorders. Kidney Int. 2006;70:423–431.
c. Copelovitch L, et al. Streptococcus pneumonia-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2008;23:1951–1956.
d. Ariceta G, et al. Guideline for the investigation and initial therapy of diarrhea-negative hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2009;24:687–696.
e. Sánchez-Corral P, et al. Functional analysis in serum from atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome patients reveals impaired protection of host cells associated with mutations with factor H. Mol Immunol. 2004;41:81–84.
f. Loirat C, et al. Atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2011;6:60–89.
g. Lemaire M, F et al. Recessive mutations in *DKGE* cause atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Nat. Genet. 2013;45:531–536.
h. Taylor CM, et al. On behalf of a working party from the Renal Association, the British Committee for Standards in Haematology and the British Transplantation Society: Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of atypical haemolytic uraemic syndrome in the United Kingdom. Br J Haematol. 2009;148:37–47.
i. Loirat C, et al. Plasmatherapy in atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Semin Thrombo Hemost. 2010;36:673–681.
j. Noris M, et al. Atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome. N Eng J Med. 2009;361:1676–1687.
k. Loirat C, et al. Complement and the atypical hemolytic syndrome in children. Pediatr Nephrol. 2008;23:1957–1972.
l. Bresin E, et al. Outcome of renal transplantation in patients with Non-Shiga-Toxin associated hemolytic uremic syndrome: prognostic significance of background. Clin J Am Nephrol. 2006;1:88–89.
m. Loirat C, et al. Hemolytic uremic syndrome recurrence after renal transplantation. Pediatr Transpl. 2008;12:619–629.
n. Noris M, et al. Thrombotic microangiopathy after kidney transplantation. Am J Transpl. 2010;10:1517–1523.
o. Sánchez-Coral P, et al. Advances in understanding the aetiology of atypical haemolytic syndrome. Br J Haematol. 2010;150:529–542.
p. Saland JM, et al. Liver-kidney transplantation to cure atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2009;20:940–949.
q. UpToDate: Atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome in children. (Accessed on April 17, 2012)
r. Schmidtko J, et al. Treatment of atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome and thrombotic microangiopathies: A focus on eculizumab. Am J Kidney Dis. 2013;61:289–299.
s. Soliris® (eculizumab) Concentrated solution for intravenous infusion. Japanese Package Insert.
t. Ozaltin F, et al. DGKE variants cause a glomerular microangiopathy that mimics membranoproliferative GN. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2013;24:377–384.

Acknowledgments These guidelines were supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare of Japan (Research fund for emerging and re-emerging infections including new types of influenza infection; Study group for pathological factors in severe form of enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* infections and the generalization of therapy. # H24-Shinkou-Ippan-012, head: Makoto Ohnishi).

References

1 Diagnosis and treatment of Shiga toxin producing *Escherichia coli* infection

1.1 Diagnosis of Shiga toxin producing *Escherichia coli* infection

1. Saito T, et al. Reported cases of hemorrhagic uremic syndrome associated with EHEC infection in 2008-NESID. IASR 2009;30:122–123. [in Japanese] (level 5)

2. Komiya N, et al. Reported cases of hemorrhagic uremic syndrome associated with EHEC infection in 2008-NESID. IASR. 2010;31:170–172. [in Japanese] (level 5)
3. Saito T, et al. Reported cases of hemorrhagic uremic syndrome associated with EHEC infection in 2010-NESID. IASR 2011;32:141–143. [in Japanese] (level 5)
4. Saito T, et al. Reported cases of hemorrhagic uremic syndrome associated with EHEC infection in 2011-NESID. IASR. 2012;33:128–130. [in Japanese] (level 5)
5. Kamioka I, et al. Risk factors for developing severe clinical course in HUS patients: a national survey in Japan. Pediatr Int. 2008;50:441–446. (level 4)

