



### Pankaj Hari, MD

Professor, Pediatric Nephrology AIIMS, Delhi

## **Overview**

How new guidelines are different

- Methodology
- Diagnosis & therapy of UTI
- Imaging after UTI
- Recurrent UTI, bladder bowel dysfunction
- Vesicoureteric reflux, renal scarring
  - Surgery/endoscopic treatment
  - Antibiotics prophylaxis, duration
  - Non antimicrobial intervention
- VUR and ESKD

### **ISPN guideline on UTI & VUR**

#### **Revised Statement on Management of Urinary Tract Infections**

INDIAN SOCIETY OF PEDIATRIC NEPHROLOGY Indian Pediatrics 2011

Excluded UTI in complex abnormalities (obstructive uropathy, neurogenic bladder)

#### PROCESS

#### Appoint Work Groups, Evidence Review Team (ERT)

Discuss process, Refine topics/questions

#### Assign topics to systematic review or narrative review

Perform new or update existing

#### **Create evidence profile**

Rate **quality of evidence** for each outcome and overall

#### **GRADE and formulate recommendation**



#### Adapted IOM systematic review standards

### **Clinical practice points** *vs.* recommendations

#### **Clinical practice points**

- No systematic review conducted
- Insufficient evidence
- Evidence inconclusive
- Guidance not actionable
- Guidance as table/figures/algorithm

#### Recommendations

- Systematic review conducted
- Ample evidence available
- Evidence shows clear preference of one action over other
- Guidance is actionable
- Statements supported with
  - Quality of evidence
  - Balance of benefit and harm
  - Values & preferences
  - Feasibility, equity, acceptability
  - Resource

#### Adapted from KDIGO Guidelines on glomerular diseases 2020

# **Method of urine collection**

#### PRECONTINENT CHILDREN :



#### *Clinical practice point:* suggest using clean-catch in toilet-trained

- Non-toiled trained stable children: clean-catch should be attempted initially, if unsuccessful catheterization or suprapubic aspiration (SPA) can be used
- Sick infants: catheterization or SPA preferred

Urine can be stored at 4°C for up to 24 h

## **Screening test for UTI**



| TEST                                    | SENSITIVITY<br>% | SPECIFICITY<br>% |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| Leukocyte esterase positive             | 83               | 78               |
| Nitrite test positive                   | 53               | 98               |
| Leukocyte esterase/ Nitrite<br>positive | 93               | 72               |
| Microscopy, WBC                         | 73               | 81               |
| Microscopy, Bacteria                    | 81               | 83               |
| LE, Nitrite, Microscopy positive        | 99.8             | 70               |

AAP Clinical Practice Guidelines, Pediatrics 2016

Microscopy for bacteria and Gram stain has excellent accuracy; microscopy for WBC can be replaced by leukocyte esterase; **Dipstick negative in 10%; cannot replace urine culture** *Williams, Lancet 2010* 

#### **Recommendation:**

- Suggest using urine dipstick (leukocyte esterase + nitrite combination) as a screening test
- When feasible urine microscopy, (for bacteriuria and pyuria) in a freshly voided sample, can be used as an alternative for screening of UTI (2⊕⊕⊕○)

### Fig.1 Approach to Diagnosis of UTI



Risk factors: Bladder-bowel dysfunction, primary vesicoureteric reflux, previous history of UTI

## **UTI: diagnosis**

#### Clinical practice point:

- Suggest diagnosis of UTI be based on the significant growth of a single bacterial species in presence of symptoms
- Growth of single uropathogenic bacteria ≥10<sup>3</sup>, ≥10<sup>4</sup>, and ≥10<sup>4-5</sup> (CFU/ml) by suprapubic aspiration, catheterization, and clean-catch, are highly suggestive of UTI

#### Asymptomatic bacteriuria

- *Clinical practice point:* Suggest **NOT** to perform routine culture or repeat urine culture after treatment if there is clinical response
- Not to treat asymptomatic bacteriuria

## **UTI: treatment guidelines**

• **Recommendation:** Use oral antibiotics for acute pyelonephritis except

i) infants aged <1 month ii) children with bacteremia/sepsis iii) children unable to ingest  $(1 \oplus \oplus \bigcirc)$ 

