Monitoring Haemodialysis Using Electronic Nose and Chemometrics
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Abstract

An ever-increasing number of patients have to undergo regular renal dialysis to compensate for acute or chronic renal failure. The adequacy of the treatment has a profound effect on patients’ morbidity and mortality. Therefore it is necessary to assess the delivered dialysis dose. For the quantification of the dialysis dose two parameters are most commonly used, namely the Kt/V value (normalised dose of dialysis) and the urea reduction rate, yet the prescribed dialysis dose often differs from the actual delivered dialysis dose. Currently, no interactive process is available to ensure optimal treatment. The aim of this study was to investigate the potential for an “electronic nose” as a novel monitoring tool for haemodialysis. Blood samples were analysed using an electronic nose, comprising an array of 14 conducting polymer sensors, and compared to traditional biochemistry. Principal component analysis and hierarchical cluster analysis were applied to evaluate the data, and demonstrated the ability to distinguish between pre-dialysis blood from post-dialysis blood independent of the method used. It is concluded that the electronic nose is capable of discriminating pre-dialysis from post-dialysis blood and hence, together with an appropriate classification model, suitable for on-line monitoring.
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1. Introduction

An ever-increasing number of patients have to undergo regular renal dialysis to compensate for acute or chronic renal failure. The estimated annual rate of patients starting renal replacement therapy (RRT) in England and Wales is 89 per million population indicating that approximately 5350 patients started RRT in 2000, haemodialysis (HD) being the predominant form of RRT (UK Renal Registry Report, 2001). The frequency and length of dialysis is generally determined empirically, with little or no on-line analysis available to ensure optimal dosage.

1.1 Renal failure and haemodialysis

Renal failure is characterised by an impaired kidney function leading to disturbances in waste excretion, hormone production and in the regulation of fluid and electrolyte status. Therefore it is necessary to replace the kidney function by means of an artificial device (dialysis) or by organ transplantation. However, artificial devices can only replace certain functions of the kidney, in particular the removal of waste products and excessive body fluids.

It is well known that the prescribed dialysis dose differs from the actually delivered dialysis dose (Manzoni et al., 1996; Keshaviah, 2002). Therefore, it is necessary to quantify the delivered dialysis dose because the adequacy of the dose has a profound effect on patient morbidity and mortality (Manzoni et al., 1996; Shak, 1999). The concept of dialysis adequacy was developed in the early 1970s to assess the treatment efficiency of end-stage renal disease (ESRD) patients (Canaud et al., 2000). From the very beginning the removal of small molecules was considered important as they were directly linked to the symptoms and signs of uraemia (Keshaviah, 2002; Lindsay and Sternby, 2001). Therefore, urea has been suggested as a surrogate marker for small toxic solutes (Keshaviah, 2002), and gained wide acceptance in 1975 as a marker substance (Vanholder et al., 1994).

For the quantification of the dialysis dose two parameters are most commonly used, namely the urea reduction rate (URR) and the normalised dose of dialysis (Kt/V) (Lowrie, 2000; Lindsay and Sternby, 2001). Both parameters are based on urea. The URR is calculated from the pre-dialysis and post-dialysis blood urea nitrogen value, whereas the Kt/V value is derived from urea kinetic modelling (Levy
et al., 2001, Kemp et al., 2001). Devices such as the Baxter Biostat 1000 (Baxter Healthcare Corp., McGaw Park, IL), the DQM 200 – Device (Gambro Lund AB, Lund, Sweden), the Bio Care Device (Bio-Care Corp., Hsinchu, Taiwan) and the Bellco – device (Bellco SpA, Miranda, Italy) are commercially available and calculate either of the two parameters on-line. However, there is a controversial discussion about whether these parameters are appropriate or not (Vanholder et al., 2002; Lowrie 2000). However, it has been shown that oversimplification of the “dialysis dose” to the Kt/V index might lead to dramatic underdialysis (Canaud et al., 2000). The Kt/V value assesses only the removal of small water-soluble compounds from the body (Vanholder et al., 2002). Hence, the molecular size of urea means that convective and/or diffusive transport of larger molecules is unlikely to be described by urea kinetics (Vanholder et al., 2002; Lowrie, 2000). Both values (Kt/V and URR) assume a dialysis frequency of three times per week. However, recently published data suggest that 5% of all American patients skip a dialysis session in any month leading to an incorrect Kt/V or URR value (De Palma et al., 2001). Other pitfalls in calculating the Kt/V value come from the incorrect post-dialysis blood sampling such as urea-rebound effect, sample dilution with dialysis fluid or blood recirculation. (De Palma et al., 2001). However, careful post-dialysis blood sampling minimises the influence of these problems (Levy et al. 2001).

