Hemoglobin levels among male agricultural workers: analyses from the Demographic and Health Surveys to investigate a marker for chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology

Authors: Yuzhou Lin,[a] Siyu Heng,[b] Shuchi Anand,[c] Sameer K. Deshpande,[d] and Dylan S. Small[a]

[a] Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States of America.

[b] Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States of America.

[c] Division of Nephrology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305, United States of America.

[d] Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, United States of America.

Corresponding Author:

Correspondence to Dylan Small (email: dsmall@wharton.upenn.edu)

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology (CKDu) has been found at high frequency in several lowland agricultural areas including Meso-America and Sri Lanka. Whether CKDu also occurs in other countries with large agricultural populations remains uncertain, primarily due to lack of systematic data on kidney function. Hemoglobin (Hgb) levels could be

an ancillary marker for presence of kidney dysfunction. Our goal is to estimate the causal effect of agricultural work on Hgb level in men. A causal effect may indicate the presence of CKDu.

Methods: We use Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) data from seven African and Asian countries (Ethiopia, Lesotho, Namibia, Senegal, Uganda, Zimbabwe, and India). We use optimal full matching and permutation inference to estimate the causal effect of agricultural work on altitude-adjusted Hgb levels after adjusting for six known confounders. To assess potential bias due to unmeasured socioeconomic differences, we use multiple control groups that differ in non-agricultural occupation. We then conduct sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our causal conclusions to unmeasured confounding.

Results: Data were available for 41,180 agricultural workers and 55,705 non-agricultural workers in seven countries. On average, Hgb levels were 0.09 g/dL (95% CI [-0.12, -0.07]) lower among agricultural workers compared to matched controls. Significant effects were observed in Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Senegal, and Uganda, with effects from 0.10 to 0.32 g/dL lower hemoglobin among agricultural workers. The effect was not attenuated in sensitivity analyses involving both better-off and worse-off occupational controls.

Discussion: We find evidence that men engaged in agricultural work in five of the seven countries studied have modestly lower Hgb levels compared with other men living in rural areas. Since underlying kidney disease could be a potential explanation for this finding, our data support consideration to integrating kidney function assessments within DHS surveys and other population-based surveys.

Keywords: Chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology; occupational health; health hazards in agriculture; full matching

KEY MESSAGES

Teaser Key Message: Evidence that agricultural work reduces hemoglobin was found in Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Senegal, and Uganda. Combined with previous evidence on chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology (CKDu) being prevalent among agricultural workers, this suggests the presence of CKDu in these countries. Health surveys should consider adding kidney function assessments.

Detailed Key Messages:

Key Findings:

- A consistent and modest effect of agricultural work on hemoglobin levels were found.
- Men engaged in agricultural work in Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Senegal, and Uganda have modestly lower Hgb levels compared with other men living in rural areas, which indicates potential presence of chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology (CKDu) in those areas.
- The findings were robust to consideration of multiple control groups (occupations that tend to have higher and lower socioeconomic status) and a modest amount of unmeasured confounding (the findings were robust to an unmeasured confounder that increases the odds of being an agricultural worker by 8%).

Key Implications:

- Further studies are warranted investigating the link between agricultural work and kidney dysfunction in the five countries where we found evidence of lower Hgb among agricultural workers (Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Senegal and Uganda).
- Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and other population-based surveys should consider adding kidney function assessments in their future surveys for African and Asian countries.

INTRODUCTION

A kidney disease of uncertain etiology has been found to be occurring at high frequency in several lowland agricultural areas of the world including Meso-America and Sri Lanka, where it is now recognized as a leading cause of death.[1,2,3] Whether this disease (CKDu) also occurs in other countries with large agricultural populations remains uncertain, primarily due to lack of systematic data on kidney function.