Suggest IV for initial 3-4 days or till defervescence, followed by oral

- *Clinical practice point:* Suggest initial intravenous antibiotic to treat acute pyelonephritis in children aged 1-3 month
- Recommendation: suggest using 3<sup>rd</sup> generation cephalosporins or amoxicillin-clavulanic acid as empirical antibiotic in febrile UTI (2⊕○○○)
- Recommendation: short course (3-5 days) of oral antibiotic for lower UTI (1⊕⊕⊕○)
- Clinical practice point: 7-10 days of antibiotic treatment for acute pyelonephritis in children aged >6 month

### **Fig.2 Treatment of Urinary Tract Infection**



## **BBD & Recurrent UTI**

**Bladder bowel dysfunction (BBD):** combined bladder and bowel dysfunction in the absence of neurological abnormality (*ICCS, 2017*)

Independent predictor of UTI; delays resolution of VUR; therapy results in downgrading of VUR

#### **Bladder**

- Urgency
  Wetting of pants
  Holding maneuvers
- Hesitancy
- Frequency

#### Bowel

Constipation

- <3 stools/wk</p>
- Hard stools blocking toilet
- Painful defecation

#### Clinical practice point

Suggest all children with UTI should be evaluated for BBD

Prophylaxis should be given in recurrent febrile UTI and BBD irrespective of presence or absence of VUR

## **Imaging after UTI**

### Imaging in selected children after first UTI

#### **Findings suggestive of VUR**

- Renal hypoplasia (B/L or U/L)
- Abnormal echogenicity
- Hydronephrosis
- Ureteric dilatation
- Uroepithelial thickening
- Bladder abnormality

Perform after 4-6 weeks; during UTI if

– urosepsis, non response, renal dysfunction

#### **Clinical practice point**

Ultrasound scan of the urinary tract should be performed after an episode of UTI in children

### Dimercaptosuccinic acid (DMSA) scan

#### Early DMSA (within 2 wk)

#### **Recommendation:**

Do not perform acute-phase DMSA scan in children with febrile UTI ( $2\oplus\bigcirc\bigcirc\bigcirc$ )

Late DMSA (4-6 mo after acute infection)

#### **Clinical practice point**

suggest performing a late-phase DMSA scan to assess kidney scarring in children with recurrent UTI or high-grade VUR



#### More relevant, since it detects damage!

### **Micturating cystourethrography**

- Gold standard for VUR; provides anatomy of urinary tract
- Invasive & radiation





#### **Clinical practice point**

Suggest performing MCU in children with one of the following: (a) children <2 yr with non-*E.coli UTI* (b) abnormal ultrasound scan (c) recurrent UTI

### Fig.3 Approach to imaging after UTI



#### Recurrent UTI: 2 episodes of febrile UTI

BBD; bladder bowel dysfunction, DMSA; Dimercaptosuccinic acid VUR; vesicoureteric reflux

### Is prophylaxis useful in normal urinary tracts?

#### Recurrence of UTI



**Recommend** against using prophylaxis for prevention of UTI in children with normal urinary tract  $(1 \oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc)$  *ISPN guidelines, 2021* 

## **Primary VUR: how therapy changed**



### **Antibiotic versus surgery/endoscopic injection**

Meta-analysis: recurrence of symptomatic UTI similar after surgery & antibiotic prophylaxis; less febrile UTI

No difference in renal scarring at 5, 10 years Surgery does not prevent progression to ESRD % change of GFR similar at 5 and 10 yr; majority of reflux improve



#### **Endoscopic treatment**

- Success 60-95%; improves with second injection, depends on grade of reflux, expertise
- Recurrence 11-26% over 3-12 mo, ureteral obstruction 0.6%
- NO benefit over prophylaxis