1.2 Electronic nose technology

Electronic nose (EN) is the colloquial name for an instrument made up of chemical sensors combined with some sort of pattern recognition system (Gardner and Bartlett, 1994). The key idea of an EN is to mimic the human olfactory system. The human olfactory receptors are replaced by chemical sensors, which produce an electrical signal (similar to nerve cells). These signals are subsequently analysed by an appropriate pattern recognition engine. The pattern recognition software corresponds to the cerebral cortex of the brain, and is able to classify or memorise odours. (Bartlett et al., 1997; Pearce, 1997 (a and b)).

The most commonly used types of sensors in electronic noses are: metal oxide sensors (Persaud et al., 1997; Dickinson et al., 1998), conducting polymers (Hatfield et al., 1994; Gardner and Bartlett, 1995), and piezoelectric based sensors such as bulk acoustic wave sensors or surface acoustic wave sensors (D’Amico et al., 1997; Chang
et al., 2000). All types of sensors share a common basic principle. The interaction of volatile compounds with the sensor surface leads to a change of physical properties (conductivity, resistance, frequency) of the sensor, which is measured. In other words, the different types of sensor vary in the way the sensor response is generated.

Electronic noses have been applied in several areas to characterise the odour of products such as beer (Pearce et al., 1993), boartaint (Bourronnet et al., 1995), cardboard papers (Holmberg et al., 1995), coffee (Singh et al., 1996), and wine (Di Natale et al., 1996; Guadarrama et al., 2001). More recently electronic noses have been used for the quality control and process monitoring of foodstuffs such as olive oil (Guadarrama et al., 2000; Guadarrama et al., 2001) or milk spoilage (Magan et al., 2001). However, the ability of ENs as a diagnostic tool is attracting more and more research groups. It is well known that smell can be used to diagnose diseases and has been used by both the Greeks and the Chinese since 2,000 BC (Mitruka, 1975). Of particular interest are infectious diseases such as bacterial vaginosis (Chandiok et al., 1997), pulmonary infections (Hanson et al., 1997), tuberculosis (Pavlou and Turner, 2000), bacteruria (Aathithan et al., 2001) and urinary tract infections (Pavlou et al., 2002) as well as breath analyses of patients suffering from diabetes (Ping et al., 1997) or uraemia (Lin et al., 2001). Di Natale and co-workers (1999) investigated the capability of an EN to detect traces of blood in urine samples of kidney patients. However, this group could not give an explanation of which volatiles are responsible for the sensor response.

1.3 Aims

The study was divided into two parts. In the first part, the potential of an electronic nose as a novel monitoring system for haemodialysis was investigated. In the second part, the electronic nose data were compared to traditional biochemical monitoring parameters (urea, creatinine, etc.). The aim of the study was to find out whether there was sufficient information within the data to discriminate between pre and post dialysis blood. This was achieved using exploratory data analysis techniques.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Blood Collection

Blood samples were collected either from patients undergoing intermittent HD-treatment at Gloucester Royal Hospital or healthy volunteers (Control blood). Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Gloucestershire Research Ethics Committee (Study No.: 01/149G). All patients and volunteers participating in this study gave informed written consent before blood samples were taken. Each sample was encoded to ensure anonymity.