On a population-wide level, lacking data on serum creatinine assessments, hemoglobin (Hgb) levels could be an ancillary marker for presence of kidney dysfunction. Although the prevalence of frank anemia (i.e., Hgb < 13 g/dL in men and < 12 g/dL in women) is relatively low even at moderate levels of kidney dysfunction, Hgb levels start to drop early in the disease course.[4] In an analysis from the third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, Astor et al. observed a decline in median Hgb levels starting at estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) below 60 ml/min/1.73m^2. Hsu et al. reported a signal starting at earlier stages of kidney dysfunction; for

example, estimated Hgb were -0.2 g/dL lower among men with eGFR 60-70 compared with men with eGFR > 80 ml/min/1.73m^2.[5]

The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) are nationally-representative household surveys primarily conducted in low- and middle-income countries that collect data on several health and sociodemographic indicators.[6] Since Hgb levels are systematically measured in the DHS, we sought to evaluate their association with occupation, with the hypothesis that Hgb levels would be lower among men working in agriculture than among men working in other occupations after accounting for age, and nutritional and wealth indices. Such a finding is potentially indicative of an under-recognized higher prevalence of kidney dysfunction among agricultural workers. Such a finding would also support rationale for integrating systematic screening for kidney disease by occupation in future DHS surveys as well as other national or regional disease surveillance systems.

METHODS

Study population

We obtained from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series' recoding of the Demographic and Health Surveys (IPUMS-DHS) the standard DHS survey data for our analysis. Standard DHS surveys, which are usually conducted in various developing countries every five years, collect comparative data on population, health, and nutrition.[7] We picked one standard DHS survey per country using IPUMS-DHS, as IPUMS-DHS recodes some DHS variables across different

surveys to make sure important data are consistent across years and surveys.[8] We used three criteria to select country samples: (1) availability of Hgb levels; (2) availability of data on six *a priori* identified potential confounders of hemoglobin and occupation (see Supplementary Materials Section 1 for details on the six measured confounders); (3) samples collected in the most recent year the DHS was conducted for the country were preferred. The final selected DHS samples were from six African countries and one Asian country (surveys were conducted in different years, between 2010 and 2016), including Ethiopia in 2016, Lesotho in 2014, Namibia in 2013, Senegal in 2010, Uganda in 2016, Zimbabwe in 2015, and India in 2015.

Since most agricultural workers live in rural areas, we included only men from rural areas in our analytic sample. We exclude all men whose occupation or Hgb level were missing. A flow diagram of inclusion criteria and data pre-processing steps is available in Section 2 of the Supplementary Materials. In all, our analytic sample contained 41,180 agricultural workers and 55,705 non-agricultural workers, whose ages ranged between 15 and 64 at the time of the surveys.

Data extraction

We extracted data on male workers' age, body mass index, wealth index, education level, marital status, religion, occupation, and altitude-adjusted Hgb. DHS adjusted its measured Hgb of male workers for altitudes higher than 1,000 meters since oxygen is less available as altitude increases so effective hemoglobin count is lowered (see Supplementary Materials Section 1 for details on the adjustment).[9] The agricultural worker category coded by IPUMS-DHS includes farmers,

either self-employed or employee, as well as fishermen, foresters, breeders, and hunters.[10] Non-agricultural workers consist of the following occupations – professional, managerial, clerical, sales, manual labor, household, domestic services, and other non-agricultural occupations – as well as those not working.

Matching

Agricultural workers and non-agricultural workers may differ substantially in the six measured confounders (age, body mass index, wealth index, education, marital status and religion) and these confounders may affect Hgb. Consequently, a direct comparison of the average Hgb levels of the agricultural workers and nonagricultural workers may be biased. To remove bias, we constructed matched sets of agricultural workers and non-agricultural rural workers who are similar on the measured confounders. We then then compared Hgb levels within these matched sets of comparable agricultural and nonagricultural workers. To construct the matched sets, we implemented optimal full matching[11,12] using the R package "optmatch"[13] for every DHS country sample. Each matched set contained either one agricultural worker and multiple non-agricultural workers or multiple agricultural workers and one non-agricultural workers. The full matching method imposes a propensity score caliper[14] and minimizes the rank-based Mahalanobis distance[15] between matched male workers with similar propensity scores.