Cochrane database of systematic reviews, 2019

### **Prophylaxis in high grade VUR is marginally beneficial**

#### Prophylaxis for high grade (III-IV) VUR

|  | ABF                   | ABP placebo/ no therapy |                 | егару | Risk Ratio |                     |      | Risk Ratio                      |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|------------|---------------------|------|---------------------------------|
| Study or Subgroup                            | Events                | Total                   | Events          | Total | Weight     | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | Year | M-H, Random, 95% Cl             |
| Garin 2006                                   | 5                     | 18                      | 1               | 19    | 2.6%       | 5.28 [0.68, 40.91]  | 2006 |                                 |
| Montini 2008                                 | 6                     | 26                      | 6               | 14    | 9.5%       | 0.54 [0.21, 1.36]   | 2008 |                                 |
| Pennesi 2008                                 | 17                    | 39                      | 15              | 40    | 17.4%      | 1.16 [0.68, 1.99]   | 2008 |                                 |
| Roussey-Kesler 2008                          | 8                     | 24                      | 12              | 30    | 13.1%      | 0.83 [0.41, 1.70]   | 2008 |                                 |
| Craig (PRIVENT) 2009                         | 7                     | 65                      | 11              | 64    | 10.2%      | 0.63 [0.26, 1.51]   | 2009 |                                 |
| Brandström 2009                              | 10                    | 69                      | 25              | 68    | 14.5%      | 0.39 [0.21, 0.76]   | 2009 | _ <b></b>                       |
| Espino 2012                                  | 3                     | 9                       | 7               | 12    | 8.1%       | 0.57 [0.20, 1.62]   | 2012 |                                 |
| Hoberman (RIVUR) 2014                        | 26                    | 143                     | 38              | 137   | 20.2%      | 0.66 [0.42, 1.02]   | 2014 |                                 |
| Hari 2015                                    | 6                     | 37                      | 2               | 31    | 4.4%       | 2.51 [0.55, 11.58]  | 2015 |                                 |
| Total (95% CI)                               |                       | 430                     |                 | 415   | 100.0%     | 0.75 [0.53, 1.06]   |      | ◆                               |
| Total events                                 | 88                    |                         | 117             |       |            |                     |      |                                 |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.10;      | Chi <sup>z</sup> = 13 | .52, df :               | = 8 (P = 0.10); |       |            |                     |      |                                 |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (P = 0.10) |                       |                         |                 |       |            |                     |      | Favours [ABP] Favours [control] |

### **Renal scarring not prevented by prophylaxis in VUR**

|   | ABP                    | )        | placebo/ no t                | o/ no therapy |        | Risk Ratio          |      | Risk Ratio                               |
|---|------------------------|----------|------------------------------|---------------|--------|---------------------|------|--|
| Study or Subgroup                       | Events                 | Total    | Events                       | Total         | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | Year | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                      |
| Smellie 1978                            | 0                      | 0        | 0                            | 0             |        | Not estimable       | 1978 |  |
| Garin 2006                              | 7                      | 100      | 6                            | 118           | 18.9%  | 1.38 [0.48, 3.96]   | 2006 |  |
| Montini 2008                            | 2                      | 187      | 2                            | 108           | 6.2%   | 0.58 [0.08, 4.04]   | 2008 |  |
| Roussey-Kesler 2008                     | 0                      | 0        | 0                            | 0             |        | Not estimable       | 2008 |  |
| Pennesi 2008                            | 0                      | 50       | 0                            | 50            |        | Not estimable       | 2008 |  |
| Craig (PRIVENT) 2009                    | 5                      | 68       | 7                            | 83            | 17.6%  | 0.87 [0.29, 2.62]   | 2009 |  |
| Brandström 2009                         | 0                      | 68       | 9                            | 68            | 3.0%   | 0.05 [0.00, 0.89]   | 2009 |  |
| Hoberman (RIVUR) 2014                   | 18                     | 220      | 19                           | 227           | 43.2%  | 0.98 [0.53, 1.81]   | 2014 |  |
| Hari 2015                               | 4                      | 37       | 3                            | 43            | 11.1%  | 1.55 [0.37, 6.48]   | 2015 |  |
| Total (95% CI)                          |                        | 730      |                              | 697           | 100.0% | 0.95 [0.58, 1.57]   |      | •  |
| Total events                            | 36                     |          | 46                           |               |        |                     |      |  |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.05; | Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.6 | i8, df = | 5 (P = 0.34); I <sup>2</sup> | = 12%         |        |                     |      |  |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.         | 19 (P = 0.)            | 85)      |                              |               |        |                     |      | Favours [experimental] Favours [control] |