1.2 Treatment of STEC infection

1. Safdar N, et al. Risk of hemolytic uremic syndrome after antibiotic treatment of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 enteritis: a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2002;288:996–1001. (level 2)
2. Proulx F, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of antibiotic therapy for *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 enteritis. J Pediatr. 1992;121:299–303. (level 2)
3. Menne J, et al. EHEC-HUS consortium: Validation of treatment strategies for enterohaemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O104:H4 induced haemolytic uraemic syndrome: case–control study. BMJ. 2012;345:e4565. (level 4)
4. Smith KE, et al. Antibiotic treatment of Escherichia coli O157 infection and the risk of hemolytic uremic syndrome, Minnesota. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2012;31:37–41. (level 4)
5. Wong CS, et al. The risk of the hemolytic-uremic syndrome after antibiotic treatment of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections. N Engl J Med. 2000;342:1930–1936. (level 4)
6. Wong CS, et al. Risk factors for the hemolytic uremic syndrome in children infected with *Escherichia coli* O157:H7: a multivariable analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2012;55:33–41. (level 4)
7. Dundas S, et al. The central Scotland *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 outbreak: risk factors for the hemolytic uremic syndrome and death among hospitalized patients. Clin Infect Dis. 2001;33:923–931. (level 4)
8. Shiomi M, et al. Effect of early oral fluoroquinolones in hemorrhagic colitis due to *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. Pediatr Int. 1999;41:228–232. (level 4)
9. Ikeda K, et al. Effect of early fosfomycin treatment on prevention of hemolytic uremic syndrome accompanying *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infection. Clin Nephrol. 1999;52:357–362. (level 4)
10. Bell BP, et al. Predictors of hemolytic uremic syndrome in children during a large outbreak of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections. Pediatrics. 1997;100:E12. (level 4)
11. Cimolai N, et al. A continuing assessment of risk factors for the development of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clin Nephrol. 1994;42:85–89. (level 4)
12. Cimolai N, et al. Risk factors for the central nervous system manifestations of gastroenteritis-associated hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Pediatrics. 1992;90:616–621. (level 4)

2 Diagnosis of HUS

2.1 Diagnosis procedure

1. Kawamura N, et al. Risk factors for the development of *Escherichia coli* O157: H7 associated with hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Int. 1999;41:218–222. (level 4)
2. Kamioka I, et al. Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology: Risk factors for developing severe clinical course in HUS patients: a national survey in Japan. Pediatr Int. 2008;50:441–446. (level 4)
3. Oakes RS, et al. Predictors of fatality in postdiarrheal hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatrics. 2006;117:1656–1662. (level 4)

2.2 Assessment of acute kidney injury (AKI)

1. Kamioka I, et al. Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology. Risk factors for developing severe clinical course in HUS patients: a national survey in Japan. Pediatr Int. 2008;50:441–446. (level 4)
2. Gerber A, et al. Clinical course and the role of shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* infection in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome in pediatric patients, 1997–2000, in Germany and Austria: a prospective study. J Infect Dis. 2002;15:493–500. (level 4)
3. Balestracci A, et al. Dehydration at admission increased the need for dialysis in hemolytic uremic syndrome children. Pediatr Nephrol. 2012;27:1407–1410. (level 4)
4. Hickey CA, et al. Early volume expansion during diarrhea and relative nephroprotection during subsequent hemolytic uremic syndrome. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2011;165:884–889. (level 4)

2.3 Diagnosis of encephalopathy

1. Gasser C, et al. Haemolytisch-uraemische syndrome: Bilaterale nierenrindennekrosen bei akuten erworbenen haemolytischen anaemien. Schweiz Med Wochenschr. 1955;85:905–909. (level 5)
2. Akashi S, et al. An outbreak of *Escherichia coli* associated colitis in a kindergarten. Committee for epidemiological study of epidemic diarrhea due to pathogenic *E. coli* in a kindergarten, Saitama, Japan. J Jpn Pediatr Soc. 1991;95:2607–2615. [in Japanese] (level 5)
3. Siegler RL. Spectrum of extrarenal involvement in postdiarrheal hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1994;125:511–518. (level 5)
4. Furuse A. Clinical analysis of the cases complicated with central nervous system involvement in diarrhea associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. J Jpn Pediatr Soc. 2006;110:919–925. [in Japanese] (level 5)
5. Sheth KJ, et al. Neurologic involvement in hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Ann Neurol. 1986;19:90–93. (level 5)
6. Bale CP, et al. CNS manifestations of the hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Am J Dis Child. 1980;134:869–872. (level 5)
7. Theobald I, et al. Central nervous system involvement in hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS)–a retrospective analysis of cerebral CT and MRI studies. Clin Nephrol. 2001;56:S3–8. (level 5)
8. Steinborn M, et al. CT and MRI in haemolytic uraemic syndrome with central nervous system involvement: distribution of lesions and prognostic value of imaging findings. Pediatr Radiol. 2004;34:805–810. (level 5)
9. Donnerstag F, et al. Patterns in early diffusion-weighted MRI in children with haemolytic uraemic syndrome and CNS involvement. Eur Radiol. 2012;22:506–513. (level 5).
10. Dhuna A, et al. EEG and seizures in children with hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Epilepsia. 1992;33:482–486. (level 5)
11. Shiraishi M, et al. Soluble tumor necrosis factor receptor 1 and tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase-1 in hemolytic uremic syndrome with encephalopathy. J Neuroimmunol. 2008;196:147–152. (level 4)
12. Shimizu M, et al. Cytokine profiles of patients with enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O111-induced hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Cytokine. 2012;60:694–700. (level 4)
13. Crisp DE, et al. Hemorrhagic cerebral infarction in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1981;99:273–276. (level 5)
14. DiMario FJ, et al. Lacunar infarction of the basal ganglia as a complication of hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Clin Pediatr. 1987;26:586–590. (level 5)