All patients are treated either with a Fresenius F6 or Fresenius F8 dialyser (Fresenius AG, Bad Homburg v.d.H., Germany) The surface area of the polysulfone membrane is either 1.3 m$^2$ (F6 dialyser) or 1.8 m$^2$ (F8 dialyser). The blood flow varied between 200 and 350 ml/min, depending on the patient, whereas the dialysate flow rate was kept constant at 500 ml/min. All patients included in this study undergo haemodialysis treatment three times a week for four hours per session.

2.1.1 Blood collection for biochemical analysis

From each patient, 10 ml of pre- and post-dialysis blood, respectively and from each volunteer 10 ml of control were drawn and placed in Vacuette® Serum tubes (Greiner, UK) prior to analysis by the Department of Chemical Pathology at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital (Gloucester, UK).

The relevant details (Gender, Age) are summarised in table 1.

Table 1

2.1.2 Blood collection for the analysis of volatile compounds using an electronic nose

The analysis of volatile compounds by means of an electronic nose was performed on whole blood. Therefore, sampling tubes containing EDTA as an anticoagulant (Greiner bio-one, Vacuette®, coagulation tubes) were used for blood sampling. A subset (8 control samples, 11 dialysis patient) from the original 11 volunteers and 28
patients, respectively were used for this experiment, i.e. the blood samples were taken at the same time and from the same patients as for the biochemical analysis. From each patient, 4 ml of pre- and post-dialysis blood, respectively and from each volunteer 4 ml of control blood were taken. The blood samples were stored at –20 °C until the analysis was performed.

The relevant details (Gender, Age) are summarised in table 2.

Table 2

2.2 Analysis of volatile compounds in blood

2.2.1 Preparation of the blood samples

Blood samples were defrosted on ice to minimise the loss of volatile compounds. Samples were diluted 1:4 in 0.9 % (w/v) NaCl-solution and mixed thoroughly. A 1 ml aliquot of the diluted blood was transferred into a 10 ml headspace vial (Jaytee Bioscience Ltd., UK) and immediately sealed using a crimp cap with Silicon/Teflon-septum (Jaytee Bioscience Ltd, UK). The sealed headspace vials were subsequently incubated for 45 minutes at 37 °C.

2.2.2 Gas-sensing system and headspace sampling

For this study an EN (Bloodhound BH-114, Bloodhound Sensors, Leeds, UK) employing 14 conducting polymers based on polyaniline was used. The sensor unit automatically sets two calibration points. The first one is the baseline, which is obtained when activated carbon filtered (Carbon Cap 150, Whatman) air is passed over the sensor at a flow rate of 4 ml min⁻¹. The second calibration point is a reference point obtained from the headspace of a control sample vial containing 9 ml of RO-water (Fig. 1).
Two sensor parameters were selected in this study: divergence (maximum step response) and area (area under the response curve). The sampling profile was set at 10 s of absorption and 15 s of desorption.

For the analysis of the unknown headspace, the sample vials were connected to the “electronic nose” by inserting a needle into the headspace of the sample vials (Fig. 1). The test gaseous phase was passed over the sensor surface at a flow rate of 200 ml min\(^{-1}\), which was automatically set by the sensor unit. Between each measurement, a time delay of 2 minutes was set. The individual samples were randomly analysed.

**Fig. 1**

### 2.3 Data Analysis

To analyse the multivariate data, two standard methods, namely principal component analysis (PCA) and hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) were applied. Prior to these methods no scaling was undertaken. To perform these analyses an Excel add-in software (XLstat\(^{\text{©}},\) version 3.4, France) was used.

#### 2.3.1 Principal Component Analysis

PCA is an unsupervised data reduction method. The basic idea of the method is to describe the variation of a multivariate data set in terms of a set of uncorrelated variables, each of which is a particular linear combination of the original variables. In other words, the original data matrix is projected from a high dimensional space into a less dimensional space, preferably a plane or a 3-dimensional space. During the process the original data set is reduced in dimensions, i.e. is compressed, with as little loss of information as possible. This is achieved by filtering out the noise in the original data matrix, without removing essential information described in the variance of the data [Otto, 1999; Massart *et al.*, 1988].