### Why has renal scarring remain unchanged ?

### Should host's inflammatory response be diminished

#### Corticosteroids

| Meta-analysis: Renal scarring rate on late DMSA in steroid versus placebo                               |                 |          |                              |       |        |                     |      |                                   |           |
|---|-----------------|----------|------------------------------|-------|--------|---------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
|   | Steroid plus an | tibiotic | otic Placebo plus antibiotic |       |        | Risk Ratio          |      | Risk Ratio                        |           |
| Study or Subgroup   | Events          | Total    | Events                       | Total | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | Year | M-H, Random, 95% Cl               |           |
| Huang 2011  | 6               | 18       | 39                           | 65    | 44.4%  | 0.56 [0.28, 1.10]   | 2011 |                                   |           |
| Ghaffari 2019   | 2               | 23       | 4                            | 29    | 8.0%   | 0.63 [0.13, 3.14]   | 2019 |                                   |           |
| Shaikh 2020   | 12              | 123      | 22                           | 131   | 47.6%  | 0.58 [0.30, 1.12]   | 2020 |                                   |           |
| Total (95% CI)  |                 | 164      |                              | 225   | 100.0% | 0.57 [0.36, 0.90]   |      | •                                 |           |
| Total events  | 20              |          | 65                           |       |        |                     |      |                                   |           |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.02, df = 2 (P = 0.99); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% |                 |          |                              |       |        |                     |      |                                   |           |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 2.40 (P = 0.02)  |                 |          |                              |       |        |                     |      | Favours [Steroid] Favours [Placet | 20<br>)0] |

### Insufficient evidence to recommend its use ISPN guidelines, 2022

### **Prophylaxis & antimicrobial resistance**

#### Odds of multidrug resistance 6.4 times more on prophylaxis; 1 MDR infection in every 21 VUR treated

**Pediatrics 2018** 

|   | ABF                  | )         | placebo/ no the                  | erapy | Risk Ratio |                       |                                 | Risk Ratio          |  |  |
|---|----------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Study or Subgroup                       | Events               | Total     | Events                           | Total | Weight     | M-H, Random, 95% Cl   | Year                            | M-H, Random, 95% Cl |  |  |
| Roussey-Kesler 2008                     | 0                    | 0         | 0                                | 0     |            | Not estimable         | 2008                            |                     |  |  |
| Pennesi 2008                            | 41                   | 43        | 0                                | 35    | 4.1%       | 67.91 [4.33, 1065.94] | 2008                            |                     |  |  |
| Brandström 2009                         | 7                    | 8         | 9                                | 24    | 27.8%      | 2.33 [1.31, 4.16]     | 2009                            |                     |  |  |
| Craig (PRIVENT) 2009                    | 24                   | 36        | 13                               | 55    | 29.1%      | 2.82 [1.66, 4.78]     | 2009                            | -                   |  |  |
| Hoberman (RIVUR) 2014                   | 26                   | 38        | 17                               | 69    | 30.7%      | 2.78 [1.74, 4.42]     | 2014                            |                     |  |  |
| Hari 2015                               | 7                    | 12        | 1                                | 5     | 8.3%       | 2.92 [0.47, 17.95]    | 2015                            |                     |  |  |
| Total (95% CI)                          |                      | 137       |                                  | 188   | 100.0%     | 3.04 [1.68, 5.51]     |                                 | ◆                   |  |  |
| Total events                            | 105                  |           | 40                               |       |            |                       |                                 |                     |  |  |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.24; | Chi <sup>z</sup> =11 | .33, df : | = 4 (P = 0.02); I <sup>2</sup> : | = 65% |            |                       |                                 |                     |  |  |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 3.6        | 0002)                |           |                                  |       |            |                       | Favours [Control] Favours [ABP] |                     |  |  |

#### Recommendations

Suggest prophylaxis for prevention of febrile UTI only in children with high-grade primary VUR. ( $2 \oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$ )

We suggest using co-trimoxazole or nitrofurantoin as the first-line antibiotic for prophylaxis in children older than 6 months.  $(2 \oplus \oplus \bigcirc)$ 

#### Clinical practice point

- Consider using prophylaxis in low-grade VUR in infants with febrile UTI
- Suggest discontinuation of prophylaxis in older than 2 years if: i) toilet trained, ii) absence of BBD, iii) no febrile UTI in last 1 yr

## **Cranberry for prevention of UTI**

Large polymeric compound (pro-anthocyanidin) inhibits bacterial adherence

Children with recurrent UTI (4 studies) (RR 0.39, 95% CI 0.25 to 0.61), one study in VUR

Not better than antibiotic prophylaxis

#### Quantity of active ingredient (36-72 mg/d), Availability



#### Recommendation

**Suggest** using cranberry products for the prevention of UTI in children with recurrent UTI and normal urinary tract.  $(2 \oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc)$ 