2.4 Acute-phase extrarenal complication (excluding encephalopathy)

1. Spinale JM, et al. Long-term outcomes of Shiga toxin hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol 2013 Jan 4. [Epub ahead of print]. (level 4)
2. Habib R, et al. Hemolytic-uremic syndrome in children and arterial hypertension. Arch Mal Coeur Vaiss. 1981;74:37–43. (level 5)
3. Siegler RL, et al. Hemolytic-uremic syndrome in adolescents. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 1997;151:165–169. (level 4)
4. Friedland JA, et al. *Escherichia coli* O157: H7-associated hemolytic-uremic syndrome: Value of colonic color Doppler sonography. Pediatr Radiol. 1995;25:S65–S67. (level 5)
5. Bernard A, et al. Digestive manifestations in hemolytic uremic syndrome in children. Arch Pediatr. 1996;3:533–540. (level 4)
6. Yoden A. Echographic significance in gastrointestinal disease. Jp J Pediatric Medicine. 1999;31:1700–1707. [in Japanese]. (level 5)
7. Crabbe DCG, et al. Gastrointestinal complications of the haemolytic uraemic syndrome. J Roy Soc Med. 1990;83:773–775. (level 5)
8. de Buys Roessingh AS, et al. Gastrointestinal complications of post-diarrheal hemolytic uremic syndrome. Eur J Pediatr Surg. 2007;17:328–334. (level 4)
9. Brandt JR, et al. Cholelithiasis following *Escherichia coli* O157: H7-assosiated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 1998;12:222–225. (level 4)
10. Nagita A, et al. Report on nine cases of gallbladder calculus disease. J Jpn Pediatric Society. 1993;97:2140–2144. [in Japanese] (level 5)
11. Yamazaki T, et al. Case Report of Two-year-old Boy with Bile-duct Stones Associated with Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome. J Jpn Pediatric Society. 1996;103:865–868. [in Japanese] (level 5)
12. Spizirri FD, et al. Childhood hemolytic uremic syndrome in Argentina: Long-term follow-up and prognostic features. Pediatr Nephrol. 1997;11:156–160. (level 4)
13. Poulton J, et al. Dilated cardiomyopathy associated with haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Br Heart J. 1987;57:181–183. (level 5)
14. Mohammed J, et al. Cardiac tamponade in diarrhea-positive haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2009;24:679–681. (level 5)
15. Askiti V, et al. Troponin I levels in a hemolytic uremic syndrome patient with severe cardiac failure. Pediatr Nephrol. 2004;19:345–348. (level 5)
16. Abu-Arafeh I, et al. Myocarditis and haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Arch Dis Child. 1995;72:46–47. (level 5)

3 Treatment of HUS

3.1 Fluid therapy and blood transfusion

1. Ake JA, et al. Relative nephroprotection during *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections: Association with intravenous volume expansion. Pediatrics. 2005;115:e673–80. (level 4)
2. Hickey CA, et al. Early volume expansion during diarrhea and relative nephroprotection during subsequent hemolytic uremic syndrome. JAMA 2012;165:884–889. (level 4)
3. Balestracci A, et al. Dehydration at admission increased the need for dialysis in hemolytic uremic syndrome children. Pediatr Nephrol. 2012;27:1407–1410. (level 4)
4. Pape L, et al. Early erythropoietin reduced the need for red blood cell transfusion in childhood hemolytic uremic syndrome: a randomized prospective pilot trial. Pediatr Nephrol. 2009;24:1061–1064. (level 2)
5. Weil BR, et al. Bleeding risk for surgical dialysis procedures in children with hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2010;25:1693–1698. (level 4)