Mathematically, the key idea of PCA is to decompose the original \(i \times j\) data matrix \(X\) into its \(i \times k\) score matrix \(T\), its \(k \times j\) loading matrix \(P\) and the residual matrix \(E\) according to:
\[ X = TP + E \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where \( i \) is the number of samples, \( j \) is the number of variables and \( k \) is the number of principal components (PCs). The PCs are determined on the basis of the maximum variance criterion. Each subsequent PC describes a maximum of variance, which is not modelled by the previous one. According to this, the first PC contains the most of the variance of the data [Otto, 1999; Everitt and Dunn, 2001]. The relationship between samples can be visualised by plotting the scores against each other.

2.3.2 Hierarchical Cluster Analysis

HCA is an unsupervised method that combines individual samples into clusters according to their similarities to each other. The similarity between two samples is determined by the (Euclidean) distance between them, which can be calculated for two samples \( p_1 (x_1, y_1) \) and \( p_2 (x_2, y_2) \) as follows:

\[
d_{(p_1,p_2)} = [(x_1-x_2)^2 + (y_1-y_2)^2]^{1/2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \( d_{(p_1,p_2)} \) is the distance between the two samples.

The next step is the reduction of the distance matrix by aggregation of clusters, whereby the clusters with the shortest distances between them are aggregated first. The most commonly used technique, and the one used here, is the Ward’s method. The key idea of this method is that clusters are aggregated in such a way, that a minimum increase in the within-group variance results [Otto, 1999; Everitt and Dunn, 2001].

3. Results

3.1 Biochemical Analysis

Five biochemical parameters (urea, creatinine, carbon dioxide, phosphate, and calcium phosphate) were selected for this analysis and are summarised in table 3.
As expected, small uremic toxins such as urea and creatinine were effectively removed during haemodialysis. However, the post-dialysis concentrations of these molecules were higher than compared to healthy subjects. These results are well known, but it is almost impossible to present this multivariate data set in a reasonable way (two- or three-dimensional space) in their raw form. Therefore, the original matrix was reduced in dimensionality using PCA. The results of plotting the PCA scores for all samples is shown in Fig 2.

Fig. 2

Fig 2a demonstrates that it is possible to discriminate between post- and pre-dialysis blood (dashed line) by using the first two PCs (axis 1 and 2), which account for 83 % of the variance of the original data matrix. However, it was impossible to separate control blood from post-dialysis blood, but according to table 3, there is a notable difference. After introducing a third PC (vertical axis 3, Fig. 2b), which accounts for 14 % of variance, it was possible to distinguish between control blood and post-dialysis blood.

The HCA revealed similar results to the PCA, as shown in Fig. 3. From the original 28-dialysis patients used in this analysis, only in 3 cases (patients: 15, 19, and 24) was it not possible to distinguish between post- and pre-dialysis blood. This is due to small difference between pre – and post-dialysis blood, i.e. there is just a slight decrease of the concentrations of the five biochemical parameters during dialysis treatment (data not shown).
3.2 Analysis of volatile compounds in blood using an electronic nose

As can be seen in Fig. 4, a good separation between control blood, pre- and post-dialysis blood was obtained (dashed lines added by the author). The first two principal components (PC) account for 94 % of the variance in the original data matrix. The third PC accounts for just 2 % of the variance, and therefore made no significant contribution to the discrimination of the samples.

Fig. 4

Similar results were obtained when using HCA, as shown in Fig. 5. In one case (patient 9), no difference between pre- and post-dialysis blood was observable. It can be seen that the odour of the post-dialysis sample of patient 1 (PoD1) resembled the odour of control blood, and the odour of the pre-dialysis sample (PD1) was similar to post-dialysis blood.