## **Circumcision and recurrent UTI**

No. needed to treat to prevent 1 UTI Normal: 111 High grade VUR: 4

#### Recommendation

Suggest circumcision should be offered for prevention of UTI only in children at risk of recurrence  $(2\oplus\oplus\oplus\bigcirc)$ 

|                                   | Circum     | ncised                  | Uncircur     | ncised       |                          | Risk Ratio          | Risk Ratio                                |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup                 | Events     | Total                   | Events       | Total        | Weight                   | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                       |
| 1.1.1 Randomised tria             | ls         |                         |              |              |                          |                     |   |
| Guïcuïk 2013                      | 0          | 0                       | 0            | 0            |                          | Not estimable       |   |
| Navir 2001                        | Ō          | 35                      | 3            | 35           | 1.2%                     | 0.14 [0.01, 2.67]   |   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)                 |            | 35                      |              | 35           | 1.2%                     | 0.14 [0.01, 2.67]   |   |
| Total events                      | 0          |                         | 3            |              |                          |                     |   |
| Heterogeneity: Not app            | plicable   |                         |              |              |                          |                     |   |
| Test for overall effect: 2        | Z = 1.30   | (P = 0.19)              |              |              |                          |                     |   |
| 1.1.2 Cohort studies              |            |                         |              |              |                          |                     |   |
| Alsawvid 2010                     | 5          | 74                      | 62           | 137          | 5.0%                     | 0.15 (0.06, 0.36)   |   |
| Brada 2015                        | 5          | 95                      | 35           | 166          | 4.9%                     | 0.25 (0.10, 0.62)   |   |
| Ellison 2018                      | 35         | 5769                    | 96           | 5351         | 6.7%                     | 0.34 [0.23, 0.50]   |   |
| Kwak 2004                         | 6          | 27                      | 18           | 50           | 5.3%                     | 0.62 [0.28, 1.37]   | <b>_</b> _                                |
| Schoen 2000                       | 22         | 9668                    | 132          | 5225         | 6.5%                     | 0.09 [0.06, 0.14]   |   |
| Simforoosh 2010                   | 0          | 2000                    | 20           | 1000         | 1.2%                     | 0.01 (0.00, 0.20)   | ←   |
| To 1998                           | 83         | 29217                   | 247          | 29217        | 7.0%                     | 0.34 [0.26, 0.43]   | +   |
| Wiswell 1987                      | 151        | 173663                  | 459          | 46112        | 7.2%                     | 0.09 [0.07, 0.10]   | +   |
| Wiswell 1993                      | 112        | 80279                   | 384          | 27319        | 7.1%                     | 0.10 [0.08, 0.12]   | +   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)                 |            | 300792                  |              | 114577       | 50.9%                    | 0.17 [0.10, 0.29]   | •   |
| Total events                      | 419        |                         | 1453         |              |                          |                     | -   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = | 0.48: Ch   | i <sup>z</sup> = 125.32 | 2. df = 8 (F | < 0.0000     | 1); <b> </b> ² = 949     | 6                   |   |
| Test for overall effect: 2        | Z = 6.73 ( | (P < 0.000              | 01)          |              | <i></i>                  |                     |   |
| 1.1.3 Case-control stu            | idies      |                         |              |              |                          |                     |   |
| Craig 1996                        | 2          | 10                      | 142          | 937          | 2.4%                     |                     |   |
| Crain 1990                        | 1          | 43                      | 16           | 037          | 2.4%                     | 0.24 [0.00, 0.34]   |   |
| Dubrovosky 2014                   | 4          | 93                      | 76           | 200          | 1.6%                     | 0.14 [0.02, 0.55]   |   |
| Ghaemi 2007                       | 2          | 105                     | 16           | 1/18         | 3.2%                     | 0.13[0.07, 0.31]    |   |
| Herndon 1000                      | 7          | 37                      | 10           | 140          | 5.2%                     | 0.10 [0.04, 0.73]   |   |
| Herron 1090                       | 'n         | 57                      | 36           | 60           | 1 3 %                    | 0.02 (0.00, 0.75)   | <b>←</b>                                  |
| Vachani 1090                      | 1          | 42                      | 16           | 00           | 2.104                    | 0.02 [0.00, 0.20]   |   |
| Kashani 1303<br>Vim 1006          | 0          | 40                      | 0            | 70           | 1 204                    | 0.14 [0.02, 0.33]   |   |
| Newman 2002                       | 15         | 672                     | 41           | 107          | 6.1%                     | 0.21 [0.01, 3.40]   | _ <b>_</b>                                |
| Ruchton 1992                      | 2          | 37                      | 21           | 10           | 2 204                    | 0.13[0.07, 0.22]    |   |
| Shaw 1998                         | 6          | 497                     | 6            | 75           | 4 296                    | 0.15 (0.05, 0.36)   |   |
| Snach 1992                        | 18         | - 64                    | 8            | 14           | 6.0%                     | 0.13 [0.03, 0.40]   |   |
| Zorc 2005                         | 6          | 262                     | 62           | 291          | 5.2%                     | 0.43 [0.21, 0.36]   |   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)                 |            | 1864                    | 02           | 2255         | 48.0%                    | 0.18 [0.12, 0.29]   | ◆   |
| Total events                      | 64         |                         | 458          |              |                          |                     |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = | 0.26; Ch   | i <sup>z</sup> = 23.33, | df = 12 (F   | ' = 0.03); I | ²= 49%                   |                     |   |
| Test for overall effect: 2        | Z = 7.61   | (P < 0.000              | 01)          |              |                          |                     |   |
| Total (95% CI)                    |            | 302691                  |              | 116867       | 100.0%                   | 0.18 [0.13, 0.25]   | •   |
| Total events                      | 483        |                         | 1914         |              |                          |                     |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = | 0.42; Ch   | i <sup>2</sup> = 151.16 | 6, df = 22 ( | P < 0.000    | 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 85 | 5%                  |   |
| Test for overall effect 2         | Z = 9.87 ( | (P < 0.000              | 01)          | -            |                          |                     | 0.005 0.1 1 10 200                        |
| Test for subgroup diffe           | erences:   | Chi <b>≅</b> = 0.0      | 5 df= 2 (B   | P = 0.97)    | I² = 0%                  |                     | Favours circumcised Favours uncircumcised |