3.2 Antihypertensive therapy

1. Spinale JM, et al. Long-term outcomes of Shiga toxin hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2013 Jan 4. [Epub ahead of print]. (level 4)

3.3 Renal replacement therapy

1. Bagshaw SM, et al. Dialysis Disequilibrium Syndrome: brain death following hemodialysis for metabolic acidosis and acute renal failure–a case report. BMC Nephrol. 2004;9:5–9. (level 5)

3.4 Plasma exchange therapy

1. Dundas S, et al. Effectiveness of therapeutic plasma exchange in the 1996 Lanarkshire *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 outbreak. Lancet. 1999;354:1327–1330. (level 5)
2. Menne J, et al. Validation of treatment strategies for enterohaemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O104:H4 induced haemolytic uraemic syndrome: case–control study. BMJ. 2012;345:e4565. (level 5)
3. Yagi K et al. Clinical experience of E. coli O-157-related hemolytic uremic syndrome. J Jpn Soc Peiatr Nephrol. 1997;10:209–213. [in Japanese] (level 5)

3.5 Antithrombotic therapy for HUS

1. Diekmann L: Treatment of the hemolytic-uremic syndrome with streptokinase and heparin (author's transl). Klin padiatr. 1980;192:430–435. (level 4)
2. Loirat C, et al. Treatment of childhood hemolytic-uremic syndrome with urokinase. Cooperative controlled trial. Arch Fr Pediatr. 1984;41:15–19. (level 4)
3. Van Damme-Lombaarts R, et al. Heparin plus dipyridamole in childhood hemolytic-uremic syndrome: a prospective, randomized study. J Pediatr. 1988;113:913–918. (level 2)
4. O'Regan S, et al. Aspirin and dipyridamole therapy in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1980;97:473–476. (level 4)
5. Asaga T, et al: A case of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura/hemolytic uremic syndrome coincident with disseminated intravascular coagulation caused by abdominal hysterectomy. J Jpn Soc Intensive Care Med. 2008;15:339–340. [in Japanese] (level 5)
6. Kaneda M, et al. Treatment of hemolytic uremic syndrome with recombinant thrombomodulin. Thrombosis Medicine. 2012;2:198–202. [in Japanese] (level 5)

3.6 Treatment of encephalopathy associated with STEC infection

1. Robson WL, et al. Causes of death in hemolytic uremic syndrome. Child Nephrol Urol. 1991;11:228–233. (level 5)
2. Kahn SI, et al. Spontaneous recovery of the hemolytic uremic syndrome with prolonged renal and neurological manifestations. Nephron. 1982;32:188–191. (level 5)
3. Steel BT, et al. Recovery from prolonged coma in hemolytic uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1983;102:402–404. (level 5)
4. Siegler RL. Spectrum of extrarenal involvement in postdiarrheal hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1994;125:511–518. (level 5)
5. Perez N, et al. Steroids in the hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 1998;12:101–104. (level 4)
6. Shimizu M, et al. Cytokine profiles of patients with enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O111-induced hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Cytokine. 2012;60:694–700. (level 4)
7. Shiraishi M, et al. Soluble tumor necrosis factor receptor 1 and tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase-1 in hemolytic uremic syndrome with encephalopathy. J Neuroimmunol. 2008;196:147–152. (level 4)

8. Yanagisawa A, et al. [Hemolytic uremic syndrome complicated by acute childhood necrotizing encephalopathy]. J Jpn Soc Peiatr Nephrol. 2009;22:161–165., in Japanese. (level 5)
9. Dundas S, et al. Effectiveness of therapeutic plasma exchange in the 1996 Lanarkshire *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 outbreak. Lancet. 1999;354:1327–1330. (level 5)
10. Nathanson S, et al. Acute neurological involvement in diarrhea-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010;5:1218–1228. (level 4)
11. Colic E, et al. Management of an acute outbreak of diarrhoea-associated haemolytic uraemic syndrome with early plasma exchange in adults from southern Denmark: an observational study. Lancet. 2011;378:1089–1093. (level 4)
12. Lapeyraque AL, et al. Eculizumab in severe Shiga-toxin-associated HUS. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:2561–2563. (level 5)
13. Menne J, et al. STEC-HUS consortium. Validation of treatment strategies for enterohaemorrhagic Escherichia coli O104:H4 induced haemolytic uraemic syndrome: case–control study. Br Med J. 2012;345:e4598. (level 4)
14. Honda T, et al. A novel strategy for hemolytic uremic syndrome: successful treatment with thrombomodulin α. Pediatrics. 2013;131:e928–33. (level 5)