Fig. 5

4. Discussion

This study has shown that by application of multivariate methods combined with traditional biochemistry (see 3.1) and modern electronic nose technology (see 3.2), respectively, it might be possible to discriminate “uremic” blood from control blood. However, more important is the possibility to distinguish between pre- and post-dialysis blood. It has to be mentioned, that PCA as well as HCA are exploratory data analysis techniques, whose main goal to visualise the original data matrix, i.e. they are not classification methods. The application of these methods to traditional biochemical data (Fig. 2 and 3), demonstrated the efficacy of these tools, even when the outcome was not “blinded”.
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In the second part of the study, an electronic nose was applied to investigate the headspace of “uremic” blood and control blood, respectively. The results of this experiment were similar to the first one, i.e. a good separation between the different types of blood was possible. However, the physical and chemical basis leading to the sensor response were more complex. An electronic nose is an array of chemical gas sensors, therefore only gas molecules in the sample headspace contribute to the sensor response. The volatility of molecules is influenced by many parameters such as concentration, equilibration temperature, equilibration time, and viscosity of the sample (Seto, 1994).

To determine which volatiles may be responsible for the difference in electronic nose response, it is important to consider the nature of chronic renal failure and its treatment. Chronic renal failure is characterised by the accumulation of waste products and excessive body fluids. These metabolic waste products as well as body fluids are normally excreted with urine. Therefore, “uraemic” blood contains numerous compounds, some of them are volatile others are not. In the past, many groups tried to identify “uraemic” molecules, which are generally divided into three groups: small, middle and large molecules (Levy et al. 2001). Volatile compounds are generally small and polar (Gardner and Bartlett, 1999). In the past, several research groups identified these molecules using mainly gas chromatography and gas chromatography – mass spectroscopy. The range of molecules retained in uraemia is broad, including free organic acids, phenolic compounds, aliphatic amines, alcohols, aldehydes, ketones and guanidines (Baba et al., 1984; Liebich et al., 1984; Niwa et al., 1981; Liebich et al., 1977). All of them are present in elevated concentrations in CRF patients. Bowen et al. (1975) investigated benzyl alcohol present in blood of CRF patients. They found elevated values of benzyl alcohol in dialysis patients before the session and lower levels after the treatment. Benzyl alcohol was not found in normal controls. Baba et al. (1984) analysed serum aliphatic amines using HPLC. They found a six-fold increase of methylamine and dimethylamine in uraemic serum compared to normal control subjects. The degree of removal of these compounds is smaller than for urea and creatinine and is approximately 55% (Baba et al., 1984; Lichtenberger et al., 1993). The same group found similar concentration of the volatile ethanolamine in pre-dialysis serum and control serum, but a two-fold increased level in post-dialysis samples (Baba et al., 1984). Other investigators found volatiles such as methylmercaptan (Dowty et al., 1975), acetone, 2-butanoine,
chloroform, benzene, toluene, pyridine, dipropylketone, cyclohexanone, and 4-heptanone in uraemic blood (Liebich, 1977). All these substances are characterised by a relatively small molecular weight ($M_r < 500$) and are retained in CRF patients. However, due to their low molecular weight they are effectively removed during a haemodialysis session, leading to a decreased concentration in post-dialysis samples. On the other hand, investigators found an increased oxidative stress in HD patients during the treatment mainly caused by the incompatibility of the dialysis membrane. This additional oxidative stress leads to the generation of free radicals causing enhanced lipid peroxidation (Tetta et al., 1999; Erdogan et al., 2002). The end products of lipid peroxidation are aldehydes (malonaldehyde, propanal), ketones (acetone) and small carbohydrates (ethane, pentane) (Hageman et al., 1992; Capodicasa et al., 1999). This process leads to a continuous increase of volatiles in the blood during the treatment.

From this, we conclude that the sensor response is caused by the combined effect of a) removal of accumulated waste products, b) the generation of volatiles during HD via lipid peroxidation and c) probably the generation of volatiles during the sample incubation period (e.g. ammonia from urea). Therefore, the difference between pre- and post-dialysis samples is mainly caused by different concentrations of molecules rather than the appearance of new molecules. Hudon et al. (2000) found that conducting polymers show a linear relationship between sensor response and concentration. This finding is in agreement with Persaud et al. (1996). Our hypothesis is supported by the fact, that conducting polymers are very sensitive (5 – 0.1 ppm) towards polar molecules (Schiffman et al. 1997).