To evaluate whether the agricultural workers and controls were balanced on the measured confounders within matched sets, we calculated the standardized differences before matching and after matching. The standardized difference of a confounder before matching is the

difference between the means of the confounder for the agricultural workers vs. controls (non-agricultural workers) in within group pooled standard deviation units while the standardized difference after matching is the weighted average of the difference in means within matched sets between the agricultural workers and controls in the same within group pooled standard deviation units as before matching where the weighting is by the number of agricultural workers in the matched set.[15] The goal was to achieve adequate balances over the six measured confounders, by making the standardized differences between the agricultural workers and controls on the six measured confounders below 0.1 after matching.[16]

Control Groups

One potential bias for the study is that agricultural workers might have worse socioeconomic status in ways that were not fully captured by the six measured confounders and this unmeasured socioeconomic status might affect Hgb. To assess potential bias from an unmeasured confounder, Campbell[15,17] suggested constructing two control groups that systematically vary the unmeasured confounder and examining whether the control groups have different outcomes after controlling for measured confounders. We considered two control groups of men – (i) men who had professional, managerial, clerical, and sales occupations and (ii) men who had other non-agricultural occupations (manual labor, household, and domestic services, other and not working). Control group (i) had higher measured wealth and education (mean wealth quintile = 3.32; higher than secondary education = 31.4%) than control group (ii) (mean wealth quintile = 2.65; higher than secondary education = 9.7%) and likely higher unmeasured aspects of socioeconomic status, which could affect the outcome of interest – altitude-adjusted Hgb.

Control group (ii) has higher measured wealth and education than agricultural workers (mean wealth quintile = 2.39; higher than secondary education = 4.7%) but is closer to agricultural workers than to control group (i). We call control group (i) the better-off controls and control group (ii) the worse-off controls. A detailed summary of wealth index and education level by occupation is in Section 3 of the Supplementary Materials.[15] To check the comparability of alternative control groups, we implemented four separate full matchings over the six measured confounders for the following four comparisons: agricultural vs. all controls, agricultural vs. better-off controls, agricultural vs. worse-off controls, and better-off vs. worse-off.

Permutation Inference

To estimate the treatment effect of agricultural occupation on the outcome, altitude-adjusted Hgb levels, we conducted permutation inferences on the matched DHS samples. Specifically, we used Huber's m-statistics for matched sets to calculate the upper bounds for the two-sided p-values[18] (using the "senfm" function with default parameters in the R package "sensitivityfull"[19]) and confidence intervals under the additive treatment effect model. We first conducted permutation tests for the overall effect on the whole matched sample. Then we tested country-specific effects for the seven matched DHS samples individually. We adjusted p-values from testing for the whole matched sample and the seven matched DHS samples to control the false discovery rate using the Benjamini-Hochberg approach.[20,21] To check if the alternative control groups were comparable (to test for bias from unmeasured aspects of socioeconomic status as described above), we estimated the treatment effects of occupations on altitude-adjusted Hgb levels in each

of the four comparisons. Testing for the four comparisons followed an ordered hypothesis testing procedure which controls the familywise error rate for multiple testing at level .05.[22]

Sensitivity Analysis

The permutation inference results of our primary analysis assume there are no unmeasured confounders. We assessed how sensitive the results of our primary analysis were to violations of the no unmeasured confounding assumption. Using Huber's m-statistics, we conducted sensitivity analyses first on the whole sample and then on each DHS country sample that was identified with statistically significant effects (p-value < 0.05) using the approach introduced by Rosenbaum.[16] In the sensitivity analysis, we consider different possible values of the sensitivity parameter Γ which is, for two participants with the same measured confounders, the maximum the odds ratio could be one for participant to be an agricultural worker as opposed to other occupations because of unmeasured confounding variables. For example, if the unmeasured confounding consisted of HIV status, Γ would be the odds ratio that a person with HIV would be an agricultural worker compared to a person with the same measured confounders (i.e., age, BMI, education, marital status, religion, and wealth quintile) who does not have HIV. If $\Gamma = 1$, then there is no unmeasured confounding while the more Γ departs from 1, the more unmeasured confounding there is. We cannot know Γ since it is determined by unobserved variables, but we can consider different possible Γ, compute a p-value for testing whether there is a treatment effect if that Γ were true, and continue until the p-value is greater than 0.05 to determine the sensitivity value, the maximum amount of unmeasured confounding there could be and still obtain a significant effect of treatment. The larger the sensitivity value is, the more robust are the

study's conclusions are to unmeasured confounding. We performed the sensitivity analysis using the R package "sensitivityfull".