3.7 Renal sequelae of HUS

1. Gerber A, et al. Clinical course and the role of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* infection in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome in pediatric patients, 1997–2000, in Germany and Austria: a prospective study. J Infect Dis. 2002;186:493–500. (level 4)
2. Kamioka I, et al. Japanese Society for Pediatric Nephrology: Risk factors for developing severe clinical course in HUS patients: a national survey in Japan. Pediatr Int. 2008;50:441–446 (level 4)
3. Oakes RS, et al. Predictors of fatality in postdiarrheal hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatrics. 2006;117:1656–1662. (level 4)
4. Spinale JM, et al. Long-term outcomes of Shiga toxin hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2013 Jan 4. [Epub ahead of print]
5. Garg AX, et al. Long-term renal prognosis of diarrhea-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. JAMA. 2003;290:1360–1370. (level 4)
6. Garg AX, et al. Microalbuminuria three years after recovery from *Escherichia coli* O157 hemolytic uremic syndrome due to municipal water contamination. Kidney Int. 2005;67:1476–1482. (level 4)
7. Sharma AP, et al. Chronic renal disease is more prevalent in patients with hemolytic uremic syndrome who had a positive history of diarrhea. Kidney Int. 2010;78:598–604. (level 4)
8. Siegler RL, et al. Long-term outcome and prognostic indicators in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome. J Pediatr. 1991;118:195–200. (level 4)
9. Fitzpatrick MM, et al. Long term renal outcome of childhood haemolytic uraemic syndrome. BMJ. 1991;303:489–492. (level 4)
10. Small G, et al. Hemolytic uremic syndrome: defining the need for long-term follow-up. Clin Nephrol. 1999;52:352–356. (level 4)
11. Kelles A, et al. Childhood haemolytic uraemic syndrome: long-term outcome and prognostic features. Eur J Pediatr. 1994;153:38–42. (level 4)
12. Spizzirri FD, et al. Childhood hemolytic uremic syndrome in Argentina: long-term follow-up and prognostic features. Pediatr Nephrol. 1997;11:156–160. (level 4)
13. Gagnadoux MF, et al. Long-term (15–25 years) outcome of childhood hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Clin Nephrol. 1996;46:39–41. (level 4)
14. Hüseman D, et al. Long-term prognosis of hemolytic uremic syndrome and effective renal plasma flow. Pediatr Nephrol. 1999;13:672–677. (level 4)
15. Oakes RS, et al. Duration of oliguria and anuria as predictors of chronic renal-related sequelae in post-diarrheal hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2008;23:1303–1308. (level 4)
16. Cobeñas CJ, et al. Long-term follow-up of Argentinean patients with hemolytic uremic syndrome who had not undergone dialysis. Pediatr Nephrol. 2007;22:1343–1347. (level 4)
17. Garg AX, et al. Absence of renal sequelae after childhood *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 gastroenteritis. Kidney Int. 2006;70:807–812. (level 4)

3.8 Extra-renal sequelae in patients with HUS

1. Crabbe DCG, et al. Gastrointestinal complications of the haemolytic uraemic syndrome. J Roy Soc Med. 1990;83:773–775. (level 5)
2. Brandt JR, et al. Cholelithiasis following *Escherichia coli* O157:H7-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 1988;12:222–225. (level 5)
3. Suri RS, et al. Relationship between *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and diabetes mellitus. Kidney Int Suppl. 2009;112:S44–S46. (level 4)
4. Suri RS, et al. Diabetes during diarrhea-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Diabetes Care. 2005;28:2556–2562. (level 4)
5. Nathanson S, et al. Acute neurological involvement in diarrhea-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010;5:1218–1228. (level 5)
6. Brasher C, et al. The hemolytic-uremic syndrome. West J Med. 1981;134:193–197. (level 5)
7. Sheth KJ, et al. Neurological involvement in hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Ann Neurol. 1986;19:90–93. (level 4)
8. Schlieper A, et al. Sequelae of hemolytic uremic syndrome. Arch Dis Child. 1992;67:930–934. (level 4)
9. Schlieper A, et al. Neuropsychological sequelae of haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Investigators of the HUS Cognitive Study. Arch Dis Child. 1999;80:214–220. (level 4)
10. Poulton J, et al. Dilated cardiomyopathy associated with haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Br Heart J. 1987;57:181–183. (level 5)
11. Mohammed J, et al. Cardiac tamponade in diarrhea-positive haemolytic uraemic syndrome. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2009;24:679–681. (level 5)
12. Askiti V, et al. Troponin I levels in a hemolytic uremic syndrome patient with severe cardiac failure. Pediatr Nephrol. 2004;19:345–348. (level 5)