## **VUR: treatment guidelines**

#### Recommendation

- Suggest prophylaxis should be the first line of management in high grade VUR (2⊕⊕⊕○)
- Suggest surgical reimplantation be considered in high grade VUR with recurrent breakthrough febrile UTI on prophylaxis (2⊕⊕⊕○)

#### Clinical practice point:

- Suggest open reimplantation be preferred over endoscopic treatment
- In high-grade VUR, surgical intervention may be an alternative for parenteral hesitancy to use antibiotics
- No consensus on the type of surgical (open/robotic/laproscopic)

### **Follow up of VUR**

### **Clinical Practice Points**

VUR need periodic follow up till considered clinically insignificant; reflux nephropathy need long term follow-up

#### Suggest

- Screening siblings (aged less than 3 years) of the children with primary VUR with an ultrasound scan
- Renal USG to monitor renal growth in high-grade reflux & those with scarred kidney
- DMSA be repeated during follow up, only in recurrent febrile UTI
- In high-grade reflux, repeat MCU be performed only if surgical intervention is planned
- DRCG may be done for documenting for resolution of reflux at 4-8 yr of age, in high-grade reflux

## **Fig.4 Treatment of primary VUR**



#### Recurrent UTI:2 episodes of febrile UTI

ABP; antibiotic prophylaxis, BBD; bladder-bowel dysfunction

## **VUR: risk of ESKD**



## **Renal scarring in VUR and ESKD**

- ANZ dialysis transplant registry from 1971-1998
- age specific incidence of ESRD attributable to reflux



# **Key Points**

New guidelines have followed rigorous methodology

- Post UTI imaging is selective, less aggressive
- Emphasis on BBD; associated with recurrence
- Surgery as good as prophylaxis for VUR; indications limited
- Prophylaxis
  - Recurrent UTI, BBD, high grades of VUR; risk of antimicrobial resistance

Non-antibiotic interventions should be explored

### **Acknowledgements**

#### **Group coordinators**

A Bagga M Kanitkar A Iyengar M Pandey Sudha E P Pais



#### **Members**

J Sharma, K Mishra, S Raut R Sinha, I Agarwal, A Ohri AS Vasudev, S Uthup, S Sethi A Krishan, M Bajpai S Banerjee, M Mantan, A Saha A Mehta, S Kalra N Krishnamurthy, B Panchal

#### **Advisors**

R N Srivastava BR Nammalwar K Mehta K Phadke U Ali

#### **Evidence Review Team**

R Thergaonkar A Sinha J Meena P Khandelwal

