No effect of increased water intake on blood viscosity and cardiovascular risk factors
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Observational data have suggested that increased water intake decreases the risk of CHD. A postulated mechanism is that increased water ingestion reduces blood viscosity. The aim of the present study was to assess the effect of increased fluid intake on blood viscosity. Men (n 67) and post-menopausal women (n 27) with one or more risk factors for CVD who reported intake of ≥0·5 litres water daily were randomised to a control group (n 31), an intervention group (n 32) that increased their daily water intake by 1 litre/d and an intervention group (n 31) that ingested 1 litre blueberry juice/d. All were encouraged to continue their usual diet and lifestyle. Whole-blood viscosity and blood and urine chemistries were measured by standard techniques after 2 and 4 weeks. Urine volume increased (by a median of 872 and 725 ml in the water and blueberry juice groups, respectively, v. 10 ml in the control group; P < 0·002), confirming the subjects’ adherence to the protocol. Urine osmolality and urinary levels of Na, K and creatinine decreased in the water and blueberry juice groups v. the controls (P < 0·05). No change was seen in whole-blood viscosity or in levels of fibrinogen, total protein, lipids, glucose, insulin, C-peptide or other chemistry and haematology variables. In conclusion, a postulated protective effect of increased water or fluid intake is not explained by a change in blood viscosity and increased fluid intake does not influence CVD risk factors in the short term.

Blood viscosity: Water: Fluids: Coronary heart disease risk factors

Few studies have investigated the effect of water intake on the incidence of CVD. In the Adventist Health Study there was a dose-relationship between water intake and protection against fatal CHD (Chan et al. 2002). One of the suggested mechanisms of this effect is that water ingestion may reduce blood viscosity; however, a recent systematic review found no direct evidence that a decrease in viscosity due to high fluid intake can prevent CVD (Okamura et al. 2005).

The primary determinants of whole-blood viscosity are plasma viscosity, packed cell volume and macromolecules, including fibrinogen. Initial reports indicated that plasma viscosity (Yarnell et al. 1991) and packed cell volume (Gagnon et al. 1994) were independent predictors of CVD. Subsequently, whole-blood viscosity and packed cell volume were shown to be independent predictors of coronary events (Danesh et al. 2000). The major CVD risk factors are independently associated with whole-blood or plasma viscosity (Bonithon-Kopp et al. 1993; Fossum et al. 1997). Thus, increased viscosity may be one mechanism by which cardiovascular risk factors promote atherosclerosis and plaque formation (Lee et al. 1998). Whole-blood or plasma viscosity is inversely related to insulin sensitivity (Høieggen et al. 1998) and strongly related to metabolic risk factors (Fossum et al. 1997).

Given this background, the question of whether increased water intake reduces blood viscosity is of interest, but only limited data exist. We examined the effect of increasing short-term water intake on whole-blood viscosity and its correlates in subjects with cardiovascular risk factors in a randomised, parallel-design, controlled clinical trial that included a control group and a group that ingested 1 litre blueberry juice/d providing a comparison with an energy-containing fluid.

Methods

Subjects

Patients seen at our clinic were informed about the study. Additional recruitment was by newspaper advertisement. Eligibility was men aged 30–70 years and women aged 45–70 years who were at least 12 months postmenopausal. Other
inclusion criteria were written informed consent, willingness to drink 1 litre water or blueberry juice per d in addition to usual fluid intake and habitual ingestion of two or fewer cups (0.5 litres) water per d. In addition, the presence of at least one cardiovascular risk factor was required, including cigarette smoking, systolic blood pressure (BP) \( \geq 135 \) but \( \leq 160 \text{ mmHg} \) or diastolic BP \( > 90 \) but \( \leq 100 \text{ mmHg} \), hyperlipidaemia, or elevated packed cell volume (\( \geq 0.40 \) for women or \( \geq 0.42 \) for men).

Exclusion criteria were impaired renal function and use of lipid-lowering drugs or other drugs that could affect blood viscosity. Additional exclusions were BMI \( \leq 31 \text{ kg/m}^2 \), alcohol or drug abuse or psychiatric illness, more than three units alcohol daily (men) or more than one unit daily (women), endocrine or other disease that affects thirst mechanisms, blood donation in the previous 6 months, CVD, any chronic disease, cancer (within 5 years) or other disease that could affect the results. The study was evaluated by the ethics committee (region 1).