4 Diagnosis and treatment of HUS in adults

4.1 Diagnosis and treatment of HUS in adults

1. Melnyk AMS, et al. Adult hemolytic-uremic syndrome: a review of 37 cases. Arch Intern Med. 1995;155:2077–2084. (level 4)
2. Tostivint I, et al. Adult haemolytic and uraemic syndrome: causes and prognostic factors in the last decade. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2002;17:1228–1234. (level 4)
3. George JN: The thrombotic thromobytopenic purpura and hemolytic uremic syndromes: overview of pathogenesis (Experience of the Oklahoma TTP-HUS Registry, 1989–2007). Kidney Int. 2009;75:S8–S10. (level 4)
4. Schieppati A, et al. Renal function at hospital admission as a prognosis factor in adult hemolytic uremic syndrome. J Am Soc Nephrol. 1992;2:1640–1644. (level 4)
5. Bell WR, et al. Improved survival in thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura-hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clinical experience in 108 patients. N Engl J Med. 1991;325:398–403. (level 4)

6. von Baeyer H: Plasmapheresis in thrombotic microangiopathy-associated syndromes: review of outcome data derived from clinical trials and open studies. Ther Apher. 2002;6:320–328. (level 4)
7. Brunskill SJ, et al. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials for plasma exchange in the treatment of thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura. Transfus Med. 2007;17:17–35. (level 1)
8. Forzley BR, et al. Treating TTP/HUS with plasma exchange: a single centre's 25-year experience. Br J Haematol. 2008;143: 100–106. (level 5)
9. Clark WF: Thrombotic microangiopathy: current knowledge and outcomes with plasma exchange. Semin Dial. 2012;25:214–219. (level 4)
10 Swisher KK, et al. Clinical outcomes after platelet transfusions in patients with thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura. Transfusion. 2009;49:873–887. (level 4)

4.2 Diagnosis and treatment of STEC-associated HUS in adults

1. Karpac CA, et al. Sporadic bloody diarrhoea-associated thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura-haemolytic uraemic syndrome: an adult and paediatric comparison. Br J Haematol. 2008;141:696–707. (level 4)
2. Frank C, et al. HUS Investigation Team. Epidemic profile of Shiga-toxin-producing *Escherichia Coli* O104:H4 outbreak in Germany. N Eng J Med. 2011;365:1771–1780. (level 4)
3. Dundas S, et al. The Central Scotland *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 outbreak: risk factors for the hemolytic uremic syndrome and death among hospitalized patients. Clin Infect Dis. 2001;33:923–931. (level 4)
4. Karmali MA, et al. Age-specific frequencies of antibodies to *Escherichia coli* verocytotoxins (Shiga toxins) 1 and 2 among urban and rural populations in southern Ontario. J Infect Dis. 2003;188:1724–1729. (level 4)
5. Dundas S, et al. Effectiveness of therapeutic plasma exchange in the 1996 Lanarkshire *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 outbreak. Lancet. 1999;354:1327–1330. (level 4)
6. Colic E, et al. Management of an acute outbreak of diarrhoea-associated haemolytic uraemic syndrome with early plasma exchange in adults from southern Denmark: an observational study. Lancet. 2011;378:1089–1093. (level 5)
7. Menne J, et al. EHEC–HUS consortium. Validation of treatment strategies for enterohaemorrhagic Escherichia coli O104:H4 induced haemolytic uraemic syndrome: case–control study. Br Med J. 2012;345:e4598. (level 4)
8. Greinacher A, et al. Treatment of severe neurological deficits with IgG depletion through immunoadsorption in patients with *Escherichia coli* O104:H4-associated haemolytic uraemic syndrome: a prospective trial. Lancet. 2011;378:1166–1173. (level 4)
9. Nitschke M, et al. Association between azithromycin therapy and duration of bacterial shedding among patients with Shiga toxin-producing enteroaggregative *Escherichia coli* O104:H4. JAMA. 2012;307:1046–1052. (level 4)
10. LapeyraqueAL, et al. Eculizumab in severe Shiga-toxin-associated HUS. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:2561–2563. (level 5)