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes the six measured confounders among agricultural and non-agricultural workers in rural areas. In our study population, agricultural workers tended to be older and have slightly lower body mass index than non-agricultural workers. They were more likely to be married, have lower educational attainment, and fall in the bottom two wealth quintiles than non-agricultural workers. **Figure 1** displays the altitude-adjusted Hgb levels for both the agricultural and all control workers across seven DHS country samples before full matching. Altitude-adjusted Hgb levels varied significantly by country. The median altitude-adjusted Hgb levels across all samples' treated and all control groups were between 13.5 and 15.1 g/dL.

TABLE 1. Mean of the six measured confounders. Except for age and BMI, we report the count (percentage) of agricultural and non-agricultural workers in each category. For age and BMI, we report the mean (standard deviation).

Correlate	Agricultural Workers (n = 41180)	Non-agricultural Workers (n = 55705)
Age (years)	34.32 (11.04)	29.20 (10.99)
BMI (kg/m^2)	20.99 (3.31)	21.20 (3.62)
Sample (n(%))		
Ethiopia 2016	5829 (14.2)	2320 (4.2)
India 2015	29706 (72.1)	44542 (80.0)
Lesotho 2014	605 (1.5)	550 (1.0)
Namibia 2013	367 (0.9)	1727 (3.1)
Senegal 2010	1327 (3.2)	1187 (2.1)
Uganda 2016	2129 (5.2)	1908 (3.4)
Zimbabwe 2015	1217 (3.0)	3471 (6.2)
Education (n(%))		
None	10374 (25.2)	6402 (11.5)

Primary school	11087 (26.9)	9469 (17.0)
Secondary school	17778 (43.2)	32180 (57.8)
Higher education	1941 (4.7)	7654 (13.7)
Marital Status (n(%))		
Never married	9562 (23.2)	25170 (45.2)
Married/partnered	30578 (74.3)	29522 (53.0)
Formerly married	1040 (2.5)	1013 (1.8)
Religion (n(%))		
No religion	403 (1.0)	897 (1.6)
Muslim	6171 (15.0)	8547 (15.3)
Christian	9653 (23.4)	10063 (18.1)
Buddhist	563 (1.4)	644 (1.2)
Hindu	23151 (56.2)	33609 (60.3)
Jewish	1 (0.0)	5 (0.0)
Traditional	107 (0.3)	107 (0.2)
Other (Specified)	581 (1.4)	1114 (2.0)
Other	550 (1.3)	719 (1.3)
Wealth quintile (n(%))		
1st quintile	12025 (29.2)	11245 (20.2)
2nd quintile	11880 (28.8)	13519 (24.3)
3rd quintile	9176 (22.3)	13875 (24.9)
4th quintile	5598 (13.6)	10716 (19.2)
5th quintile	2501 (6.1)	6350 (11.4)



FIGURE. 1: Boxplots for altitude-adjusted Hgb (g/dL) by DHS samples.

Result of Matching

We calculated the standardized differences before and after matching for agricultural workers vs. all controls from seven DHS country samples respectively (Section 4 of the Supplementary Materials). Before matching, the absolute values of the standardized differences for most confounders were larger than 0.1 for most country samples, which indicates that the two groups were not adequately balanced. After matching, all the absolute values of the standardized differences were reduced below 0.05, suggesting adequate balances on the six confounders was achieved. Matching for the comparisons of the agricultural workers vs. each control group and the comparison of control groups also achieved adequate balances.