Study design

Subjects completed the study between 2 January and Easter, between Easter and the summer vacation in June or between the end of the summer vacation in August and Christmas to minimise seasonal and holiday effects on physical activity, thirst, and risk factors. A randomised, parallel design with a 1- to 3-week run-in period followed by a 4-week intervention period was used. Following the screening visit 1–3 weeks before randomisation, potential subjects recorded all fluid intake and physical activity for 1 week. Subjects that met all the inclusion criteria were randomised to one of three groups. The control group continued their usual diet, physical activity and fluid ingestion patterns. The intervention groups continued their usual diet, physical activity and fluid ingestion and in addition were asked to increase their water intake by 1 litre/d or to ingest 1 litre blueberry juice/d. Either tap water or bottled still water was allowed; however, less than five subjects drank tap water primarily. Bottled water (Imsdal, Ringsnes AS, Oslo, Norway) and blueberry juice produced with no additives or sugar (Coronar Safteri AS, Ranheim, Norway) were provided free of charge. The study coordinator obtained the group assignment for each subject by opening a sealed envelope at each visit. All subjects were asked to record total fluid intake and physical activity for 4 weeks, respectively, in the control group, while consumption increased from 1·97 (SD 0·69) to 3·01 (SD 0·78) and in addition were asked to increase their water intake by 1 litre/d or to ingest 1 litre blueberry juice/d. Either tap water or bottled still water was allowed; however, less than five subjects drank tap water primarily. Bottled water (Imsdal, Ringsnes AS, Oslo, Norway) and blueberry juice produced with no additives or sugar (Coronar Safteri AS, Ranheim, Norway) were provided free of charge. The study coordinator obtained the group assignment for each subject by opening an envelope at each visit. All subjects were asked to record total fluid intake and physical activity for 4 weeks, respectively, in the control group, while consumption increased from 1·97 (SD 0·69) to 3·01 (SD 0·78) litre/d in the water group and from 1·93 (SD 0·90) to 2·85 (SD 0·75) litre/d in the blueberry juice group.

BP, pulse and body weight remained stable and unchanged between the groups (data not shown). There were no changes in blood haematology and chemistry values including fibrinogen, total protein, lipids, glucose, insulin and C-peptide in the intervention compared with the control group (data not shown). In both intervention groups, urine volume increased and levels of urine osmolality, electrolytes and creatinine decreased (Table 1). The median change in urine volume from baseline to week 4 was 10 (range \(-1500 \) to \(+1230\) ml in the control group and \(872 \text{ ml} \) in the water group and \(725 \text{ ml} \) in the blueberry juice group.

Whole-blood viscosity was unchanged between the groups (Table 2). Baseline levels of blood viscosity (shear rate 99/s)
Table 1. Urine volume and chemistry in the control and intervention (water and blueberry) groups
(Mean values and standard deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Blueberry</th>
<th>P between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Mean)</td>
<td>Week 4 (Mean)</td>
<td>Baseline (Mean)</td>
<td>Week 4 (Mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (ml/d)</td>
<td>1587 (594)</td>
<td>1649 (657)</td>
<td>1693 (645)</td>
<td>2573** (880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmolality (mosmol/kg water)</td>
<td>655·4 (214·3)</td>
<td>609·9 (185·5)</td>
<td>639·1 (225·9)</td>
<td>437·0 (155·6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na (mmol/l)</td>
<td>116 (46)</td>
<td>113 (47)</td>
<td>109 (47)</td>
<td>77* (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na excretion (mmol/d)</td>
<td>165 (54)</td>
<td>174 (81)</td>
<td>173 (84)</td>
<td>185 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (mmol/l)</td>
<td>56·4 (17·4)</td>
<td>56·8 (20·0)</td>
<td>56·3 (19·4)</td>
<td>38·2** (14·8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K excretion (mmol/d)</td>
<td>89·4 (39·6)</td>
<td>86·0 (25·9)</td>
<td>87·9 (25·6)</td>
<td>91·5 (29·3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine (mmol/l)</td>
<td>10·0 (5·3)</td>
<td>9·2 (3·2)</td>
<td>10·7 (5·2)</td>
<td>6·9* (2·6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine excretion (mmol/d)</td>
<td>13·5 (3·9)</td>
<td>13·9 (4·6)</td>
<td>16·1 (6·6)</td>
<td>16·1 (4·2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean value was significantly different from that of the control group: *P = 0·03, †P = 0·01, ‡P = 0·007, §§P = 0·003, ||P = 0·002, ¶P = 0·001, **P = 0·0001.