5 Diagnosis and treatment of atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome (aHUS)

5.2 Treatment of aHUS

1. Krysan DJ, et al. Renal transplantation after streptococcus pneumonia-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Am J Kidney Dis. 2001;37:e15. (level 5)
2. McGraw ME, et al. Haemolytic uremic syndrome and the Thomsen-Friedenreich antigen. Pediatr Nephrol. 1989;3:135–139. (level 5)
3. Gilbert RD, et al. Streptococcus pneumonia-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 1998;17:530–532. (level 5)
4. Noris M, et al. Relative role of genetic complement abnormalities in sporadic and familiar aHUS and their impact on clinical phenotype. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010;5:1844–1859. (level 4)
5. Remuzzi G, et al. Combined kidney and liver transplantation for familial haemolytic uremic syndrome. Lancet. 2002;359: 1671–1672. (level 5)
6. Noris M, et al. Relative role of genetic complement abnormalities in sporadic and familiar aHUS and their impact on clinical phenotype. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010;5:1844–1859. (level 4)
7. Remuzzi G, et al. Hemolytic uremic syndrome: a fatal outcome after kidney and liver transplantation performed to correct factor H gene mutation. Am J Transplant. 2005;5:1146–1150. (level 5)
8. Remuzzi G, et al. Hemolytic uremic syndrome: a fatal outcome after kidney and liver transplantation performed to correct factor H gene mutation. Am J Transplant. 2005;5:1146–1150. (level 5)
9. Cheong HI, et al. Attempted treatment of factor H deficiency by liver transplantation. Pediatr Nephrol. 2004;19:454–458. (level 5)
10. Saland JM, et al. Favorable long-term outcome after liver-kidney transplant for recurrent hemolytic uremic syndrome associated with a factor H mutation. Am J Transplant. 2006;6:1948–1952. (level 5)
11. Jalanko H, et al. Successful liver-kidney transplantation in two children with aHUS caused by a mutation in complement factor H. Am J Transplant. 2008;8:8216–221. (level 5)
12. Saland JM, et al. Successful split liver-kidney transplant for factor H associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2009;4:201–206. (level 5)
13. Gruppo RA, et al. Eculizumab for congenital atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome. N Eng J Med. 2009;360:544–546. (level 5)
14. Nürnberger J, et al. Eculizumab for atypical hemolytic-uremic syndrome. N Eng J Med. 2009;360:542–544 (level 5)
15. Ohanian M, et al. Eculizumab safety reverses neurologic impairment and eliminates need for dialysis in severe atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clin Pharmacol. 2011;3:5–12. (level 5)
16. Dorresteijn EM, et al. Eculizumab as rescue therapy for atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome with normal platelet count. Pediatr Nephrol. 2012;27:1193–1195. (level 5)
17. Zimmerhackl LBHofer J, et al. Prophylactic eculizumab after renal transplantation in atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. N Eng J Med. 2010;362:1746–1748. (level 5)
18 Weitz M, et al. Prophyractic eculizumab prior to kidney transplantation for atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Pediatr Nephrol. 2011;26:1325–1329. (level 5)
19. Al-Akash SI, et al. Eculizumab induces long-term remission in recurrent post-transplant HUS associated with C3 gene mutation. Pediatr Nephrol. 2011;26:613–619. (level 5)
20. Zuber J, et al. for the French Study Group for atypical HUS: Eculizumab for atypical haemolytic uremic syndrome recurrence in renal transplantation. Am J Transplant. 2012;12:3337–3354. (level 5)

Neurology®

Clinical and radiologic features of encephalopathy during 2011 *E coli* O111 outbreak in Japan

Jun-ichi Takanashi, Hiromichi Taneichi, Takako Misaki, et al.

Neurology 2014;82;564-572 Published Online before print January 17, 2014
DOI 10.1212/WNL.0000000000000120