Effect of Agricultural Work

Main results for estimating the treatment effects of agricultural occupations on altitude-adjusted Hgb are in **Table 2**. We calculated the 95% confidence intervals and p-values for testing the null hypothesis of no treatment effect for all country samples and after matching agricultural workers with all controls. From **Table 2**, in our whole dataset after adjusting for potential confounding, we estimated the average effect of agricultural work on adjusted hemoglobin levels is -0.09 g/dL with a 95% confidence interval of [-0.12, -0.07]. Among the seven countries' samples, five countries had statistically significant (false discovery rate adjusted p-value < 0.05) effects – Ethiopia (95% CI: [-0.25, -0.06]), India (95% CI: [-0.13, -0.07]), Lesotho (95% CI: [-0.56, -0.09]), Senegal (95% CI: [-0.32, -0.02]), and Uganda (95% CI: [-0.30, -0.08]).

TABLE 2. Estimated effects of agricultural work on altitude-adjusted Hgb (g/dL) after matching agricultural workers with all controls by DHS samples. Point estimate (PE) of effect and 95% confidence interval (CI). Single asterisks if the false discovery rate adjusted p-value is <0.05 and double asterisk if the false discovery rate adjusted p-value is <0.001.

DHS Sample	Number of Agricultural Workers	Number of All Control Workers	Hemoglobin Difference PE [95% CI]
Whole DHS Sample	41180	55705	-0.09 [-0.12, -0.07] **
Ethiopia 2016	5829	2320	-0.15 [-0.25, -0.06] *
India 2015	29706	44542	-0.10 [-0.13, -0.07] **
Lesotho 2014	605	550	0.32 [-0.56, -0.09] *
Namibia 2013	367	1727	0.15 [-0.07, 0.36]
Senegal 2010	1327	1187	-0.17 [-0.32, -0.02] *
Uganda 2016	2129	1908	-0.19 [-0.30, -0.08] *
Zimbabwe 2015	1220	3482	0.01 [-0.10, 0.13]

Test for Hidden Bias

Table 3 shows the estimated treatment effects of agricultural occupations vs. occupations in multiple control groups and better-off occupations vs. worse-off occupations on male workers' adjusted Hgb levels. Overall, agricultural workers had lower altitude-adjusted Hgb levels than each control group. All effects were significant using the ordered testing procedure. Agricultural workers had a more negative estimated average effect vs. better-off controls (-0.16 g/dL) than worse-off controls (-0.09 g/dL). The better-off controls had significantly better altitude-adjusted Hgb than the worse-off controls (0.08 g/dL; 95% CI [0.04, 0.13]) though the estimated difference between the better and worse off controls (0.08 g/dL) was less than the estimated difference between the worse off controls and agricultural workers (0.09 g/dL).

TABLE 3. Estimated effects of agricultural work on altitude-adjusted Hgb (g/dL) after matching agricultural workers with all controls by treated and multiple controls for the whole DHS sample. Point estimate (PE) of effect and 95% confidence interval (CI). Single asterisk if the adjusted p-value (from ordered testing) < 0.05, and two asterisks if the adjusted p-value < 0.001.

Treated vs. Control	Number of Treated Workers	Number of Control Workers	Hemoglobin Difference PE [95% CI]

Male agricultural workers vs. All Controls	41180	55705	-0.09 [-0.12, -0.07] **
Male agricultural workers vs. Better-off Controls	41180	10322	-0.16 [-0.20, -0.12] **
Male agricultural workers vs. Worse-off Controls	41180	45383	-0.09 [-0.12, -0.07] **
Better-off Controls vs. Worse-off Controls	10322	45383	0.08 [0.04, 0.13] **

Result of Sensitivity Analysis

From **Table 2**, the whole sample consisted of all seven selected DHS samples and samples including Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Senegal, and Uganda were respectively identified with statistically significant treatment effects. The result of sensitivity analysis for these samples is in Section 5 of the Supplementary Materials. For the whole sample, the sensitivity value of Γ to reach p-value 0.05 was 1.09. This means that if there were an unmeasured confounder that increases the odds of being an agricultural worker by 8%, we would still have evidence (p-value < 0.05) that being an agricultural worker causes a reduction in Hgb, but if the unmeasured confounder increased the odds by 9%, we would no longer have evidence. For the five country samples, the sensitivity value Γ to reach p-value 0.05 were between 1.04 and 1.12. Lesotho had the highest sensitivity value (1.12), and Senegal had the lowest sensitivity value (1.04).