Table 2. Whole-blood viscosity (mPa s) at different shear rates in the control and intervention (water and blueberry juice) groups*
(Mean values and standard deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shear rate (/s)</th>
<th>Control Baseline Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Control Week 4 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Water Baseline Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Water Week 4 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Blueberry Baseline Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Blueberry Week 4 Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>24·3 (3·9)</td>
<td>23·2 (3·6)</td>
<td>22·7 (3·9)</td>
<td>22·7 (4·6)</td>
<td>23·7 (4·4)</td>
<td>22·3 (3·8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>17·5 (2·9)</td>
<td>16·5 (2·7)</td>
<td>16·3 (2·8)</td>
<td>16·2 (3·2)</td>
<td>16·8 (3·3)</td>
<td>15·8 (2·6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4·6 (0·47)</td>
<td>4·4 (0·39)</td>
<td>4·5 (0·41)</td>
<td>4·4 (0·50)</td>
<td>4·5 (0·44)</td>
<td>4·4 (0·34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>4·2 (0·41)</td>
<td>4·1 (0·36)</td>
<td>4·1 (0·37)</td>
<td>4·1 (0·45)</td>
<td>4·1 (0·37)</td>
<td>4·0 (0·32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There were no statistically significant differences between the groups.
were correlated with BMI (Pearson’s correlation coefficient r 0.22, P=0.03), waist circumference (r 0.39; P<0.0001), triacylglycerols (r 0.24; P=0.02) and HDL-cholesterol (r −0.27; P=0.008). Blood viscosity was not related to urine volume (r 0.03; P=0.8), urine osmolality (r 0.18; P=0.09) or reported fluid intake (r 0.18; P=0.08) at baseline (shear rate 99/s). All these correlations were similar to those at other shear rates (data not shown).

Discussion

We observed no change in whole-blood viscosity, fibrinogen, lipids or other chemistry and haematology variables in the present randomised clinical trial of a short-term increase in water or blueberry juice ingestion. Subjects were men and women with one or more risk factors for CVD and thus may have had a high potential for a reduction in blood viscosity. Blood viscosity was correlated with the cardiovascular risk factor levels as expected and as has been demonstrated in previous studies but there was no relationship between blood viscosity and water intake, urine volume or urine osmolality at baseline.

There are several probable explanations for the lack of effect of water ingestion. First, the subjects had no clinical conditions likely to cause mild hypohydration and their intake of total fluids was adequate at baseline (nearly 2 litres/d). Furthermore, the subjects had normal renal function; normal kidneys are very effective in maintaining intravascular volume. Second, the increased fluid ingestion (water or blueberry juice) was distributed throughout the day and not just before the measurement of blood viscosity. Usual homeostatic mechanisms are expected to rapidly compensate for the increase in fluid ingestion leading to an increase in urine volume. In contrast, in a previous study conducted among a small number of elderly subjects, ingestion of a glass of an electrolyte drink at midnight was associated with a drop or a lower rise in blood viscosity at 04.00 and 08.00 hours (Kurabayashi et al. 1991).

Though we did not evaluate fluid intake from solid foods, the observed increase in urine volume indicates that the primary aim of the study, to attain an increase in fluid intake, was achieved, and that the subjects in the study complied with the instructions to increase fluid intake. A larger increase may have been required to show an effect on viscosity. Urine osmolality was reduced and changes in urinary excretion of Na, K and creatinine were observed. Total fluid intake at the start of the study correlated with urine volume (r 0.56; P<0.01) and with urine osmolality (r 0.31; P<0.01), strengthening the validity of the reported fluid intake according to the diary.

In conclusion, increased water intake in the short term did not decrease blood viscosity in subjects with cardiovascular risk factors. Further study is required to determine long-term effects and whether these may occur in other patient groups.
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