In the past only a few applications have been described in the literature where electronic noses have been used for renal diseases. Among these is the work of Lin et al. (2001), who applied an electronic nose for the diagnosis of uraemia. This group found marker substances in the breath of chronic renal failure patients such as di- and trimethylamine, which allowed the differentiation between healthy controls and uraemic patients. Based on these findings, breath analysis may be a useful substrate for a new monitoring system.

The main aim was to investigate the potential of an electronic nose as a novel online monitoring system for haemodialysis. To date, no medical application could be found in the literature where a gas-sensing array was applied on-line and in real-time. Such applications described in the literature are mainly located in the food industry or
for waste water treatment. For example, Bourgeois et al. (2001) used an electronic nose for the on-line monitoring of waste water streams.

The electronic nose itself showed good reproducibility, i.e. any sensor drift was insignificant compared to the difference between samples types.

5. Conclusions

This study suggests that electronic nose technology might be a useful tool in discriminating pre-dialysis form post-dialysis blood as well as control blood. Together with an appropriate classification model, it might be possible to build an on-line monitoring system for the management of renal failure. It might also be possible to improve and modify currently used sensor arrays towards specific volatile markers or marker groups, which would simplify the optimisation of such applications.

However, more work needs to be done to make this application a rapid and efficient diagnostic/monitoring device.
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Legend:

Table 1: Personal details of volunteers / patients for the biochemical analysis

Table 2: Personal details of volunteers / patients for the analysis of volatile compounds using an electronic nose

Table 3: Summary of results of biochemical analysis, showing minimal (min) and maximum (max) concentration as well as the mean concentration of Control blood, Post- and Pre-dialysis blood

Fig. 1: Experimental set-up of the electronic nose. The set-up consists of the electronic nose itself, a sample and a control vial as well as two activated carbon filters and a HEPA-Vent filter. The carbon filters ensure an odourless airflow over the sensor surface and control and sample headspace, whereas the HEPA-VENT filter prevents the fouling of the sensor surface. The electronic nose is connected to a PC running the control software and a data analysis package.

Fig. 2: PCA – Analysis of Control blood (■), Post-dialysis blood (▲) and Pre-dialysis blood (●) based on five biochemical parameters. (a) The first two principal components allow the discrimination between pre-dialysis blood and a mixed cluster containing post-dialysis blood samples and control blood samples. (b) The introduction of a third principal component allows the discrimination between post-dialysis blood and control blood. The Post- and Pre-dialysis blood with the same number belong to the same patient.

Fig. 3: Cluster analysis of Control blood, Post-dialysis blood and Pre-dialysis blood based on five biochemical parameters Legend: PD = Pre-dialysis blood, PoD = Post-dialysis blood, and C = Control blood
Fig. 4: PCA – Analysis of Control blood (■), Post-dialysis blood (▲) and Pre-dialysis blood (●) after 45 min incubation at 37 ºC. Post- and Pre-dialysis blood with the same number belong to the same patient.

Fig. 5: Cluster Analysis of Control blood, Post- and Pre-dialysis blood after 45 min incubation at 37 ºC. Legend: PD = Pre-dialysis blood, PoD = Post-dialysis blood, and C = Control blood
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteers / Patients</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control blood</td>
<td>11 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and Post-dialysis blood</td>
<td>28 7 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteers / Patients</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control blood</td>
<td>8   5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and Post-dialysis blood</td>
<td>11 3 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control blood</th>
<th>Post – dialysis blood</th>
<th>Pre – dialysis blood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urea [mmol L⁻¹]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creatinine [mmol L⁻¹]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>366.5</td>
<td>788.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO₂ [mmol L⁻¹]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phosphate [mmol L⁻¹]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ca²⁺ x PO₄²⁻ [mmol L⁻¹]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1
Fig. 2
Fig. 3
Fig. 4
Dendrogram

Fig. 5