DISCUSSION

In this study of rural men participating in DHS surveys in six African and one Asian country, we find a consistent and modest effect of agricultural work on Hgb, indicating that agricultural workers have lower Hgb levels than other men residing in rural areas. This effect held up when a quasi-experimental device – multiple control groups – was used to examine concerns about

unmeasured confounding. Since kidney dysfunction may be one potential explanation for our finding, we posit that our data provide rationale for systematic surveys of kidney function by occupation, especially in countries with large proportions of populations engaged in agricultural work.

Our observed effect size is modest (Hgb lower by ~ 0.1 g/dL among agricultural workers versus other rural men), but it is concordant with effect sizes described in prior studies among persons with mild kidney dysfunction.[4,5] We expect participation in DHS to be subject to survivor bias, and thus few, if any, persons who develop advanced kidney disease and substantial anemia, are likely present in our analytic cohort. Furthermore, our findings were robust to consideration of multiple control groups (occupations that tend to have higher and lower socioeconomic status) and a modest amount of unmeasured confounding (the findings were robust to an unmeasured confounder that increases the odds of being an agricultural worker by 8%).

Hgb level is an admittedly imperfect surrogate marker of kidney dysfunction. That said, few population-based data exist on kidney function and incidence of kidney dysfunction in agricultural communities. Even among the best described hotspots of "CKDu", systematic surveys of prevalence and incidence of kidney dysfunction are lacking. Without better mapping of affected regions and populations, identification – and prevention – of risk factors for development of kidney dysfunction will be difficult. The International Society of Nephrology has put forth a simple minimal data set inclusive of serum creatinine and urine dipsticks to assist with integration of kidney function in population surveys.[23]

Laudable investigative efforts have focused on the best-described hotspots of CKDu in Sri Lanka and in Mesoamerican countries.[2,3,24,25,26] However, the cause of CKDu remains unclear for many reasons, including due to the potentially long lag between exposure and disease, lack of advanced research infrastructure, and political unrest. If a broader link between agricultural work and CKDu is confirmed – as has been suggested as plausible by at least two studies from the US as well[27,28] – this could increase the desirability of in-depth investigations into cause. Our analysis is an attempt to evaluate the possibility of this broader link, using available data, and supports further direct investigations of kidney function by occupation.

The limitations of our study include lack of information on potential CKD-related confounders or risk factors, such as nutrition status, water quality, and HIV status. Either DHS did not measure these factors or there were too many missing values for the sample surveys we selected. There may also be other reasons besides kidney dysfunction for an effect of agricultural work on altitude-adjusted Hgb.

We recommend that DHS and other population-based surveys add measurements about agricultural workers' kidney function assessments in their future standard surveys for African and Asian countries. Further studies are warranted investigating the link between agricultural work and kidney dysfunction in the five countries where we did find evidence of lower Hgb among agricultural workers. Further detailed investigation on the effect heterogeneity of agricultural work on Hgb levels by confounders such as age and temperature could also be valuable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

None declared.

FUNDING

This research was supported in part by the University of Wisconsin – Madison, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education with funds from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation. Dr. Shuchi Anand was supported by R01DK127138.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared.

REFERENCES

1. Almaguer M, Herrera R, Orantes CM. Chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in agricultural communities. *MEDICC Rev*. 2014;16(2):9–15.

2. Rajapakse S, Shivanthan MC, Selvarajah M. Chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Sri Lanka. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2016;22(3):259–264.

3. Wesseling C, Crowe J, Hogstedt C, Jakobsson K, Lucas R, Wegman DH. The epidemic of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Mesoamerica: a call for interdisciplinary research and action. *Am J Public Health*. 2013;103(11):1927–1930.

4. Astor BC, Muntner P, Levin A, Eustace JA, Coresh J. Association of kidney function with anemia: The third national health and nutrition examination survey (1988-1994). *Arch Intern Med*. 2002;162(12):1401.

5. Hsu CY, McCulloch CE, Curhan GC. Epidemiology of anemia associated with chronic renal insufficiency among adults in the United States: results from the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2002;13(2):504–510.

6. Corsi DJ, Neuman M, Finlay JE, Subramanian SV. Demographic and health surveys: a profile. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2012;41(6):1602–1613.

7. United States Agency for International Development. *DHS Survey Types*. The Demographic and Health Surveys Program; 2021. Accessed August 16. 2021. https://dhsprogram.com/methodology/survey-Types/DHS.cfm

8. Boyle EH, King M, Sobek M. *IPUMS Demographic and Health Surveys. Version 8*. IPUMS DHS; 2020. Accessed August 16, 2021. https://doi.org/10.18128/D080.V8

9. United States Agency for International Development. Guide to DHS Statistics DHS-7. The Demographic and Health Surveys Program; 2021. Accessed August 16, 2021. https://dhsprogram.com/data/Guide-to-DHS-Statistics/Anemia_Status.htm

10. Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. *WKCURRJOBMN (MV717)*. IPUMS DHS; 2021. Accessed August 16, 2021. https://www.idhsdata.org/idhs-action/variables/WKCURRJOBMN#description_section

11. Hansen BB. Full matching in an observational study of coaching for the SAT. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 2004;99(467):609–618.

12. Hansen BB, Klopfer SO. Optimal full matching and related designs via network flows. *J Comput Graph Stat*. 2006;15(3):609–627.

13. Hansen BB, Fredrickson M, Fredrickson MM, Rcpp L, Rcpp I. *Package 'optmatch'*; 2021. Accessed August 16, 2021. https://cran. r-project.org/web/packages/optmatch/optmatch.pdf.

14. Rosenbaum PR. A characterization of optimal designs for observational studies. *J R Stat Soc*. 1991;53(3):597–610.

15. Rosenbaum PR. Design of observational studies. 2nd ed. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature; 2020.

16. Silber JH, Rosenbaum PR, McHugh MD, Ludwig JM, Smith HL, Niknam BA, et al. Comparison of the value of nursing work environments in hospitals across different levels of patient risk. *JAMA Surg*. 2016;151(6):527.

17. Campbell DT. Reforms as experiments. Am Psychol. 1969;24(4):409–429.

18. Rosenbaum PR. Sensitivity analysis for m-estimates, tests, and confidence intervals in matched observational studies. *Biometrics*. 2007;63(2):456–464.

19. Rosenbaum PR. *Package 'sensitivityfull'*; 2017. Accessed August 16, 2021. https://cran. r-project.org/web/packages/ sensitivityfull / sensitivityfull.pdf

20. Storey JD. The positive false discovery rate: a Bayesian interpretation and the q-value. *Ann Stat*. 2003;31(6):2013–2035.

21. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc*. 1995;57(1):289–300.

22. Rosenbaum PR. Testing hypotheses in order. *Biometrika*. 2008;95(1):248-252.

23. Caplin B, Yang C-W, Anand S, Levin A, Madero M, Saran R, et al. The International Society of Nephrology's International Consortium of Collaborators on Chronic Kidney Disease of Unknown Etiology: report of the working group on approaches to population-level detection strategies and recommendations for a minimum dataset. *Kidney Int*. 2019;95(1):4–10.

24. Jayasumana C, Gunatilake S, Senanayake P. Glyphosate, hard water and nephrotoxic metals: are they the culprits behind the epidemic of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Sri Lanka? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014;11(2):2125–2147.

25. Jayasumana C, Paranagama PA, Amarasinghe MD, Wijewardane KM, Dahanayake KS, Fonseka SI, et al. Possible link of chronic arsenic toxicity with chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Sri Lanka.

26. Weaver VM, Fadrowski JJ, Jaar BG. Global dimensions of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology (CKDu): a modern era environmental and/or occupational nephropathy? *BMC Nephrol*. 2015;16(1):145.

27. Lebov JF, Engel LS, Richardson D, Hogan SL, Hoppin JA, Sandler DP. Pesticide use and risk of end-stage renal disease among licensed pesticide applicators in the Agricultural Health Study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2016;73(1):3–12.

28. Anand S, Staniec A, Montez-Rath M, Vlahos P. Using GIS mapping to track hot spots of kidney disease in California. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(23):2265–2267.